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Abstract

This thesis is an ethnographic study of rights restitution as an arrangement that establishes boundaries, and how those boundaries are translated, challenged, and exceeded. Following the guidelines of International Humanitarian Law and its version contained in the Law of Victims and Land Restitution (1448/2011), the Colombian government established a wide network of professionals in charge of registration and reparation for claimants registered as victims of the armed conflict (7,999,963 people in April 2016). In these procedures of recognition and reparation, technologies like forms and protocols become crucial for the mediation of rights restitution.

As a starting point, I trace the trajectories of technologies of recognition and reparation across assistance centres, governmental offices and sessions of psychosocial assistance. I am interested in functionaries and applicants’ experiences of forms and protocols, the procedures of recognition and reparation, and the circulation of official numbers as narratives of rights restitution. Drawing on Science and Technology Studies, a central concern of this thesis is to ask what technologies of recognition and reparation assemble. I interrogate the translation of experiences of pain and mobility into numbers and the circulation of those numbers by state representatives. I also explore some of the material forms of organisation developed by registered and unregistered interlocutors, as arrangements beyond the boundaries of state interventions. I describe how some of those alternative orders translate state interventions and enact spaces of material justice.

Instead of reproducing the notion of reparation as a cornerstone of rights restitution in transitional justice societies, I suggest that a different sort of Reparation might occur beyond the boundaries of post-conflict statehood and within its intersections with alternative arrangements.
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Prelude

Depicting rights

It is August 2014 and negotiations between the Colombian government and the Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia (FARC) are taking place in Havana. Besides land distribution and the possibility of a new political party for FARC members, the situation of Human Rights in Colombia comprises a recurrent topic in the peace dialogues. In spite of the existence of an official record of people registered as Victims by the state, representatives of the guerrillas claim that the record must be extended to include their members, so a new census must be implemented by a different agency. A strong tension is scrutinized by the media regarding the selection of people already granted the status of Victims who should participate in the negotiations in Cuba. Additionally, the tensions in Havana are nuanced by recent confrontations between government agencies and private organizations like Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch regarding the mechanisms of reparation and the effectiveness of the implementation of the recent Law of Victims. Frequent narratives mobilizing Human Rights, recognition, reparation, psychosocial assistance, and compensation, among other claims appear all over the national media.

At this same time, I am visiting Buenos Aires to attend the annual meeting of the Society for Social Studies of Science (4S) to share and discuss some of my reflections and field notes contained in the document you are about to read. After the conference, and perhaps as a consequence of my recent fieldwork in Colombia, I find myself visiting the Parque de la Memoria, a public space for the commemoration of the victims of the Argentinian dictatorship in the 1970s. During my walk, a particular object attracts my attention. It is a conceptual sculpture entitled A los Derechos Humanos (To Human Rights). Here, uncountable pieces of metal intersecting, shaping, and sometimes moving each other to the rhythm of the wind become an insightful space for an amateur observer. While looking at the metallic object aesthetically performing what the artist meant by Human Rights, I wonder about the objects used in different spaces to perform those same rights, their assemblage, materiality, continuities, discontinuities, as well as the ways they intersect and the resulting mediations of the experiences of the people in contact with them.
Right at that moment, I gather my memories of Colombia over the last two years, all those forms and protocols that enact rights for people affected by collective violence at assistance centres. I recall the queues, offices, protests and other spaces where rights restitution is discussed, defined, denied, defended, objectivized, questioned, mobilized, and naturalized. I evoke my participation in the sessions of the protocols of psychosocial assistance for people affected by violence throughout the territory, and the several attempts to reconstruct the “social tissue” by the psychosocial professionals. Just like the dispositions of every piece of the sculpture, it becomes clear that the intersections of those devices traced in the fieldwork materialize rights for all the different actors - the functionaries, the recognized and the rejected applicants, and the Colombian State - while configuring a social imaginary of the situation of the
Victims of the Colombian armed conflict. Despite the substantial difference between the pieces of the sculpture and the protocols and forms, both have been expertly fabricated to allow them to assemble things that were not necessarily foreseen in their original design. Both arrangements display a notion of rights for an audience and consist of organised patterns that emerge from particular materials. The metaphoric resemblance between the metal of the sculpture and the objects I have traced during the last few years becomes increasingly clear.

Similar to my observation of the metallic pieces of the sculpture by Ferrari, this dissertation tracks the technical devices and trajectories that materialize rights restitution in Colombia. I wonder what rights restitution is made of, its materials, its assemblage and trajectories, but mainly how it pierces and organises the lives of actors. I am particularly interested in state interventions using technologies of recognition and reparation, the social orders assembled by those technologies, and the experiences of actors using and translating them. For documenting recognition and reparation, I walked with a first group of actors, usually known as forced migrants, while they were applying for registration, filling forms, engaging in endless administrative procedures, and participating in psychosocial assistance sessions. Moreover, I accompanied a second group of actors, known as functionaries or state representatives, during the applications, the assessment of forms for registration, the implementation of psychosocial protocols, and the production and circulation of official reports. I also had the privilege of visiting leaders and communities living in cities and rural areas to learn from their experiences outside the borders of official recognition, some of their cooperative strategies, their ongoing efforts to slowly recover justice in their daily lives, and their continuous efforts to challenge state interventions.

Registration is reframed here as an arrangement between humans (functionaries, applicants) and objects (forms, databases) that translates embodied experiences of pain into official numbers, establishes boundaries of official recognition and citizenship, and legitimizes the status of Victims as a particular notion of recognizable subjects of perpetrated; registration is revisited as a sociotechnical border. Meanwhile, the state’s logic of reparation as a modern project of intervention and organisation of migrating populations is described, along with its potential translations into ungoverned and revivifying spaces; or repairing betrayals carried out by its participants. Although I
explore how sociotechnical borders, official numbers of registration, and reparation indicators promote ongoing state projects, I am also interested in how people neglected by those same numbers and borders cooperatively organise to challenge the boundaries of legitimate statehood. Instead of reproducing the legal notions of reparation, this dissertation explores how a different kind of Reparation (with a capital R) can occur outside the boundaries of statehood or within its intersections with alternative arrangements; this is what I address as Reparation beyond statehood.

As my picture of Ferrari’s sculpture shows, an important feature of the upcoming pages is continuously present in my own research practice: my shadow. The historian of photography, Clement Chéroux, has described this situation in the following remarkable way:

[…] the same reasons that led the photographer to ignore the shadow in the image, led him to reconsider it again, not as an undesired sign that betrays the objectivity of the production process, but as a sign of an assumed responsibility by which the author asserts himself […] (Chéroux 2003: 11 translated from the French)

My shadow in this dissertation will be continuously and reflectively materialized by the tone of my words, the selected metaphors, and the presentation of different voices. The upcoming chapters present an assemblage of collected information, reconstructed accounts, narratives of my interlocutors, and also my embodied experiences, reflections, impressions, and feelings on how rights restitution is being enacted in Colombia. I have transformed my shadow in the picture into the words you are reading to share a life-changing experience as a Colombian, a migrant, a researcher, and a human being willing to keep on learning from the invaluable experiences of people challenging and transforming statehood, within and outside the borders of official recognition. As a picture, this reconstruction is limited by time, space, and the devices used to portray my interests. However, it is my hope that the reflections and considerations constructed through the different encounters and pursued trajectories can actually offer insights for further depictions of how human rights are assembled and how reparation might occur beyond the boundaries of a post-conflict statehood and its sociotechnical borders which I now start tracing.
CHAPTER 1 TRACING
The Law of Victims

The song sounds familiar. I doubtless heard it before. Its lyrics are fervently performed by its interpreters.

I had a ranch as pretty as the sunrise; its splendour was a morning gift for me, it was God’s little gift lost in grassland with flowers. And with my partner, inseparable lover, we knew the secret of happiness. But the fatal destiny came over my ranch, and all my happiness was ruined.

Their version of Gianitti’s *El Camino del Dolor* – the Path of Pain – is carefully attended to by most of the passengers in the bus. After the song finished, the younger member of the duo salutes the audience and steps on every seat to collect coins and food. This is not the first time they had done this as I can deduct from the ways they manage to resist the inertia of the movements of the bus while successfully playing the guitar and singing. I am returning from Altos de Cazucá, a slum in a town called Soacha located in the South West of Bogotá where people moving into the city usually settle after escaping from the ongoing situation of violence in the rural areas of the country. I will later learn that the performers in the bus also live there. When the duo is getting down from the bus, I decide to join them and initiate a conversation. This impulsive and intuitive act, I am pleased to say, results in a revealing encounter with Luis and his son who generously share their story after I explain my interest in their performance and experiences.

I notice that Luis has a visual impairment and actually plays the guitar by heart. He is most of the time walking guided by his son and describes his impairment as “nothing worthy of stopping trying to earn some money to survive in the city”. Luis does not want his audience to become aware of his visual impairment, so he is extremely careful and effective when he moves inside buses. “I don’t want to earn this money because of their pity for me” he explains. When asked about their lives before coming to the city, Luis seems to be quoting the lyrics of the song they played before in the bus. They lived in their own farm until 2008 when an armed group occupied the region, assaulted and assassinated his wife and daughter before expelling them from their land. “Even if

---

1 Yo tuve una casa tan linda como el alba, que todas las mañanas me daba su esplendor, perdido en la llanura de flores que aromaban, rinconcito de vida que Dios me regaló, Y con mi compañera, amada inseparable, supimos el secreto de la felicidad, pero el fatal destino, se echó sobre mi rancho y a toda mi alegría la convirtió en ruindad.
it was safer to go back, I would not do it” are the words he uses to describe their own Camino del Dolor. Luis tells me how he moved among different towns trying to find a job and a place to stay. He also explains how they have unsuccessfully applied for official registration as Victims² of the armed conflict at least three times since their arrival in the city in 2009. An inconsistency in the information he provided, the requirement for more information and, most recently, a record indicating they were already affiliated to the health system, are the reasons for rejection he can immediately state. Luis refuses to apply again since he does not want to become a “beggar” but make his own way. Meanwhile, Luis’ son is about to finish high school at a public institution. Although he likes music and learned to play the guitar from his father, he would like to study sound engineering. They both claim to be earning enough money to survive in the city through their performances on the buses.

Figure 2 Luis and his son in Bogotá (author’s photograph)

² I will henceforth use the word with capital V exclusively to address the notion of perpetration recognized by the Colombian State on applicants who are successfully registered in the RUV.
Luis and his son have been advised by several friends, mostly experts in matters of administrative procedures, to use a legal resource to appeal their rejection from the Registro Único de Víctimas\(^3\) (henceforth RUV). Through their friends, mainly people living in Altos, they found out that official communications take a long time so they have been exploring other options. Nevertheless, there are not many jobs Luis can take given his visual impairment. Luis and his son had gone through unthinkable experiences before arriving in Bogotá and they had to leave behind their homes, jobs, friends, relatives and everything they knew. Although their life is not reduced to pain, its presence becomes an inevitable part of their daily life experiences. My encounter with Luis and his son is shocking because of their experience of pain, but it also provokes different reflections. People in similar situations arriving in the cities share common challenges: engaging in administrative procedures to be granted with rights restitution by the government, and rummaging through their own skills to fit the forms of employment available for them in the city. Luis’ story makes me wonder what exactly is granted as “rights restitution” and what it takes to be given the status of Victim which seems to be bestowed only after the successful completion of administrative procedures validated by state representatives. It also provokes questions about the grounds of those application procedures so important for people in these situations.

The local situations of violence affecting people like Luis and his son are not recent in the national landscape. I do not attempt to offer a reductionist and simplistic summary of the complexities, longevity, and political entanglements of the historiography of violence in Colombia. Instead, I present a partial chronology that offers an important background for the purposes of this dissertation. A few years before the formation of guerrillas and the upsurge of violence around drug trafficking, other episodes were part of the history of violence in Colombia. The events surrounding the assassination of the liberal candidate Jorge Eliécer Gaitán on April 9, 1946, an event widely known as El Bogotazo\(^4\), escalated the already existing violence since 1930 triggered by the fall of the Conservative Party and the rise of Liberal representatives (see Jaramillo-Marín 2014, see also Palacios 2003). After the assassination of Gaitán, the elections of 1946 resulted in the recovery of the presidency by the Conservatives. El Bogotazo also

---

3 Single Record of Victims
preceded a period of politically motivated violence widely known as La Violencia5 which atrocities affected different rural sectors of the national terrain, instigated the formation of armed groups of peasants, and lasted approximately until 1955 (Campos et al. 2005, Bailey 1967).

In the mid-1950s, the dictatorship of Gustavo Rojas Pinilla supressed some of the insurgent groups while also declaring communist parties illegal. The dictatorship ended with the foundation in 1958 of the National Front as a coalition of distribution of power between representatives of Liberal and Conservative parties exclusively. The previous decades of violence in the rural areas and the prohibition of communist parties resulted in the foundation of peasant armed movements and important tensions around land distribution and agrarian reforms (Molano 2015). Such struggles and the revolutionary initiatives in Cuba and other countries in Latin America would later nurture the grounds of guerrilla movements like Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia (FARC), the Ejército de Liberación Nacional (ELN), and the Ejército Popular de Liberación (EPL) during the 1960s as well as the Movement of April 19 (M-19) in 1970.

For almost two decades, armed confrontations between guerrillas and the state persisted grounded in their differences regarding agrarian reform (GMH 2013). Consequently, the number of guerrilla militants expanded throughout the country along with the number of armed confrontations affecting rural regions. After the fall of the Medellin and Cali drug cartels in the 1990s, the production and transportation of cocaine became one of the predominant economic activities of guerrillas increasing their presence and the installations of rural laboratories (Brittain and Petras 2010, see also Peceny and Durman 2006). During the same period, also known as the era of neoliberal reforms led by former President Gaviria, paramilitary groups partially tolerated by sectors of civilian politicians (Avilés 2006, Hernández and Martínez 2010) started to engage in armed confrontations with guerrillas (Hristov 2010) struggling for the control of drug trafficking and territory. Between 1996 and 2002, violence reached one of its most critical points given the military strength of FARC and ELN, the formalisation of paramilitary forces into Autodefensas Unidas de Colombia (henceforth AUC), the economic crisis, and the expansion of drug trafficking (GMH
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During the inauguration of the Policy of Democratic Security by former President Alvaro Uribe, the presence of the FARC was partially diminished while partial military control of the national space was regained from 2002 to 2010. This policy sought the destruction of the guerrillas following their re-labelling as terrorist groups, while it also increased the frequency of armed confrontations, rural displacements, and Colombian State crimes (CODHES 2011, Romero 2006). Despite the peace negotiations during the last few years there have still been armed confrontations between the Army, guerrillas, paramilitary groups, and new urban groups consisting of demobilized guerrilla and paramilitary militants (BACRIM), among other emerging armed groups.

Although violence in Colombia has not necessarily been homogenous and constant (GMH 2013: 33) the attempts to determine its historical inflexions and repertoires are very diverse. As part of those repertoires, armed actors attack civil populations to accumulate strengths, maintain their loyalties, and to gain political and economic support (see Lair 2003, see also Waldmann 1999). Despite the length, complexity and variety of accounts of violence in Colombia, there is an important consensus about the huge detriment to rural areas as a consequence of historical violence. During the 90 years or so since the beginning of La Violencia, the confrontations between different armed groups have importantly affected the lives of people living in rural areas like Luis’ home. The specialized repertoires of those affectations seem to be partially differentiable with reference to the perpetrator. From the basis of extensive interviews and document analyses, the Group of Historic Memory (GMH 2013) in Colombia has recently established that paramilitaries seem to structure and implement a repertoire predominantly consisting of selective assassinations, massacres, forced disappearances, torture, threats, economic blockade and sexual aggression. Similarly, the guerrillas’ repertoire is apparently comprised of kidnappings, selective assassinations, attacks on public infrastructures, and illegal recruitment. The repertoire of the Army and the police force includes arbitrary detentions, torture, selective assassinations, and collateral damage after bombings and other armed interventions (GMH 2013: 35). The distinctions between unthinkable practices of violence brought to perfection by different armed groups give us a topographic idea of the atrocities mainly occurring in the rural sectors of Colombia during the last several decades.
The diverse forms of violence by a variety of actors have produced a historical dynamic of displacement. The official number of Internally Displaced People in Colombia is currently 6,766,422 (UARIV 2016: April 1). Despite the absence of intra-urban displacement and the nonexistence of official numbers before 1996, Figure 3 partially represents the origin of people displacing into the cities throughout the country (GMH 2013: 75). The information above is particularly relevant for at least two reasons. Firstly, almost 14% of the current population of Colombia has been violently displaced in the last couple of decades. This makes forced displacement and other
consequences of violence important aspects of the daily life of people like Luis migrating into the cities as well as a crucial feature of the economic and political atmosphere of the country. Secondly, and perhaps in a more relevant way for the purpose of the present study, the experiences of pain, torture, suffering and loss embodied by people living in the crossfires of violently occupied regions, are also experiences of mobility. Experiences of pain and mobility are brilliantly portrayed by Luis and his son in their version of *El Camino del Dolor* in which dispossession, loss, and uncertainty become constants. One might initially wonder how the state organises those experiences of pain and mobility embodied by a significant proportion of its inhabitants. Although, as I mentioned before, this research is not about the genealogy, historiography, and topography of violence in Colombia, this thesis interrogates how state interventions deal with the historical, individual and social consequences of violence by offering rights restitution. The most recent legal foundations of those organising and restitution attempts of the Colombian State are stipulated in the guidelines offered by the document of the Law of Victims and Land Restitution.

As Michael Lynch (2009) notes in his reflections about the relation between ethnotmethodologies and history, “documents as well as stories have a crucial place in histories; documents are collated, checked against one another, and used to confirm or question stories” (p.88). Following this reflection, I will initially recreate the configuration of the Law of Victims (henceforth LV) in the Colombian legal system by examining some of the relevant documents and accounts regarding the promulgation of the LV. Lynch argues that the analysis of documents and stories has importance for a “history of the present” inasmuch as it describes “how present-day political actors (and others) lay down historical tracks (or attempt to cover such tracks) in a prospective-retrospective fashion” (p.99). I hope to introduce my readers into the configuration of the LV, in order to subsequently share my story about the technical objects deployed after the promulgation of the LV and the orders they produce.
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7 Ley de Víctimas y Restitución de Tierras, or Law 1448/2011 in Colombia.'República de Colombia (2011) Ley de Víctimas y Restitución de Tierra, 1448/2011’, I use the most common way of addressing the regulation: Law of Victims (LV)

8 Lynch (2009) builds on the Foucauldian term to argue that ethnomethodology precisely encourages an orientation to the practical and interactional production, reading, and establishment of documentary details which might be of thematic and practical interest to historians.
This first chapter is about how the stories of the pain and the forced movement of people like Luis have recently become a wider matter of public and technical interest in Colombia. It particularly addresses the legal production of rights restitution and the negotiations around the parameters of recognition and reparation that resulted in the promulgation of the LV in 2011. After briefly depicting the LV as an ongoing project, I explore how it defines the technical procedures of registration and reparation currently implemented in the country. I claim that technologies of recognition and reparation derived from the LV comprise a relevant, plausible, and controversial area of inquiry for interdisciplinary approaches concerned with the hybrid materiality of rights restitution.

**Tracing the law projects**

*I. The rejection*

It was 2007 and Graciela, was assaulted by paramilitary groups in the farm where she lived. Her husband had been assassinated three years before by an unidentified group. She and her children started the journey to Bogotá at some point after 2007 after the last assault. Our frequent and fortunate encounters with Graciela in the queues ended up in several informal conversations. During our encounters, her own Camino del Dolor, her expectancies towards the compensations given by the Colombian State, and her strategies to cope with the administrative procedures became evident to me. Besides introducing me into the world of application for recognition and reparation, Graciela’s invaluable story endowed me with a timeline of events exceeding the temporality of regulations, the Congress and many other instances of the state. By the same year Luis had been working on his farm for decades by the time he and his family were threatened by the guerrilla. The same night after the public execution of his daughters and wife in the town main square, he and his son escaped to Altos de Cazucá, near Bogotá, where some relatives took them in.

Almost at the same time that Luis and Graciela were being assaulted at the end of 2007, the preliminary law project 157/2007 was presented in the Colombian Senate. The project proposed “a statute of victims of crimes and violent acts within the armed
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9 Law project 157/2007 in which a statute of victims of crimes and violent acts within the armed conflict is proposed"
conflict”. In his outstanding and exhaustive reconstruction of the establishment of a legal framework for reparation of Victims in Colombia during the first decade of the century, Gabriel Gómez (2013) argues that this law project was importantly influenced by the discussions carried out by social movements of people claiming the status of Victims, NGOs, and legal experts. Recognised social movements like the Movimiento de Víctimas de Crímenes de Estado (MOVICE), the Mesa Nacional de Víctimas de Organizaciones Sociales (MNV), together with an emergent working group on the new LV project were summoned by the NGO, Fundación Social to participate in the discussions of 2007 (Gómez 2013).

The above encounters configured an important network of existing organisations that were crucial in the formulation of the law project. After a series of collective mobilizations starting in the 1990s, the MOVICE was formally founded in 2005 and is currently one of the most established social movements organised in 19 branches along the country. The MNV includes a variety of social organisations that, after intense and controversial negotiations, ended up gathering around their critiques of the Policy of Democratic Security and the Ley de Justicia y Paz. Meanwhile, different human rights organisations like the Comisión Colombiana de Juristas, the Centro de Estudios en Derechos, Justicia y Sociedad and the Corporación Nuevo Arco Iris were summoned by the NGO Fundación Social to lead discussion spaces that would produce inputs for the members of the Senate promoting the law project (Gómez 2013: 141). The results of the discussions were published, circulated and provided to members of the Congress leading the initiatives of the law project (Gómez 2013:143). While the MOVICE and the MNV were mainly interested in social mobilization (p.143) and the “voices of Victims”, the workgroup was emphatically pursuing the consolidation of legal arguments based on the international notions of human rights and comparative law.

The results of the discussions between the workgroup, the MOVICE and the MNV were circulated mainly by the coordinator of the human rights program of Fundación Social, Paula Gaviria, and used by one of the promotors of the law project in the

\[10] The Ley de Justicia y Paz 97/2005 was a previous regulation addressing the demobilization of paramilitary groups and the compensations for those affected by their perpetrations.

\[11] Current Director of the UARIV
Congress, Senator Juan Fernando Cristo. For Gómez (2013), the network comprised of the MOVICE, the MNV, and the working group supported and promoted the “discussion and improvement” of the initial law project in the Senate in which debates started without important setbacks (p.143). The absence of setbacks was partially due to the discrediting of the Congress at that time due to several investigations of its members’ links with paramilitaries (De León-Beltrán and Salcedo-Albarán 2008), the “generality” of the first law project that did not represent any risk for the government (Gómez, 2013: 144), and the international support crystallised in the sponsorship of the meetings and discussions by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) partially negotiated by Gaviria and Cristo.

Cristo explains part of the strategy for presenting the first project and reducing the possibility of detractors:

The first big debate was over the title of the law because the government refused to incorporate the concept of armed conflict. People from the UN persuaded us about the irrelevance of the topic especially for the victims because it was more a political debate. They reminded us that even for their application for the extension of their office in Colombia, the government had insisted on removing the term armed conflict and they accepted. With a certain sarcasm, the employees of the [UN] office privately expressed the view that “(…) they are the only ones who believe there is no [armed] conflict, but it is not worthy of discussion”. Finally a very general and ambiguous title was agreed: “Assistance and Reparation for Victims of Violence”, not before embracing a difficult argument because the government wanted it to be addressed exclusively to the “victims of terrorism” (Cristo 2012: 59. Original quotation marks, emphasis added)

The first project received wide and public support by the media, social movements and international organisations (Gómez, 2014). While the promoters of the project favoured a notion of reparation addressing “victims of the armed conflict” grounded in international standards of law, the government of former President Uribe defended a different notion targeting the “victims of terrorism” (Sánchez 2009, Gaviria and Gil 2010). Together with the acknowledgement of an “armed conflict”, an important tension would arise regarding the universe of recognised Victims and the responsibility of the Colombian State as a perpetrator (Cristo 2012). The UNDP guidelines of reparation and rights restitution dictate that any policy of reparation
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12 Current Minister of Interior
should guarantee the absence of discrimination of perpetrations with respect to the actors involved. However, some of the resistances exerted by members of the government invoked the necessity of legal rulings determining the responsibility of state representatives to enable compensations to proceed. Distinct from perpetrations by guerrillas and paramilitary forces, the claims against members of the state armed forces would have to follow a different procedure for recognition and compensation. Cristo explains this resistance in the following way:

The argument behind that thesis was that the law could not equate homeland soldiers with guerrilla and paramilitary bosses and the reality is that nobody was equating them: it was the victims who were put in the same conditions, but this is something entirely different. There was an abysmal difference in the way of approaching the Colombian conflict. The government saw it through the different actors of war, the legal and the illegal ones. Meanwhile, the law project precisely intended to radically change this vision, to see the conflict only with the lens of the victims who suffered it. Nobody sought to equate soldiers with terrorists: we just wanted to equate their victims. This debate would later terminate with the [law] project and would be present continuously in the discussions of its second version in September 2010. (Cristo 2012: 61)

In the previous quotes, Cristo presents a claimed interest of promoting a notion of “armed conflict” through the law project and displacing a narrative of “terrorism”. However, when referring to the comparisons between soldiers and militants of other armed groups, he still addresses the latter as “terrorists”. This is perhaps due to the ongoing transition of narratives especially in the Congress in which Cristo was a Senator. In spite of the initial resistance to the narrative of “armed conflict” and the expansion of the universe of Victims, the law project achieved a second set of sessions in June 2008. By then, Luis and Graciela were already in Bogotá. Luis was living in Altos de Cazucá and started to become aware of a vision problem. His eye cataracts required surgery but he was not covered by any health service and could not afford a private consultation. His application for registration in the Registro Único de Población Desplazada (RUPD), a preliminary version of the current RUV, was unsuccessful. Meanwhile, Graciela was working in domestic services for different families in Bogotá. Her children spend most of the day in a nursery in a marginal neighbourhood of the city until 6 pm when she managed to get back from her workplace. Graciela has also applied for registration in the RUPD and is waiting for
an official communication. Graciela and Luis have never met nor participated in a social movement of human rights or victims. However, their Camino del Dolor, as well as the situations of thousands of people like them, was becoming an object of wider legal and political interest in the Senate, the House of Representatives, and later the Colombian Congress.

During the sessions at the Senate, representatives from the UNDP, the High Commissioner of Human Rights, the Secretary of the Episcopal Conference, and the Director of the Office of Transitional Justice, among others, spoke in favour of the law project. Nonetheless, the project faced the resistance of the Ministry of Finance, the Ministry of Interior, and the Ministry of Justice who continuously claimed that the project was unsustainable (Cristo 2012: 62). In spite of the resistances, the law project succeeded in the second sessions. However, its approval on June 18/2008 coincided with the resignation of the Minister of Finance two days later (El Tiempo, 20/06/2008), and the appointment of Fabio Valencia Cossio who would later become an important critic of the project.

The law project reached the agenda of the House of Representatives in June 2009 and it faced more explicit tensions and resistances in this new arena. The Representative Guillermo Rivera presented arguments favouring the approval of the project, meanwhile the new Minister of Finance insisted on the lack of financial viability of the initiative. Cristo (2012) claims that “[…] Valencia started an official steamroller and in just two sessions […] they completely defeated poor Rivera who was only lying dead in the field” (p.67) Most of the modifications resulted in a document that apparently differed from the initial law project with regard to its main claims: compensations, recognition of Victims, and the acknowledgement of an armed conflict. However, when the voting moment came on November 18/ 2008, a document by the Ministry of Finance indicating that the implementation of the initiative would require at least 80 billion pesos (£16bn approx.) was widely circulated in the House and the Congress. According to Cristo (2012), the purpose of the financial warning was to “induce financial terror” (p. 71). After the unfavourable voting against the passage of the law project in the Congress, the Presidency issued an official communication stating
The National Government, in a meeting with the President and some of the presenters of the Project of Law of Victims has requested that the Act is not approved because a cost higher than 80 billion [of Colombian pesos] would create an irrepairable trauma to the State’s finances. It would make impossible the reparation for the victims [...]. Moreover the text, that the Government emphatically insists on rejecting, represents a serious threat to the Policy of Democratic Security since it equates terrorists and agents in the service of the State [...] the Government will initiate in the following weeks the first payments of almost 200 thousand millions of pesos [...] for almost 10000 victims. (Communication by the Colombian Presidency. 18/06/2009, emphasis added)

The rejection of the law project by the Government of President Uribe in June 2009 was grounded in financial arguments but more importantly, in the resistance towards a notion of “armed conflict” that inherently challenged the acknowledgement of responsibilities by members of the public armed forces as state representatives (Céspedes-Báez 2012) Nonetheless, the account offered by the Presidency in the official communication was also about the impossibility of its offering a proper “reparation for the victims” because of the “irrepairable trauma” to the financial balances of the Colombian State. The proposal to “repair the victims” is presented as a direct cause of making the state “irrepairable”. Such mutual logical exclusion and antagonism presented in the communication of the Presidency legitimatized and stamped the argument against the law project. In spite of the efforts and discussions involving the MOVICE, the MNV, the workgroup of the law project and other organisations, this first rejection represented a significant setback. Besides those efforts, other mobilizations would be necessary to transform the way of addressing violence in the legal narratives and expanding the official notions of Victim, reparation, and the responsibility of the Colombian State.

The passage to the Congress
It has been almost two years since Graciela and Luis arrived in the city. After her registration in the RUPD, Graciela has received some vouchers for groceries and a few stipends for the rent. She still works in domestic services and one of her children has started to attend school. Meanwhile, Luis has not been able to register; apparent inconsistencies in his information are giving him a difficult time. With the money that he has been able to collect singing in buses, he has been able to pay for his son’s school, the rent and the daily expenses. The slow pace of the law project almost matches the
lack of possibilities in Graciela's and Luis' lives. Nevertheless, the recent election of the former Minister of Defense Juan Manuel Santos as the new President in May 2010 promises to improve the prospects of a new law project.

A few months after the presidential inauguration in 2010, a new law project was submitted to the House of Representatives (Wills-Otero and Benito 2012). The law project 107/2010 dictated measures of assistance and integral reparation for the “victims of human rights violations and infractions of International Humanitarian Law”. It proposed a change in the definition of Victims, the absence of deadlines and ranges of dates for the validity of perpetrations, and the absence of maximum amounts for legal reparation (Cristo 2012; Gaceta 17/11/2010) The interest of the recently elected President represented an opportunity for the consolidation of reparation and rights restitution as constitutional matters (Gómez 2014). The sessions of discussion of the new law project started in November 17/2010 and showed at least two groups of interest. On the one hand, representatives of the Liberal Party, Radical Change, Democratic Pole, and the Green Party which supported the initiative. On the other hand, resistances were exerted by the Conservative Party, the U Party, and members of the Party of National Integration who expressed their concerns about the financial impact and the necessity of maximum amounts.

According to Cristo (2012) the resistances were diminished because “[…] they did not have a government indifferent to the victims but instead had President Santos leading the process, which radically changes the equation”. One of the main discussions about the new law project had to do with the starting date from which perpetrations should be considered as subject to reparation. This aspect resulted in even greater controversy when the argument of financial sustainability was defended by the
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13 In Spanish Partido Liberal, Cambio Radical, Polo Democrático y Partido Verde. With the exception of the Green Party, these parties can be allocated to either sectors of the extreme right like Radical Change and the Liberal Party, or leftist initiatives like Democratic Pole. For an extensive analysis of Colombian political parties see Escobar, J. C. E. and Osorno, E. Z. (2015) 'Acerca de los estudios sobre partidos políticos en Colombia', Reflexión Política, 17(34), 36-49.
14 In Spanish Partido Conservador, Partido de la U, and Partido de Integración Nacional. The U Party was initially a variation of the Liberal Party. It was founded by former President Uribe and his followers. Even Santos belonged to this party until his split from it partially due to the promulgation of the LV in 2011. Radical Change also emerged as a variation of the Liberal Party. Meanwhile the PIN, originally named Party of Citizen Option (POC) consisted of former members of M-19. Its disintegration occurred after public investigations for links with paramilitaries. For an extensive study see Alfonso-Martinez, P. A. (2013) 'Análisis de la creación y el comportamiento del Partido de Integración Nacional (PIN) a la luz del marco institucional colombiano'. Available at http://repository.urosario.edu.co/handle/10336/4764
detractors of the project like the Conservative Party, the U Party, and members of the Party of National Integration

In his reconstruction of the tensions around the discussions of the project in the House, Cristo (2012) claims with regard to the starting date for relevant perpetrated:

Passing a Law of Victims that did not recognise the crimes of the FARC in the 1980s, the first massacres by paramilitaries, and the murder of Patriotic Union representatives15, as well as the assassinations of Pardo Leal, Galán, Jaramillo, and Pizarro16 was frankly inconvenient for the State and the Government. Santos was absolutely aware of this and asked about the most convenient date, so we suggested the first of January of 1980 but he thought it was too early […] we suggested the first of January of 1985 since it included all the victims of the UP […] and all the massacres and crimes of the paras17 and the FARC in the second half of the 1980s, perhaps the most violent years in the history of the country (p.110)

It was imperative to choose a date range covering the assassinations of politicians whose family members were now in the Senate and the Congress. Different accounts have claimed that the reasons for choosing 1985 was so that it included the siege of the Palacio de Justicia in 198518, but, at least in the account offered by Cristo, the date of the 1st of January seems entirely arbitrary. Such arbitrariness was subject to tension in the subsequent sessions of discussion that Cristo (2012) narrates in the following way.

[…] the law could not include all the victims with no starting date because it was not financially sustainable. Different dates were shuffled. While liberals and Polo […] suggested the first of January of 1980, the conservatives and the U succeeded in their proposal of the first of January of 1991 (p.90)

15 Most of the members of the Patriotic Union, a left oriented political party, were massacred in the 1980s. See Cepeda, I. (2006) 'Genocidio político: el caso de la Unión Patriótica en Colombia', Revista Cetil, 1(2), 101-112.
16 Sons and relatives of former members of the Patriotic Union, Galán and other assassinated politicians were now members of the Senate and the House of Representatives
17 Paramilitaries
18 The Palace of Justice (Toma del Palacio de Justicia in Spanish) was a 1985 attack against the Supreme Court of Colombia, in which members of the M-19 took over the Palace of Justice in Bogotá as an attempt to hold a trial of President Belisario Betancur. After a military raid, the incident left almost half of the 25 Supreme Court Justices dead, and many other civilians assassinated by the Army as alleged guerrilla members. See Ojeda Palacio, P. (2009) La impunidad en la Justicia Penal Militar: una investigación periodística, unpublished thesis Pontificia Universidad Javeriana. And the report of the Truth Commission in Gómez Gallego, J. A., Herrera Vergara, J. R. and Pinilla Pinilla, N. (2010) 'Informe final: comisión de la verdad sobre los hechos del Palacio de Justicia'.
The initial date defended by the detractors was 1993 who claimed that it “was not the product of the arbitrariness of the presenters” because it was the year in which the Colombian State assumed the existence of an “armed confrontation” and the first law of Public order was promulgated. That law started a “frontal fight against illegal armed groups” and an escalation of violence (Gaceta 30/11/2010) However, the switch to 1991 was claimed as the result of the massive dispossession of land executed by guerrillas and emerging paramilitary movements. The tensions around the date continued to be evident in the different sessions of discussion. In the session of November 30 2010, Senator Hemel Hurtado of the PNI questioned the arbitrariness of the date:

The Party supports this project […] however there are concerns […] what happens with victims going through an event that occurred on the thirty first of December of 1984, with the same circumstances, motives and actors as a victim involved in an event that occurred on the first of January of 1985?, I mean, 4, 5, 6, 8 or 10 hours later? (Gaceta, 30/11/2010)

In spite of expressing the support of his Party for the law project, the arbitrariness itself was a motive for interrogating the law project for the technicalities that it represented. About this, Luis Avellaneda of the Green Party argued:

We consider that this date [01/01/85] is improper although we also consider that any date […] is arbitrary to start counting victimizations in this country. We believe that the whole decade of the 1980s cannot be disregarded by this Congress, for the reparation of victims and land restitution […] during the whole decade we had land dispossession that reached almost 248,342 acres […] I insist we must put, as the unique date for reparation and land restitution, the first of January of 1980 (Gaceta, 30/11/2010)

Similarly, in the above quote there is an acknowledgement of the inevitable arbitrariness of fixing a starting date for counting. However, an additional element appears here in the discussion to establish the date that would define the universe of recognised Victims under the new regulation: the use of official numbers and expert reports. The final vote for acceptance of the project demanded the alteration of the starting date to 1st January/1991. At the same time others complained because both the dates of 1991 and 1985 made “the universe of the concept of victims restrictive, violating the right to equality”. The same statement insisted on the uncertainty of the
financial resources for the reparation of victims. But it also claims that such uncertainty should not prevent the Colombian State from fulfilling its duties in consistency with the guidelines of the International Pact of Human Rights, and the international standards of transitional justice. Even though the tensions around the starting dates would continue in the Congress sessions, the narratives of International Humanitarian Law and transitional justice were now circulating in the law project. The support of President Santos and his dissension from former president Uribe seemed to be the crucial aspects for this success (Gómez, 2014). In spite of the resistances, the project passed with amendments and was scheduled for discussion in the Congress with 26 original articles (Gaceta 30/11/2010). The main amendments addressed the exclusion of former militants of illegal groups as Victims, the starting date to be set on 1st January 1991, and alterations of several articles on land restitution to protect financial sustainability (Cristo 2012: 91)

A notion of rights for people affected by different armed actors was assembled in the law project, almost 80 years after the traceable tracks of political violence in the first half of the 19th century, 60 years after El Bogotazo, 30 years after the escalation of violence around drug trafficking, 20 years after the paramilitary incursions, and 4 years after the perpetrations suffered by Luis and Graciela. The starting date for official recognition might be arbitrary, but the existence of ongoing forms of violence and perpetrations were already there, as a set of events lying outside the world of the House. Let us see how this world of violence was partially contained in the final version of the LV.

**The promulgation of the LV**

The so far successful law project was approved in the House and finally presented in the Congress sessions. The main areas of struggle to overcome in this new arena consisted of the financial sustainability of the law which would define its scope, the legal consequences for members of the Army, and the starting date as a criterion that would shape the universe of recognised Victims. Before the first discussions in the Congress, a representative of the U Party requested an official letter to be sent by the Ministry of Finance to the Congress “quantifying the cost of the project with the guarantee of the Government” (Cristo 2012: 92). The Ministry of Finance rejected this request considering it impossible to “reach an exact number of victims” (Cristo, 2012:
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19 Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives participate in these joint sessions.
The tensions about the funds for reparation were partially eased when the promoters of the law project suggested that illegal armed groups would eventually provide some of those funds.

In spite of the achieved rhetoric of armed conflict, the Minister of Justice and representatives of the Army were concerned about the legal implications of the new law. Before the sessions in the Congress, in a meeting between President Santos, the Army leaders, and the Minister of Justice, it was agreed that “[…] the recognition of a Victim of State crimes in the new regulation did not imply the responsibility of its agents which could only be judicially established” (Cristo 2012: 102) These two points of controversy are still present in the peace negotiations in Havana, in spite of the passage of the law.

The starting date still represented an arena of controversy because the established date of 1991 disregarded public assassinations and other crimes between 1985 and 1990. In the second session of the Congress on May 11 /2011, the paper for discussion quoted the numbers provided by the Proyecto Colombia Nunca Más read:

Without counting guerrilla events, 4423 criminal acts were reported between 1966 and 1979, 16,618 acts between 1981 and 1990, and those acts increased to 20,366 between 1991 and 1998. All of these are imputable to members of the public force and paramilitaries. Hence, as the table shows, an upsurge of violence is evident in Colombia, especially since the second half of the 1980s (Discussion paper of Congress session at Gaceta 11/05/2011)

The table referenced in the above quote was the following:
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20 This consisted of an initiative of historic memory of State crimes and crimes against humanity in Colombia.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Political assassination</th>
<th>Disappearances</th>
<th>Social cleansing</th>
<th>Total of Victims</th>
<th>Dead in combat</th>
<th>Great total</th>
<th>Daily average of Victims</th>
<th>Total homicides</th>
<th>Daily average homicides</th>
<th>% political violence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td>370</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>10,713</td>
<td>29.76</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td>655</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>10,580</td>
<td>29.39</td>
<td>8.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td>703</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>9,721</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>9.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td>664</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>10,694</td>
<td>29.71</td>
<td>8.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td>712</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>10,899</td>
<td>35.83</td>
<td>8.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1,387</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,378</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>15,072</td>
<td>45.83</td>
<td>12.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1,651</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,760</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>2,073</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>17,419</td>
<td>48.39</td>
<td>11.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>2,758</td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,928</td>
<td>1,085</td>
<td>3,013</td>
<td>11.79</td>
<td>21,100</td>
<td>58.61</td>
<td>20.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1,978</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,479</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>3,211</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>23,312</td>
<td>64.76</td>
<td>13.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2,007</td>
<td>217</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,441</td>
<td>1,229</td>
<td>3,720</td>
<td>10.19</td>
<td>24,267</td>
<td>67.41</td>
<td>15.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1,829</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,209</td>
<td>1,364</td>
<td>3,573</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>22,284</td>
<td>78.57</td>
<td>13.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>14,150</td>
<td>1,588</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,033</td>
<td>6,031</td>
<td>23,062</td>
<td>184,661</td>
<td>12.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Table used in the discussion paper of the last sessions at the Congress before the promulgation of the LV. The table does not only address crimes of the public force, which would inevitably strengthen the argument in favour of the recognition of perpetrations by soldiers of the Colombian State, but also suggests the mid-1980s as an escalating point of violence in the country. Hence, it would be more difficult for the detractors of the law project to reject the idea that there were significant crimes, state crimes, before the 1 of January/1991 to be acknowledged in the scope of the new law. The conventions of numbers, previously introduced to address acres of land and financial sustainability, were now used to make violence a more graspable object. This kind of numerical and conventional production of rights in the law project resembles what Martha Mundy and Alain Pottage (2004) suggest in their analysis of the “fabrication” of people and things in the law. Mundy and Pottage suggest that even though one might expect that claimants “invoked some prior act or event” as a basis for their claims, claimants “ground the ‘substance’ of the claim” within the convention itself, instead of the world of facts lying outside the law (p.15). In the case of the law project, the claim of violence was simply not enough. It was perhaps necessary to ground the claim in numeric conventions that seemed to have more weight in the ongoing and past discussions. Mundy and Pottage claim that “Law consist[s] in action because rights - and importantly their relation to the facts which were their warrant - ha[ve] no ‘ontology’ other that which was granted to them by the drama of the trial process”. (p.15)
Even though the passage of the law project is not a trial in itself, its legal foundations, legitimacy, and ruling status makes it equitable with any other legal process. Here, the ontology of the rights of people experiencing violence, even before 1991, was produced in the law through rhetorical negotiations and numerical conventions. Luis and Graciela, and people in similar situations were produced as subjects of rights restitution. Their embodied experiences of pain and mobility became objects of management and intervention. Similarly, the perpetrations before the starting date were configured as a financial excess and objects of symbolic recognition by the state. I wonder what this kind of recognition means for people like Luis and Graciela and whether their existence in the law through the medium of numbers is better than no existence at all in the world of the state.

The tensions around the starting date remained present in the subsequent discussions of the law project. During the session of May 24/2011 Cristo claimed

“[...] who are the victims? Who are excluded? [...] a victim is every person affected from January 1st 1985 according to this law, we reached this consensus, there is debate, and not everybody likes it for different reasons, but that is the agreement: January 1st 1985. Infractions of Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law, and victims are a couple or permanent partner, a same sex partner, a close blood relative, that is where we are, everything around the armed conflict [...] I mean, the law incorporates every victim in every time, it just makes the distinction of the victims before and after the first of January 1985 for the economic reasons that impose a financial cost for the Colombian State, but every victim of the armed conflict in this country will be recognised and dignified by this law (Congress session minute. Gaceta 24/05/2011)

The title of the final version of the law project read: “Law project 107/2010 dictating measures of assistance and integral reparation for victims of the internal armed conflict and other dispositions” (Gaceta 31/05/2011). After a long journey the words “armed conflict” appeared again in the final version of the project, hours before it was finally voted on in the Congress. The inclusion of these words in the final session of discussion in the Congress was not well received by former President Uribe and his followers who claimed that the acknowledgement of an armed conflict “would grant terrorists political status”, “would not exonerate the public force of collateral damage”, and “would give back power to FARC terrorists in Europe” (Cristo 2012, Rettberg and
Quiroga 2016). Despite the dissension between Santos and Uribe as an evident outcome (Wills-Otero and Benito 2012), the Law 1448 (República-de-Colombia 2011) dictating “measures of assistance, aid, and integral reparation for victims of the internal armed conflict” was finally promulgated in June 10/2011 and is considered a significant progress towards reconciliation (Montero-Carvajal 2011).

The LV is claimed to be the first law officially recognizing the existence of an armed conflict in Colombia and creating mechanisms to assist and repair its perpetrations (Rettberg and Quiroga 2016). This was the first time that the Colombian Congress acknowledged the existence of an armed conflict by incorporating the term in a Law. This legal production potentially meant that the outcomes and effects of violence should not only be addressed as the result of terrorism or common criminality. With the promulgation of the LV, Luis and Graciela, as well as all the people whose Caminos del Dolor started after 1985, might have a chance of being considered by the State as Victims of the armed conflict in Colombia. The violence and crimes originated by a variety of perpetrators have not differentiated its targets, but those kinds of differentiations were crucial in the negotiations and the legal technicalities for producing rights restitution in the LV.

The LV: intertextuality and (possible) intersections

In his ethnography of the Conseil d’État, Bruno Latour (2010) asserts that when discussion of laws and regulations come to an end, they do so only to "inaugurate a new phase of intense discussion about the entities which have only recently come into existence". Latour argues that what is actually involved in the resolution of discussions is the “exhaustion” (p.328) of possible routes for different accounts to appeal against each other. Likewise, Latour describes value objects as emerging entities that make their way through the law like the variable authority of the members, the modifications of interest which allow the members to qualify the dynamic of their evolution in real time, and the ongoing process of quality control that is exercised by all members, among other objects (p.140). Emerging entities in the discussions of the law project that resulted in the LV included the notion of armed conflict, a set of recognizable Victims possibly granted with rights restitution, integral reparation including compensations, and the Colombian State as an acknowledged actor of the armed conflict. At different points these value objects made their way through the transit of law and its intersections, or “intertextualities” (Latour 2010:256), with other texts like
the International Humanitarian Law, the Human Rights declaration, other existing regulations, and reports containing numbers about violence and dispossession during the periods in discussion. Hence, the resolution of tensions did not necessarily bring the controversies to an end but “involved the totality” (Latour 2010: 257) by exhausting the channels of appeal.

The production of the LV acknowledged the multiplicity of violent actors and has transformed the legal narratives addressing violence in Colombia. This production has also reconfigured the participation of state representatives in international relations that are redistributing the political and economic reality of the country (Montero-Carvajal 2011, Ramírez 2011). Thereby, the circulation of the LV as a recognised state achievement has reached different arenas where narratives of human rights, peace, and post-conflict become increasingly relevant. Though far from an exhaustive and systematic attempt at discursive categorisation, and with the exclusive purpose of tracing and illustrating some of the mobilizations of the LV in different scenarios, table 2 summarizes a partial chronology of national and international media reports and public documents from 2008 to 2015 available online. The criterion for choosing the reports was the presence of the words “Law of Victims”, “human rights”, and “reparation” involving representatives of the Colombian State. The reports are classified into three categories for a content analysis: Financial Relations (FR) including international investments, free trade agreements, and financial support for reparations, Favouritism (FA): including re-election, and international recognition, and International Participation (IP): like relations of cooperation with other countries, and inclusion or consideration of Colombia in international organisations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Headline/Event</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21/11/2007</td>
<td>Law project 137/2007 was presented in the Colombian Senate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/04/2008</td>
<td>&quot;The leadership of the U.S. Congress forced a vote along party lines that has delayed consideration of the U.S.-Colombia Free Trade Agreement (FTA) indefinitely.&quot;</td>
<td>Roberts, 2008</td>
<td>FR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/7/2008</td>
<td>&quot;Improve Human Rights, Presidential candidate McCain tells Colombians&quot;, to increase the possibilities of a Free Trade Agreement</td>
<td>The NYT</td>
<td>FR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/11/2008</td>
<td>&quot;Colombia's ties with the US could be severely damaged if Congress does not approve a planned free trade deal, the country's vice-president has warned.&quot;</td>
<td>BRC News</td>
<td>FR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/10/2008</td>
<td>Amnesty International criticizes President Uribe for not acknowledging the existence of an armed conflict in Colombia.</td>
<td>El Tiempo</td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/06/2010</td>
<td>Juan Manuel Santos is elected as President supported by President Uribe</td>
<td>El Espectador</td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/05/2010</td>
<td>&quot;EU highlights improvements in the situation of Human Rights in Colombia&quot;</td>
<td>W Radio</td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2010</td>
<td>Second law project 107/2010 passes to the Congress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/06/2011</td>
<td>&quot;Colombia Leader Seeks Wide-Ranging Changes, and Looks Beyond the U.S.&quot; Santos calls himself a traitor to his class to demarcate himself from Uribe, especially for his interest on social policies like the Law of Victims and Land Restitution</td>
<td>The NYT</td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/06/2011</td>
<td>The Law of Victims and Land restitution is promulgated by the Congress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/10/2011</td>
<td>&quot;Obama wins as Congress passes free-trade agreement&quot;</td>
<td>The Washington Post</td>
<td>FR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/04/2012</td>
<td>The Law of Victims starts its 10 year-implementation period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2012</td>
<td>FTA between the EU and Colombia is signed in Brussels</td>
<td>Ministry of Commerce of Colombia</td>
<td>FR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2012</td>
<td>The negotiations between The Colombian government and FARC become public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/05/2013</td>
<td>The first agreement [&quot;FARC-government&quot;] is a significant step after long negotiations: &quot;US is encouraging Colombia's development.&quot;</td>
<td>BBC News</td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2013</td>
<td>The OECD decided to open accession negotiations with Colombia</td>
<td>OECD bulletin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/06/2013</td>
<td>Santos submits request at NATO to become part of the organisation</td>
<td>El Nuevo Siglo</td>
<td>FR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/06/2013</td>
<td>&quot;Colombia: A rediscovered country&quot; &quot;For decades the rugged Andean landscape harboured crime and violence, but today regional pride is emerging in a revived economy.&quot;</td>
<td>The Financial Times</td>
<td>FA/IP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/06/2013</td>
<td>$5700MM of COP (1.5MM GBP approx. ) approved for the Plan of Assistance and Reparation for Victims</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/06/2013</td>
<td>David Cameron manifested his support for peace negotiations: Santos' &quot;[Santos'] will receive a distinction at University of Oxford as a recognition for implementing effective social policies like the Law of Victims&quot;</td>
<td>El Tiempo</td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/06/2013</td>
<td>Santos says that British investors are interested in Colombia due to the social policies that allow families to increase their capability as consumers.&quot; &quot;From London, Santos boosts the Colombian Trade Market&quot;</td>
<td>El Tiempo/ Portafolio</td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/06/2013</td>
<td>&quot;British might nominate Santos for the Nobel Peace Prize&quot;</td>
<td>El Tiempo</td>
<td>IP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/06/2013</td>
<td>&quot;World needs new ways to tackle drugs trade, says Colombian president&quot;</td>
<td>The Telegraph</td>
<td>IP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/06/2013</td>
<td>Peace boosts favourability of Santos in 50%</td>
<td>El Tiempo</td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/06/2013</td>
<td>The OECD officially launched Colombia's accession process</td>
<td>OECD Bulletin</td>
<td>FA/IP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/11/2013</td>
<td>EU willing to offer concrete aids for the Colombian Post conflict</td>
<td>Vanguardia</td>
<td>IP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/11/2013</td>
<td>Santos confirms his candidacy for re-election.</td>
<td>La Silla Vacia</td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/12/2013</td>
<td>The United States and Colombia – Strategic Partners: US Aid announces $65 million more for supporting Colombian efforts in land restitution. The report argues that the US has invested nearly 100 MM USD for assisting Victims and the investigation and prosecution of criminal organizations.</td>
<td>The White House reports</td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/03/2014</td>
<td>The US increases by55MM USD its support to the Law of Victims</td>
<td>UARIV</td>
<td>FR/IP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/03/2014</td>
<td>Santos loses the first round of the presidential elections against Oscar Zuluaga the new candidate affiliated to former president Uribe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/04/2014</td>
<td>&quot;FARC-EP announces an unilateral cease fire because of the second round of presidential elections&quot; This is interpreted as a gesture of support to Santos</td>
<td>BBC News</td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/05/2014</td>
<td>Santos is re-elected defeating Zuluaga (Uribe's sponsored candidate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/06/2014</td>
<td>Santos defeats Zuluaga in the second round of elections after a successful campaign with the slogan &quot;yes for peace, not for war.&quot;</td>
<td>El Tiempo</td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/6/2014</td>
<td>World Bank to support collective reparations in Colombia</td>
<td>UARIV</td>
<td>FR/IP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/12/2014</td>
<td>U.S. urges Colombia to make quick progress to peace</td>
<td>Reuters</td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/12/2014</td>
<td>Colombian Congress approves FTA with South Korea</td>
<td>El País</td>
<td>FR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/04/2015</td>
<td>UARIV claims &quot;The process of Reparation in Colombia is the most complete and successful in the world&quot; during the International Seminar of Transitional Justice and the International Court of Human Rights</td>
<td>UARIV</td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/06/2015</td>
<td>EU waves visa requirement for Colombian tourists</td>
<td>El Tiempo</td>
<td>IP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/06/2015</td>
<td>&quot;You are the person for whom I have prayed the most: Pope to Santos.&quot; The Catholic Church manifests its support for the peace dialogues during a visit to the Vatican</td>
<td>El Espectador</td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/06/2015</td>
<td>The post conflict is here: Santos points out it is a matter of months for the signature</td>
<td>El Espectador</td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/05/2015</td>
<td>Santos and Timochenko, the representative of FARC-EP, shake hands in Cuba. The final agreement is announced for March 2016. The remaining point: The Victims</td>
<td>International Business Time</td>
<td>FA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Summarized chronologies of events mobilizing the LV
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The chronology suggests that LV is intersecting with ongoing governmental projects represented in the categories FA, FR, and IR that take place within the country and international arenas. The mentions of the LV consistently coincide with mentions of economic and political relations with other countries and international associations. In her analysis of the relation between Human Rights and free trade agreements, Emilie Hafner-Burton (2013) explains how powerful countries adopt bilateral and regional free trade agreements that regulate human rights mainly to “solve problems that have little, directly to do with the protection of human rights” (p.4). Thus, the new regulations are increasingly aligned with the interests of policy makers who use human rights to compete for influence over trade policy. Hafner-Burton also claims that the US and Europe make these agreements mainly to “suit their own needs and purposes” (p.6) but also argues that, almost like an unpredicted and unexpected result, these regulations also motivate governments to better protect people and to punish those who break the rules. For the specific case of Colombian regulations on human rights for people in situations of displacement, Roberto Vidal-López (2007) claims that the main purpose of these regulations is not the preservation of people’s rights, but the protection of transnational borders from massive migrations. Thus, humanitarian concerns expressed in international texts are strictly marginal. Similarly, with reference to the case of the negotiations of the LV, (Gómez 2013) asserts that the narrative of human rights was a language that paradoxically “inspired resistance and reproduced forms of oppression” (p.133) insomuch as human rights became the main form of protection against the aggressions of the State while also constituting part of “a colonial project promoting the universality of particular experiences of Western societies” (De Sousa Santos and Rodríguez-Garavito 2005 cited by Gómez 2013)).

The negotiations of the LV in Colombia intersect with other ongoing projects exceeding the chronology in table 1.2. What becomes apparent though is that the intertextuality between the LV and international texts on Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law matches different intersections between the LV and other financial and political projects. These correspondences perhaps cleave to what Hafner-Burton (2013) addresses as the motivation of governments encouraged by developed countries to become part of the global, modern, Western agenda of Human Rights. Thus, the LV as an ongoing project for dealing with the consequences of violence must also produce effective outcomes to be used in its mobilizations in different scenarios. I presented a partial reconstruction of the negotiations around the
LV although tracing the genealogy of the state’s notion of Victim exceeds the purpose of this dissertation. Instead of establishing the historiography of the official notion of Victim in the LV and other derivative regulations, I seek to understand the deployment of this status in administrative and bureaucratic procedures. I particularly wonder about the technical procedures of registration and reparation grounded in the LV and their effects on the experiences of people like Luis and Graciela. During the deployment of those procedures, I am interested in the “unexpected” (Hafner-Burton 2013) and unforeseen potential results of the LV as a local adaptation of the modern discourse of Human Rights. I seek to account for unforeseen results by tracing the trajectories of technologies of recognition and reparation like the official forms and the psychosocial protocols that materialize the state’s notion of Victim. At the same time, these technologies may also legitimate, transform, and deviate from the governmental attempts at control and regulation embedded in Human Rights Policies. Here, I am particularly interested in the translations of those technologies carried out by their users, as part of those unexpected results of the LV in Colombia.

**Tracing forward: interrogating rights restitution**

In this chapter, I described the tensions around the promulgation of the LV and some of the emerging entities resulting from those negotiations. Particular areas of friction were evident between interest groups: the acknowledgement of an armed conflict, the responsibility of the Colombian State as an actor in the conflict, the financial sustainability of the LV, the recognition of Victims, and their reparation, among others. About this kind of ethnomethodological reconstructions of historical controversies, Lynch (2009) claims that:

“The picture we get is not a simple conspiracy of interested actors manipulating the materials of history, because none of 'history's actors' has complete control, and they are often at odds with one another. I wouldn’t want to suggest that history always, or even often, is an intentional production; sometimes it just happens. But there are times when agents caught up in local historicity grasp, and express, the possibility that what they are doing has relevance for what Graham Button once called “big time”. Their efforts to piece together, erase, or put a spin on history themselves make up a rich subject matter for sociological study” (p.99)

In line with the above quote, we could appreciate how different actors struggled for the control over the discourse used in the LV to address violence in Colombia.
Between the lines of some of the actors involved in this decision, especially Cristo (2012), it is not difficult to extract their claims of their activities and decisions as crucial for the promulgation of the LV as “big time”. Likewise in the minutes of the Congress, the attempts of different actors to “piece together” and “erase” each other’s accounts were evident. I also depicted how numbers played a role at “involving the totality” of the discussions around the starting date for recognition of Victims. In a parallel way, I addressed the stories of Luis, Graciela and their families in an attempt to partially portray what the temporality of the negotiations of the law represents for people embodying experiences of pain and mobility migrating into the cities. Even though the LV seemed to stabilize different controversial points like recognition of Victims and their reparation, these points still represent plausible areas of further interrogation.

The richness and entanglements of the controversies around the promulgation of the LV fall beyond the scope of the present thesis. Nevertheless, my purpose in recreating this controversy was to trace backwards how recognition and reparation became topics of wider interest at least in the legal and political arenas. But more importantly, I portrayed the promulgation of the LV as a starting point to understand the subsequent deployment of technologies of recognition and reparation which constitute plausible areas of inquiry. For this dissertation, the ways those technologies assemble an official notion of Victims, their recognition, and the restitution of their rights represent relevant fields of study. Hence, I have described some aspects of the configuration of the grounds of those technical procedures in the legal world. This dissertation also interrogates how technical procedures of recognition and reparation grounded in the LV translate and organise the experiences of people like Luis, Graciela and their families.

Although the channels of appeal at the time of promulgation of the LV were apparently exhausted, other channels have arisen since then, particularly regarding the materialisation of recognition and reparation in Colombia since 2012 and the controversial peace negotiations in Havana. Different studies analysing the implications of different articles of the LV represent an important portion of the literature. As Céspedes-Báez (2012) argues: “this new body of Law, with its 208 provisions, is much broader so that a close review of its articles is urgently needed”. Hence, the extensive literature on the LV address its challenges at fulfilling the
guidelines of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights policies (Valdivieso-Collazos 2012, Valdivieso-Collazos 2015), the administrative and legal challenges of reparation (Medina-Velandia 2013, Cáceres-Mendoza 2013, Mendoza 2016), the implications of the LV in the ongoing peace negotiations (Torres 2015, Cruz-Rodríguez 2015), and the political participation of Victims (Vargas-Reina 2014), among others. Particularly concerned with the technologies of governance used by the Colombian State to deploy public policies of reparation in the Magdalena region, Twiggy Ortegón-Medina (2015) puts forward the argument that letters, minutes and other mechanisms exhibit discursive and strategic flows reflecting the political struggles for power.

The above studies represent invaluable lines of enquiry that enrich our understanding of the entanglements of the LV. Although studying the LV and its derivative regulations is not the purpose of the present study either, the articles of the LV actually offer preliminary insights regarding my actual objects of concern. About the technical aspects of recognition and reparation, the LV defines Victims in its article 3 as follows:

\[
\ldots\text{} \text{those people who individually or collectively had suffered damage by events occurring after January 1 1985, as a consequence of infractions to the International Humanitarian Law or severe and manifest violations to the international norms of Human Rights, occurred as part of the internal armed conflict (emphasis added)}\]

Besides the intertextuality of the LV appealing to international regulations, the article defines the universe of Victims to be recognized during the ten years after the promulgations of the LV. In article 29, the LV offers a first guideline of the procedures to be used for officially recognizing Victims:

The Unit for Assistance and Integral Reparation for Victims will define the means, instruments and mechanisms for taking the declarations, in which the information will be registered to obtain, with differential focus, the necessary information for a proper assessment. The information will also determine the particular measures of assistance, aid and reparation proper to the damage suffered and the needs of every victim (emphasis added)

The stipulation of “means”, “instruments”, and “mechanisms” indicates the necessary mediation of technical objects in the declarations and statements as requirements for being registered as a Victim in the restitution system. Since the promulgation of the
LV, the official number of people in situations of forced displacement after violence has increased dramatically from 3,876,000 in 2011 to 6,279,720 in 2016. This increase in the cases counted as Forced Displacement of almost 3.5 million people is strictly mediated by those “means”, “instruments”, and forms of “proper assessment” stipulated by the LV. I find the role of these technologies of recognition absolutely intriguing, particularly with regard to the criteria for successful and unsuccessful registration. Similarly, I also find enthralling the establishment of “particular measures of assistance, aid and reparation” dictated by the LV. I wonder how that determination works, whether and how this intervention by the state matches the individuality of “every victim”, and how it is measured or accounted. Within the category of reparation, article 136 says about psychosocial assistance:

[….] Psychosocial accompaniment must be constant in the process of reparation and extend for the necessary time according to the needs of the victims, their families, and the community […]

Besides the different forms of reparation that become accessible for people registered as Victims, psychosocial assistance as a “constant” aspect of reparation also offers a potential area of exploration inasmuch as it represents a form of restitution different from monetary compensations, and because it appeals to a specific type of expertise capable of dealing with “psychosocial” aspects of reparation. I find provoking and susceptible of enquiry the deployment of techniques employed by state representatives to fulfil this “psychosocial accompanying” and the uses that claimants defined as “victims” make of those same techniques.

The past and ongoing violent perpetrations in Colombia are not a matter of debate here. On the contrary, I will consistently portray such worlds of perpetrations as inherently exceeding the interventions of professionals and the state. My interrogation is aimed at the strategies to manage, translate and organise the consequences of those perpetrations. While doing so, I expect to gain, and hopefully make my readers gain, a better understanding of the unexpected results of the Colombian version of international human rights policies contained in the LV, especially in the lives of people like Luis and Graciela. Their world, the world of the State, and the world of international relations are intertwined by the LV and the objects comprising it, so I want to trace the arrangements enacting such interweaving.

---
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Just as the melody played in the bus at the beginning of this chapter evoked a certain familiarity, the stories of people in similar situations to those of Luis, Graciela and their families are also part of my own experience as a Colombian and now as a researcher. This familiarity takes on a different meaning that endows me with a reflexive ethnographic research tool. My reflections revolve around the assemblage of technologies of recognition and reparation and the translations carried out by their users. In the present chapter, I traced the legal production of my objects of interest, the technologies of recognition and reparation, as matters of wider public concern and as a legal domain. At least two additional steps become important to outline my approach to the deployment of recognition and reparation of Victims of the armed conflict in Colombia. The first step consists of reframing those interventions as sociotechnical assemblages comprised of human and non-human entities. The second step, mutually performed with the first, has to do with establishing and reflecting on ethnographic approaches as plausible methodological strategies to depict and reflect on the assemblage of rights restitution in Colombia and its emerging orders. Following this journey, in chapter 2 I try to answer how recognition and reparation can be conceptually and methodologically portrayed as fields of interest drawing on Science and Technology Studies and other interdisciplinary approaches. Here, I first describe the possible human and non-human elements that make recognition and reparation into sociotechnical assemblages susceptible to ethnographic inquiry.
CHAPTER 2: REFRAMING

Recognition and reparation as sociotechnical assemblages

His inquisitorial tone was fairly justified because I was asking for permission to accompany him in the queues. “Sure... but why?” was followed by a first explanation of my interests in engaging with the queues at assistance centres. “Why would you want to be in the queue with us? There are reports, aren’t there?” I did not know it then, but his questions would provoke meaningful reflections about my own practices. Rather than accompanying Elias and other applicants in the queues, I had initially pictured myself conducting in-depth interviews with functionaries in charge of dealing with official forms of registration for applicants at assistance centres in Bogotá. To gain such access, I started the administrative journey contacting the relevant instances in Bogotá in 2013. After almost three months of waiting, I was finally granted an appointment with a representative of the Mayor’s office. Besides interviewing me, the functionary requested a summary of this research project, my CV, a letter of registration from the university, my national ID number to run a background check, and contact information, among other documentation. I promptly gathered, printed, and submitted the necessary documents. “Everything seems to be in order, this information will be assessed by the executive committee and we’ll contact you as soon we have a communication” were the words used by the functionary to end our encounter. At the time of writing I have not received an official response from that particular government instance. I was disappointed and concerned about the bureaucratic barriers; they would inevitably delay my planned schedule.

During the waiting time, I decided to visit different assistance centres in Bogotá without entering the premises but staying in the long queues outside. My first experiences of the queues in those centres were full of encounters that would radically transform my approach. With immense generosity, people in the queues shared their experiences of forced migration, economic despair, but more recurrently, their frustration when engaging with governmental bureaucratic procedures. I did not share the same experiences of pain and mobility, but I could relate to their frustration. The stories about registration, compensations, and psychosocial assistance as well as the dilemmas between staying in the city and returning to their lands became regular experiences in the queues. The bureaucratic barriers and their success in containing people in situation of displacement resembled a border, an internal border regulating the access to rights restitution for claimants in the queues. Their dilemmas between
coping with the system and returning suggested that their mobility was not entirely captured by the state intervention. The preliminary impressions in the queue and my experience of the government barrier endowed me with an alternative research tool.

My access to assistance centres would not be granted by the Mayor’s office, but by the people in the queues and their experiences. I would not begin to understand the system through the experience of functionaries but of claimants instead. A regular aspect of those first visits and queues was a pervasive bureaucratic indifference from the functionaries towards the claimants. An indifference present in my observations but also in the narratives of my initial interlocutors. Hence, the bureaucratic barrier, that for people in the queues represents an inherent feature of official recognition and rights, became an object of interest for my research. It became clear to me that before carrying out an ethnographic study of the role of professionals in charge of reparation and psychosocial assistance, I needed to decipher the entanglements of registration and reparation as arrangements comprised of claimants and functionaries, but also of forms, assessments, protocols, state representatives, and reports. But beyond understanding the specificities of the technical procedures of official recognition and reparation, I gradually became aware of the need to learn from particular forms of organisation carried out by registered and unregistered people. The encounters produced during the initial fieldwork transformed the approach itself, and the approach also transformed my object inasmuch as it was not only the role of professionals in charge of reparation anymore, but also the registration system as a mandatory step, and the challenges faced and portrayed by applicants within that system.

When obtaining informed consent at different sites, the mention of official reports as substitute sources was invoked by a variety of actors. Some of them repeatedly addressed the reports as a plausible alternative instead of spending my mornings in the queues. Similarly, during my visits to the government offices where the applications for registration are assessed, an office coordinated by the Unidad para la Atención y Reparación Integral a las Víctimas (henceforth UARIV), functionaries recurrently quoted the official reports as a potential source of the information I requested. Contrastingly, psychosocial professionals implementing assistance protocols along the
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country continuously emphasized the necessity of participating in the sessions to understand the protocols instead of reading the reports. People participating in psychosocial protocols addressed the reports and numbers as something mandatory for functionaries to account for the activities carried out in the sessions. The trust and distrust towards official reports made me think of the chains of translation for those reports to exist and to be widely circulated and promoted as reliable or expendable objects. The assemblage of official reports and their capability of acting at a distance were now part of my object too, but the possible detours that actors performed from the protocols and other objects also triggered my ethnographic interest. While participating in the queues, the application assessment procedures, and the psychosocial sessions, I started to understand some of the entanglements arising within the assemblage of recognition and reparation and the spaces and practices produced at a distance by the LV. Likewise, while learning from the experiences of applicants and people migrating into the cities, I began to grasp how the official reports and their embedded technical arrangement are exceeded by those experiences. Claimants’ generous and collaborative practices in the queues suggested to me how people managed to cope with barriers and borders, so it became part of my methodological approach to gain some understanding of those arrangements materialised by the people on both sides of the bureaucratic border.

Besides the bureaucratic barrier for accessing assistance centres through the Mayor’s office, the official number of registered Victims who have suffered perpetrations by the public force was tremendously elusive. I inevitably wondered about the reasons for this elusiveness especially after recreating the tensions around the production of the LV locating the responsibility of armed state representatives as an innovative feature of the proposed law (see chapter 1). Such resistance contrasted with the openness shown by psychosocial professionals working in the country, my interlocutors in the queues, sessions, riots, and the warm welcome by community leaders living in the surrounding areas of the city. My interest in making resistance and openness parts of this assemblage, this so-called thesis, to picture rights restitution arose from my very first experience of them. An important question that I have tried to understand since then is how to comprehend both the receptiveness and the reluctance of my interlocutors as part of the arrangement of rights restitution, or perhaps its excesses.
The above experiences and the questions of my interlocutors are some examples of how the present study, as a relational, ethnographic, and reflexive tool, performs its object whilst also being performed by the object itself. I inherently embed myself into this relation as a Colombian concerned with the ongoing transformations of the country, a researcher interrogating the role of expert knowledge and technologies in such transformations, and a human being interested and concerned about the experiences of pain and mobility shared by most of his interlocutors. These intellectual-affective-ethical individual entanglements are embedded in an assemblage of heterogeneous elements comprising rights restitution in Colombia. In the previous chapter I traced the controversial configuration of the LV and its narratives in the legal scenario. I claimed that the technical and expert procedures that materialize recognition and reparation as part of the LV comprise relevant areas of inquiry concerned with the technical aspects of rights restitution. In this chapter, I depict an assemblage of conceptual, methodological, theoretical, and empirical contributions to the study of rights restitution in Colombia as a hybrid arrangement. Following the stimulating ideas of Eileen Honan & David Bright (forthcoming in 2016) about reflecting on doctoral theses, this chapter is a description of the theoretical and methodological grounds of the assemblage machine (p. 4) comprised of discourses–languages–writing–methods (p.7) that I use to trace rights restitution. By doing so, I hope to outline a plausible, controversial, and revealing area of inquiry for interdisciplinary social approaches concerned with the techniques materialising recognition and reparation within rights restitution and their limits.

Reframing recognition and reparation

The promulgation of the LV in 2011 also resulted in the formation of a National System for Assistance and Reparation for the Victims (Art. 39) which is comprised of at least 51 state offices and NGOs coordinated by the UARIV. Particularly about recognition, the procedures of declaration are in charge of functionaries working at the Office of the Ombudsman (DP^24) whereas the decision of registration is in charge of professionals at the UARIV. Reparation as a wide set of measures involves different entities in charge of providing compensations and symbolic strategies of restitution. Within reparation, psychosocial assistance is being implemented by professionals working at the UARIV, at least in a parallel way to the establishment of the national

^24 Defensoría del Pueblo
Plan for Psychosocial Assistance for Victims (PAPSIVI) by the Ministry of Social Protection.

In Colombia, particular studies of the procedures of registration and reparation have been addressed from a variety of perspectives. These include outlining the demographic aspects of official registration systems (Ibáñez and Velásquez 2006), conducting surveys about the necessities and expectancies of reparation of different groups of people affected by violence (Rettberg et al. 2008), the operability of the legal accusation system available to people in situations of displacement (Londoño 2015) and the recognition of displaced people as a form of citizenship (Giraldo 2009). These studies are grounded in a perspective in which recognition and reparation are conditions granted by the state through the assistance of technical systems. Hence, forms, protocols, and other devices are the vehicles for the LV and state representatives to provide recognition and reparation. This perspective is challengeable in at least one sense: it portrays the technical artefacts as objects that are detached, alien, and accidental to the materiality of recognition and reparation understood as social phenomena.

From a critical approach to rights restitution system and its resulting forms of governance, Yomaira García-Acuña (2012) notes that claimants in situation of forced displacement are “caught” in a paradoxical situation consisting of vulnerability but at the same time they are expected to engage in the administrative procedures to access rights restitution neglecting their own experiences. Similarly, Alejandro Castillejo-Cuellar (2014) inquiries about the certifications of damage carried out by the Attorney General during the Law of Justice and Peace (97/2005). The author indicates that the capture of information through a protocol was a bureaucratic mediation between state representatives and members of indigenous communities suffering forced displacement. Within that bureaucratic space, “pain is given a legal existence […] and acquires the language of the State” (p.220)

In her revealing study of the bureaucratic mediations of registration and reparation in the Awa indigenous community in the South West of Colombia, Angélica Franco-Gamboa (2016) explains how the suffering of people as a result of violence is crossed by the actions of professionals and bureaucratic actors that “neutralise” the practices of people (p.39). This neutralisation consists of “semantic disagreements between victims
and professionals” that impede the fulfilment of the administrative procedure to access rights. Additionally, she further explains, neutralisation consists of the implementation of interventions mismatching the needs of people (Franco-Gamboa 2015 cited by Franco-Gamboa 2016). The author asserts that such disagreements are also the outcome of the requirement for claimants to become familiar with the meanings, signifiers, textual codes and expert repertoires of functionaries and professionals in charge of receiving the statements. Here, expert knowledge becomes a tool of functionaries for establishing symbolic borders and “distance between historically produced groups in terms of class, race, and gender” (p.50). Franco-Gamboa (2016) suggests that in the case of the procedures of registration and reparation for the Awa Community, “the dissociated science informs the State through experts” and their techniques (Hanssen and Steputah 2001 cited by Franco-Gamboa 2016). This represents a structural failure grounded in the “epistemic and sensitive borders of symbolic nature underlying the interventions, the semantic disagreements and the unfinished reparations” (p. 47).

Relatedly, in his inspiring ethnography with the Wayuu indigenous community in the North of Colombia, Pablo Jaramillo (2012) explores the role of reparation and the narratives of “debts” voiced by the State. Jaramillo puts forward the argument that the legitimacy of the Law 975/2005\(^\text{25}\) is better understood in the relation between “the submission of sovereignty and the strategies to control the time of the victims” (p. 43).

In spite of a predominant resistance against registration in the Wayuu community, reparation and the narrative of “debt” by the Colombian State stand out as effective technologies for the regulation of temporality. The deployment of procedures of denunciation mediated the entrance of what Jaramillo calls “the promise of reparation” (p.53), a discourse of commitment of compensations by the state that never becomes true. Here, the promise of reparation mobilizes a narrative that inverts the accountability of the alleged debt allowing the State to control the temporality of the lives of claimants The researcher explains how the community leaders used databases documenting the dimensions of the perpetration and their testimonies. Thus, for the community to participate in an exchange with the state, they have to “make a reprocessing” of their situation through lists, spreadsheets, printed and recorded testimonies so “converting their situation into numbers […] granting victimization

\(^{25}\)As mentioned before, this Law is a previous regulation addressing the demobilization of paramilitary groups and the compensations for those affected by their perpetrations
with facticity” (p.53). The transformations into numbers produce other forms of violence like disputes about the membership of subcategories necessary to be considered a Victim. Jaramillo concludes that the State deploys its bureaucratic power to dispossess Victims from their agency, so that keeping them waiting for reparation, as an unfulfilled promise, inverts the moral scales of the alleged initial debt.

The above critically oriented studies offer invaluable and plausible lines of inquiry for the present study. The bureaucratic demands that require claimants to neglect their own experience (García-Acuña 2012) initially suggest an agentic feature of the techniques of recognition and reparation. Moreover, the notion of translation of pain into the language of the State (Castillejo-Cuéllar 2014) leaves room for questioning the crucial role of the techniques used in such translation, perhaps not as a transformation of languages but as an exchange of properties (Callon, 1986). Likewise, besides being grounded in semantic disagreements, the configuration of bureaucratic indifference (Franco-Gamboa 2016) is also mediated by technologies of recognition and reparation used by experts. Regarding this mediation, Bruno Latour notes that the most typical feature of human societies is not that they consist exclusively of people and their actions and relations, but that they rest upon a heterogeneous composition of humans and non-humans, that is, of people and artefacts (Latour 1988; 1996). Thus, human societies are an interweaving of humans and non-humans into complex collectives, which acquire their characteristics and stability from a myriad of tools, artefacts, machines, and devices (Latour 2005). In the case of recognition and reparation, technologies used by functionaries are not only vehicles of indifference or sources of disagreement; they are the very materiality enacting the boundary between experts and claimants. As with any other technologies, the devices of registration and reparation work through material and immaterial elements so that the social and the technological become indistinguishable. Wiebe Bijker and John Law (1992) and Hommels (2005) use the term sociotechnical to denote the social aspects of technology and the deeply technological nature of society. Instead of a technocracy or society, the term acknowledges that technical artefacts mediate social relations instead of controlling them (Latour, 2002). In this sense, one might think that the bureaucratic indifference is also sociotechnically performed by technologies.

The materiality of devices is one of the aspects pointed out by Jaramillo (2012) in his analysis of reparation and the narratives of debt by the State in Wayuu communities.
What he refers to as technologies of the control of temporality addresses a particular kind of agency that administrative and measuring procedures materialise during recognition and reparation. As mentioned before, the promise of reparation and the narrative of debt allow the State to tame the temporality of the lives of claimants. An interesting aspect to explore has to do with the translations and transformations of those technologies across different circulations. Franco-Gamboa (2016) suggests that experts and claimants face discordances between the law, the expert procedures, and the claimants’ situated needs as the result of semantic disagreements. I propose to describe how those discordances, as material arrangements, are assembled across different trajectories of the technologies of recognition and reparation. The studies of Franco-Gamboa (2016) and Jaramillo (2012) successfully dissect the interactions between functionaries/experts and claimants to unveil the political aspects of such arrangements. There is an additional way to achieve the same dissecting purpose: opening up the technologies mediating the interactions between claimants and State representatives.

In their study of the technologies developed by the European Union (EU) Justice and Home Affairs administration, Rocco Bellanova and Denis Duez (2012) reframe the 2011 EU Passenger Name Record (PNR) project as a sociotechnical assemblage. The authors put forward the argument that such devices played a crucial role in materialising European security. Bellanova and Duez (2012) argue that the process of assembling bodies, institutions, materials, regulations, and software did not distinguish between human and non-human elements or between internal and external spaces of the EU. Instead, most of the operations stabilized those “external elements” by incorporating them into a sort of “black-box” (p. 123). The authors point out that the description of the assemblage of the PNR reopened important spaces for politics in the very functioning of the systems by discussing their “articulations and potential effects” (p.124). Bellanova and Duez conclude that a sociotechnical perspective offers a possibility to explore the participation of different actors and discuss the making of European security also in terms of the politics assembled in the materiality of the PNR.

Although rights restitution consists of a wide set of relations the entire description of which escapes the scope of the present study, I propose to approach the technologies of recognition and reparation and their relations as a sociotechnical assemblage
understood as a heterogeneous arrangement composed of human and non-human elements. The former include applicants, functionaries, and other state representatives whereas the latter consist of forms, psychosocial protocols, and other devices. Here, it is important to notice that such an approach establishes a principle of symmetry in the sense of granting agency to both human and non-human elements participating in the assemblage. Understanding the technologies of recognition and reparation as a sociotechnical assemblage also brings special attention to their role in transforming, translating, distorting, and modifying the meaning of the elements they are assembling. Similarly to Bellanova and Duez (2012), I consider that a sociotechnical approach to recognition and reparation might offer additional and alternative insights to ethnographically depict the politics assembled by those devices. However, to argue in favour of the latter statement, I now follow a sequence of argumentative steps, the first of which is to describe the possible actants involved in recognition and reparation whilst presenting some preliminary ideas of their possible features.

**Devices/technologies of recognition and reparation**

Michel Foucault (1972) defines the French term *dispositif* as a “heterogeneous ensemble consisting of discourses, institutions, architectural forms, regulatory decisions, laws, administrative measures, scientific statements, philosophical, moral and philanthropic propositions” (p.194). The *dispositif* then is the system of relations that can be established between those elements and has a dominant strategic function inasmuch as it is part of a power play. Following Foucault, Gilles Deleuze (1992) explains how different issues of visibility and enunciation, of force and of subjectification converge in devices (Deleuze 1992), and treating this concept differently from his own concept of “apparatus” (*appareil de capture*). About the notion of device, Michel Callon, Yuval Millo and Fabian Muniesa (2007) have proposed that it comprises material and discursive assemblages that intervene in the construction of different fields. From the latter perspective, devices can be brought into sociological analysis, be considered as objects with agency, and articulate actions (Callon, Millo and Muniesa, 2007: 2), insofar as devices exert performativities in a distributed agency between actants.
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2626 For an extensive discussion on the possible distinctions between *dispositif* and apparatus see Bussolini, J. (2010) “What is a Dispositive?” *Foucault Studies*, (10), 85-107.
From a sociotechnical perspective of recognition and reparation, technologies like forms and psychosocial protocols can be also understood as Deleuze’s *appareils de capture*, inasmuch as those technologies also perform the world that they are designed to capture; the worlds of recognition and reparation. I suggest then that technologies of recognition and reparation are both material and discursive, both textual and physical, and enact particular forms of organisation within and beyond the boundaries of governance. As Steve Brown (2012) notes about the features of technologies, within Science and Technology Studies (STS) there seems to be at least two partial agreements. Technologies are the concretization of social relations by realizing social arrangements, and are defined precisely by how users define, alter, and circulate them (p. 237). Here social worlds, of which recognition and reparation are instances, refer to hybrid arrangements between humans and things (see Latour 2005). Let us outline specific features of forms, numbers, and psychosocial assistance as technologies of recognition and reparation.

**Forms**

The agency of bureaucratic technologies like forms and documents is a crucial aspect in understanding governance. In *Seeing Like a State*, James C. Scott (1998) views bureaucracy (and its forms) as instruments for extending the state's capacity to “see” and thereby rule populations. This aspect of bureaucracy is formidably portrayed by Matthew Hull (2012, 2003) in his ethnography of documentary practices around forms in the Capital Development Authority of modern Islamabad. By following files, maps, letters, reports, and office manuals, Hull shows how contemporary governance is importantly organized by those artefacts. Alongside his ethnographic descriptions, Hull argues that the bureaucratic process is inherently material with this becoming essential to understand how agency works in modern states. For Hull, the document’s authority is achieved by being authored collectively through a dispersed network of agents. Hence, bureaucratic organization is a “social technology for aligning the efforts of a large number of people so that they act as one” (Hull 2003: 288). Hull also notes how forms achieve collective organisation by defining adequate actions for individuals and detecting them to a degree not known in any other kind of social organization. As Kregg Hetherington (2014) notes, Hull demonstrates how the technologies of documentation gather together the cooperation of different members of the bureaucratic collective, including runners and pieces of paper. Thereby, “State schemes may sit atop bureaucratic processes like powerless potentates commanding unruly
masses of subjects who refuse to do their bidding” (Hull 2012: 207). However, Hull’s study suggests how bureaucracy also lessens political power insofar as “dependence on written artefacts to secure fixity can result in its opposite” (p. 169).

The study of forms and bureaucratic technologies may also have to do with the side effects of bureaucracy and what is left outside the boundaries of governance. Josiah Heyman (2012) points out how Hull’s work subtly merges the study of bureaucracy with the study of governments, so that other forms of bureaucracy in large-sized private corporations, non-governmental organizations, and even universities might be forgotten. Heyman argues that deepening the anthropology of bureaucracy, and consequently of forms and other technologies, might be achievable by directing attention to bureaucracy as a “life world” (p. 1275) and power process across many domains. Although Heyman gives attention to private forms of bureaucracy, his mention of bureaucratic forms of organisation as life worlds opens up the possibility to inquire about bureaucratic boundaries as sociotechnical assemblages that displace other life worlds. Hence, the study of forms as technologies of governance is not only about governments and the establishment of forms of statehood; it is also about what is displaced by those bureaucratic sociotechnical assemblages across other life worlds or forms of organisation.

In his inspiring ethnography of the politics of transparency in neoliberal Paraguay, Kregg Hetherington (2011) documents how the ideal of bureaucracy became an arena of confrontation between peasants, bureaucrats and development experts. The conflicts between actors revolve around the uses of documents, the notions of how bureaucracy should work, and the rights to narrate the history and future projects of Paraguay. Hetherington suggests that bureaucracy, and extensively its constitutive technologies, is not only a material world enacting forms of governance. Instead, bureaucracy and its alleged ideals of democratic transparency are also spaces of negotiation between documents, forms, and bodies that assemble partial forms of agreement. Hetherington describes alternative forms of organisation, or guerrilla auditors, led by campesinos (peasants) around the uses of technologies of bureaucracy. Those spaces of negotiation, mainly achieved by peasants, and the collaborative practices of alternative organisation around bureaucracy endowed peasants to inquire into and challenge governance practices in Paraguay. Hence, in the study of bureaucratic technologies as sociotechnical assemblages a possible step further consists in depicting what those technologies displace and reconfigure, even beyond the boundaries that bureaucratic
technologies assemble. In the case of the technologies of recognition and reparation for Victims in Colombia, a step further should explore the alternative forms of organisation exceeding the boundaries of official recognition and reparation.

About the kind of displacements and effects of the assemblage of bureaucracy in Colombia, Malcolm Ashmore and Olga Restrepo-Forero (2013) explore how bureaucratic technologies used in and by notaries produce and certificate evidence. By tracing the ways in which documents, stamps and certifications are assembled in notaries, Ashmore and Restrepo-Forero describe how trust in such spaces becomes legitimated. However, the authors claim that the concentration of trust within the notary space is both cause and consequence of the observable lack of trust elsewhere in Colombian society. In this last study, the assemblage of governance is also understood in relation to what it displaces in other sites. I wonder how the forms of recognition and reparation assemble boundaries and forms of governance, but also how the effects of those boundaries reconfigure and are reconfigured by other social worlds and dispossess them of trustworthiness.

**Numbers**

Besides enacting boundaries of official recognition and reparation, bureaucratic technologies also translate the information they collect into quantifications, standards, and indicators. About quantification through forms and other technologies, Akhil Gupta (2012) describes practices of enumeration as “techniques of statecraft that […] appear as neutral technolog[ies] of government” (p. 159). With regard to the “structural violence” reproduced by bureaucracy, Gupta argues that the collection of information about individuals, the transformation of those cases into numbers, and their circulation in the bureaucracy enforce commensurability between the lives of poor people. This commensurability, although useful for identifying systemic patterns of poverty, inevitably fails to understand the conditions that lead to poverty and overlooks the necessity for diverse strategies for its alleviation. About the failures and limitations of quantifications and numbers assembling recognition and reparation after the promulgation of the LV in Colombia, Lina Buchely (2015) presents a critique of the version of the Colombian conflict constructed by the LV and the indicators designed to evaluate its implementation. Through an urban case study in Cali, Buchely upholds the argument that the text of the LV and its indicators have mobilized and naturalized an exclusionary account of the armed conflict whilst consolidating an idea of the conflict
as a series of events centred on the rural and the distant. Such an account of the conflict ignores its quotidian and local nature. For Buchely, the exclusionary account of the conflict is closely related to the construction and globalization of the transitional justice model adopted in Colombia. Buchely concludes that besides being measures “summarising” the reality of the armed conflict, indicators also shape reality and have important impacts on people’s lives.

At least two preliminary conclusions can be drawn on the above approaches to numbers and indicators. First, practices of counting are also acts of classifying insomuch as they need to distinguish, even in the most dichotomist situations, whether something or someone counts or not. Thereby, classifying people into sociotechnical categories of “poor” or “Victim” within a system of enumeration also implies disregarding others as unlikely members of the categorical groups. Second, practices of enumeration and quantification, as intrinsic of bureaucratic technologies, importantly reconfigure the lives of those who are counted (and those who are not). About the last two points, the consequences of quantifications, classifications and standards in daily life have been remarkably presented by Geoffrey Bowker and Susan Leigh Star (2000). These scholars define classification as “a spatial, temporal, or spatio-temporal segmentation of the world” so a taxonomic system consists of “a set of boxes into which things can be put to then do some kind of work - bureaucratic or knowledge production” (p.10). Although classification systems should ideally be consistent, complete, and mutually exclusive in their categories, Bowker and Star concede that no real-world working classification meets these requirements since the world they attempt to classify inherently exceeds the categories. Instead, classification and quantification systems are constantly confronted by disagreements, misunderstandings, mixtures and contradictions among their users (p.11) but are still “rich of texture” and “central to social life” (p.13)

In their distinction between classification and standards, Bowker and Star define the latter as a set of agreed-upon rules for the production of textual or material objects that reaches different communities and persists over time. Similarly, standards are deployed in making things work together over distance whilst building on installed bases. Standards and their constitutive technologies of quantifying are usually “enforced by legal bodies” and their alteration can be “very expensive” (p.14). With regard to this, Latour (1987, cited by Bowker and Star 2000) explains how the
resources invested in creating and maintaining standards notably exceed the investments in scientific research. Star and Bowker argue that “the process of building to a standardized code usually includes a face to face negotiation between builders and inspectors, which itself includes a history of relations between those people” (p. 15). For the case of technologies of recognition and reparation, the arguments regarding the costs of standards, their enforcement by legal bodies, and the face to face negotiations between actors are particularly relevant. As pointed out by Franco-Gamboa (2016) and Jaramillo (2012), the practices of registration and reparation involve interactions between state representatives and claimants that result in the configuration of measurements and quantifications of people fulfilling the necessary conditions to be considered Victims. These interactions also configure classifications about the kind of perpetrations suffered by claimants. Following Gupta (2012) these enumerations (and classifications) produce commonalities that overlook the conditions and necessities of claimants. Thinking with Bowker and Star (2000), the world of violence and perpetrations in armed conflicts exceed the scope of the classification systems and standards used to translate the pain of claimants into the numerical language of the State.

Bowker and Star (2000) claim that systems of classification “form a juncture of organisation, moral order, and layers of technical integration” and that every “subsystem inherits the inertia of the installed base of systems that come before” (p. 33). Thereby systems of quantification, classification, and standardization enact and are embedded by infrastructures (Bowker and Star 2000: 16). When addressing information infrastructures, Bowker and Star assert that infrastructures are actually difficult to appreciate. Therefore, “good, usable systems disappear almost by definition” (p.33) but at the same time they are not transparent for everyone. The authors offer a suggestive empirical invitation: “through due methodological attention to the architecture and use of these systems, we can achieve a better understanding of how it is that individuals and communities meet infrastructure” (pp. 33-34). Their invitation is particularly relevant for the present study. If technologies of recognition and reparation enact a particular form of infrastructure, a crucial aspect of it to describe has to do with how claimants meet infrastructures. Bowker and Star speak of quantifications, classification and standards as “objects for cooperation across social worlds” (p.15). An adequate methodological approach might account for those possible forms of “cooperation” as well as other kind of relations between recognition
and reparation, and other social worlds. Bowker and Star define the features of infrastructure: a historical process of development of many tools for a variety of users, a practical match among routines of work practice, a set of negotiated epistemological and transparent compromises, and a negotiated order to permit its features to function together. Far from establishing standards of standards themselves, the authors suggest such features as possible descriptive tools when engaging with quantification systems and infrastructures. A highlighted aspect of numbers enacting systems of quantifications and emerging forms of organisation such as infrastructures is the negotiations that produce them in spaces where individuals and communities meet infrastructures. Here, ethnography is a plausible methodological approach for understanding these spaces.

With regard to forms and bureaucratic practices, where individuals and communities meet technologies that quantify and classify, Hull (2012) proposes the term “documentary infrastructure” (p.65) to describe a crucial feature of bureaucracy. As Hetherington (2014) claims about the ethnographic study in Islamabad though, Hull’s work does not further develop this concept despite its constant narrative use. Building up from Hull’s term, Hetherington claims that “[Bureaucratic] infrastructure is that which somehow endures the comings and goings of political machinations, development plans, and graft schemes” (p.197). These “comings” and “goings” make me think of a feature of forms, quantifications, and classifications embedded in bureaucratic systems: its multiplicity of directions which is also traceable through ethnographic approaches. Other interesting aspect to establish about infrastructures has to do with how “inertia” is “inherited” (Bowker and Star 2000) among all the systems of its organisation. Thinking of the kind of order emerging from practices of enumeration and quantification between claimants and functionaries, a plausible question importantly concerns the kind of infrastructure enacted by technologies of recognition and reparation, its logic, materials, moral orders, and layers. According to the LV, the RUV seems to be one of those quantifications delimitating the universe of Victims to be granted with the alleged benefits of rights restitution, and a subsystem of a wider infrastructure. An ethnographic enquiry in this regard should trace the practices of assembling quantifications like the RUV and other official numbers, and how the experiences of people are shaped by such enumerative practices.
Within the boundaries of rights restitution enacted by forms and numbers, psychosocial assistance is emphatically stipulated by the LV as one of the measures of reparation for Victims. Continuing the purpose of the present chapter, an alternative way to understand the materiality of psychosocial assistance consists in directing our attention to its technologies. The latter strategic shift is not an entirely new approach to psychology and the study of the psychosocial. Kurt Danziger (1979) uses the precept of *symmetry* already portrayed by David Bloor (1975) to explore the sociocultural conditions participating in the configuration of psychological knowledge in Germany and the US in the 19th century. Similarly, Nikolas Rose (1996) proposes a critical history of psychology integrating Foucauldian genealogies of psychology with resources offered by Science and Technology Studies. As Rose (1990) points out, psychological sciences are “intimately bound up with programmes, calculations and techniques for the government of the soul” (p. 9).

Following possible intersections between the approaches of Danziger and Rose on psychological technologies and the resources of STS, Christine Leuenberger (2001) explores the transformations of psychotherapeutic practices in socialist East Germany before the fall of the Berlin Wall, outlining the relations between psychological knowledge embedded in psychotherapies, national policies, and expert-client relationships. Other studies in Colombia explore the mediations of psychological tests in application procedures for accessing institutions of higher education (Jaraba-Barrios 2013); the materiality of psychotherapies as objects of disciplinary demarcation and as techniques of social rehabilitation in prisons (Mora-Gámez 2013, 2014); and the role of psychological discourses and techniques in the production of modern workers (Pulido-Martínez 2007, Pulido Martínez and Carvajal Marin 2014). When reframed as sociotechnical assemblages, psychological objects, and psychosocial techniques become material mediators of interactions. On this aspect, Sheila Jasanoff (2004) has argued that natural and social orders are mutually productive or *co-produced*. Building on this, psychological objects then also “embed and [are] embedded in social practices, identities, norms, conventions, discourses, instruments, and institutions” (p.5). Psychosocial techniques are then some of the actants holding “society together as a durable whole” (Latour 1990: 103) or at least the forms of social order organised by reparation. The psychosocial world and the possibilities enacted by its techniques represent a major area of interest in this thesis.
An important issue raised especially by Rose and the studies in Colombia mentioned above has to do with what kind of technologies psychological or psychosocial objects are and their differences, if any, with other forms of technology. Foucault (2000, p.25) distinguishes between technologies of production that transform or manipulate things, technologies of sign systems, technologies of power that regulate the conduct of individuals, and technologies of the self, which permit individuals to perform different operations on their own bodies and thoughts, and finally conduct to achieve forms of wisdom or happiness. Building on Foucault, Nikolas Rose (1996) uses the term *human technologies* to address assemblages for the “calculated transformation of human conduct” (p. 121). For Rose, techniques like self-inspection, self-problematization, and self-monitoring assist individuals successfully to achieve their adjustment to the system and even its modification. The governmental system then is comprised of “a set of programmes, strategies, techniques for acting upon the action of others towards certain ends” (Rose 1990: xx). However, from a sociotechnical understanding of technology, the specificity of psychological techniques seems to face tensions and challenges. This is because from this perspective, all technologies embed and are embedded in social relations. On this issue, Marteen Derksen, Signe Vikkelso, and Anne Beaulieu (2012) propose the concept of *social technology* as a way of collecting technologies from psychology and related fields. According to Derksen et al, the sociotechnical approach has rejected the concept of social technology because it supposedly reaffirms the ontological distinction between humans and things, and more explicitly between the social and the technical. That rejection discourages possible analyses of the technologies produced by psychology and the social sciences with the resources offered by STS. The sociotechnical approach, the authors elaborate, rules out the study of categories like “social”, “psychological”, or psychosocial as empirical active phenomena (p. 142). As Derksen et al explain:

The distinctiveness of people and their interactions is still invoked, produced, repressed, and utilized in many technological assemblages, not only those stemming from the social sciences. How is the social, or the psychological, produced and singled out by technology? How does the HR [*human resources*] manager, for instance, employ his or her humanity as a distinctive
asset? Through what techniques and tools are “social influence” and “empathy” produced as distinctly psychological and social phenomena? (p.142)

In the comparison between sociotechnical approaches and their concept of social technology, carefully presented by Derksen et al (2012), at least two different notions of the social might be extracted from their examples. Firstly, the social can be understood as the set of relations performed by the use and circulation of psychological or psychosocial techniques among specific groups of people. In Derksen’s example, this first version refers to the relations between people interacting with the HR manager, or the rearrangements in the social relations between the participants in a psychosocial assistance session in the cases approached in this thesis. Secondly, the social appears as the specific knowledge domain embedded by the techniques themselves. In the quoted example, this notion refers to the production of “social influence” and “empathy” as knowledge categories. Perhaps, the latter notion of the social is the one addressed by Derksen et al. when they claim that “social technology” ameliorates the consequences of the sociotechnical approach. The authors argue that the (psycho)social can emerge and be performed from distinctive technological assemblages because “the social and the technological don’t always blend so seamlessly” as is assumed in the sociotechnical approach in STS (Derksen et al. 2012: 143). In the same argumentative line, Brown (2012) defines social technology as “that which enables as its primary object the self-modification of some subjective state of affairs of a human subject” and produces novel experiences and modalities for performing the psychological and the social (p. 328).

The debate about the specificity of (psycho)social technologies is still on the table, especially for those interested in the intersections between psychology and STS. A strategy for empirically moving on in spite of the tension is signalled by Derksen et al. (2012) and consists of showing how the social and the technological are intimately linked, while at the same time analysing “this link as an achievement, and not always a stable, comfortable, or definitive one” (p.143). I will assume, for the transitory benefit of my approach, that psychosocial techniques are assemblages of humans and things (see Latour 2005) that enact the social world whilst transforming the subjective states of affairs of humans (see Brown, 2012). These latter can include experience (Brown and Middleton 2005) and memory (Allen and Brown 2011, Brown and Reavey 2014). Besides embedding and being embedded by social relations, psychosocial assistance techniques also enact an empirical field that can be addressed as social and/or
psychological. Reframing these techniques as sociotechnical arrangements directs attention to their physical and textual materiality as matters of inquiry. Similarly, outlining psychosocial assistance techniques as social technologies emphasises their social embeddedness and ability to reconfigure subjective experiences. This effort to outline psychosocial assistance techniques as both “sociotechnical assemblage” and “social technology” is far from a flawless solution but it establishes a starting point for their ethnographical description.

**Applicants**

“Desplazados”, says the guard in the assistance center when asked about the people in the queue. The word is everywhere in the media, official documents, and texts of research. It is perhaps the most naturalized word for naming people mobilizing into and within the cities after experiences of violence. It is also present when people make their own conclusions about my explanations of this thesis: “So, your project is about desplazados”. I was not aware of its uses before, but during the fieldwork I could attest how people living in cities like Bogotá and Pasto use the word to address people in the queues, performing at the traffic lights, singing on buses, working as street vendors, or doorstep selling. Almost all of my friends, colleagues, and relatives in Colombia know someone who they name desplazado even when the person went through violent experiences not resulting in displacement. Sometimes, people also call themselves desplazados to swiftly explain their situation to functionaries and guards at assistance centers. “It takes less time” say some of my queue friends after telling me about the troubles they avoid when using that word instead of explaining in detail their situation.

Though it is a well spread category that addresses one of the main consequences of violence in Colombia, it also encloses a way of discursively locating people whose geographic origins can be hard to judge by simple observation. Besides carrying a classist and sometimes racist load, I find the word desplazado problematic in at least two ways. Firstly, rather than referring to the dispossession of lands, farms, and houses, the term addresses a lack of a proper place within the cities. Desplazado does not refer to unfortunate experiences of violence that resulted in migration into the cities. Instead, it refers to difficulties in coming to terms with the marginalised places that cities have established for migrating people. Secondly, desplazado becomes a
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discursive tool used by people living in the cities to diminish the challenge to understand the situation of mobility experiences by migrants. This mobility becomes a habitable living space for them in spite of being instigated by violence.

More recently, partly due to the promulgation of the LV, desplazados is sharing its semantic domain with the word víctimas. The latter seems to address the existence of an experience of violence within the recently acknowledged Colombian armed conflict. Its use is particularly frequent by functionaries working in different reparation strategies, but also increasingly in the media by state representatives including the President. I find troubling the use of the word not only because of its patriarchal history portraying the State as a legitimate repairer of víctimas, but also due to its sociotechnical status. Not all people in Colombia facing experiences of violence are víctimas, only those successfully registered and recognized by the State. The word also marks an attempt to understand the world of those experiencing the consequences of violence exclusively arising from violent perpetrations. In some cases, the word becomes an explanatory category for poor economic situations when migrating into the cities, or even worse, a case of co-morbidity with “mental trauma” and “disorders” affecting “cognitive decision styles”, especially when facing economic decisions. Other similar terms include declarants and claimants (particularly in legal settings which reduce their role to producers of narratives), forced migrants (a term predominant in international reports emphasizing the instigated nature of their mobility), campesinos (specially frequent when circumscribing violence as something occurring exclusively in rural areas), and vulnerable populations (widely preferred in demographic studies and academic reports critical of the notion of víctimas).

These diverse ways to refer to “them” is perhaps the result of an inevitable difficulty in grasping their world, but also occurs because people in mobility have to become many different things to live in the city. Their world exceeds any attempt at capture, even through the use of different words. Through my own ethnographic journey across various sites, I have struggled to find a proper way to address the actors engaging and rejecting the sociotechnical assemblage of recognition and reparation. People in the queues, registered and rejected people, participants of psychosocial assistance sessions, claimants of promised compensations, and people avoiding the registration and
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reparation system, among others, constitute forms of mobility exceeding my reflections. All that variety cannot and should not be reduced to a single category. What word can be used then without taming or reducing their world? How to address their role in this assemblage of recognition and reparation? These are not mere nomination issues; these are interrogative ethical questions. Different from the preliminary descriptions of other actants in the assemblage depicted in this chapter and in consistency with a reflective ethnographic approach, I had to navigate in my journals and transcriptions to find a possible, though still restricted, retrospective alternative.

Can you imagine it? I was there, my son had just been snatched from my arms and they made me believe I might eventually see him again. It was…it was unbearable. Can you even imagine it? I…I…I had to know where he was, I talked to the police in my town, I…I ended up going to their [guerrillas] very camp the day after, and talked to the guards, one of them was wearing my son’s clothes, Can you imagine it? […] after two hours of begging and insisting to their captain that I would not leave until I saw my son, the guy wearing his watch took me to a common grave and there he was…my life stopped for a moment…I…had to see it…but…mmm…but…here I am now, after moving out of the town, I went to X city, then to X city, I have no relatives in this city now but I am moving on…mmm….I still think of him you know? (Vivian, 52)

Although Vivian’s entire life is not defined by pain, it becomes a vital aspect of her daily life. Even if her pain might worsen given the unfortunate result of her search, it is integrated as part of the confrontations that she made with the members of the armed group. Pain is continuously acknowledged in her narrative which also demands similar acknowledgement from me. In her narrative, mobility represents an alternative for bearing the “unbearable” and establishing the whereabouts of her disappeared son, and for starting her life in the city. Here, mobility does not appear as a definite solution for pain, although it provides ways to try to understand the events leading to the loss of her son. In Vivian’s story, as in many others, determining the direction and order of the relation between pain and mobility is irrelevant. Like Vivian, some of my interlocutors share their stories with the expectancy of showing me the scope of their difficult experiences and what they went through. But more importantly, they make me participate in their embodiment of pain and thus better understand how they are
overcoming it. Borrowing the words of Elaine Scarry (1985), they project their *sentience* in our encounters whilst meaningfully expanding my own. Their very act of sharing their embodiment of pain, requests that I acknowledge this dimension of their experience (See Das 1996); a request that I promptly and actively match. At the same time, most of their stories are designed to show me the many alternatives that they have pursued in response to their experiences of pain. Like Vivian, they insist on their continuous effort to overcome it without forgetting what is left behind, a task in which mobility becomes crucial. In different encounters, the dyad pain-mobility was constantly present in their sentience, whilst expanding mine. About this, an alternative to understand mobility in situations of migration is offered by Dimitris Papadopoulos and Vasilis Tsianos (2013) who reject understanding migration as a “mere response to economic and social malaise” or a “movement that is defined and acts by making claims to institutional power”. Instead, the authors argue that “the very movement itself becomes a political and a social movement” (p.11). Building on Papadopoulos and Tsianos, the mobility exhibited by Vivian and many of my interlocutors is not the mere result of violence, vulnerability, or displacement. It is an activity that can have profound meanings, both personal and political, for those in movement.

The embodiment of pain becomes then an aspect of daily life for people like Luis, Graciela (Chapter 1), Elias, and Vivian, but so also does their mobility. I will often address actors like these as *people embodying experiences of pain and mobility*. It is still a reductive and impractical set of words to use in a thesis, but I find it close to my own experiences of their world. For writing and reading purposes, I will use other words to describe specific moments of engagement with the sociotechnical assemblage of recognition and reparation. Henceforth I will use *applicants* to address only people engaging with administrative procedures of registration, and *Victims* exclusively to refer to applicants successfully registered in the RUV. During my descriptions and reflections in this thesis, I will appeal to the set of words inspired in the dyad pain-mobility when I consider that other categories are simply insufficient. As my reader will be able to appreciate in the upcoming chapters, my affinity with queue friends and other interlocutors who generously shared their accounts is deeply grounded in my experience of their world. Though I would never claim to speak for them, I can definitely claim some affective relation to their world for at least three reasons. Firstly my own sentience has been enriched and deeply transformed during this journey and through the stories shared by people embodying experiences of pain and mobility. As a
native from Bogotá, walking with them has inevitably shaped my initial naïve understanding of Colombia and our history of violence. Secondly, I share an evident skepticism towards the promises of bureaucratic practices as adequate means to acknowledge the pain resulting from political and armed violence. Such skepticism is grounded in much of the ethnographic literature about bureaucracy but also in the experiences of my interlocutors. Here, precariousness is a constant aspect of the lives of many of my interlocutors which is frequently reproduced by states’ own bureaucratic practices. Finally, my affective relation with the accounts of people embodying experiences of pain and mobility grew with every single encounter. I am supportive and optimistic with regard to their material forms of cooperation as genuine means for recovering justice in their daily lives. However, I am also aware that their world exceeds my own understanding and the present thesis and that the mobilization of interests is also part of the world of applicants, Victims, and people embodying experiences of pain and mobility.

Functionaries

The LV has enabled the establishment of a wide network of professional functionaries to design and deploy technologies of recognition for applicants and reparation for Victims. Although reparation measures are in charge of functionaries working in different instances of the SNARIV, the specific procedures this study is concerned with are carried out by functionaries working mainly at assistance centres and the UARIV. Applications and questionnaires for registration in the RUV are filled in in assistance centres, and are subsequently assessed at the offices of the UARIV. Other groups of functionaries, mainly at the UARIV, are in charge of the delivery of compensations and a variety of forms of reparation. Meanwhile, the psychosocial team of the UARIV is in charge of developing and providing psychosocial assistance in the country, although psychosocial services for Victims are formally a responsibility of the Ministry of Social Protection which, at the time of writing, is defining the PAPSIVI. The network of experts currently working in rights restitution include lawyers, psychologists, social workers, sociologists, political scientists, anthropologists, administrators, artists, and other professionals mainly from the traditional human and social sciences.
The role of expertise articulated in governmental interventions has been studied by Adriana Petryna (2013). In her ethnography of medical care, biocitizenship, and rights restitution, Petryna examines the role of experts in granting rights restitution on behalf of the State after Chernobyl. Similarly, João Biehl (2007) has documented the experiences of people with insufficient economic resources in Brazil claiming government assistance to treat their psychiatric diagnoses. With regard to cases of politically motivated violence, other ethnographies are offered by Barbara Harrell-Bond (1986) about the administrative practices resulting in the imposition of humanitarian aids for refugees in different regions of Africa. Boyden and De Berry (2004) have documented the experiences of youngsters and experts in war situations. More generally about functionaries, Michael Herzfeld’s (1993) *The Social Production of Indifference* reflects widely on the role of (professional) bureaucrats as state representatives. Herzfeld claims that their indifference is created “through the selective deployment of a kind-based discrimination between selves and others” (p.172). Bureaucrats, the author explains, avoid engaging with clients by deploying a “pose of neutrality” that shows a lack of interest in the client’s wasted time. This strategy is for Herzfeld, a tactic of *alochronism* (Fabian 1983 cited by Herzfeld 1993), that is, “the use of narrative techniques to place the other in a time radically different from one’s own” (Herzfeld 1993: 172). Hence, for Herzfeld, professionals working for the State are not only experts in their respective fields. They also develop strategies to demarcate their time from clients’. Building up from this, the agency of functionaries using technologies of temporal regulation seems crucial for the State. It contributes to the transformation of claims, of rights restitution in the present case, into forms of control. For a detailed reflection about these forms of control under narratives of “debt” to the State see Jaramillo, P. (2012) ‘Deuda, desesperación y reparaciones inconclusas en La Guajira, Colombia’, *Antípoda*, 14(1), 41-65.
Considering that most of the functionaries responsible for the procedures of interest of this study hold professional degrees, their role as experts within the sociotechnical assemblage of recognition and reparation constitutes a source of interrogation. Functionaries can sometimes be considered experts, not only in the management of forms and administrative procedures, but also regarding the technical decisions that may be crucial for recognition and reparation. From this perspective, expertise has been a matter of debate within STS. Particularly, the so-called Third Wave of Science Studies (Collins and Evans 2002) suggests a turning point of STS into Studies of Expertise and Experience to solve what the authors call the Problem of Extension. For Harry Collins and Robert Evans the problem, vividly present in public debates involving technical matters, has to do with the “tendency to dissolve” the boundary between experts and the public so that there are no longer any grounds for limiting the indefinite extension of technical decision-making rights. Besides attempting to define expertise in relation to “lay” knowledge and skills, Collins and Evans (2002: see also Collins 2014), suggest an agenda for STS to approach the problem of expertise; an agenda I find entirely unattractive. More recently, Collins (2014) expands his earlier argument claiming that:

\[
\text{\textit{It is important to understand the difference between the knowledge of experts when they make assessments of technical value and the knowledge of non-experts; [...] technical judgements are the prerogative of experts and it is only the consequences of those judgements that are the prerogative of non-experts. But it is easy for the two kinds of judgement to become mixed up, with non-experts believing that it is possible for them to make technical judgements}} \text{ (Collins 2014: 723 )}
\]

About Collins and Evans” original claim, recently reiterated in the above quote, Sheila Jasanoff (2003) asserts that their agenda is founded on a misreading of STS regarding the production of expert authority, a rejection of the politically configured grounds of expertise, and a misconception of the role of ordinary citizens in “even the most esoteric domains of public decision-making” (p.398). Instead of legitimating such demarcation, Jasanoff invites critical STS studies precisely to “show what is at stake in the making of those boundaries” (p.399). Similarly, Papadopoulos (2011) notes that the formulation offered by Collins and Evans (2002, 2008) legitimate the borders of what counts as legitimate expert participation in a region of objectivity. Here, instead of
offering substantial sociological insights into scientific controversies, the Third Wave formulation actually consists of “policing these borders” (p. 181) and reproducing the western liberal politics that STS criticize.

The above arguments presented by Collins and Evans, Jasanoff, and Papadopolous inspire an important reflection regarding the assemblage of recognition and reparation. The decisions about who the Victims are and what they should receive in the assemblage of recognition and reparation are delegated to expert-professional functionaries. I want to understand how these decisions are made by functionaries, the role of their expertise in these decisions, and how the certified legitimacy of professionals provides administrative decisions with credibility. But also, I think of the dyad pain-mobility embodied by some of my interlocutors as irrefutable sources of expertise about dealing with violence and dispossession. In the present thesis, I will also try to explore how forms of expertise gained through this dyad are transformed, displaced, or hopefully acknowledged by certified forms of expertise within the sociotechnical assemblage of recognition and reparation.

From the stipulations about recognition in the LV, the task of deciding on the status of Victims by experts seems to be importantly grounded in the declarations produced by applicants. Important insights about how expertise is deployed to scrutinize the declarations of people seeking asylum and adjudication as refugees have been collected by Benjamin Lawrence and Galya Ruffer (2015). The studies presented by these authors explore how the narratives of asylum seekers are dissected and produced in ways that enhance the credibility of asylum claims. The pieces presented by Lawrence and Ruffer also describe how the tensions regarding asylum adjudications are reconciled and sometimes strengthened by experts. Besides exploring the role of expertise in this assemblage, I dedicate an important part of my descriptions and reflections to portraying the production of veracity and legitimacy in the applications for registration in the RUV. I also explore some of the tensions that are faced specially by psychosocial professionals wishing to provide genuine assistance whilst fulfilling bureaucratic requirements.

The State?
A common narrative, constantly present while reframing recognition and reparation through the literature presented up to this point, explicitly has to do with the state.
Particularly, the questions depicted by Herzfeld (1993), Hetherington (2011), and Hull (2012) critically discuss bureaucracy as practices of governance. Similarly Rose (1990), Leuenberger (2001), and Pulido-Martínez (2007) portray psychological interventions as techniques for assembling governance by state representatives. The emergence of this entity of relevance, the State, for the assemblage of recognition and reparation provokes an important question regarding its role and a plausible way to approach it.

The question of how to reframe and approach the State is not new, especially in the field of anthropology. This matter is present in the studies reported by Akhil Gupta (1995, see also Gupta 2005) about bureaucracy and governance examining the discourse of corruption in India. The ethnographer describes the practices of bureaucrats in North India and the representations of the state in the mass media. Across his descriptions, Gupta criticizes the conceptualization of the state as a monolithic and unitary entity. Similarly, in their suggestive collection of ethnographic studies on the state, Veena Das and Deborah Poole (2004) distance themselves from the “entrenched image of the state as a rationalized administrative form of political organization that becomes weakened or less articulated along its territorial or social margins” (p.3). Das and Poole explain how a recognized tradition in anthropology has consisted of mapping the effects and presence of the state in local life, and looking for signs of universal administrative rationalities that offer “order links” with the apparatus of the state.

A second ethnographic alternative to approach the state is concerned with the resistance to the state and its local forms of articulation. The latter perspective focuses on describing how state practices run through everyday life on its margins. Das and Poole claim that “the forms of illegibility, partial belonging, and disorder that seem to inhabit the margins of the state” precisely make it a “theoretical and political object” (p. 6). Hence, the authors suggest exploring the unstable features of the margins to open up (perhaps like a black box) the “solidity and stability typically granted to the state” (p. 20). Legitimacy emerges then in the very production of boundaries through state practices so the state is conceived as an “incomplete project that must constantly be spoken of - and imagined” (p.7). In Das and Poole´s conception, the state is reframed as having emerging, and inherently local, qualities comprised of regulatory and disciplinary practices that configure “that thing that we call ´the state´” (p.3).
Some qualities of the state emerge from the practices that establish and expand its boundaries, but how best to understand such emerging features in relation to the sociotechnical assemblage of recognition and reparation? In their recent reformulation of statehood as the Actor Network State (ANS), Jan-Hendrick Passoth and Nicholas Rowland (2010) argue that the state is not a thing but “the ongoing relational outcome of practices and processes which iteratively expand and protect it while others disband and unravel it” (p.828). This formulation by Passoth and Rowland implies that “[s]tate actors only exist in relation to assemblages of human bodies, borders and fences, tax payments and government forms, even bogs and trees” (Carroll, 2006, cited by Passoth and Rowland, 2010). But this argument also implies that states, as emerging and assembled entities, perform agency, understood as relational sets of outcomes produced by the contributions of different actants in an arrangement that overcomes the distinctions between the micro and macro levels (Passoth and Rowland 2015). From this perspective, “states only become powerful through [...] assemblages, mechanisms, procedures, texts, and trained bodies” (p.20), so the study of statehood directs our attention to “how states act” (p.21). With regard to this, Rowland and Passoth (2015) also argue that an approach to how states act requires empirical studies that explore “what enables politicians to speak for [the states] as actors [...] and how political entities of all forms are constructed, invoked, and performed” (p.21).

An evident commonality among the above studies is the portrayal of heterogeneous elements like forms, numbers, psychosocial assistance techniques, applicants, and functionaries as assembling a form of statehood that is made and unmade in the very boundaries of recognition and reparation. The arguments presented by Gupta, Das and Poole, and more emphatically by Passoth and Rowland, about the state make me think of rights restitution as a set of technical practices that establishes, expands, and defines the margins/boundaries of official recognition, as well as the presence of the Colombian State. The latter appears not as an orchestrator or a monolithic unitary entity, but as an emerging order in the assemblage of recognition and reparation. Although the present study is not intended as ethnography of the state, by thinking along these lines I do try to examine how statehood is assembled within the sociotechnical arrangement of rights restitution in Colombia.

My assembling practice

An emerging element that becomes embedded in the arrangement of rights restitution is precisely my own ethnographic practice. In a traditional sense, ethnography is
broadly considered a potential tool for answering questions about experiences, implicit rules, and meanings (Lichterman 1998). Ethnography is also addressed as a plausible strategy to document practices and performances “as they happen, where they happen” (Baiocchi 2005: 166). In his reflections about ethnography, Loïc Wacquant (2003) defines it in the following way:

“[Ethnography is] social research based on the closed-up, on-the-ground observation of people and institutions in real time and space, in which the investigator embeds herself near (or within) the phenomenon so as to detect how and why agents on the scene act, think and feel the way they do” (p. 5)

I am interested on gaining understanding on the experiences of people while using technologies of recognition and reparation in real time space. However, my research practice is not only about detecting how functionaries and applicants “act, think, and feel”. It is also about the materiality of technologies and the translations made by their users. Among the consolidated strategies in STS research concerned with the materiality of objects, the mobilization of actors, and the configuration of sociotechnical assemblages, ethnography (Hess 2001) and ethnomethodology (Garfinkel 1967) represent important traditions. Throughout this chapter, I depicted different contributions and reflections on the range of elements configuring the sociotechnical assemblage of recognition and reparation. Some of these studies constitute examples of the critical achievements of STS oriented ethnographic approaches to account for the configurations between actors (e.g. applicants, functionaries, state representatives) and devices (e.g. forms, numbers, psychosocial assistance techniques) enacting social orders (e.g. rights restitution, governance, statehood).

The deployment of forms, psychosocial devices, and numbers is one of the two lenses that permit a focus on what the technologies of recognition and reparation assemble. The other lens consists of the experiences of applicants and functionaries when engaging with the recognition and reparation system. Specifically about documents and other similar sources, the compilation made by Annelise Riles (2006) of these objects as ethnographic sources offers analytical routes to be included in my research practice. Hence, besides the trajectories of devices and the narratives of actors, I also trace the circulations of numbers in official reports, communications, training handbooks, and the mobilization of state representatives especially in local
newspapers. These sources provide me with relevant information about sites and moments different from the ones that I visit and accompany.

Tracing the trajectories of technical objects and learning from the experiences of different interlocutors are activities that occur in a variety of places. I started my ethnographic journey in 2013 at the queues gathering in front of assistance centres located in Bogotá, Medellín, Tunja, Pasto, Sincelejo, Monteria, and other towns. From there, my path was a continuous discovery. The apparently chaotic movements across sites like assistance centres, the Mayor’s office in Bogotá, the assessment offices of the UARIV, psychosocial assistance sessions, peasants' fairs, protests, marginalised neighbourhoods, documents, and news are the results of that discovery. The logic underlying this discovery initially consisted of following the trajectories of forms, numbers and protocols. Simultaneously, this logic was permeated by a growing interest in the experiences of my interlocutors. Hence, the present journey collects the accounts of 21 functionaries of which 8 work at assistance centres, 2 at assessment offices, 6 in other relevant government instances and 5 other psychosocial professionals. This document also condenses the stories of 38 people from different locations in the country of which 17 are registered as Victims, 6 had their application to the RUV rejected, another 8 never applied for registration, and a further 7 whose registration or application experience was not brought up as relevant in our encounters. The richness and detail of the accounts offered by these 59 interlocutors inevitably exceeds this thesis. However, the particular stories I choose to present in every chapter offer a clear idea of the commonalities that I extracted from all the encounters.

As mentioned before, this STS-oriented ethnographic study consists of an attempt to account for the sociotechnical aspects of rights restitution, but it is also about potential and revealing experiences of people within and beyond rights restitution. Some of the documents reviewed to enrich the encounters with interlocutors and the visits to different sites consist of the guidelines for filling out the official application form for the RUV, psychosocial assistance protocols currently used by the UARIV, the guidelines for administrative procedures for reparation and compensations, governmental periodic reports about the LV, and reports by private organisations about human rights in Colombia. Additional sources, specially used to describe the mobilizations of state representatives, include local and international newspapers.
The chapters in this text are an attempt to outline a plausible, controversial, and revealing area of inquiry for interdisciplinary social approaches concerned with the techniques materialising recognition and reparation within rights restitution and their limits. By reframing recognition and reparation as objects for critical STS, this thesis addresses two interrelated questions: what do technologies of recognition and reparation assemble? And, how are these technologies used and challenged by their users? With regard to the first question, I seek to establish the sequences of translation of recognition and reparation across different sites, as well as depict the accounts of the actors participating in those sequences. I wonder here about the orders that emerge from the assemblage of recognition and reparation, the accounts that they legitimate and silence, and the transformation of narratives of pain and mobility into other objects. About the second question, I expect to explore the emergent features of different actants, the detours, diversions, and the translations that users make when engaging with technologies of recognition and reparation. I also hope to describe some of the features of the sociotechnical features of Victimhood and the boundaries of statehood.

To address the above questions, this thesis deploys six interwoven moments of reflection about rights restitution in Colombia that also configure each chapter: tracing, reframing, registering, organising, staging, and exceeding. The first chapter has already begun this journey by tracing the public configuration of registration and reparation and the initial guidelines contained in the LV about their technical deployment. Correspondingly, the present section is an attempt at reframing, both conceptually and empirically, rights restitution as a sociotechnical arrangement that can be ethnographically depicted by following the trajectories of the technologies of recognition and reparation and the experiences of their users. These first two chapters and reflective moments mainly refer to the strategies that I use to assemble and approach my objects of interest. I have also been registering observations, organising reflections, staging arguments, and exceeding my objects of interest. Additionally, each of the last four chapters also refers to the patterns I predominantly perceived as being performed across sites and trajectories during my fieldwork in Colombia: registering applicants as Victims or rejected applicants, organising them through reparation strategies, staging numbers and indicators creating boundaries, and exceeding the boundaries of statehood. Thereby, my understanding of these moments as interwoven is inherently related to my own learning experience of writing, and my reflexive presence in the thesis embedded in my methodological approach.
There is however another implication particularly about registering, organising, staging, and exceeding: they are permanently present to a greater or lesser extent in the different trajectories and moments of recognition and reparation. The arbitrary division into those descriptive categories is based on my experience of their predominance in particular moments and sites, which effectively backgrounds the others. Thus, in chapter 3 I address how the state, through technologies of recognition, grants claimants the status of Victims. My descriptions starts in the queues at assistance centres, where I describe the forms and practices that assemble the official numbers of people registered with such status. Here, I inquire into how functionaries capture, register, assess and manage the experiences of pain and mobility provided by people seeking official recognition and the access to compensation as a form of reparation. Following registration, what the state grants as reparation for official Victims is described in chapter 4. Here, I trace the technologies and actors configuring the arrangements that materialize reparation. A notion of reparation as an attempt at organisation by the state becomes predominant, even for registered claimants. I explore some of the possibilities of the translation of psychosocial assistance protocols into objects challenging the state’s logic of reparation.

The LV has been widely addressed as a significant achievement not only for its promulgation in 2011 instituting discourses of armed conflict, but also due to its reported outcomes and results. In chapter 5, I examine how those outcomes and results are circulated in the country and how people like Luis, Graciela (chapter 1), Elias and Vivian are incorporated into those outcomes through the mediation of technical objects. I also explore how interventions of recognition and reparation endow state representatives with the ability to speak in different forums on behalf of contained and accounted people. Although the circulation of successful outcomes assembles forms of statehood, experiences of pain and mobility are invisibilized and displaced by the same technologies of recognition and reparation that captured them. However, within those same displacements of exceeding worlds, other alternative arrangements might emerge. In chapter 6, I describe some of those arrangements as material forms of organisation that represent plausible forms of the recovery of justice for people like Luis and Graciela. I will also try to share my experience of those alternative arrangements and their possibility of reparation for people within and beyond the boundaries of statehood.
I started this chapter narrating a story of people interrogating the purpose of this project. I then reflected on such interrogations to outline the conceptual-methodological approach of the thesis. My ethnographic reflections will be embedded all over the document, let me now proceed to tell other stories that interrogate recognition and reparation in Colombia.
CHAPTER 3: REGISTERING  
On forms, official recognition, and *sociotechnical borders*

The clock strikes 7:30 am and it is still cold in Bogotá, a noisy city with a population of nearly 7.5M people, almost the same as the number of people currently registered as *Victims* of the armed conflict. Despite the early hour, there are rivers of people who gather for hours in front of different assistance centres to apply for registration. These centres were formerly known as Unidades de Atención y Orientación\(^{30}\), but the current administration renamed them as Centros Dignificar\(^{31}\) and Centros Regionales (henceforth CDR). Finding out the motivations of the people in the queues becomes my initial focus.

![Queue of people waiting to access a CDR in Bogotá (author’s photograph)](image)

While I am trying to participate in the queue, the news on the radio reports with heroic narratives the on-going visit of the President Santos to the United Kingdom, the imminent signature of a Free Trade Agreement between Colombia and the European Union, and the visit of the Colombian President to Oxford University; all because of the successful implementation of social policies like the LV. Frequent expressions such as “post-conflict”, “peace dialogues” and “recognition of Victims” are strongly and proudly presented in presidential speeches (Peña 2013a, Peña 2013b). I ask one of the participants about the purpose of the queue.

---

\(^{30}\) Orientation and assistance units  
\(^{31}\) Dignification centres
**Applicant:** This is to ask for help from the UAO [CDR], police officers told me to come here, supposedly to receive humanitarian aid but I arrived too late...around 7 am and I don’t think I will be getting assistance today because I got one of the last tokens

**Fredy:** And do you know if they ask for something from you so that you can receive that aid?

A: Mmmm...yeah, well...I’ve been told about some of them but I’m not sure...the cédula and the titles of the farm...but I wouldn’t know for sure, they sometimes hurry you up with so many things and in one place they say I need this, in other place they said I need that...but for me it was the cédula and the titles

F: Oh, Do you know where I can get a token?

A. Noooo Mr. … you’ve come too late, there are always a lot of people here, and you must wake up really early to get a token.

In the above conversation, “they” refers to the functionaries who work at CDR such as lawyers, social workers and psychologists. During the conversation, I realize that registration of *Victims* begins with a set of documents that supports the claims presented by applicants. Back in the queue, a police assistant announces that the gates of the centre will soon be opened and most of the people grab their documents to their chests. This religious-seeming behaviour of the applicants in their treatment of documents as valuable objects might be seen as overly fetishistic, but in fact it is well grounded in the guidelines of the Formato Único de Declaración (FUD). This form instructs functionaries to collect as many documentary proofs as possible regarding the events in the narratives of the applicants ([CRC 2012](#)). The FUD also collects the information required for the assessment of an application and the registration of people in the Registro Único de Víctimas (RUV) which grants people with governmental assistance and compensation ([UARIV 2013](#)). On the relevance of documents, the FUD handbook provided by the Departamento para la Prosperidad Social (DPS) says:

“This additional documentation significantly facilitates the process of registration [...] and the access to assistance and reparation. It is necessary to notify the applicants about the benefits of providing additional documents that support the facts and their effects ([CRC 2012 p. 3](#)).

A general concern about evidences for being registered as *Victims* is shared by first-time applicants, people asking for humanitarian aid, and other people in the queue who want to know whether their application has been successful. The latter have waited for at least three months after providing a statement and documents to receive a
notification from the Unidad para la Atención y Reparación Integral a las Víctimas (henceforth UARIV). Their narratives are shaped by a profound disappointment after understanding that their prior expertise in the rural areas is useless for working in the city.

The above are daily experiences for applicants and functionaries interacting at CDR. The material arrangements of those spaces and the central role of forms to deal with applicants’ statements resemble the production of governmental order through forms and bureaucratic devices in Pakistan documented by Matthew Hull (2012). Following a detailed narrative of the circulation of forms among bureaucrats, politicians, peasants, and builders, Hull describes the architectonic construction of Islamabad during the late 1990s and highlights the mediation of forms in the configuration of a new regime. Similarly, the FUD resembles the envelopes followed by Marnie Jane Thomson (2012) containing information and evidence of persecution of Congolese refugees. Whilst tracing the trajectories of a particular envelope, Thomson describes how, after a continuous demand for transparency from the declarations of refugees, there is still certain “opacity” in the technical criteria and bureaucratic procedures of assessment of the envelope in the office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). By using a similar strategy as Thomson and a line of enquiry close to Hull’s study of the mediating role of forms, I wonder about the technical configuration of Victims with the FUD as its corner stone, the materiality of the assessment of applications, and the orders and borders produced by such configurations.

In this chapter, I follow the circulations of the FUD with a particular interest in its role in assisting the determination of veracity in the stories of applicants, the production of standardized narratives for assessment, and the translation of applicants’ pain into codes and official numbers. I describe the encounters between applicants and functionaries at the CDR, and the expert assessment of the FUD at the offices of the UARIV that results in the registration or rejection of applicants. This chapter also revisits the RUV as a sociotechnical arrangement that unmakes embodied experiences of pain to create codes and official numbers. Building on the Double R axiom (Papadopoulos et al. 2008) that describes the balance between rights and representation as the basis of sovereignty, I suggest that the RUV enacts a sociotechnical border. Similarly to other borders, the RUV attempts to control and tame
mobility and constitutes a promise of rights. In the case of the Colombian RUV, this sociotechnical border also displaces other versions of the armed conflict whilst legitimizing a particular notion of Victim and the official account of the armed conflict offered by the Colombian State.

My visits to different CDRs in Bogotá, Medellín, Santa Marta, Monteria, Carmen de Bolivar, and Pasto occurred between 2013 and 2015, and started mainly in the queues with the applicants who generously shared their stories and granted me permission to accompany them along the administrative procedures in different CDRs. Some of the applicants were already registered as Victims and were claiming for compensations, whereas others had just arrived in the city to provide their initial statements. Back in the queue described at the beginning, I have the opportunity to learn from Mario, a just-arrived applicant in his early twenties who comes from a rural area where he was working until last week. His wife gave birth to a girl just six days ago, but he had to leave them in the hospital because he was threatened by an armed group. He says “I just want to get a job, but I only know how to grow things, the only things you can grow in Bogotá are mushrooms on your feet after long walks”. Mario rapidly grabs his documents and we start talking about the long waits for getting and submitting documents, and the cold weather that makes people from Bogotá more stressed and aggressive according to him. I ask about his application process.

Mario: Well, that woman in the centre said the declaration was the first step and took out this form… and started to ask many… really many questions…she….well… I told her about my wife, and why I need a job to bring my wife to the city because she is in danger….she……

Fredy: she…

M: That woman… I don’t know, she kept asking me the same questions, I don’t know why… perhaps she thought I was not understanding… but in the end I told her what had happened and then signed that thing

F: Are there any questions you remember?

M: Yes, sure. My age, my wife’s name, our cédulas32 the birth certificate of my daughter, if I knew who had threatened me and why, if I had family in Bogotá, dates… the date I had arrived in the city, the date of the menace… she kind of kept asking me about the dates and places… I guess they have to be sure… but I don’t know…

F: Why so much insistence?

M: I guess she was trying to test me…

F: test you? What do you mean?

M: Yeah, kind of checking the information again and again but well….. I don’t know…. I guess they have to test everyone don’t they?

32 National ID
Similar descriptions are offered by applicants in different CDRs, pointing out an important feature of their first interaction with a functionary: the repetitive verification of dates, places and the accuracy of their statements. The description of being in a “test” situation is justified by Mario as something grounded on the need of interviewers “to be sure” about the information. At the end of his first interview where his FUD was filled by a functionary, Mario was given a detachable piece of paper which he could use to receive emergency medical assistance and some coupons for groceries. Hence, Mario’s narrative is transformed into an object that now allows him to receive benefits that were previously absent from his life in the city. A statement, some documents, a signature, and a stamp have granted Mario a ticket that he can exchange for food and other goods, at least for a couple of weeks; I initially wonder about the chains of translation (see Callon, 1986) that comprise such exchanges through the FUD.

Opening the FUD

The origin of the FUD is difficult to establish because of the diversity of previous versions, and the lack of accessible records to account for its configuration process. I manage to obtain a brief account of its origins when my interlocutors in the Bogotá Mayor’s office refer to it as an improved version of an administrative form created by Acción Social, the government organisation in charge of administering compensations to Victims under regulations prior to the LV). The previous forms collected demographic information and a few notes about the violent events. However the current version of the FUD was modified and re-designed by psychologists, social workers and lawyers working at the UARIV in 2011, to collect many more different types of information from the people and families applying for registration. Currently, the FUD consists of a form of 4 pages and 13 annexes for different victimizing events, 1 page for the narration of events and 1 page for the cases of group displacements. The form gathers information under oath from applicants regarding dates of birth, cédulas, place of residence, ages, jobs, schools attended, health records, medical and psychological symptoms noticed by functionaries, among other categories. The number of pages of the FUD is consistent with the taxonomy of “victimizing events” described in table 3.
Besides representing the massive violations taking place in Colombia during the previous decades, functionaries at CDRs claim that this taxonomy allows them to perform their duties in a “more directive way”. During the initial interview with

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | Acts of terrorism / Murder attempts / Combats / Confrontations / Harassments | **Acts of terrorism**: systematic use of terror to coerce societies or governments, performed by an organization in order to promote their purposes in the absence of war.  
**Murder attempts**: every single attack against a person, their rights or goods.  
**Combats**: Every armed contact between the Army or other functionaries and illegal armed groups.  
**Confrontations**: Every armed conflict between illegal armed groups.  
**Harassments**: Every act made by an armed group against an opponent to provoke an unexpected attack. The intensity of the attack is designed to be weaker than the response capability of the opponent. |
| 2    | Threats | Promote fear in a person, family, community or institution, in order to cause alarm and fear in the population or a specific group of people. |
| 3    | Crimes against freedom and sexual integrity as part of the armed conflict | Forms of sexual aggression made as part of the armed conflict such as violent sexual access, sex slavery, forced prostitution, forced sterilization, forced abortion, among others. |
| 4    | Forced disappearance | Deprivation of freedom of one or more persons by agents of the state or people acting with the authorization, the support or the approval of the state. This privation is followed by a lack of information or false information about the location, so that the legal resources and guarantees are not permitted. Forced disappearance is also performed by illegal armed groups. |
| 5    | Forced displacement | Every person forced to migrate inside the national territory, moving away from his/her residence or usual economical activities, because his/her physical integrity, safety, security or freedoms have been trespassed or are under threat. |
| 6    | Massacre | Execution of three or more people in a single event, or different events made by the same actor, or in the same time and place. |
| 7    | Anti-personnel mines, Unexploded ammunition or improvised explosive object | **Anti-personnel mine**: Explosive device designed to hurt and damage people. These can operate for several years, usually installed beneath the soil and explode by contact with a person or an animal. These devices cannot be directed towards specific targets, so they can hurt soldiers, civilians or animals.  
**Unexploded ammunition**: explosive weapons like bombs, bullets or grenades that did not explode when used or were rejected but are still active, even for years, conserving their destructive power.  
**Improvised explosive devices**: manufactured in a non-industrialized way and which explode by contact with an object, animal or person. |
| 8    | Kidnapping | Illegal detention of people against their will with the purpose of requesting money or any economic utility for their liberation, or coercing people or institutions to do something. |
| 9    | Torture | Every action that produces intentional pain, physical or psychological damage to a person, with the purpose of acquiring information, confession, or as punishment for actions. |
| 10   | Recruitment of children and teenagers by armed groups | Every under aged person that engages in acts of war led by illegal armed groups, as well as the children that have been removed or that have deserted by choice, or after their capture. |
| 11   | Forced withdrawal or expulsion from lands | A person deprived of his/her property or land by violent means, legal manoeuvres, administrative action, sentence, or violent crimes. In this situation the person is removed from their lands or properties temporarily or permanently, without the possibility of benefitting from his/her goods. |

Table 3 Victimizing Facts during the armed conflict used to fill the FUD (DPS 2012)
applicants, functionaries must collect information regarding the dates, places and consequences. Here, proofs of assistance (medical, psychological, governmental) and reports to the authorities made by the applicants or the members of their family are required. Thus, the narration of events takes place, only after an initial procedure of codification and constant verification of dates, places, proofs and circumstances. Finally, the applicant is invited to review his statement and modify it if necessary, so that the FUD can be signed, stamped, finger printed, and submitted to the UARIV for its assessment. From the previous description of the procedure for filling the FUD before its assessment, there are two aspects that are particularly interesting: the production of certain types of narrative encouraged by the FUD, and the translation of pain by functionaries during the interview.

On the production of narratives, the guidelines of the FUD insist on orienting the statements to provide a “complete, conscious and coherent statement of the facts” by using the questions suggested in the annexes, which emphasize places and dates (DPS 2012, CRC 2012). I wonder how these orientations occur and how they shape the narratives contained in the FUD for their expert assessment. With regard to the pain of applicants the guidelines of the form also instruct functionaries to “…”record all the affective, emotional, cognitive and behavioural details that the applicant has experienced regarding the facts, as well as the emotional expressions whilst providing the narration…” (DPS 2012, p. 59). This is also a crucial aspect of the deployment of the form that I consider particularly interesting since it will provide insights on how the experiences of pain offered by applicants are transformed into something else and incorporated into the FUD and its subsequent assessment. Let us accompany other trajectories of the FUD to explore these two interwoven aspects in more detail.

The FUD at CDRs

Producing narratives

I visit another CDR but, contrary to my expectation, there is no queue and the facilities are far smaller. Instead of cubicles and offices, the interaction space is now configured by a desk, a printed FUD, the applicant, and the functionaries. The initial interview can be easily observed and heard from the waiting area, so I inevitably become part of the arrangement. Sentences like “Almost a year ago…”, “when I lived
in a farm near…” “I was assaulted by paracos\textsuperscript{33} forces…” were rapidly interrupted by the functionary who offered other plausible examples to continue the narration like “On July 25 2013…” “I lived in a farm located at kilometre 25 between X and X”, and “I was assaulted apparently by members of paramilitary forces”. The narration of events is continuously driven by instructions like “remember that we need specific dates”, “please be clear about the place”, “can you repeat the date and place”. The functionary takes notes in the FUD only when the narration finally fits the instructed parameters after repetitive rehearsals with the sequences of questions following almost by heart the script provided by the FUD. In the meantime, the annotations of the functionary in the FUD are accompanied by multiple box-ticks, short footnote annotations, and several cross marks.

The above story of pain offered by the applicant was initially full of tragic events like constant threats to his children, sexual aggression towards his partner and his oldest daughter, ongoing massacres in his village, and the possibility of his sons being forcibly recruited. His tears and gasps were constantly interrupted, and thereby augmented, by the rehearsal of the statements until it became almost impossible for the applicant to continue and the functionaries had to bring water and a tissue. However, many of the large number of details initially pointed out by the applicant were absent from the edited version now written in the FUD. The new “free” narrative of events, a quality insisted upon in the official documentation, was also “free” of the most important details of the applicant’s experience of pain. Thus, the final result of the interview was a produced narrative tremendously explicit about the dates and places that, according to my understanding of the guidelines for the FUD, should be accompanied by marks in the boxes 2, 3, 5, 6 and 10 of the Victimizing Facts of the form.

\textsuperscript{33} Members of paramilitary groups
After determining that the applicant had previously received psychological treatment as certified by a document, the guidelines of the FUD require ticking the boxes for “problems in speech”, “memory and reasoning” and “psychological trauma”. The functionary frequently insists on the necessity of documents and evidences as means of increasing the chances of registration, but the applicant admits that he has not got many of those documents. The encounter finishes after half an hour, when the FUD filler asks the applicant if he wants to change or modify anything. Without any amendment, he signs the document adding his *cédula* number and the same is done by the functionary after stamping the FUD and delivering the detachable part of the FUD to the applicant. I will later learn that the number in the detachable sheet is the consultation code that the applicants must keep for possible inquiries. Lastly, the applicant receives vouchers for groceries and the address of a temporary accommodation in Bogotá where he can stay for 30 days. Thus are the experiences of pain of an applicant transformed into a satisfactory, rehearsed, and standardized narrative that fulfills the requirements of the FUD.

My observations in different CDRs across the country and the narratives about the FUD interview by several of my interlocutors in the queues are consistent on the predominance of the standardized production of narratives. The thousands of stories of pain daily offered by applicants at the CDRs are promptly translated into fitting

---

narratives, codes, ticked boxes, and stamped forms that fulfil the technical requirements for the provision of dates, places and times. This configuration of relatively homogenous types of narratives puts me in contact with the lines of inquiry brilliantly pursued by Martha Lampland and Susan Leigh Star (2009) about how standards are naturalized and become tacit knowledge. They differentiate between conventions, for example the ways in which a doctor treats a patient, and standards imposed at a national level or a wider scale. To explain such differentiation, Lampland and Star suggest the notion of “degrees of delegation” (p. 17) which arise from how the enforcement of standards and their moral orders is managed. The FUD is currently used throughout the country and has mediated the applications of millions of people since 2011. Thereby, the standardization of narratives by the FUD configures both the ways in which functionaries treat and transform the narratives of applicants, and its mandatory use at a national scale. As Lampland and Star point out, this disseminated action of formalising practices, like the guidelines of the FUD, resembles the notion of “action at a distance” (Latour 1987: 219 cited by Lampland and Star, 2009). In the case of the FUD, the “action at a distance” illustrates how the UARIV and state representatives come to know and act upon interactions that are apparently distant from the places where the FUD is designed and assessed. According to Latour, “action at a distance” is possible by “bringing home” (knowledge of) distant entities and subsequently inventing mechanisms for their representation that are mobile, stable and combinable (Latour, 1987, p. 223). This action of “bringing home” is possible through the standardization of narratives of pain now contained in the FUD, but such mobile, stable and combinable mechanisms also suggests the existence of organised settings circulated by the narratives. That kind of order is addressed by Lampland and Star (2009) as a relational property that emerges from the very use of standards. The mobility of the standardized narratives of pain and their emerging infrastructural order is something that I will portray in more detail in later chapters of this dissertation, but before that, let us continue describing and discussing the trajectories of the FUD at CDR.

Translating pain

We have described the production of narratives in the interviews between functionaries and applicants for filling the FUD. Such standardization seems absolutely necessary for Luna, a functionary formerly working at CDR, because “[...]sometimes they [the applicants] are so affected and cannot even speak, or they
simply don’t know how to describe what happened, so you must make a huge effort to decipher their intentions, though remaining respectful about their pain […]”. Luna’s words make me think of how functionaries are encouraged to pay special attention to the observable medical and psychological symptoms of applicants. I become interested in the kind of impressions indicated by Luna about how functionaries experience the applicants’ experiences of pain during their face to face interactions at CDR.

I am in another queue with Mónica, an applicant visiting a CDR for the third time to check if there has been any formal communication about her application. In the entrance, a person takes note of the names, addresses, and cédulas and delivers turn tokens which will determine the order of assistance. Unlike other CDRs, people can sit inside the facilities to wait for the call of the functionary so Monica and I are quickly surrounded by lots of people in the waiting room. A functionary sitting at a desk calls every turn and indicates the cubicle where the assistance will be provided after corroborating the name with the cédula and checking the documents. Everybody is paying careful attention to the calls which are made almost every 15 minutes. Ana, a queue friend of Monica’s, is suddenly called by her name. The person in the desk asks for her cédula and I inevitably witness the following dialogue between Ana, her companion Juan, and the functionary:

**Functionary**: Why do you want to provide a statement?

**Ana**: I have lived here with my son, since right after they killed my husband….I came here to Bogotá

F- Do you know the address?

**A**: I guess that it is near X

F- But I need your address…

**A**: Yeah, I came right after they killed my husband…

F- mmmmm

**Juan**: Yeah, she comes from X, she lives in X, she came after the problem she had

F: Why hasn’t she provided her address, phone number or anything else?

**J**: It’s just that when her husband was murdered, she got kind of traumatized…they took her daughter and then…

F: But, what is the address?

**J**: Street X, number X, but she came because she was recently abused…so…

F: Well…What is her cédula number?
J: She has a problem with the cédula and she has been trying to solve this for the last five months and because of the abuse….

F: But, what is her cédula number?

J: It is just that since her husband was murdered, she kind of lost her mind, she was then abused and her farm was burned down so the documents were also burned.

F: Wasn’t there at least any chance to grab a copy of her cédula?

J: No, she could not be identified because she lost her mind so they decided to register her again by asking her about her names so she got a new cédula, but then they found the old cédula in the system and she had other surnames…it was a hell of a problem because she had two cédulas…that is the problem…the thing is that she was displaced from her farm and…

F: Well, but… what is her cédula number?!

The above interaction occurs where several spectators, including me, can easily witness what happens. I understand now why people in the queue hold onto their documents so strongly and the importance of the cédula. The script outlined in the FUD evidently configures the interaction between the functionary official and the applicant, so the official repeatedly requests the documents even though this particular story of pain suggested a different approach. In spite of the guidelines of the FUD indicating that applicants must be assisted even if they don’t have any documents, the functionary assisting Ana is exclusively concerned about her cédula. Such concern inevitably and violently displaces the overwhelming pain of the applicant, even after a failed attempt of her companion to make her particular story more explicit for the functionary. The bureaucratic-technical inflexibility of the functionary is explained by Clara, a lawyer working in the Human Rights Office at the Mayor’s Office in Bogotá. Clara claims that the situation of Ana is “unfortunately common”, because public officials (1) may lack the training to perform good work, (2) have not got the human capabilities for conducting successful “emotional labour” and (3) do not have enough time to behave properly since there are lots of people waiting for assistance. Clara also asserts:

I had been working for several years with Victims, and after 2002-2003, the number of Victims increased exponentially, I had to deal with daily cases of sexual abuse, traumas, stress, anxiety, depression and other problems caused by guerrillas and paramilitary forces. My team and I reached our limit and had no
alternative to hiring more psychologists to manage that, and because we were getting sick as well.  

Clara firmly believes that functionaries in charge of dealing with applicants should be psychologists, social workers or people trained in psychosocial assistance to prevent the occurrence of cases like Ana’s. The account offered by Clara does not question the FUD, its nature or guidelines, so the situation of Ana is instead ascribed to the inability of experts or functionaries to undertake the correct management of procedures. For Clara and other functionaries supervising statement-taking procedures at the CDRs, the failure to provide good treatment to the applicants resides in the inadequate training of the technicians in charge of the FUD. This kind of account was also present in expressions such as “we need more time”, “you cannot expect us to treat everybody with the same patience”, “I am a lawyer not a psychologist”, and “you cannot have your cake and eat it too”. Again, such accounts do not question the design of the FUD as a device that inherently mediates the interaction with applicants.

As Clara suggests, the encounters with applicants demand from functionaries a set of empathic dispositions towards embodied forms of pain that exceed standardized narratives, or in the words of Elaine Scarry (1985), a sentience of other’s pain. Scarry argues that the expansion of human sentience is possible beyond the limits of the body through artefacts that work as tools for projecting sentience. However, Scarry also distinguishes between tools and weapons as artefacts for making and unmaking human sentience respectively. While tools allow the projection of sentience, weapons pursue its reduction by interfering with other’s mobility at a distance. Discussing Scarry’s distinction, Steve Brown (in press 2016) suggests that artefacts can also have an ambiguous status insomuch as they can support projects of making and unmaking. Whilst reframing artefacts from a relational ontology (Mol 2002 cited by Brown in press 2016) Brown argues that the making or unmaking character of techniques is defined by how the artefacts become embedded in a network of actions. From the above perspectives and my observations at CDRs, the FUD can be understood as a technology that does not follow a single trajectory. The FUD is an artefact that...

---

35 Llevaba trabajando varios años con víctimas, y luego del 2002-2003, la cantidad de víctimas se disparó exponencialmente, tuve que lidiar con casos diarios de abuso sexual, traumas, estrés, ansiedad, depresión causados por la guerrilla y los paramilitares. Llegué al tope y con mi equipo no tuvimos otra opción sino contratar más psicólogos para que manejaran eso, además porque nos estábamos enfermando.

36 No se puede estar en la procesión y tocar las campanas al mismo tiempo.
unmakes the pain of applicants and yet controls their actions in order to create standards that transform applicant’s sentience into codes and paperwork. The “world-annihilating” (see Scarry 1985) experience of pain embodied by Ana is disregarded by the functionary following the script of FUD. However, Brown (in press 2016) also suggests that “[r]ather than treat making and unmaking as contrasting projects, we may then see them instead as reciprocally bound in the sociotechnical trajectory of a given setting”. Hence, it is not entirely impossible that in circumstances different from the ones I observe at CDRs, the FUD may actually become a vehicle for the projection of the applicant’s (or the functionaries’) sentence.

The encounters taking place at the CDR around the FUD assemble heterogeneous singularities that also perform each participant in hybrid forms as applicants-Victims, experts-functionaries and statements-forms. The FUD becomes a partially stable and unquestioned artefact, supposedly designed for accompanying people in their first encounter with a representative of an absent state but now also used to produce a standardized narrative. As suggested by Callon and Latour (1981: p. 279), actors assume the authority to “speak in the name of others” during translation. Similarly, Callon (1986) states:

To speak for others is to first silence those in whose name we speak [...] to translate is also to express in one’s own language what others say and want, why they act in the way they do and how they associate with each other: it is to establish oneself as a spokesman. (p. 216)

Hence, through the FUD, functionaries position themselves as spokespersons of applicants and, whilst circulating in other trajectories, the FUD subsequently speaks in their names to other actors. Therefore, the making of standardized narratives, codes and filled FUDs is only possible by unmaking and reducing the experiences of pain of the applicants. The assemblage of the FUD in CDRs displaces and neglects the pain embodied by applicants. Translating pain through the FUD is then unmaking pain and speaking on behalf of the people embodying the pain. The language of such speech is comprised of the codes and categories made by the FUD. Thereby, a unique and apparently harmonic arrangement emerges in the encounters in the CDR between (a) the expert as a box ticker and manager of public benefits, (b) the applicant as a person willing to exchange his/her stories for provisional humanitarian aids, and (c) the FUD
as a stabilized device that orients the interactions. A life-changing experience of pain and a script legitimated by different forms of expertise are now contained, materialized, signed and stamped in a textual device. In order to explore other chains of translation, I now follow the circulations of the FUD in the offices of the UARIV where the assessment of the application occurs.

The FUD at the UARIV

Containing

The UARIV is a government office founded in 2012 by the current administration after the promulgation of the LV in 2011. It is an instance of the Department of Social Prosperity in charge of the administrative procedures for rights restitution of Victims (CONPES 2011). According to the documents of strategic planning of the UARIV, the purpose of the assessment procedures is to “[…] lead, orientate, mobilize and articulate the necessary actions for developing harmonised, organised and systemic processes that guarantee an adequate implementation of the policy”37. The office of assessment of the FUD is constituted by professionals and technicians in charge of a) receiving the printed or electronic FUDs, b) inputting the data of the FUD in the information system of the UARIV, c) checking the fulfilment of the minimal requirements of the FUD (blanks, annexes, supporting documentation, correct signatures), d) detecting inconsistencies or missing information of the FUD, e) assessment of the circumstances of time, mode and place narrated by the applicants on the grounds of “[…] technical, legal and contextual criteria, as well as approved assessment criteria to decide on the inclusion in the RUVR.” In addition, this same team must f) write down the administrative response or communication and submit it to the CDR for collection by the applicants. Among its functions, the UARIV must guarantee, “[…] the opportunity, confidence, integrity, transparency and security of the information by using standardized procedures, proper channels and a wide technological platform that allows access and control, given the nature of the information it contains […]” (UARIV 2012a) and warns its employees that “[…] the public servants will make a responsible use of the information they may access, being aware of the existing disciplinary penalties”. The technical criteria used during the assessment of the FUD stands as a constant inquiry during my visits.

37 “[…] liderar, orientar, movilizar y articular las acciones requeridas para el desarrollo de procesos ordenados y armónicos con carácter sistémico, que permitan garantizar la adecuada y oportuna ejecución de la política
After familiarizing myself with the documentation of the UARIV, and having being granted authorization, I find myself in the facilities of the assessment office in Bogotá. While I am waiting in the pedestrian entrance for my interviewee to finish his previous meeting, I can see that several boxes are delivered by trucks in the warehouse entrance of the building after the security guards open the garage doors. The boxes contain FUDs from all over the country and are received by a couple of people wearing blue uniforms. A few hours later, thanks to the access my interviewee has as the director of the SVR, I will be able to see how those people at the reception are in charge of writing up an inventory that lists the numbers in the forms, so only after checking the inventory can they sign a form for the truck driver. During my time in the entrance, I keep wondering about what happens after the FUDs are received. Later, I will notice how the people at the reception desk spend a long time with the received forms, checking again the numbers of the forms. I do not know it yet, but I will also have the opportunity to see how a large database contains the numbers of thousands of FUDs delivered during the last year, and how every single space of the reception office is used to store and temporarily stack, the many boxes containing the forms. According to the surveillance staff at the reception, a recent remodelling was carried out because “more security was required, and our information is pretty sensitive”. At the entrance, checking my cédula, taking a picture of my face, recording my fingerprint, and printing a temporary sticker with my personal information remind me of the standard practices in many different government buildings that I have visited, even before my research journey.

A buzz in the desk of the security guard precedes my authorization to come up to the second floor where the director awaits. During my walk, I can see that every floor is full of offices, cubicles and computers. One e-mail to the director of the UARIV, a couple of e-mails more to one of her assistants, three letters of introduction by a British University and a few months of waiting have finally made this encounter possible. Our meeting with the director of the section takes place in the middle of offices where the assessment of the FUDs is taking place. My host offers to walk me around the whole building beginning with the first floor, where the FUDs are received. Once there a couple of persons in their uniforms explain to me the inventory procedure. My host leaves me for a while to solve a situation in the digitization area, meanwhile the people in the reception show me the large database they have been
creating during the last 5 months, and also explain that every FUD number is registered in a particular territorial category, so they can identify where it comes from and where it was filled.

I can see the boxes that were received a few minutes ago while I was waiting to enter the building. Several signatures, dates and identification records are fixed to the outside of the boxes. FUDs from the Departments of Tolima, Quindío, Sucre, Bolívar, Norte de Santander, Nariño, Huila and Magdalena are the ones I get to see more clearly, but there are more I cannot distinguish. I feel overwhelmed when thinking of the stories behind those boxes, of the years of experiences of pain, perpetractions and assaults contained now in those forms that inevitably remind me of the people that I have been accompanying. I think of the necessary chains of translation for those forms to be there in a single place waiting for expert evaluations. Such boxes and databases resemble a form of Panopticon (Foucault 1983) inasmuch as through techniques like the FUD, the Colombian State maximizes its effectiveness by individualizing the applicants in forms that put them in an apparently constant state of visibility. In his analysis of the failures of modernist governmental schemes, James Scott (1998) suggests that the state acts as an organiser of its inhabitants in designing spaces and development projects. Scott describes how different forms of knowledge and control also require a “narrowing of vision” (p.11) that focuses in certain limited aspects of a phenomenon making it more visible, legible and susceptible to measurement and efficient management.

Piles of boxes with filled forms full of annotations, standardized narratives, and codes allow the state to partially represent and control the mobility of people seeking registration in exchange for a promise of reparation (See Jaramillo 2012). This is one of the ways that the Colombian State sees the pain and mobility embodied by applicants for registration. Dimitris Papadopoulos, Niam Stephenson, and Vassilis Tsianos (2008) describe this relation between representation and rights as the double R axiom that precisely addresses the attempts of states to control people’s mobility in exchange for official recognition of citizenship. People then are incorporated into formal systems that guarantee control of their location, displacements, and forms of employment in exchange for rights so that the balance between representation and rights becomes a condition for the sovereignty of states (Papadopoulos et al. 2008: 6). Here, the FUD emerges as an artefact that besides unmaking the embodied pain of
applicants whilst making standards, also enacts the state’s attempt to capture and control the mobility of people. But at the same time, the procedures around the FUD resemble transnational borders inasmuch as they also seem to “define the matrix of positive rights and representation within the national territory, and the non-existence of rights and symbolic presence beyond the nation’s borders” (Papadopoulos et al. 2008: 7). Let us explore this possibility in the upcoming paragraphs, where I suggest how representing actually becomes translating into codes and containing in boxes, databases, and official numbers.

Assembling “rigour” and “objectivity”

After the reception, a procedure called Crítica is made. It consists of checking that every FUD is properly filled, every signature is in place, and the situations in the narration of events is explicit about time, places and modes, elements that can only be fixed in the place where the statement was made. If the result of the Crítica is not satisfactory, the FUD is returned to the place of origin to be properly filled. Then, Captura is made by digitizers by scanning the FUDs and uploading them into the intranet so that, as explained by the director, “terabytes and terabytes of information in the servers contain the digitalized forms”. Following this, Glosas comes onto the scene. This is a matter of filtering those cases in which there is information that can be easily corrected by contacting the functionary or the applicant to provide clarification of a date or a place. About these first three steps, my host explains that the number of returned FUDs has dropped tremendously during the past year, probably because functionaries throughout the country are now more familiar with the form and lots of training has been provided by the assessment office. The director also claims that the on-line FUD is now reducing the amount of FUDs that are printed and sent to the assessment office.

About 130 professionals are in charge of assessment of the national FUDs and, according to the director of the assessment office, most of them hold backgrounds in Sociology, Psychology, Law, Political Science, and some of them additionally hold graduate training in Human Rights. The director claims: “this is important because we need professionals who know about the history of the armed conflict and understand

---

38 Olga Restrepo-Forero and Malcolm Ashmore coined the term “rule of formality not legality” underwriting how notarial procedures frequently return forms and documents that do not fulfil the filling requirements. See Asmore, M. and Restrepo-Forero, O. (2013) ‘El documento en su paso por la notaria; confianza, formalidad y credibilidad en Colombia’ in Restrepo, O., ed. Ensamblando Ciudadanías, Bogotá, Colombia: Centro de Estudios Sociales CES.
its context so that they make a better decision […] It must be a competent professional because every case is very particular and complex”. My host’s appreciation sounds sincere, so I ask him to take me to the assessment office to talk to one of the professionals working there. Unfortunately, presidential elections are happening at the weekend, and most of the professionals are preparing a report for the Director of the UARIV to be presented to the media as part of the achievements of the current government. I manage to listen to some of their simultaneous conversations regarding the election, and a general feeling of worry is easily perceived. Some of the conversations of the people working in the building address the chances of Oscar Iván Zuluaga, the “Uribista” candidate. If that were the result, some of them might lose their jobs because in their words “Uribe and his puppet are not interested in peace but war instead, so reparation of the victims would stop being a priority”.

During another visit to the assessment office, the director introduces me to the psychosocial assessment professional who I will be accompanying for some days. The social worker who will now be my host is finishing a report and asks me to wait at a desk. While I wait, I see lots of people greeting each other without leaving their screens unattended, and some of them look at me perhaps wondering about the purpose of my visit. Some others are constantly opening PC windows and several files at the same time almost as fast as my eyes blink. I can make out that some of those files are FUDs that have already been digitalized for assessment and it seems that the assessors also look at different records, copying and pasting lots of texts as well as checking, marking, and cross-referencing information. According to one of the supervisors, every professional must complete at least 10 to 12 applications per day, which becomes a challenging task considering the amount of information every FUD compiles. After receiving a list of FUD numbers as assignments of the day, assessment professionals must check for the cédula numbers in different databases in case there are previous applications. Tania, the psychosocial evaluator who has allowed me to accompany her with the consent of the director, inputs the FUD unique number so that the digital version of the form appears on the screen. Then, Tania checks the correspondence between dates, places and events contained in the section of narration of events in the FUD against the ones already registered in different sections of the form.
Different databases such as the Procuraduría’s for preventing mistakes in the cédula numbers, the System of Information of Displaced Populations (SIPOD), and databases created under past regulations must also be checked to determine whether the applicants have already received compensations. If that is the case, a communication is sent whereby inclusion in the RUV is recorded but no compensation is granted since it has already been given under a previous regulation. The same happens with people who were underage when their parents applied and received compensations, but now have a cédula and try to apply as Victims of the same event under the current legislation. These people are reassured or included in the RUV, but no compensation is granted. Something different happens with people who were former guerrilla members, since every cédula is searched in the ACR (Colombian Agency for Reintegration) database, and if the result is positive, the communication contains the words *not included.* “The law is very clear about those cases… a former member of an armed group will not be recognized as a victim” says Tania. When I ask her about the applications with chances of success, Tania points out that female applicants in charge of children whose partners were not members of illegal groups were the ones most likely to be included in the RUV, whereas single young men without documents or proofs were the least likely to be registered as Victims.

Tania shows me on the screen the steps of the assessment and the elements that an official communication must comply with to be sent. The case of a woman who had been displaced from her land and moved to Bogotá is assessed in the following 4 stages. Her textual claims were quoted in the *Motivation,* in this case the box marked in the FUD with the category Forced Displacement allowed the assessment professional to quickly select the parts of the narration describing the conditions of displacement. After checking again the cédula of the applicant and determining she had not been registered before nor received any compensation, the functionary proceeded by quoting the legal definitions of displacement and article 3 of Law 1448. One of the reports of the presidential program on human rights was quoted, since it indeed assured the reader that there had been a significant number of armed confrontations in the area where the applicant came from during the stated time period. Finally, the words “recognize” and “inclusion” are typed into the resulting communication. The first assessment I witness happens so fast in front of my eyes that I could barely extract the mechanics of the procedure consisting of textual extractions, copying, pasting, comparing, and double-checking. I become aware that I am witnessing the
practices that assemble official recognition as Victims of the armed conflict in Colombia, the official number of Victims to receive reparation, and the universe of people to be understood as Victims in the official reports.

I follow another assessment, and this time I am more familiar with the procedure so that I am able to pay more attention to other details. Tania takes the application of a woman whose husband was a former guerrilla member. During the Motivation, literal parts of the narration of events in the FUD are selected, copied and pasted in the communication draft already opened. In the FUD under assessment the part reads as follows

Considering that X in her statement says: “[…] He didn’t come back home that day and I got really worried because he had never spend a night out. The next day around 6 am I went out looking for him…and when I went to the river near our house I saw him lying on the ground” […]” Then, the claimant says: “The X killed him because when he was a little boy he had been recruited and he had managed to escape from them” […] 39

The box marked in the FUD containing the category Homicide was quickly looked at by Tania, and it worked as a selective filter for the extensive narration of events so she was able to collect the specific parts in the narrative regarding the homicide. She quickly had a look at the dates and places again, copied the cédula of the applicant’s husband and opened the database of the ACR which contained the documents of former guerrilla members finding a positive match. Tania then moved to the next stage of the assessment, the Juridical where resolutions, laws, sentences and statements are quoted as support for the decision in the case. In this case she chose paragraph 2 of article 3 of law 1448 which says:

[…] the members of illegal armed groups will not be considered as Victims, except in the cases when children had left the armed group while still being underage. For the purposes of the current law, the partners or relatives of former members of illegal armed groups will be considered as direct Victims for the damage they suffered in

39 Considerando que X en su declaración señala: “(…) Ese día no volvió a la casa, yo me preocupé mucho porque él nunca se quedaba fuera de la casa. Al otro día como a las 6.00am yo salí a buscarlo… y cuando pase por la quebrada cerca a nuestra casa lo vi tirado en el piso. (…)” Más adelante la deponente manifiesta: “(…) La … fue quién lo mató porque cuando pequeño lo habían reclutado y se había logrado escapar (…)”
their rights in the terms of this article, but not as indirect Victims of the damage suffered by the members of those groups […]40

Tania explains that although the applicant’s husband was recruited while a child, his desertion occurred when he was an adult. The following stage is the Context, which consists of referencing the official documents and reports on human rights made by different sources like (a) the Presidential Program of Human Rights (Programa Presidencial de Derechos Humanos) (b) reports per department from 2000 to 2007 made also by the presidential program, (c) the District Attorney office reports (d) the ICBF41 reports, also (d) reports made by the local authorities, the police or the military forces, and less frequently (e) documents produced by NGOs, or (f) information in the media; also documents that may be considered “serious”, this is according to Tania, documents made by research centres at Universidad de los Andes or Universidad Javeriana. The references taken from these databases and reports must provide a description of the context pointed to by the applicant. For example in the case of the female partner of a former guerrilla member who was being assessed, the reports made by local authorities about extrajudicial executions might be used to indicate the truth of her narration. Despite the veracity of the account presented in this FUD, it seems that the person cannot be recognized as a Victim since her case represents an exception to the law as the Technical stage will argue.

[Considering that] after consulting the database of the Agencia Colombiana para la Reintegración –ACR– a record in the name of the claimant’s husband was found with the number X […] On the grounds of the above arguments, it is established in an objective and rigorous way in the statement of the claimant that the homicide of her husband was not caused by the circumstances described in article 3 of Law 1448 of 2011; instead, that homicide was caused by personal and social circumstances […] This office resolves not to include X, identified with the cédula X nor the members of her family in the RUV, and not to recognize the victimizing fact of Homicide, for

40 “(…) Los miembros de los grupos armados organizados al margen de la ley no serán considerados víctimas, salvo en los casos en los que los niños, niñas o adolescentes hubieren sido desvinculados del grupo armado organizado al margen de la ley siendo menores de edad. Para los efectos de la presente ley, el o la cónyuge, compañero o compañera permanente, o los parientes de los miembros de grupos armados organizados al margen de la ley serán considerados como víctimas directas por el daño sufrido en sus derechos en los términos del presente artículo, pero no como víctimas indirectas por el daño sufrido por los miembros de dichos grupos. (…)”

41 Colombian Institution of Family Welfare
Finally, after several clicks and editions the resolution is printed and saved in the servers where it will be printed and sent to the office it came from in the form of an official communication. The assessment script is evident during my visits to the office and was strictly followed by most of the psychosocial professionals in charge of evaluating the FUD. Official acts granting and denying recognition grounded in assumptions of “objectivity” and “rigour” are assembled in digital and printed documents. What had been initially translated into a standard narrative is now transformed into a communication of acceptance or rejection. “Objectivity” and “rigour” are not the pre-existing criteria for assessing the applications but emergent qualities of the assessment procedures. Both qualities arise from the consistency among governmental databases that narrate the official account about the violence in Colombia. I have argued before that the embodied pain of applicants is unmade so that codes and filled forms can be made. Likewise, the diverse and possibly divergent accounts of the violence offered by applicants are also unmade so that the official account of the conflict can be made. Every acceptance or rejection of an application inevitably strengthens and corroborates the official account of the conflict, and the objectivity of the databases used in the assessment. Every single application and assessment materializes a formal arrangement comprised of forms, standards, databases, experts, and official communications. Let us now describe some of the specificities and tensions within this arrangement.

Performative effects

When asked about the feeling of being under evaluation experienced by applicants like Mario during their interviews for filling the FUD, a functionary working at a CDR asserted that repeating questions about places, dates, and details of the events was a strategy to “identify the liars.” The functionary also claimed: “[…] as you and I know, not all of the applicants are real victims, are they? This country is full of ‘vivos’”\textsuperscript{43} and

\textsuperscript{42} Que al consultar las bases de datos de la Agencia Colombiana para la Reintegración –ACR– se encontró registro de X con el código X […] de los argumentos anteriores, se establece de manera objetiva y atendiendo rigurosamente el relato del declarante que el homicidio al que fue expuesto su cónyuge no se ocasionó por las circunstancias previstas en el artículo 3º de la Ley 1448 de 2011, sino que fue ocasionado por circunstancias de tipo social y personal […] este Despacho resuelve […] NO INCLUIR en el Registro Único de Víctimas a X, identificada con cédula de ciudadanía ni a los miembros de su hogar y NO RECONOCER el hecho victimizante de Homicidio, por las razones señaladas en la parte motiva de la presente resolución

\textsuperscript{43} People taking advantage of a situation to obtain benefits, especially those that they are not entitled to.
the resources for the victims are minimal”. The FUD seems to be positioned as an objective device that assists the scrutiny of veracity in the stories of pain offered by applicants. Among the diverse stories of pain, it can become difficult for functionaries to perform the task demanded by the State, a task also consisting of establishing which stories deserve to be treated as legitimate. Similarly to the observations offered by Thomson (2012) about the refugees’ envelopes headed to the UN, the FUD assembles notions of objectivity and transparency that offer certainty to functionaries and even applicants. Judging the truthfulness of stories as a human lie detector is in itself impossible, so the repetitive questions encouraged by the FUD become a source of certainty for functionaries at the CDR and other instances. Therefore, the imaginary of internal consistency between the procedures of filling and assessing the FUD is grounded in a wider set of relations that involve the inscription of the FUD as an official document legitimized by the State. Something similar has been documented by Hull (2012) in his study of bureaucracy and the construction of Islamabad who argues that the execution of states schemes depends on a “set of human and artifactual mediators” (p. 207).

In opposition to what experts in charge of reception may believe regarding the importance of their annotations and comments while filling the FUD, these do not seem to play a prominent role in the decision of registration. Instead, the mutual corroboration between databases and the consistency between dates and places seem to be the crucial criteria. Similarly, after accompanying the elaboration of different communications and observing similar trajectories that resulted in registration or rejection of several applications, the role of expertise in the assessment procedures also becomes unclear. However, the presence of experts in both stages of the FUD, the collection and the assessment, embody a sort of guarantee about the veracity of the initial statements, and the rationality of the assessment; the role of expertise being simply the legitimation of information collection and its assessment. If those procedures were performed by actors other than experts, problems would probably arise when administrative decisions needed any type of review, when public opinion wanted to question the RUV, or even when applicants received exclusion notifications and wanted to complain. About this performative legitimation, a functionary said: “you could never make a system do the work of an assessment professional since every application is unique and complex so a competent expert is always required”. Nonetheless, the necessity of a trained expert seems to be dispensable from my
understanding of the procedures. Considering the above statement of a functionary comparing humans and informatics systems, professionals are perhaps doing the work of an informatics system instead of the other way around. The assessment procedure follows a set of hard to alter steps that are almost automatic. The script followed by evaluators resembles a sequence of pre-established decisions with an expected result. The relevant element provided by the experts in the assessment procedure that might not be easily substituted or obviated is their signature. The signature becomes then the evidence of participation of a “human” element as part of the procedure; an element shaped and displaced by the technique itself.

Another aspect that is particularly controversial is the length of time taken for the assessment of the FUD. This procedure takes at least 3 months for an official communication to be sent by the UARIV. When asked about what happens during the three months of assessment, Mario, an applicant who I introduced at the beginning of this chapter, assures me that a thorough investigation is implemented by the assessment office. Mario thinks that functionaries conduct an investigation making calls and even visiting places to corroborate the statements provided by applicants. Similar remarks are offered by different applicants at CDRs who believe in the exhaustiveness and carefulness of the assessment. However, the digitalization and assessment of the FUD does not take more than 2 hours or at most a couple of days in difficult cases, whereas the remaining time is spent in the collection, transportation and storage of the FUD including the delivery of the communications. I feel struck by this delay, especially after witnessing what applicants have to do to survive in the city during the period of assessment. I wonder what the registration system achieves by containing a significant proportion of the population of the country in the RUV.

The RUV as border
It has been almost 4 months since Gloria had to leave her farm after the assassination of her partner and to prevent her girls from being assaulted. Despite the difficult experiences, Gloria is optimistic about her recent application to be registered as a Victim. She thinks that after being granted with such status, she will have more possibilities to make her way towards a better life. She is aware of the benefits of the registration but is also worried because she could not produce evidence of her ownership of the farm she abandoned. During the interview with the functionary, Gloria made a big effort to show her current situation, the necessity to get medical
assistance for her children, and her interest in studying so that she can get better jobs. Recently, Gloria had rejected a six-months-contract for working in cleaning services for an important company. She explains that during the procedures of registration, the UARIV checks the databases of the national health and pensions systems to determine who is already registered in those records as active contributors. If she happened to be active in those systems, her application would be immediately rejected. During one of our visits to a CDR, Gloria finally receives a letter that she shares with me:

The communication sent to Gloria indicates that the information she provided in the FUD is consistent with the databases and that the UARIV has established that she and her daughters have not received any former compensation. The communication begins:

“Communication number X by which the registration in the RUV is decided, on the grounds of the article 156 of Law 1448 of 2011 and article 37 of Decree 4800 of 2011. The Technical director of registration and information management of the UARIV, following the guidelines of the Administrative Contentious Code, Law 1448 of 2011, Decree 4156 of 2011, Decree 4800 of 2011, Resolution 1674 of July 31 2012 and considering that[...]”

Following this, three pages of the letter quotes segments of the narrative offered by the applicant registered in the FUD, and several paragraphs of the relevant regulations. Finally, the communication says:
On the grounds of the above, this office has decided: Article 1. RECOGNIZE Mrs X identified with cédula X and her family for the victimizing fact of Homicide, for the reasons quoted above. Article 2 ATTACH the established route for victims to access the measures established for their benefits […] Article 3. NOTIFY the content of this administrative act.

The above is the kind of recognition that the Colombian State makes of Gloria’s embodied experiences of pain and mobility, a form of recognition grounded in the foundations of bureaucracy. Gloria is now registered in the RUV as a Victim of the armed conflict so from now on, Gloria must ask at the CDR about the procedures of rights restitution and the gaining of benefits. She refers to the letter as a “passport for living in the city” because it allows its carrier to access the benefits as “citizens of the capital city”. With her compensations, she is planning on attending college and stopping working in cleaning services.

According to the report of the UARIV in May 2014, 625,662 applications have been received since the implementation of law 1448 in 2012, and 515,892 applications were included in the RUV (UARIV, May 2014). As corroborated by the assessment office in June 2014, nearly 26,000 FUDs are being assessed per month, registering approximately 21,500 in the RUV and rejecting 4,500 applications. Considering that between 3 and 4 people are included in every application, as in Gloria’s case, around 75,000 applicants are granted with official recognition as Victims of the armed conflict whereas almost 16,000 are rejected. If we add together the nearly 5,000,000 millions of people registered until 2010 under previous regulations, the official number had increased significantly to 7,028,776 by December 2014 and to 7,999,663 by April 2016. Along with the other millions of applicants, Gloria is now a member of the 16.55% of Colombians granted with the official status of Victim of the armed conflict; after a set of chains of translation of her embodied experience of pain, the official number now speaks on her behalf.
The RUV as an artefact mediating rights restitution encourages a set of relevant questions about the global order and the politics that it assembles. As in many other countries in similar circumstances of civil war, the status of Victim in Colombia can be understood as a category specially shaped by the guidelines of international Humanitarian Law and transitional justice. Nevertheless when it comes to administrative procedures, the status of Victim becomes a sociotechnical issue, a set of technical mediations organised by an infrastructure of registration comprised of forms, numbers, produced narratives, and certified veracity. Hence, applicants are performed into a new form of existence that supposedly allows them to access different benefits and types of compensation. Whatever the result of the application, people are anchored and contained either as included or not included in the RUV. In the former, people are promised compensations and in the latter, people are contained as assessed applications that become official management indicators. The pain embodied by applicants is translated and incorporated into either the RUV or management indicators both of which help to strengthen and consolidate a notion of rights restitution by the state as a responsible, rational, objective, and just intervention.

I previously mentioned how the boxes of FUDs and the databases resembled a sort of Panopticon to visualize the applicants. In his analysis of parliaments and courtrooms presented in *Reassembling the Social*, Bruno Latour (2005) offers the idea of the Oligopticon to express how “extremely narrow views of the whole are made possible, as long as connections hold” (p.181) This seems an appropriate way to describe how
the Colombian State sees the pain and mobility embodied by applicants for registration. Thus, what the State can actually see of the applicants through the lens of the FUD is a narrow version of their world, a reduced amount of information that is, nevertheless, enough to speak on their behalf and to make decisions on how to intervene in their lives. In this attempt at control and containment, the promise of reparation becomes an important aspect that holds the connections of the RUUV as an arrangement. Through the Double R axiom we have encountered previously, Papadopoulos et al. (2008) explain how the balance between representation and rights becomes a condition for the sovereignty of states (Papadopoulos et al. 2008: 6). Although the RUUV does not define the limits of the Colombian State nor controls the mobility of people crossing a national border, it does establish boundaries of official recognition of populations in mobility and migration after situations of violence. As an arrangement, the RUUV enacts a border which limits and defines the access to rights restitution of the people it contains. Gloria’s reference to her successful registration in the RUUV as a “passport to live in the city” actually addresses this kind of border that enacts Victimization as a form of citizenship within the country.

Gloria’s use of the word “passport” is a powerful metaphor to address the requirements for crossing the sociotechnical border of registration. Her life has been widely transformed since her arrival in the city. Instead of cultivating her own food, and selling the harvest, she now works in cleaning services, a work she only does because it provides for her family and that she initially accepted while waiting for the result of her application. “Es lo único que hay” -It’s the only available thing” - she explains with discomfort. The metaphor she uses, the precarious jobs available to her, and her clear discomfort remind me of the argument presented by Valerie Walkerdine (2006) in her critical reflections about class borders. Walkerdine claims that in the neoliberal world of work, emotional and geographical borders collide in relation to the crossing of class boundaries. The author argues that all subjects exist at a border because the border is fundamental to western and modern ways of understanding the individual (p.11). Thus, “beingness is taken out of its relational production and rendered as describable” by mechanisms of power that “strip beingness of the very relations, practices, meanings, and actions that make it possible” (p.12) The result of this process, Walkerdine explains, is to pull subjects from their “moorings in the relations of sociality”; borders, then, enact a form of violence. The author also asserts that people having to accept undesired jobs or having to show interest in precarious forms of
employment due to their status as migrants, are constantly living on the border. In these borders, there is an excess that “cannot be tamed to produce the normal individual” so the border, for the subjects who are objects of the gaze of power, “must always be a site of pain” (p.15). Borders also demand transformations that subjects have to embrace to become a new kind of subject. These borders, Walkerdine claims, are anxious borders.

Gloria’s experience and Walkerdine’s reflections make me think of the sociotechnical border enacted by the RUV also as a site of pain. Living in the city demands that Gloria accept precarious forms of employment to sustain her family. But, the RUV also demands other transformations beginning with one's naming as Victim, a sociotechnical category that people like Gloria must embrace so that she can aspire to the promise of reparation. The excess of her experiences of pain and mobility, now produce a different kind of pain, a division, a demand for transformation. Recognition through the RUV, as a sociotechnical border, is also a site of pain due to the transformations and divisions it enacts. The RUV as sociotechnical border does not only capture, it also produces subjects and boundaries of distribution of rights. Papadopoulos et al (2008) argue that the Double R axiom defines the distribution of rights within the national territory so rights restitution is something that cannot occur beyond or outside the RUV since official recognition becomes the condition for accessing rights. As explained before, official recognition as Victim consists of a status granted after technical procedures. Such status is grounded in a boundary between successful and unsuccessful applicants, between those recognized by the Colombian State and granted with a promise of reparation and those who fail to be captured by technologies of recognition. A boundary is also established between those who cross this “anxious border” embracing the new forms of life available within the border of recognition and those who reject such forms of life.

I claim that the RUV enacts a border grounded in a sociotechnical arrangement comprised of forms, databases, fillers-in, and evaluators. As with any other kind of border, it controls the access to rights whilst attempting to control and tame people’s mobility. This border also demands that applicants embrace new unnegotiable forms of organisation. With regard to this, the Double R axiom also organises political life inside the national space and “designates the nation state’s relation to other states and
their people” (Papadopoulos et al. 2008: 8) This is particularly true for people like Gloria who lived in the rural areas near the border between Colombia and Ecuador. Gloria tells me about her dilemma of mobility: should she stay on her farm despite the threats, cross a geographical border with the neighbour country and be considered an “illegal”, apply for asylum in Ecuador to attain the status of refugee, or move to a Colombian city and cope with the RUV, a sociotechnical border, to be registered as Victim. Although the RUV does not define the limits of the Colombian State as national borders do, it does establish the boundaries of its project of rights restitution as a particular form of statehood that is absent outside the RUV. What might fall outside this form of statehood?

Following their disappearance from their towns near Bogotá, at least 19 men were presented as guerrilla casualties in the North of the country in 2008. The registration of their death by administrative offices of the Army promised monetary rewards for those members of the military responsible for the alleged casualties. Such casualties were also claimed as the results of the effective interventions of the army in the region, previously or currently occupied by guerrillas. However, further investigations instigated by the mothers of the dead men, public prosecutors, and senators established that the assassinated men had been kidnapped, dressed up in guerrilla uniforms, and executed by members of the army. By April 2015, the public prosecutor was investigating almost 3,400 more cases of this kind, currently known in Colombia as Falsos Positivos (False Positives). The mothers of the first 19 assassinated men, known as Madres de Soacha44, have been continuously struggling for the recognition of their sons and families as Victims of the armed conflict. After experiencing the RUV, I think it is unlikely that their narratives would easily fit the codification of the FUD or that the government databases would consider the death of their sons as proper consequences of the armed conflict. Their deaths exceed the notion of Victim materialised by the technologies of recognition. The accounts of the armed conflict offered by Madres de Soacha also reveal the Colombian State as an armed actor, a notion invisibilized in the current technical system of assessment and registration.

44 Mothers of Soacha: Soacha is a small town bordering Bogota where an important settlement of displaced people exists. See a version of the case in Spanish named “falsos positivos” http://www.semana.com/nacion/articulo/madres-soacha-recordaron-cuatro-anos-falsos-positivos/265282-3
As mentioned before, every acceptance or rejection of an application consolidates the official account of the conflict under precepts of objectivity and rigour. The RUV as a sociotechnical border also enacts the boundaries of a form of statehood deeply grounded in both a particular notion of Victim and an account of the armed conflict provided by one of its participants: the Colombian State. Madres de Soacha are now a collective that has gained important public recognition and a few cases of Falsos Positivos have indeed been included in the RUV. However, the registration of these few cases were initially rejected through the FUD, so they had to pursue a different route comprised of legal resources like suits, appeals, and actions for protection locally known as *tutela*\(^45\) The latter has become one of the most widely used alternatives for those claiming perpetrations by representatives of the state and also by other applicants appealing their rejection from the RUV. Other types of rejected cases from the RUV include applicants perpetrated by BACRIM which are urban armed groups consisting of former members of demobilized paramilitary groups, and people in situations of forced displacement who missed the deadlines for providing their statements. Recent legal appeals regarding the registration criteria include the Sentence C280/2013 revoking missed deadlines and the Auto 119/2013 for perpetrations by BACRIM. These regulations have mandated the registration of 332,149 (April, 2016) rejected applicants in the RUV which is a small proportion of the RUV, a sociotechnical border that despite the tensions and alternative legal resources continues to consolidate the official account of the armed conflict and the State’s notion of Victim.

**Reframing the RUV**

I have described the trajectories of the FUD at the CDR and the assessment offices until the point that the results of its evaluation are incorporated into official numbers like the RUV and management indicators on rights restitution. By describing how embodied experiences of pain are unmade through the FUD to make codes and numbers, I addressed Brown’s invitation to revisit Scarry’s notion of making and unmaking as interdependent instead of contrasting projects (Brown in press 2016) through a relational ontology of artefacts (Mol, 2002 cited by Brown, in press 2016). I have depicted the performative effects of the registration system, some of its internal

\(^{45}\) Tutela is the most used legal strategy for a number of claims in the country. In the particular case of rights restitution it has permitted the registration and compensation of a small proportion of applicants in the RUV. However, such legal procedures usually take much longer than the mere application, and frequently provoke administrative loops, according to the accounts offered by my interlocutors.
tensions, and how this organised setting assembles notions of objectivity and rigour for different actors. Using the Double R axiom, the RUV was defined as a sociotechnical arrangement that establishes the boundaries of official recognition as Victim, a sociotechnical border, whilst legitimising a particular account of the armed conflict. The traced trajectories, reflections, and descriptions portray the RUV not as a rational, infallible, or unquestionable tool, but as an artefact that mediates how the Colombian State grants applicants with official recognition as Victims of the armed conflict and emerging forms of citizenship attached to such status. But the mediations of the RUV are not unidirectional; instead we might reframe it as a space of multiple forms of agency. The oligoptic state interventions of registration that unmakes the lives of people embodying experiences of pain also expand a form of statehood built upon rights restitution. An extension of the oligoptic organisation that the RUV produces has been recently developed as the mobile software application App-RNI-Cifras (Figure 9) by the UARIV. The app provides updated and crossreferenced information on the RUV, including the number of registered applicants per Victimizing Fact, gender, region, and year of perpetration.

![Figure 8 Print Screen of the App RNI-Cifras developed by the UARIV and the National Information Network (RNI)](image)

Through a sociotechnical border like the RUV and the kind of numbers and management indicators it produces, the Colombian State is becoming a greater presence in the national space. One might say that the RUV becomes an object used
for regulation and governance (Schaper-Rinkel 2013) which legitimizes regulations through specific practices, of registration in this case. But more than being merely the vehicle of governance, the RUV and its derivative objects enact such governance. Through the RUV, the state also establishes its presence in places where it was absent before. For Papadopoulos et al (2008) the Double R axiom also establishes “the non-existence of rights and symbolic presence beyond the nation’s borders” (Papadopoulos et al. 2008 p.28. original emphasis). Although the UARIV promotes objects like the App-RNI-Cifras as initiatives to improve the existing knowledge about Victims and the armed conflict, the app in itself and similar objects enact the symbolic presence of rights restitution in the territory that is achieved through registration. These objects consist of oligoptic forms of knowledge, accurate enough about the geographic origin of applicants and the year of their perpetraions, but simplistic with regard to the experiences of pain and mobility of those contained in the sociotechnical border. These numbers and objects enact a juncture of order that permits a sort of apprehension mainly by those who are not embodying those kinds of experiences of pain and mobility.

Objects like the RUV and its derivatives are vehicles for the abrasive presence of statehood of rights restitution in Colombia. As Papadopoulos et al (2008) argue, “[t]he double-R axiom retains its power not only when it is active and functional in the domain of a certain territory but also when it is absent – this is its potency” (p.7). By unmaking embodied experiences of pain the RUV makes numbers and indicators. But also, through the RUV, both rejected and registered now embody the intervention of the State. Their existence as officially recognized Victims or rejected applicants materialize the presence of a previously absent form of statehood concerned with rights restitution. Thus the sociotechnical border not only organises embodied experiences of pain and mobility into a formal setting, it promotes the notion that governance has reached areas where the State seemed to be absent during the armed conflict. The sociotechnical border unmakes mobility and pain, whilst remaking and expanding the presence of the State as a legitimate recognizer.

Although it is possible to establish registration as a space of multiple forms of agency, the RUV also assembles an asymmetric relation between applicants and the State. On the one hand, without considering any kind of evidence, applicants decide to trust the
state representatives with their experiences of pain, their accounts of violence, sometimes full of intimate details and deep affective engagements. Besides trusting almost blindly in the state intervention, most of the applicants must also provide evidence so that functionaries can establish the veracity of their statements. But the state intervention does not repay such trust correspondingly. On the contrary, trusted applicants are those whose accounts are well-corroborated in official information systems. In none of the cases must the state provide evidence of their investigation insofar it is grounded in already Black-boxed artefacts. Additionally, there are no guarantees that the application process will result in any positive change for applicants. And it is even the case that if an application is declared false, the applicant will receive a sanction and a criminal indictment. About such asymmetrical relations, Donna Haraway (2013) invites us to be sceptical of a vision of the world that promotes itself as objective, neutral, rigorous and, moreover, free of political and cultural influence. In the particular case of registration of applicants, the notion of Victims assembled by the RUV is one of those visions of the world that is legitimized by experts through different chains of translation, and becomes naturalized as an unquestionable procedure. Conversely, people affected by State crimes cannot freely produce enough evidences. In spite of the existence of alternative routes for the legal processing of those crimes, such routes do not enjoy the same degree of legitimation as the RUV.

The invitation offered by María Puig de la Bellacasa (2011) makes me think of those people who exceed the notion of Victim as legitimized by the expert system, as actors who “[…] can be harmed by an assemblage but whose voices are less valued” (p 92). Thus the differentiations between registered cases that reproduce the official notion of Victim, and the establishment of a legal, epistemic, and ontological boundary between legitimate and illegitimate cases inevitably produces damage to those in the latter category. A particular kind of harm has to do with trust and veracity of the accounts offered by rejected applicants. In their study of the Colombian notarial system, Malcolm Ashmore and Olga Restrepo (2013) describe how the practices of certification and production of evidence occurring inside the notaries enact such spaces as perhaps the only places in Colombia where there is a surplus of trust. By tracing the ways in which trust is assembled in notaries through signatures and stamps, Ashmore and Restrepo claim that such hyperproduction of trust in this one specific place accentuates the general practices of distrust outside the limits of the notary. Building
on this study of notarial systems, the forms of pain that exceed the sociotechnical border of the RUV irremediably become illegitimate and this consequence deserves further consideration, especially by the actors responsible for the RUV.

In the case of the RUV, the kind of recognition offered by the Colombian State is also a matter of interrogation. In her inspiring reflections about pain, body and recognition, Veena Das (Das 1998, see also Das 1996) claims: “To say ‘I am in pain’ is to ask for acknowledgment from the other, just as denial of another’s pain is not an intellectual failure but a spiritual failure, one that puts our future at stake” (Vas, 1998 p.192). Of course, applicants at CDR are pursuing the promise of rights restitution and compensation. But some of them are also seeking a sort of acknowledgement of their pain, an extension of the interviewer’s sentience after projecting their painful experience, even when it is simply a requirement mandated by the technical guidelines of an official form. Following Das’ reflections one could argue that the procedures of collection of information and assessment are more likely to “put our future at stake” than acknowledging the pain of applicants, and of those who exceed the sociotechnical border. A clear example of this is materialised in the official communication returned to the applicant.

An important question that I will address in the final section of this dissertation is how people preserve their mobility and attempt to escape the state’s Oligopticon. A description of such divergent attempts first requires exploring both sides of the sociotechnical border enacted by the RUV. In the following chapter, I depict how other artefacts and arrangements for rights restitution intersect with the RUV and the forms of reparation that are available after successfully engaging with this sociotechnical border.
CHAPTER 4: ORGANISING

On compensations, psychosocial assistance, and Repairing Betrayals

It is Thursday night and lots of people are heading home after partying in a popular area in Bogotá. A recent victory of the Colombian football team in the World Cup painted the streets with yellow, blue and red shirts worn by people who were massively celebrating. I had to withdraw myself from the national celebration so that at 2 am I could be at an assistance centre to accompany Elias. By the time we arrived in there, at least 30 people were already in the queue also wearing the popular triple colour shirts. My host and his son greet almost everybody and have brought food and coffee for sharing while they are queuing to “claim what the government had promised”. The scene is surprising for me since most of Elias’ friends already have official notifications of successful inclusion in the RUV; as they will explain later, the RUV “is just the beginning of the administrative procedures”.

In the previous chapter we reframed the RUV as an arrangement between functionaries, the Formato Único de Declaración (FUD), the state databases for corroborating information, and people who, after migrating from different rural areas into the cities, are now reconfigured by the RUV as either registered Victims or rejected applicants. We also discussed how the RUV establishes boundaries of rights restitution. We also discussed how the RUV, as a sociotechnical border, establishes boundaries of access to rights restitution. According to institutional documents “once people are included in the RUV they access the complete route of assistance and reparation” (MEP 2012 p. 2). Reparation consists of “restitution, rehabilitation, measures of satisfaction and guarantees of no repetition” (UARIV 2012b) in consistency with the notions of reparative justice proclaimed by the General Assembly of the United Nations (UN 2005 items 18-23). After his successful registration, I am accompanying Elias in order to gain a deeper understanding of the promise of reparation achieved once the sociotechnical border has been legitimately crossed.

While queuing with Elias, I engage in different conversations with the people about the performance of the Colombian football team in the World Cup, the Colombian cyclist Nairo Quintana’s feat in the Giro d’ Italia, the ongoing presidential campaign, and their experiences after receiving the official communication of registration in the RUV. Frequent comments regarding the registration resemble “I thought that it [the registration] was going to change my situation…” “I was happy in the beginning…”
“I thought that it was going to be the best thing that ever happened…” are expressions often followed by consistent complaints about long waiting times for official responses, bureaucratic “traps”, and long delays for accessing health services, schools, and higher education. Their narratives are notably shaped by tones of discomfort, acceptance, wrath and even humour- “Yeah well… we have to milk the government a bit before elections… after that…there won’t be any milk left”- satirically says Maggie, a farmer whose dairy cows were stolen by armed groups before her forced displacement.

In this chapter I follow the strategies that assemble reparation, its predominant notion of compensation, and the trajectories of psychosocial assistance as a particular form of reparation. I specially problematize the potentialities of the latter device to manage the consequences of collective violence in registered Victims. While enacting an *overcoming infrastructure* (See Brown and Middleton 2005) as an order emerging from standardized practices that anchors emotional experiences into formal settings of quantification, I claim that psychosocial assistance protocols might also enact spaces for people to create alternatives that diverge from the logic of the state.

**Tracing reparation**

Accompanying registered applicants for accessing benefits at government offices has become a daily activity. I can easily remember the locations of the desks for housing benefits, documents registration, social security, and occupational training in several assistance centres. Long queues, endless administrative procedures, limited periods of access to functionaries for inquiries, additional forms, letters of certification circulating between different desks, waiting lists, published lists, security controls exerted by security staff, among other regularities become constant scenarios of our daily life. The commonality among these scenarios: a notion of reparation as something to be achieved through long applications. Expressions about reparation include statements like “…compensations to redo your life from zero…” (woman, 28, 2 years in the city) “…the means to become productive in the city” (man, 34 years, 1 year in Bogotá) “…the resources for guaranteeing a future for my child…” (woman, 24, 3 years in the city) and perhaps a more intriguing one “…the price given by the government for your suffering…” (man, 36, 4 years in the city).
This statement regarding price and suffering reminds me of the specifications of the LV (República-de-Colombia 2011) where the taxonomy for administrative compensations is built on the basis of the classification of Victimizing Facts described in the previous chapter. Article 148 of the Law states that the estimation of the monetary compensation granted by the UARIV is based on “…the nature and impact of the victimizing fact, the damage inflicted and the state of vulnerability…” Thus, the compensations are estimated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victimizing fact</th>
<th>Money in COP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homicides, forced disappearing and kidnapping</td>
<td>Up to 40 times the monthly minimum wage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injuries causing permanent disability</td>
<td>Up to 40 times the monthly minimum wage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injuries not causing permanent disability</td>
<td>Up to 30 times the monthly minimum wage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torture and degradation</td>
<td>Up to 30 times the monthly minimum wage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crimes against sexual integrity</td>
<td>Up to 30 times the monthly minimum wage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced recruitment of children</td>
<td>Up to 30 times the monthly minimum wage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Displacement</td>
<td>Up to 17 times the monthly minimum wage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Estimations per Victimizing Fact (UARIV 2015c)

The above table was designed based on the assumption that “those amounts of money would allow people to start productive projects in the cities despite the violence suffered in the past” as Fabiola, a functionary working in the UARIV, puts in her own words. Evidence of disabilities, incapacitating injuries, kidnapping, traumas, homicides, torture, sexual aggressions, and forced recruitment increase the chances of a person receiving higher compensations because- “they are having difficulties to function normally and get a job so they deserve that kind of compensation”. According to Fabiola, the state encourages people to follow the reparation route after the registration in the RUV in order to “abandon the dependence on assistance and substitute it with symbolic and other reparation measures”. Fabiola’s statements remind me of Elias’ account regarding the unfortunate result of being registered under the category of Displacement instead of Homicide:

Displacement is where they put everybody and you will perhaps get some vouchers, temporary accommodation, registration on a waiting list, and in the best case scenario some money. But if you manage to be put in the Homicide or Kidnapping category, the compensations are for real.

---

46 1 monthly minimum wage = 689,454 COP / $ 230 / £161 (March 2016) According to the database NUMBEO, the monthly cost of utilities in Bogota in a middle class neighbourhood is approximately 243,669 COP, renting a one-bedroom-flat outside the city centre is about 917,948.72 COP, and transportation for a month costs 80,000 COP

47 “Desplazamiento’ es donde ponen a todo el mundo… de pronto uno consigue solo unos bonos, albergue, que lo pongan en una lista de espera y si está uno muy de buenas algo de dinero…pero si uno logra que lo metan en ‘homicidio’ o ‘secuestro’, la indemnización es de veras”
I met Elias when he decided to apply for registration in 2013 and since then, he has generously shared with me his experiences in the city. I have come to appreciate Elias, his persistence, optimism and his constant concern about his son who has recently granted me the honorific title of “queue pal”, because of the amount of time we have spent waiting in the queues despite his difficulty in understanding my interest in accompanying them while doing his “boring stuff”. After a violent displacement from a first small town in 2008 with his family and being registered in the RV (the 2009 version of the RUV) under the category Displacement, Elias lived with his wife and his son in a different town. However, in 2012 his wife was kidnapped by armed groups operating in the town, and three months later the same armed group threatened to recruit Jr, so Elias decided to abandon his house and his hope of seeing Liz again to escape and protect Jr.

After arriving in Bogotá in 2013, Elias and Jr. applied again for registration under the category Homicide, but no proofs regarding those events had yet been released by the public prosecutor, so the expert assessment of Elias’ application only resulted in a notification of registration in the RUV under the same Displacement category. The appreciation offered by Elias about the estimation of compensations (table 5.1) is quite accurate inasmuch as 85% of the RUV consists of displaced people (UARIV, 2014) with fewer chances of compensation or inferior amounts of money for being categorized only in Displacement. Hence, the compensations within the reparation system are apparently targeted to a reduced proportion of the universe of recognized Victims, who after conquering that sociotechnical border, are now counted in the official number mobilized by the UARIV.

On one of the days that I am accompanying Elias, he receives a tragic notification from the public prosecutor that will surely change his current registration status. The official letter stated that his wife had been found dead, and the prosecutor asks him to approach the office in Bogotá for more details and other administrative procedures. The content of the notification is tremendously painful, and Elias hides the letter from Jr. After asking a friend in the queue to stay with Jr for a moment, Elias asks me to come with him while he smokes a cigarette and I decide to join him despite my long tobacco abstinence.
Elias: Well, somehow this is not news at all, I always knew, maybe now we will be put me on Homicide and things will go better, but….but…. (Elias gasps)

Fredy: Yes...

Elias: But now I have to make another request for a psychologist from the Unit that gives the news to Jr., I hope it doesn’t take too long, I will invest that money in a small business to vender minutos improving my stock, I will also save some money to pay for Jr.’s college of course.

Elias has been working as a street vendor for 10 months and just a few weeks ago his son started attending school again after long procedures of registration. Last year has consisted of endless queues, long walks, photocopies, letters of certification, uncountable consultations from new-comers, and even mistreatment received from the public servants that Elias humbly explains: “maybe they were having a bad day, it must not be easy to maintain patience after assisting so many people”. Witnessing Elias’ reaction after the latest notification about his wife reminds me for a moment of the question asked by Paul Stenner (2005) in his reflections regarding rights to emotions: what are the right emotions to feel in particular circumstances? In spite of the fact that, in Stenner’s words, Elias might have the right to feel sad, helpless and perhaps devastated for her loss, I am witnessing a different kind of moral order (Harré 1986 cit. by Stenner 2005) performed by a technical-legal system that prevents Elias from feeling the “right emotions”, displacing his emotional experience, and conditioning it to his success inside the administrative system.

However, I find amazing the capability of adjustment shown by Elias who remained especially concerned about the best way to inform his son about the latest tragic experiences, while persisting in the administrative procedures for reparation and explaining the mistreatments by public servants. Similarly, I also find overwhelming the way in which the reparation system performs the emotional experiences of people like Elias such that the confirmation of the death of one’s partner is rapidly translated into a plausible technical guarantee of registration under a category that will more effectively result in rights restitution and compensations. Perhaps everybody cannot mourn following a certain set of stages, but Elias’ emotional reality and the reactions of many other people under similar circumstances comprise experiences violently shaped by the system of reparation. This thought embeds itself in my reflections even more deeply when Elias asks for psychological counselling to tell his son about his

---

48 “vender minutos”, use cell phones with extensive mobile plans to allow people in the street to make calls, only charging them with the minutes they use.
mother’s death, but as the waiting time from the UARIV exceeds 2 months he decides to take Jr. to a practice administered by a local University which will provide him with free assistance. Later in this section, we will explore how the Colombian government deals with the emotional experiences of past violent events of registered applicants.

Just like Elias before receiving the tragic news of the death of his wife, the people registered on Displacement seem to be consistently less successful in obtaining monetary compensations. A recent report presented by the Carr Centre\textsuperscript{49} (Sikkink et al. 2014) suggests that none of the comparable countries to Colombia had included populations in situation of Displacement as targets of transitional justice and reparation. Nonetheless, I wonder about the reasons for the decision of the Colombian State of including a large displaced population as Victims of the armed conflict despite the apparent impossibility of such cases to be monetarily compensated in an adequate manner. Perhaps, the possibility of actually accessing benefits supports a widespread imaginary regarding state aids and this imaginary allows the bureaucratic reparation system to remain stable and continue demanding a considerable amount of time from registered people’s lives. About this, Elias interestingly addresses such feature claiming- “I have the lifestyle of a manager; I can call the day as I want so that I can come here anytime to check for any news”\textsuperscript{50}. Elias’ claim surely does not refer to his earned wage, but to a regular feature of the majority of the forms of employment preferred by applicants and recognized Victims, this is, part time jobs that guarantee availability for engaging in the administrative procedures.

The assemblages performing reparation produce a form of engagement that intrusively demands significant time investments from people. Beyond engaging in a discussion regarding the chances for registered Victims of getting a job in the city under stable contracts and social security guarantees, the core design of the expert system of reparation discourages the possibilities of searching for those forms of employment. In addition to the time-consuming procedures described so far, in the previous chapter we also exposed how the applications for registration in the RUV are withdrawn if evidence related to stable contracts and benefits is obtained. Let us explore now what the reparation system demands from people receiving monetary

\textsuperscript{49} In 2014, the UARIV hired the Carr Center for Human Rights Policy at Harvard Kennedy School to conduct a benchmarking of restorative justice systems in countries comparable to Colombia in situations of transitional justice.

\textsuperscript{50} “Tengo vida de gerente, puedo dejar de trabajar a la hora que quiera para venir a ver si ha pasado algo”
compensations, and then some other forms of reparation designed by the experts from the UARIV.

**De-signing reparation**

Elias and most of our “queue pals” frequently address their expectations of receiving reparation as monetary compensations, housing benefit and resources for productive projects – “That’s what we need the most” - is their main claim. They also tell me about a requirement for receiving the compensations; this is the design of an Integrative Plan for Assistance and Reparation (PAARI), which consists of a meeting with functionaries from the UARIV to decide the best alternatives to invest the compensations. According to the documentation of the UARIV, the PAARI “identifies the current needs and capabilities[and] is designed to be used with families under the criteria of progressiveness and gradualness and consists of three modules[…] (i) assistance, (ii) return and relocations, and (iii) other reparation measures” (UARIV 2015a: p. 17). Fabiola from the UARIV explains that “progressiveness” refers to the way the delivered aids will increasingly support an improvement in different areas of reparation, whereas “gradualness” refers to how the delivery of compensations and aids must be planned in advanced to guarantee that they will be enough to develop the plan.

![Figure 9 Session of the PAARI in Samaná, Caldas. July 2014. Samaná Council website](image)

The official documents claim that the purpose of the PAARI consists of “[…] accompanying the adequate investment of resources received as compensations through the management and access to real investment opportunities […]” (UARIV,
In a report submitted to the Congress (UARIV 2014), a total of 426,031 registered Victims were granted some form of compensation since 2012, from which 213,796 people had already designed their PAARI. In the same report the priority areas of investment manifested by these 213,796 Victims during the design of their PAARI were collected from the answers. The following table shows a preliminary version of the official report (June 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>People with PAARI (TOTAL)</th>
<th>1. With intention to invest and be advised</th>
<th>2. With intention of receiving psychosocial assistance</th>
<th>3. With priority of investment in owning a house</th>
<th>4. With priority of investment in their own business</th>
<th>5. With priority of investment in education</th>
<th>6. With priority of investment in rural land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>31,565</td>
<td>26,653</td>
<td>25,372</td>
<td>12,404</td>
<td>10,038</td>
<td>3,130</td>
<td>1,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>157,907</td>
<td>74,693</td>
<td>57,672</td>
<td>46,531</td>
<td>25,411</td>
<td>10,404</td>
<td>4,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>24,324</td>
<td>15,488</td>
<td>9,019</td>
<td>10,094</td>
<td>8,052</td>
<td>3,384</td>
<td>1,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>213,796</td>
<td>114,834</td>
<td>92,063</td>
<td>68,979</td>
<td>43,501</td>
<td>16,918</td>
<td>7,374</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 Priorities of investment of administrative reparation manifested by Victims during the PAARI modified from the original in the order of the columns. Draft versión of the official report by the Dirección de Reparación - Subdirección de Reparación Individual-UARIV. June 2014

Alternatives like owning a house, investing in a productive project with the assistance of the government, and receiving psychosocial assistance represent the main priorities manifested by people quoted in the official reports. As a result of the queue sessions and an introduction by Elias, I meet Maggie, Sergio and Jazmine, three registered applicants who have already attended PAARI sessions and are willing to share their experiences with Elias and Jr’s “queue pal”. I decide to share the numbers contained in the official report with them and try to learn about their experiences with the PAARI, its procedures, and its meaning.

Maggie and Sergio are registered in the categories Displacement and Homicide, while Jazmine is registered in Displacement and Kidnapping. Their first comments about the PAARI refer to the necessity of being registered under more than one category to increase the chances of receiving compensations. My interlocutors in the queue explain the requirements for accessing monetary compensations in a simple and powerful way: “to get the money, you cannot only be in Displacement; you have to be Displaced and something else”. They also highlight the mandatory character of the PAARI, the necessity for registered Victims especially under the new regulations to attend the session as a requirement for accessing the compensations. Sergio narrates that he was just expecting to receive the money or claim it at the bank like he did with the first monetary aids that he received during the first months. The sequence of events during
the PAARI was narrated by each of them almost following a uniform script. They were initially given an appointment with a functionary at the UARIV and the meeting lasted about an hour, they were asked in detail about their health conditions, education, job experience, employable skills, and such aspects were also assessed in every member of their families. —“In the beginning it was almost like a job interview”- says Sergio while recalling some other job interviews he attended during the last year. Then Maggie intervenes—“when they asked me about my health I thought a doctor might come and see me but the lady saw that everything was fine and kept going with the interview”—. Right after this, Jazmine tells us she had previously worked as a secretary, so the woman in charge of the PAARI session kept asking her about that job experience and insisted on the importance of using that job experience in the city, because it would “open many doors for her”.

After being asked about the alternative of going back to their towns and farms, my spontaneous interviewees unanimously agreed it was not worth it in terms of investment, security, and because in Sergio’s words, “the future is now in the city”. I am deeply intrigued about whether they could choose several possibilities, and the way they design their own route of reparation, so I expand my questions about it—“I was only given the chance to choose one of those”- says Jazmine, Sergio and Maggie agree with her statement. Sergio continues

He [the functionary] told me the money had to be strategically invested so I should choose one or two that I preferred the most […] if you think it through, well, going back to the countryside at this time is not safe yet, and if you manage to go back and built up a new place, there is always the chance that they [the armed groups] come again and kick you out, or kill your family, so I definitely prefer the city.

Jazmine agrees with Sergio, but in her case, she tells us how the psychosocial professional told her to choose any alternative she wanted, but since she already had job experience as a secretary, she might take advantage of that to get a “better job at the city”. She admits that her choices to apply for housing benefit and technical training to improve her secretarial skills were partially motivated by the psychosocial professional told her to choose any alternative she wanted, but since she already had job experience as a secretary, she might take advantage of that to get a “better job at the city”. She admits that her choices to apply for housing benefit and technical training to improve her secretarial skills were partially motivated by the psychosocial professional told her to choose any alternative she wanted, but since she already had job experience as a secretary, she might take advantage of that to get a “better job at the city”. She admits that her choices to apply for housing benefit and technical training to improve her secretarial skills were partially motivated by the psychosocial

---

51 Él me dijo que tenía que ser estratégico para invertir mi dinero y tenía que elegir una o dos cosas que prefiriera más […] si uno echa cabeza bien, bueno, volver al campo en este momento no es todavía seguro, y si uno lo logra y construye de nuevo un rancho, siempre está el chance de que [los grupos armados] vuelvan y lo saquen a uno a patadas, o le maten la familia, por eso prefiero la ciudad
professional’s suggestion. In the case of Maggie, housing benefit and a productive project oriented her choice considering she needed an urgent place for her family.

I find the above encounters useful to understand the reparation system and its logic materialized in the PAARI in distinct aspects. First, beyond the different objectives claimed in the official documents, the PAARI is designed to establish the skills, capabilities and employability of recognized Victims, as well as depicting their potential areas of expertise especially in the city. Appropriating the expression used by Sergio, the session of the PAARI resembles a “job interview” inasmuch as the evaluator gets an idea of the possible areas where the candidate may be allocated. Second, instead of assisting recognized Victims to design their own route of reparation, the routes are already designed so the PAARI becomes a space where people must actually agree on the terms of reparation. This makes me reframe the PAARI as a sort of contract between the government and the recognized Victims where compensations are subordinated to specific terms and compliance clauses. This last notion of the PAARI as a contract was highlighted when I asked them about the possibility of only claiming the compensations without engaging in any of the alternatives that they were given. They all agreed it was not possible and it was the only way, unless you were granted with administrative reparation\(^{52}\), which was reserved mainly for Victims living in different countries, and stopped being a likely alternative under the recent regulation. People are given advice regarding how to successfully engage in the available alternatives, so the session of the PAARI turns into a job interview or even an induction session.

The reparation system through the PAARI successfully captures people’s preference for staying in the cities. The numbers who gain land restitution and safe return barely reach 3% (HRW 2013) so the preference of people for apparent safety in the cities, the ongoing difficulties of guaranteeing safe returns to the land, and a plan of reparation encouraging the improvement of employability skills, enact the PAARI as an attempt to guarantee the productivity of people recognized as Victims. Such productivity takes place especially in the cities, consequently favouring a redistribution of the population initiated by the armed conflict and other factors. Unlike the narrative contained in the official documents that promotes the PAARI as an attempt to support an autonomous plan, reparation is not being *designed* but rather *signed*, just like any other pre-established labour contract. The predominant trace of the contract and the preferred

\(^{52}\) Reparación por la vía administrativa
alternatives of people, both target monetary compensations where delivery, as we are about to see, is not entirely unconditional.

Reparation as compensation
Maggie is 28 and arrived in Bogotá in 2010 and applied for housing benefit in 2011. She tells me how she was asked for an additional letter certifying she was a Victim of Displacement despite having already received the notification of registration in the RUV. According to Maggie “…it could even take years since you are only put on a waiting list, after… they just say they will call you…” Maggie explains that the government provides the initial fee of nearly 20% of the price of the house but after being granted with the benefit, it is necessary for Victims to submit evidence of additional funds to pay for the remaining fees of the debt. Maggie recalls a friend of hers who managed to get housing benefit in a different city, but when the time for claiming the money was due, he had to sell a recently inherited farm for a reduced price to comply with the evidence of financial solvency required by the government and effectively claim the housing benefit. With an expression of discomfort, Maggie also tells me about another friend that could not claim her house for not having enough money to pay the remaining fees.

Whereas Maggie was struggling with her application for housing benefit, Sergio’s initiatives of opening a restaurant, setting up a company for the distribution of plastics, and working as a street vendor were denied during his PAARI. In Sergio’s words all of those initiatives were turned down because the psychosocial professional in charge of the session stated that Sergio lacked the “necessary experience for administering that kind of business” and the financial capability for guaranteeing the success of the business. Sergio expresses his discomfort because back in his farm, he was in charge of buying the necessary hardware, chemicals and equipment for fumigating his fields of corn and potatoes. However in his own words, he is now pursuing a different goal: “if you go into a business on your own, it is less likely that they will support you, so it is better to try to be part of one of their projects”53-. Sergio is planning on becoming part of one of the most publically promoted examples of accompanied productive projects, the recently inaugurated minimarkets 2 x 3. There, recognized Victims must invest a significant part of their monetary compensations, meanwhile the remaining money is

53 “Si uno se va por un negocio por su cuenta, es más difícil que lo apoyen a uno, es como mejor tratar de clasificar en uno de sus proyectos”.
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provided by the Ministry of Commerce, the International Organization for Migrations, the UARIV, the National Agency for the Elimination of Poverty, and commercial organisations like the National Federation of Traders, the Colombian Tobacco Company, and Postobón S.A, a fizzy drinks company. The director of the UARIV has stated that every Minimarket 2x3 requires 120,000,000 COP (approx. £30,000, November 2015) to be opened, and every market is administered by registered applicants with the coordination of professionals of the UARIV.

![Figure 10 President Santos and the director of the UARIV inaugurating a minimarket 2x3 in Bello, Antioquia. Caracol Noticias 21/12/2014](image)

In a recent inauguration of a minimarket 2x3, President Santos claimed:

[...] this is a space for reparation of Victims [...] our Law of Victims has been pointed to as an example by other countries [...] this is one of the initiatives [...] for Victims [...] to find a worthy life and redo their lives, leave behind the pain they felt, and optimistically have a look at the future [...] 

It seems that the best way for Sergio as a recognized Victim from a rural area of Colombia to redo his life consists on signing in for productive projects already determined by the government. Therefore spaces like the minimarkets outline reparation as an intervention which enhances and promotes different types of expertise that favour the employability of recognized Victims in rural spaces. Moreover, articulated notions of social order that enact the interests of the government emerge in
these identity assemblages, in which huge companies and organizations are interested in participating.

The experiences narrated by Maggie and Sergio are particularly revealing in that each of them made different choices during their PAARI, but in the end their situations share a common trace: chains of translation that enact compensations as financial pre-designed contracts. Contrary to the narratives in the official documents, the PAARI represents a possibility of investment provided by the government, which demands from recognized Victims some financial solvency and monetary guarantees that are not common in the universe of recognized Victims. The previous trajectories also perform a notion of reparation in which reconstruction of social tissue becomes a matter of guaranteeing employability, wages, and profit aligned with investment plans considered as viable by the State itself.

A friend of Sergio and Elias, Marco, who happens to be a registered applicant working in a minimarket 2X3 tells me that he wanted to open his own tienda de barrio in the neighbourhood where he first arrived into the city, however during the filling of the PAARI he was persuaded to work in the minimarket. During a visit to Marco in the minimarket, I can see that the discouragement of tiendas de barrio and chazas is a common experience for other registered applicants working in the same shop. Marco’s oldest son explains to me that every family invested equal amounts of money, almost their entire compensation, and that only for the first six months they would have the prices of certain supplies reduced because they had been donated by different companies. Marco tells how they must submit their accounting books to a consultant of the UARIV who is in charge of supervising and assisting the Minimarket, and after paying suppliers, rent, bills and salaries, the remaining profit will be distributed among the families participating in the Minimarket except for 15% that must be reinvested in the business, and another 20% that must be saved for supplying the shop when the donations stop. Marco claims:

In the end, I am earning almost the same as I could earn on my own, that woman insisted a lot so I decided to give it a shot. I am not complaining, it is just that I’d rather not report to anyone about the way I spend my money

\[54\] Shops in neighbourhoods usually selling groceries, cleaning products, liquors, and tobacco.
\[55\] Wood box used by street vendors to sell different products. It is usually carried in the chest or has wheels in order to easily change the location.
President Santos has addressed reparation as the actions to “find a worthy life and redo their lives, leave behind the pain they felt, and optimistically have a look at the future”. What actually lies beneath such expressions promoted by official documents is a notion of improvement, enhancement of working capabilities, and profit production of registered applicants that should allow them to fit into new working urban environments. A sort of employment for Victims emerges through compensations. An administrative feature of this arrangement is promoted by the Colombian government and is also used to demonstrate effective investments through management indicators.

In Chapter 3 the endless boxes of FUDs enacted an Oligopticon of registration in the assessment offices materialising the surveillance of the population. Now the deployment of reparation with the PAARI, as a second Obligatory Passage Point\(^{56}\) (Callon 1986), materialises the management of investment in a portion of the represented populations. In spite of the fact that only 213,976 out of 426,031 possible applicants had signed their PAARIs by 2014, the projection for the next 5 years is to do it with all the people that receive compensations as a result of their applications.

Instead of accompanying people in the design of their reparation plan, the government seems to be slotting them into its own projects. Similarly to the FUD that legitimated a notion of Victims and an account of the armed conflict promoted by one of its actors, the PAARI and its reparation strategies legitimate the government’s notion of reparation and rights restitution. The reparation offered by the State becomes a form of organising people embodying experiences of pain and mobility inside the national territory by arranging people’s skills and aligning their workforce into productive projects and conditional compensations. Here, registered applicants are implicitly forced to become productive by recruiting them into the promise of becoming urban workers, entrepreneurs, and investors. This same promise inevitably locks them in the city as unskilled workforce whereas an investment in their upskilling is being allegedly made. Thus, the apparently unconditional reparative compensations offered under the narratives of International Humanitarian Law are translated into forms of governance and investments that recruit already registered employees into profitable activities and numeric indicators.

---

\(^{56}\) The term is coined by Callon (1986) to address a situation of mandatory occurrence for all the actors to satisfy the established requirements of a network and focal actors. In this case the procedures defined as mandatory by the state (RUV, PAARI) become a necessary requirement for applicants.
Even though productive projects have been more widely promoted and are well established in the expectancies of registered applicants, there is another form of reparation that is allegedly different. As explained by several functionaries from the Mayor’s office and the UARIV, reparation in the LV must be “integral”. In chapter 1, one of the debates about the LV revolved around the kind of compensation that recognized applicants should obtain. After the promulgation of the LV, a general agreement between the accounts offered by functionaries consisted on addressing psychosocial assistance as the best example of the “integral” reparation stipulated in the LV. “It had never been done by the State before”, “it is what makes the LV different from other regulations”, “victims have both, medical and psychological needs” are only some of the recurrent mentions that interviewees in different instances use to address psychosocial assistance. The report in table 5.2 shows psychosocial assistance as the second most common preference by registered applicants. However, it has not been addressed at all by my group of interlocutors in the queue but I manage to extract a brief explanation from them as participants of such strategies. When asked about the reasons to attend the sessions of psychosocial assistance, they offer accounts like – “they keep records of attendance in the sessions”- says Sergio whereas Maggie claims: “it is a way of showing interest, I want them to know I am not only interested in the money, you never know when it can come in handy”. About this, Jazmine expresses “it doesn’t hurt” and “you never know, you might get a bonus”. My curiosity about psychosocial interventions increases with every answer so I decide to inquire about psychosocial assistance devices to have a more comprehensive experience of such interventions and its apparent difference to monetary compensations.

Psychosocial assistance is defined in the LV and its derivative guidelines as a strategy of reparation that is parallel to compensations. According to the director of the psychosocial team of the UARIV, the necessity of psychosocial assistance became evident during the medical assistance to applicants under previous regulations, and the constant *tutelas requesting* psychiatric and psychological assistance. Since 2012, the Sub directions of Individual and Collective reparation have gathered professionals from different fields like arts, sociology, psychology, social work, and anthropology to develop strategies that provide “Victims with the tools to overcome their pain”

---

57 Sentence T-025/2004 is commonly used by my interlocutors as a reference point for psychosocial assistance as a reparation strategy. In it, the absence of psychological and psychiatric services in the national health system is declared unconstitutional, particularly after the tutelas presented by applicants registered under previous regulations.
Currently, several expert meetings are being called by the Ministry of Health and Social Protection to design a National Plan for Psychosocial Assistance for Victims (PAPSIVI). The Colombian Professional Association of Psychology (COLPSIC), the Psychosocial Team of the UARIV and other experts are being appointed to provide expert opinions regarding the kind of psychosocial assistance that Victims require. One of the strategies designed by the UARIV is the *Emotional Recovery Strategy* (ERE), which is currently used throughout the national territory in a group format despite it being targeted to individuals. I move from the offices of registration and the queues towards the places where the ERE is being implemented to gain a better understanding of its deployment and the relations it entangles. I do so by choosing the places where my queue pals come from to further integrate their stories in my descriptions.

**Opening the Emotional Recovery Strategy**

In a town very close to the city that hosts the minimarkets of reparation, the first session of the ERE is having place in backyard with thirteen people. I am first asked to write a personal word for every initial of my name; thus, fortunate, resourceful, enthusiastic, and dynamic emerge as quick answers to the question. Then the introductions come and I can listen to the members of my group that come from different regions. Mariana, the psychosocial professional of the UARIV asks the following question:

---

58 These interventions must fulfil the stipulations of the Legal sentence T-024 of 2005. Such regulation was emitted after different public disputes regarding mental health and psychological care for the Victims of a massacre in el Salado and Montes de María, (Bolivar) mainly by paramilitary incursions from the late 1990s to the early 2000s.
Figure 11 Session of the ERE (author’s photograph)

Mariana: What has motivated you to accept the invitation and decide to come today? (10 seconds) come on, don’t be shy…OK, I will start then, I am here because I want to contribute and be your support. Who is next?

Participant 1: Well, I am here because the lady in the assistance centre told me to…. she said I was going to receive help that I needed so I came

P2: same here…the lady said this could also help my children after….well you know…after all that happened…..

M: that’s why we are here of course… thanks… OK another question then…What would you like to achieve with these encounters?

P3: Yeah well…perhaps showing my interest in this…I want to do the most so that I can improve my situation….

As I was able to establish at a later time, the strategies to recruit participants for the workshops were implemented in some of the assistance centres and the City Council of the nearest towns. The encounter to fill the PAARI, personal meetings in the assistance centres and telephone calls were the main strategies used by the psychosocial professionals hired by the UARIV to recruit participants of the ERE strategy in the national territory. The session continues with the delivery of an album containing the records for every session.
After receiving the album, Mariana asks the participants: “In my region, when you feel bad you say you are anguished...in your region, what word is used to address that feeling?” The room was filled with silence and the question triggered faces of confusion in the beginning, but after a few examples the participants started to enunciate different words. Some of the words were “achilado” “achicopalado” “achantado” “desparcha’e”59. In the end, most of the participants registered “achantado” in their albums. Another question, a bit more intriguing now occupied the minds of the participants- “From one to ten, how “achantado” are you feeling today?” The Likert-semantic differential question had used the idioms given by participants to establish an approximation of the emotional state of the participants. The same question produces expressions of confusion in the attendees. Right there, while watching the people filling their albums and marking the numbers, I realize that I am witnessing the sequences of translation of the emotional experiences of the participants into a technical device explicitly designed for coding that experience into a number.

59 Synonyms of “sad”, “under the weather”, “blue”.

Figure 12 First session of the ERE album (UARIV, 2015b)
However, the above trajectory also comprises important discontinuities. For example, many participants repeatedly ask questions about the number to the person sitting next to them, some others do not read nor write so their interaction with the device is limited, and some others simply do not understand the purpose of marking a number representing their emotional states so they ask for assistance from the psychosocial professional. I am witnessing an effect of the device other than emotional recovery inasmuch as its written materiality and numeric request provokes unexpected reactions in its users diverting, challenging and resisting the managerial logic partially contained in the design of the ERE. Instead of facilitating the planned activity for the session, or the expected trust relation and emotional recovery, an important portion of the session is employed to make the participants into competent individuals for using the album.

The session continued with a statement and a question by Mariana “For some of the Victims of the armed conflict “emotional recovery” means “to be able to contend with life”. In a single sentence, what does “emotional recovery” mean for you?” Here, a vast variety of words were enunciated by every participant: “Simply move on with this”, “shaking these feelings off”, “stop feeling bad”, and “overcome these emotions” were the expressions that I managed to observe in their albums. In consistency with the script outlined by the handbook of the UARIV (2014, p 49) the next question was asked by Elvira, another psychosocial professional. “If we were on a road and the final goal was shaking these feelings off, and we had to walk down that road in ten steps, where being 10 steps away means being really far but being one step away means being very close to the end of the road, How many steps away are you from the end of the road?”.

Again, an important part of the session is dedicated by Mariana and the most competent participants to filling the album and assisting others while engaging with the device. After making sure every participant has written down their numbers, Mariana finishes the session and reminds people that they cannot leave without signing the attendance record and the minute. The quick way in which participants queue with their cédulas⁶⁰ in hand for signing reminds me of the assistance centres in the cities. Following the training received in Bogotá, Mariana takes note of the names, their cédula numbers, the numbers indicated in the album and asks them to sign and finger-print the forms.

---

⁶⁰ National IDs
A particular interaction occurs between a participant who has marked two numbers instead of one in his album, and Mariana who asks him about the reasons for marking 3 and 7. Matias argues he does not see the point of marking only one number because he feels different emotions—Yes, but you have to mark only one, Matias—says Mariana who is in a hurry to fill the final form. Matias replies he does not understand why he has to put a number to his feelings but after Mariana’s insistence he erases his two marks and puts a new circle around number 1. When Mariana asks for the reasons for the new number, Matias claims in a very convincing manner— I guess I am just beginning at this, and 10 is the goal, so I am marking one because this is the start—Mariana accepts Matias’ reasons and registers the number 1 among the other information. Matias keeps his album, and the records obtained by Mariana will then be
included in the official reports of the strategy by the central office in Bogotá. For example in 2014, the official report by the President to the Congress claimed:

> The implementation of the ERE increased since 2013 until 24,789 participant survivors exceeding the projected goal of 20,000, so this was fulfilled by 124%. In total, the ERE was implemented in 206 locations in the country. (p.152) Report by the President to the Congress about the LV, March 31, 2014

Similarly, in his report to the Congress in 2015, the Presidency reports states:

> 82000 victims of the armed conflict were assisted by the Program of Integral Health and Psychosocial Assistance in its modes: individual, family, and community. During the same period, 57000 victims were assisted through the Emotional Recovery Strategy

Thus, the participants’ embodied experiences of pain, their memories of violent events, and even their perceptions of the uselessness of the quantification are now translated into a number, an official report, and a management indicator. About these kind of quantifying practices, Martha Lampland and Susan Leigh Star (2009) have collected invaluable reflections about the mediations of standards in everyday life. When presenting case studies related to the parameters for determining the health of infants, food portions, work allocation, and drinking water risk, among others, one of the things that the authors outline as a major trace of standards is their crucial role as “bricks of the infrastructure wall that are placed there in the form of codes, protocols, algorithms and so forth” (p. 18). That kind of material order consists of a relational property that emerges from the use of standards. The landscape of reparation through the PAARI and the ERE looks pretty familiar to the one I experienced while following the FUD and the RUV (chapter 4). During registration procedures, the embodied experiences of pain were organised in a formal setting comprised of standardized narratives and codes produced through the FUD. Then, such narratives and codes were translated into official numbers and management indicators enacting a infrastructure that allowed the UARIV to “act at distance” (Latour 1987: 223) In an attempt of consistency with a relational understanding of the emerging arrangements
that arise in spaces mediated by devices like the ERE, I wonder about the formal setting of quantification and accountancy that is being built up from the numbers qualifying participants’ experiences of pain and the way those same standards underrepresenting emotions also configure such arrangements.

To understand what the numbers collected through the ERE create and displace, one possibility shifting to a relational ontology of such objects (See Mol 2002). Thus, the emotional experiences of participants are now materialised in a technical device that produces quantifications. In this translation or exchange of properties, the experiences of participants are unmade to be incorporated into numbers, but those same numbers produce an arrangement that makes visible the pain of participants to other spectators. Those technical mediations (Latour 1994) of the ERE organise and formalise painful experiences into a new arrangement. As mentioned in chapter 2, the term *Infrastructure* has been used to address “something that other things run on, things that are substrate to events and movements, railroads, highways, plumbing, electricity” (Lampland and Star 2005: 17) so it emerges as a relational property and not as a “thing stripped of use” (Star and Ruhleder 1996: 113). However, the infrastructure emerging from the FUD and the ERE diverges from the ones described by Lampland and Star since, instead of concrete, plastic or metal, its materials consist of the embodied experiences of pain and memories of violence offered by applicants and participants. A circular dynamic becomes evident insofar as the infrastructure that emerges from embodied experiences of pain is the same one that assembles and deploys the moral order (see Stenner 2005) that displaces and performs their current emotional experiences.

In a more specific account of the infrastructures that emerge from archivist practices of collecting memories into organised settings, Steve Brown (2005) has used the term *overcoming infrastructures* to describe the embedding of social practices of remembering in formal classifications or standards. The collected numbers in the sessions of the ERE are anchored in the files that become sources of consultation for official reports and management indicators. Thereby, the overcoming infrastructure that emerges in the number request during ERE encounters objectifies peoples’ experiences into a number that displaces their pain, but at the same time endows them with a particular form of accounted visibility. The overcoming form of organisation is partially successful to deal with the memories of participants of the ERE so that “living
becomes no more than enacting a future that has already been programmed in advance” (Brown 2005: 177) Thus, the numbers and indicators collected through psychosocial assistance not only enact an infrastructure of accountability of the intervention of the state, but they also encourage participants to fulfil the expectations of the intervention itself, as the legitimate way to manage their pain.

Registration and reparation assemble quantifications and codifications that enact an infrastructure concerned with rights restitution. Although the FUD and the ERE both collect numbers and produce forms of order that organise people’s experiences, their target and purpose are different. The FUD enacts the RUV as a sociotechnical border that establishes a boundary of official recognition whereas the ERE is designed to manage the embodied experiences of pain within the borders of official recognition. The FUD unmakes bodies in pain to make a number, whereas the ERE, in a more generous interpretation, seems to be designed to acknowledge the pain of participants. Although the deployment of the ERE described so far fails to accomplish the later purpose, in an attempt at symmetry (Bloor 1984, Latour and Woolgar 2013, Turner 2012) let us accompany other session of the ERE that will nuance further possibilities of this device.

Reparation in spite of protocols

I travel with other members of the psychosocial team of the UARIV to a different region located very close to Elias’ town (which I am omitting). Several inhabitants of the nearby towns were massacred in different years by guerrillas and paramilitary groups. The region is famous in the history of violence in Colombia because the occupation by paramilitary forces led by Salvatore Mancuso in the early 2000s was widely known by the media and the events have been reconstructed by different official investigations and academic research. On this occasion, I am accompanying a psychologist during the second session of the ERE, his name is José and he has been working for the UARIV for more than 4 years. He has just started implementing the ERE with a group of women from the vereda.

During the session, José starts with a script that diverges from the handbooks.

Today our session is going to be full of emotions; we are going to start tuning it up and besides remembering things, we are going to think of the ways we have managed
to recover from what violence left in our lives, because you have been tough people, almost like heroines. Please note that you have not had psychosocial assistance so far, during this entire time you have survived without anybody’s help, you are experts in handling these situations and that is what I mean by tough and heroines. We are not going to tell you how to recover, you don’t need us to do that, that is why we are simply going to make a suggestion that can help. 61

José delivers some paper sheets and says: “Let us think of an animal that you consider really dangerous and we are going to draw it, any animal you consider dangerous”. The suggestion produces laughs and comments “must it have any legs?” “Must I have seen it in person?” Jose laughs and asserts they are free to draw any animal they want, so lions, sharks, snakes, caimans and huge birds are drawn on the paper sheets. After, José says: “Let us now think of the violence in our lives, let us think of that animal as the violence or the actors that assaulted us” and asks what that animal did to them. Regina, the first participant is approached by José repeating the question, but she keeps silent so José gets closer and asks her to speak if she wants, clarifying that keeping silent is also an option.

61 Hoy nuestro encuentro va a tener mucha emocionalidad, vamos a empezar como a calibrarla y además de recordar vamos a pensar en cómo han logrado recuperarse de eso que les dejó la violencia, porque ustedes son unas berracas, unas heroínas. Fíjense que no habían tenido acompañamiento psicosocial sino hasta ahora, durante todo este tiempo han sobrevivido sin asistencia de nadie, Uds. son expertas en el manejo de estas situaciones y por eso digo que son heroínas, sobrevivientes, unas berracas, nosotros no vamos a decirles cómo recuperarse, no nos necesitan para eso, vamos es a hacerles una sugerencia que podría ayudar’
Regina starts crying and José kneels very slowly and touches her hands while waiting silently for her words, and asking the other participants to join Regina in her silence. An atmosphere of pain and sorrow quickly spreads in the room. José asks her if she wants to speak and she nods her head so José asks again:

**José:** What did that animal do to you?

**Regina:** That snake bit me and injected me with poison, a kind of poison I have not been able to get rid of, it injected a poison in my son and he lives sick for remembering how they hurt his mom.

**J** What happened?

**R** I lived with my husband in the ranch and during those years everybody was accused of being guerrilla62. One night four men knocked at my door, all of them paras63 and asked: Where is your husband? But I told them he was not

---

62 Member/collaborator of guerrillas
63 Member of paramilitary forces or AUC (Autodefensas Unidas de Colombia)
at home so they said they were going to leave a message for him with me... and.... and they.... took me one by one, they brought my 7 years old child and made him watch... and at the end they told him, they told him... they told him it was the way of satisfying a woman. After...one of those godless people took a lighter and burned me there...in the front and the back and since then I have not been able to be with my husband...(gasps) years go by and this doesn’t go away

A long moment of silence reigns until another woman who also drew a snake points her finger towards her child, hugs him and says he is what violence left in her life. After following the instructions in the script of the ERE, José and the participants fill the room with lions destroying families, sharks infecting young women with HIV, big birds taking away the childhood of children and providing them with sterility and hate. Expressions like “it tore me apart, and devoured women” “it made us run away” “they mobbed our children but miraculously forgave their lives” “they tortured older people” become part of their accounts of the passage of violence through their lives.

The narrations offered by participants fill me with pain, anger, helplessness, but mainly a deep shame as a member of my gender, an unbearable repulsion towards the ways women during war can be particularly subject to rape and torture by men. Right in that moment, José says something that makes participants´ heads nod in the session:

We have used the drawings of animals that belong to the wild nature, but please be very aware that what happened to you was not natural at all, it was not supposed to happen, it was the responsibility of actors that trespassed your rights, those groups that use women as war instruments, but it shouldn’t have happened, it is our fault, the Colombian state´s fault that was not there to prevent it from occurring. Because of that, you must not blame yourselves for wearing shirts, skirts, make up or simply for being women, oh no!, nobody has the right to assault you for any reason, even less for those reasons. You are tough, expert heroines that cope with such events and move forward. Both, Fredy and I are learning something here; you are teaching us a lesson as men, thank you for this

A few minutes later, José asks them to summarize 5 things that the violent events left in their lives and 10 achievements they have fulfilled or expect to reach in the short term. José assists the participants that need help writing. The use of a higher number for achievements “makes the achievements more visible than the painful event, precisely for them to realize that they are experts in handling such situations”. One of
the responses offered by Regina is particularly interesting: “Continue organising ourselves against corruption by some functionaries and their abuses”. I will later realize that after their inclusion in the RUV, two functionaries requested money from these women to speed up the delivery of their compensations, so they decided to sue them with a public attorney. In spite of the subsequent intimidations that these women received, their statements were quickly accepted by the public prosecutor and the functionaries were imprisoned. After the case was publically known, the women in this group decided to organise themselves in a Collective and establish connections with similar collectives in the region.

The session ends with hugs between every participant, and individual meetings with José were agreed with some of the participants. However, albums were missing from the session and numbers were never collected. The script of the ERE was partially followed but the management indicator was not registered at all so that the forms, minutes, and finger prints did not become a part of the arrangement of the session. While in the bus back to the town where José lives and I was staying, I ask him how he filled the reports and the way he collected the numbers. José explains that the number was created by the directives of the psychosocial team in Bogotá to fulfil the requirements of the UARIV. Considering the “intrusive nature of the number” and the importance that things like “reassurance, visual contact and listening time” deserve, José has decided to fill the number only in three of the nine sessions (table 4.3) especially in those without such a strong “emotional content” as the ones I had just observed. This translation made by José and the participating women, this particular use of the number dissolves my first impression of the ERE as an exclusively managerial strategy. Among several sessions of the ERE in different locations where the number was requested, the participants understand the number as “something to realize how you are” or “how the pain goes down”. Some others address the number as an object to “put the pain in words”. A comment offered by a participant of the ERE in another vereda is quite useful for illustrating its performative character: “[…] it helps them (psychosocial professionals) to check whether what they are doing works or not”.
The mediations by the ERE becoming evident during its different sessions generate ambivalent feelings in my reflections. On the one hand it can be understood as a device that somehow has the potential of arranging a space where people share their experiences and position themselves as experts in pain recovery. Likewise, I find quite innovative the attempt of encouraging the use of participants’ own words to address their feelings. It is likely that the partial success of the strategy expressed by the participants in different visits is not actually captured by the management indicator or the emotional recovery index. On the other hand however, it is still inevitable that the ERE takes something from the participants and psychosocial professionals in quantifications that circulate in official reports.

The ways in which some of those psychosocial experts deploy the strategies and the reflections that they encourage in participants of the ERE makes me think of functionaries as a heterogeneous category. But in a more emphatic way, the narratives offered by participants when remembering the violent events that deeply transformed their lives are very special, not only for the emotional engagement they produce, but also because of the meaning that such memories have in participants' lives. More than the recollection of episodes which are taken to have personal significance, also called autobiographical memories (See Bernsten and Rubin 2012), the events narrated by the women in this group resemble what Steve Brown and Paula Reavey (2014) have recently and more emphatically called vital memories, this is “[…] kinds of memories that present considerably greater difficulties in both accommodating into daily life and in reconstructing in alternative ways” (p. 329) and that are particularly evident in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Creating a context</td>
<td>Generate a confident environment and provide self-physical regulation strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 What is left after the violent event</td>
<td>Legitimize the suffering while recognizing the sense of resistance of the survivors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Reuniting: more than suffering</td>
<td>Promote new senses of life while recognizing the adjustments after the victimizing facts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Recognizing</td>
<td>Strengthen the own resources to overcome their situations by recognizing the heroic acts in their lives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Finding support on the network</td>
<td>Recognize the availability of support by other people to make visible the social network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Let us make bring some memories</td>
<td>Recognize the social and family practices that may constitute support to overcome the violent events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Reinventing yourself</td>
<td>Facilitate the recovery of life projects inviting them to rethink the need of making decisions again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Tracking my footprints</td>
<td>Facilitate a closure environment to recognize the progress of every participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Follow Up</td>
<td>Monitor the emotional recovery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 6 Summary of titles, objectives and activities contained in the ERE protocol (UARIV, 2015)*
groups of people usually considered as vulnerable. As the experience of Regina shows, those kinds of memories become recurrent features of the past that will always be pertinent and require current management.

ERE seems to facilitate spaces in which people produce estimations of their emotional state, and act upon them so that the awareness of their feelings together with other activities might facilitate transformations in their experience. Considering affect as a relational dynamic (Brown and Reavey 2014: 333), in the session led by José the tone of the recalled memories was a recurrent element during the interaction between participants, the protocol, and the psychosocial companion. More than individual responses to the questions asked by José, the affective experience of recalling violent events comprised arrangements of relations between the particular details of the participants’ memories, the assaults, the expressions, words, times, places and specificities that came together when participants during the session narrated and shared their stories of sexual abuse, and represented the perpetrators in drawings. But at the same time, the experience of sharing those memories in a group of people in similar circumstances possibly incorporated other elements to the affective arrangement that may transform the recalling itself in ways that can be useful for the participants.

After many of the sessions I joined, most of the participants commented with each other how their sharing in the sessions had made them feel “less ashamed and guilty” about their past, and that they had few friends from whom they did not have to hide their stories. Perhaps this is a notion of Reparation (with capital R) that exceeds legal documents and protocols. Here, Reparation emerges from the detours of the ERE carried out by its participants into ungoverned spaces. It originates from their affective experiences, and creates something unexpected in the initial design of the ERE. Reparation becomes meaningful for people pursuing recovery after violent experiences; besides enacting emerging spaces exceeding the initial design. Reparation with capital R is a relational achievement possible by betraying the state’s logic of reparation.

In spaces like the ones facilitated by the ERE, important similarities and differences with assistance centres and registration procedures arise. As Brown and Reavey (2014) outline, ‘vital memories’ are also relationally transformed by the institutional practices
that elicit them, so that for example legal and therapeutic environments pursue different goals when recalling difficult events (p. 335) since the first demands evidence and precision whereas the latter is interested in meaning and symbolic value. This is important when trying to establish the notion of reparation that actually comes from the people affected by violence insofar as the accounting practices partially unfolded by the ERE still demand from participants things similar to the FUD (Chapter 4) and the PAARI. Nonetheless, the recalling of memories elicited by José, in the absence of records, numbers, and signatures seems to produce a transformation of the meaning of the experience of violence and the expansion of a supporting empathic network of participants.

Reflecting again on the number, the mere establishment of a subjective recovery goal may have important implications in the experiences of participants. It seems that ERE produces individuals more aware of their personal feelings who develop certain skills for overcoming those feelings that they find impairing. Thus, ERE entangles forms of agency between the participants who develop a new form of expertise in dealing with their personal feelings, the psychosocial professionals as extractors of estimations and modulators of new forms of expertise in participants, and the ERE, as a representational and instructional device that relatively standardizes the guidelines for promoting new forms of expertise and provides a partial indicator of the success of the strategy as a form of reparation. However, such form of agencement is also a reproduction of certain aspects of the most common forms of relation between lay people and experts. In most of the cases, experts have already designed a set of strategies based on their assumptions and core knowledge of the needs of certain populations, so that successfully recognized lay people are those who adequately demonstrate a certain mastery of the strategies.

I find absolutely fascinating the way professionals like José and the group of women adapt, recreate and deviate from the managerial design partially present in the ERE, and the way some emerging features seem to substitute, recover, relieve or revivify the social tissue among participants. It occurs to me that what actually results as “repairing” is something beyond the devices themselves, the handbook, the album, or the emotional recovery indicator. Instead, Reparation might emerge from the alterations and shifting made by the people who use, transform, appropriate and promote the ERE in the national territory. Maybe, Reparation, understood as the transformation experienced and manifested by the participants in sessions like the one
led by José, might actually be achieved by promoting such appropriations and detours. Hence, the managerial design of the interventions and the infrastructure that supports it must be translated (see Callon 1986) and rearranged. One might think that government intervention is not enough or just unnecessary because it is exceeded by the universe of experiences of people affected by violence who are recognized as Victims. But contrary to what some critical approaches might assert regarding the obsolescence of the design, I claim that the managerial design is necessary in these spaces for its translation to be possible. In other words, people affected by violence could create repairing arrangements or transform their emotional and social configuration, in spite of the governmental design but still on the basis of its mobilization. After acknowledging the complexity of relations involved in reparation as a creative exercise that may or may not be supported, we can perhaps stop thinking about how psychosocial assistance or government interventions should be designed or how rigorous they ought to be, and start reflecting on what they should simply… let be.

**Reparation as betrayal**

We have established the managerial logic of the governmental reparation system for people registered as Victims of the armed conflict. The system itself displaces the emotional experiences of people participating in the administrative procedures for accessing benefits. Unsurprisingly, such logic partially expands during the deployment of psychosocial assistance protocols, a set of technical tools to manage people’s emotional experiences. However, we have also established possible alternative configurations that emerge within the system itself and permit more autonomous arrangements both for lay people and psychosocial professionals.

The above reflections bring us to a crucial question for understanding the challenging potentialities of psychosocial interventions in/from/with people affected by violence. What is a translation like for it to be accounted as repairing? Or, an even more challenging question, how can a device facilitate/allow (or at least not prevent) a repairing shift? Revisiting the concept of social technologies (Vikkelso 2012, Brown 2012) the notion of reparation assembled by devices like the PAARI comprises a social world nurtured by an accountable logic that is still partially present in the ERE. But in the particular case of the latter device that is explicitly promoted as an object for repairing social tissue, how could a social technology be translated from a
governmental managerial design to enact a social world that actually makes a difference for its users in their affective experiences and daily lives?

John Law states that translation consists of making two words equivalent but “since no two words are equivalent, translation also implies betrayal […] so translation is both about making equivalent, and about shifting. It is about moving terms around, linking and changing them” (Law 2009: 144) Acknowledging the link between psychosocial assistance devices and government interventions, does not necessarily mean to reproduce the managerial logic of the latter. Instead, reparation devices and their users can “shift” (Law 2009: 144) the direction of the use of the device to pursue meaningful changes in Victims experiences of violence and everyday life. As we were able to establish in chapter 4 (Recognition) the government translates statements and experiences into numbers and management indicators positioning itself as a sort of “spokesactant” (see the use of “spokesperson” in Callon 1986: 215). However the sessions of the ERE show us that the users of the devices can also produce arrangements where the voice of participants is not necessarily diminished or neglected. Allowing participants to become their own spokespersons, and any shifting in that direction, should be encouraged, so displacing the voice of the government in the sessions of the protocols can be a powerful strategy. Elaborating Serres’ notion of translation, Steve Brown (2002) offers a pertinent interpretation:

Communication may be “betrayed” by the medium through which it passes. But if we take the position “downstream”, at the point of destination rather than departure of the message, we may see this failure, this betrayal, as also the process of invention. (Brown 2002: 7)

Assuming that the participants of psychosocial assistance sessions are the destination point of the strategy, the reference to translation depicted by Brown makes me think of Reparation as an inventive process that cannot be scheduled or designed, just expected, supported, and under certain circumstances, facilitated. Instead of following the exact path traced by the design of a strategy like the ERE, for creativity to possibly emerge, something totally different is required: a betrayal of the governmental design. This is precisely what José and the participants of the session have achieved by ignoring the number request, focusing on their affective experience while recalling violent events, and creating an arrangement of empathic confidence that will also transform other aspects of their lives. The latter achievements would not
be so easily obtained by spending 40 minutes explaining the use of the album of the ERE and the logic of the number for addressing the current emotional state. Repairing Betrayal has no defined direction or formula, it is instead something that people allow, permit, and decide to experience so, distinct from what the original design pursues and in opposition to clinical and mental health intervention protocols, psychosocial assistance devices cannot and should not forecast the results of their implementation, but precisely assist them and let people create them. Repairing betrayals create arrangements that exceed assistance.

The ERE allows room for betrayal and it is being used for creative ways of signifying, sharing and managing vital memories. I have suggested that such docile social technologies can potentially translate and betray the governmental managerial design to enact a different social reality for their users. My appreciation does not imply that the presence of the ERE in itself guarantees the emergence of creative arrangements. For betrayals of managerial forms of assistance to emerge, it is necessary that particular configurations and cooperation between psychosocial professionals, participants, and the uses of the ERE coexist. An important question emerges here regarding the possible directions of such translations and betrayals. I have outlined different notions of reparation as a bureaucratic achievement or administrative task, and established a difference with Reparation as an arrangement emerging within betrayals from participants transforming the overcoming infrastructure that emerges particularly among the technical mediations of psychosocial assistance devices.

Appropriating the elaboration offered by Michel Serres (1982) on communication networks let us metaphorically think of the government as the sender of a message, registered applicants as receivers, and psychosocial assistance devices and professionals as the passages or channels of such relation. Here, the opening of a passage allows noise, interruption, and interference, and therefore potential transformation (Brown 2002: 7). Such interferences, explained through the metaphor of Parasites, inevitably introduce variations in the trajectories between senders and receivers which represent a paradox since effective communication implies also a risk of failure. As Brown (2002) explains, the injections of difference can take different forms that analyse (take but do not give), paralyse (interrupt usual functioning), and catalyse (force to act differently). Here, I think of the psychosocial professional as a noise, an interferer, that can paralyse the managerial features, and at the same time the
psychosocial expert can instigate the situation for participants to take a different direction towards interactions that they found significant, important and revivifying.

The emergent definitional feature of Reparation suggests that it is not only the mere result of deploying the device, but a creation of an arrangement between the object, the psychosocial professional, and the participants. However, the professional’s role as interferer and mediator demands additional tasks consisting of comprehending what people expect to be regained, positioning the already existing expert knowledge on managing vital memories and experiences of pain, as well as allowing room for participants to make their own decisions regarding the design and deployment of the strategy. These tasks make of psychosocial professionals something close to hybrid agents since most of them are employees of the government, pro-Reparation interferers, vital memories facilitators/managers, but also functionaries, and creative betrayers.

Even though psychosocial professionals working in the field including the directors of the psychosocial team acknowledge the limitations of the numbers and management indicators, they are also aware that such numbers “make the money keep coming”. Thus, the managerial feature in the design of the PAARI and the reparation system inevitably spreads into psychosocial assistance devices. The same management indicators suggest that at least 80,000 people have attended ERE sessions since 2013 throughout the country, a total that becomes an important part of the 426,031 registered Victims granted with compensations since 2012, and the 213,796 registered Victims already with a (de)signed PAARI in 2014. Despite these numbers, the Ministry of Social Protection is still deciding about the best strategy for providing psychological care to the remaining registered Victims through a Plan of Psychosocial Assistance for Victims (PAPSIVI) implemented within the national health system. The psychosocial team of the UARIV is being consulted about such plans, but so also is the professional association of psychologists (COLPSIC) which has resulted in tensions around the topic.

The valuable and rich hybridisation of psychosocial professionals facilitating repairing betrayals currently faces resistance from the government and disciplinary representatives, especially from COLPSIC. For example, a controversial project was submitted to the Congress in 2013. The document, labelled as law Project 73, pursued
the recognition of a new form of psychosocial expertise that operated independently from COLPSIC and academic disciplines like social work. (Senado-de-la-República 2013). In the presentation of motives, the Project argued that the field of work of the Psychosocial Therapist consisted of “working with families, communities, groups and people affected by different types of violence like social, familiar, political, forced displacement […] and in every situation produced by a catastrophic event (p. 13).” COLPSIC and the National Association of Psychology Departments (ASCOFAPSI) strongly opposed this law Project claiming that “the professional limits of psychology were not clear, and this could affect their professional work” (COLPSIC 2015: p. 1).

Even though the tension is still on the table and has mobilized forums, colloquiums and different types of academic events organized by COLPSIC and ASCOFAPSI, the academic organisms have also proposed a different set of devices for providing mental health care to Victims in the national territory through the PAPSIVI. They claim that Psychology has promoted the implementation of intervention models as the Narrative Exposition Technique (NET) and brief therapy models for managing PTSD, depression, anxiety, as well as the implementation of instruments like the Multiscale Inventory for Psychosocial Evaluation (EMP), screening tests, among others that assess the effectiveness of interventions and the mental and psychosocial conditions of people (COLPSIC 2015).

I cannot imagine how a screening test consisting of a symptoms questionnaire (SRQ) symptoms questionnaire for children (RQC) and an APGAR Familiar of 5 Likert items would be implemented in a backyard or a room in a couple of hours with all the participants of the sessions I have accompanied. However, about the future directions of the PAPSIVI, a national forum in 2014 in different cities in the country was carried out in three universities. As the basis for the discussion of the panellists, who were mainly the same across all the presentations in different universities, the COLPSIC wrote a communication addressed to every subscribed member of COLPSIC claiming:

There are reported weaknesses in the implementation of group and individual interventions that provide a full response to the particular needs of people (handicapped, with psychiatric disorders, with different regional origins, etc.) Hence, achieving a characterization will contribute to the comprehension of the problems, features, needs, interests and particular interpretations in these
populations that improve their assistance [...] it is important to recognize that the purpose of the interventions is not research, but the contribution to the quality of life of people and community welfare, so the skills for registering, collecting, organising and reporting information must be strengthened [in psychologists] (COLPSIC 2015)

The route suggested by COLPSIC precisely reproduces the administrative logic of effectiveness assembled in the reparation system, and perhaps because of this, such an approach will have a strong predominance in the resulting PAPSIVI. Psychosocial assistance may become an object for institutional psychology to demarcate itself from other emerging fields. Nevertheless, the addition of COLPSIC and ASCOFAPSI as qualified experts on psychosocial assistance/care increases the chances of their suggested devices being deployed on a wider scale. How to choose among the possibilities? Perhaps we should first acknowledge that the reality of the armed conflict and the pain suffered by people largely exceed the government reparation system and the limits of any discipline. Embracing this excess is a first step to prevent the “spiritual failure” remarkably portrayed by Veena Das (1998) consisting in the denial of other’s pain, an ongoing denial displayed by the managerial logic of the state. Although the strategies proposed by academic and professional associations align more easily with the infrastructure of rights restitution, there is still room to pursue Repairing Betrayals of those strategies.

I pointed out the potentiality for Repairing Betrayals that ERE performs when allowing participants to recognize themselves as experts in the management of their own vital memories, which is even more important and meaningful than the empirical validity of the device or the scientific knowledge that they assemble. Moreover, the flexible use of technologies of reparation like the ERE might allow people to decide how they want to achieve Reparation. The priority of people’s network reconfigurations over the management indicators and the un-black-boxing of the government machinery make of the potential translations of the ERE more interesting, enriching, powerful and reliable tools to perform Reparation with/from people. If there is a starting point for transforming the logic of the reparation system, it is perhaps the one dealing with vital memories and emotions of people where it becomes easier to discern the favourable routes that may result in revivifying experiences for the people: those that deviate from its initial logic. In this sense a session of the ERE, in which the psychosocial professional as a catalyser injects
information that results in creative arrangements for participants, is far more repairing than a minimarket that recruits registered Victims as employees, a psychometric test that will inform the government about its apparent success in managing peoples’ emotional recovery, and empirically validated psychotherapies interested in referring symptoms, modifying ‘dysfunctional’ behaviours, or producing effectiveness indicators.

We have explored the intersections between recognition (registering) and reparation (organising) as two spaces of assemblage of rights restitution as a state intervention. Artefacts such as the FUD, the RUV, the PAARI, and the ERE enact an infrastructure of rights restitution that establishes boundaries of official recognition, organises the experiences of people within those boundaries, and manages their vital memories and embodied experiences of pain. Following Latour (1987), Lampland and Star (2009) I argued that such infrastructure of rights restitution allows state representatives to “act at distance” in the spaces of registration and reparation. Some of the diverting possibilities of psychosocial assistance as a strategy embedded in the reparation system have also been outlined. An important question about the depicted organised settings has to do with the uses of the quantifications that enact it. The official number of the RUV and the management indicators of reparation and psychosocial assistance are translations of embodied experiences of pain, among other things, that speak on behalf of applicants. Such numbers circulate in different spaces and their uses mobilize and reconfigure other instances of the infrastructure they enact. I wonder where and whom those numbers speak. Within this same line of enquiry, I will now follow a downstream approach swaying registration and reparation as the departure points. While doing so, I expect to understand how the assembled orders of registration and reparation “act at distance” in the scenarios where state representatives mobilize and speak on behalf of people contained and displaced by the sociotechnical border of the RUV. For doing so, I will describe the staging in which the numbers and official numbers establish grounds for an emerging form of statehood.
CHAPTER 5: STAGING

The *mise-en-scène* of post-conflict statehood

The *firma de la paz* - the signature of a peace agreement between the Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia (FARC) and the government - seems unstoppable, at least that is the impression you can build up from the news all over the national and international media since early 2014. Supporters from different parties address president Santos as a “peace leader” and express their full support for the negotiations referring to it as an “historical and unprecedented political process” (reference?). Simultaneously, other political sectors claim that impunity is the only result of the negotiations in Havana, and that Victims will be neither repaired nor dignified by the *firma*. During most of my visits to assistance centres in different cities over the country between 2013 and 2015, I have witnessed how the lives of habitants in Bogotá, Santa Marta, Barranquilla, Montería, Medellín, Cali, and Pasto are frequently surrounded by campaigns that promote a series of events mainly organised by the UARIV. Some of those events include TV programs titled “repairing to move on” broadcasted on TV, weekly radio shows inviting them to “get on the train of reparation and peace”, widespread propaganda calling people to donate money by saying “together we can repair the Victims”, widely advertised football matches with the slogan “I play for the Victims”, and “concerts for the peace” with famous local and international musicians.

Besides the media mobilization, different groups of people converge in massive and emblematic marches with the slogan “all together for the Victims”, mainly held every 9 April, also known as the National Day of Victims, celebrated since 2012. Representatives of every political party furiously shout messages in favour of the recognition of “rights for the Victims” and the urgent need of their reparation for peace to be possible. Some of the quotes that I collect from people participating at the march in Bogotá address the Victims as “people affected by FARC”, “farmers and poor people who are more vulnerable”, “families caught up in crossfires”, and “people who deserve a second chance to get a job and move forward”. When asked about the reasons for participating, some of the participants claim that they attended voluntarily after they heard and saw the advertisement, and a few of them explain that their offices and universities cancelled the afternoon activities to allow employees and students to participate in the marches.
The massive invitations to march, the diversity of events related to the Victims and peace, the attendance of representatives of every political party, the huge media coverage, and the salient response of people in every capital city of the country make me feel part of a high scale arrangement. This arrangement enacts an explicit claim to support people like my interlocutors, who I have accompanied in the queues and psychosocial sessions. I wonder about the intersections and relations between the assemblages of recognition and reparation and their incorporation into this impressive display that resembles a *mise-en-scène*. The French expression, sometimes translated as staging, is used in a variety of disciplines, but particularly in scenic and cinematographic arts, to address the arrangement of props, lights, music, actors and their disposition for the performance of a play in an acting space (Venstein 1955: 7, cited by Pavis 1990). It also involves the assemblage of objects, prompters, and audiences in a particular and designed harmony usually assisted by a coordinator. Such harmony also requires the translation of text into a space, a proper decoding of textual sheets into spatial arrangements, and a transformation of the script through actors and scenic spaces. The metaphor makes me wonder how such massive national calls around Victims have come to be successful to mobilize an important proportion of people in the national space. More emphatically, I also wonder about the highlighted visibilities and a plausible way to understand the organisation of such staging.
Following the elaborations about standards and infrastructures offered by Martha Lampland and Susan Leigh Star (2009), in the previous chapters I described how an emerging Infrastructure of Rights Restitution (henceforth IRR) is assembled by the codifications and quantifications obtained in registration and reparation spaces. This infrastructure organises embodied experiences of pain and allows actions by distance from representatives of the state. Instead of using the mise-en-scène to suggest the existence of an identifiable director, I want to use the artistic term to metaphorically address how the mobilization of representatives of the Colombian State also occurs in scenarios that are configured and organised by what occurs precisely in the trajectories of registration and reparation. Within such attempt, I assume that the official numbers and management indicators become some of the texts and scripts that are transformed into scenic assemblages targeting a national audience.

In this chapter, I use the metaphor of the mise-en-scène to depict the entanglements of the IRR by recreating public controversies around official numbers assembled through technologies of recognition and reparation. While exploring the suggestive invitation offered by Jan-Hendrick Passoth and Nicholas Rowland (2010) to emphasize the relational emergence of the state, I suggest that the mobilization of numbers around registration and reparation of Victims successfully assembles a post-conflict statehood in Colombia. This statehood is comprised of at least three complimentary and almost undifferentiated features that I describe as scenes of the state: inclusive, repairing, and transparent. Hence, while an apparently harmonic mise-en-scène of a post-conflict statehood is pointing the lights towards its expanding presence, I examine how such statehood also displaces experiences of pain and mobility as well as other forms of organisation that exceed its boundaries.

First scene: an inclusive state

A few years before the firma de la paz, but almost at the same time when the National Day of Victims was promulgated, an important tension regarding the official number of Victims in the country emerged. In 2011, the Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC 2011) estimated the existence of at least 26,400,000 Internally Displaced People (IDP) caused by violence in the world. Such estimation was calculated by contrasting the reports of the governments, the information produced by representatives of United Nations (UN) in every country, and the inputs offered by NGOs. The global distribution showed that the countries with the largest IDP
populations were Colombia (4.9-5.9 million), Iraq (2.3-2.6 million), Sudan (2.2 million), Democratic Republic of Congo (1.7 million) and Somalia (1.5 million). In the particular case of Colombia, there was a huge discrepancy between the number presented by the government of 3,876,000, and the records of the Human Rights and Displacement Consultation Office (CODHES) that registered 5,281,000 cases.

Besides the tensions around official number, important discrepancies were observed between the cases of displacement accounted by the Presidency and CODHES between 2002 and 2011. While the Presidency claimed that the number of displaced people decreased in 56% since 2004 (Santos 2012), CODHES stated that such numbers and statistics had actually been manipulated (Semana 2009). After the promulgation of the LV in 2011 and the resulting deployment of technologies like the FUD (chapter 3), the difference between the official numbers and the private reports significantly reduced to approx. 600,000 registered cases by the end of 2012. According to the information provided during an interview in June 2014 by a functionary in charge of assessing applications, of the almost 26,000 FUDs assessed per month, 21,500 (meaning approx. 75,000 people) are registered in the RUV, whereas almost 4,500 (around 16,000 people) are rejected. One of the main criticisms CODHES (2011) pointed out in their reports was the rejection of people from the RUV despite their “evident situation of displacement” (p. 7). As indicated by my interviewees at the assessment office, the “rigour of the assessment inevitably leads to rejections” of people that “have not been displaced by the armed conflict” but by situations other than the armed conflict. However, disregarded applications are still counted as managed cases.

Before the recent official number of Victims in the RUV, the differences between public and private accounts about the amount of people affected by violence in Colombia were a matter of controversy. The tensions arose mainly from the differences around the Policy of Democratic Security signalled by the Director of CODHES (Romero 2006) as the main cause of violence in the first decade of the century. The controversial Policy promoted by former President Uribe and coordinated by his Minister of Defence (the current President) Santos, augmented the army from 145,000 to 431,253 soldiers in the first decade of the century to fight back outlawed groups, mainly guerrillas.
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64 As mentioned in chapter 1, this policy sought the destruction of the guerrillas following their re-labelling as terrorist groups, while it also increased the frequency of armed confrontations, rural displacements, and Colombian State crimes.
CODHES claimed that forced displacement was a direct consequence of the upsurge of violence after the deployment of the improved Colombian Army in the rural areas. CODHES pointed out that the government was presenting partial numbers of displacement to “convince the national and international public opinion about the success” of their Policy of Democratic Security (CODHES 2005: 5).

The tension between the official number and CODHES seemed to stabilize after the end of the presidential period of Uribe, and after the mandatory registration procedures through the FUD which included Forced Displacement as its major category. The discrepancies between the government and CODHES about the official number, now in the form of the RUV, became almost non-existent after 2013 in the reports by CODHES so that the latest IDMC report of 2014 quotes the UARIV as its only source. Meanwhile, Marco Romero, as a member of the Displacement Policies Monitoring Committee, has lately focused his political and academic activity to follow-up the implementation of the LV since 2012. A more recent detractor of the RUV, the National Group of Historic Memory (GMH) claims that there is a “sub-register reflecting the technical and logistic limitations of state entities, but also the effectiveness of the strategies deployed by armed actors to make crimes invisible” (GMH 2013: 7). The GMH conducted a quantitative study in 2012 with a sample of 460 people directly affected by armed confrontations in the national space, of which only 63 were registered in the RUV. The GMH argues that the RUV ignores the cases of people that have not sought assistance or reparation, due to fear or ethical-political disagreements, as well as those people assassinated without relatives to apply for registration. One might initially think that the much-deliberated increase in the RUV reflects a success of CODHES or a genuine attempt of the Colombian State to acknowledge their responsibility in a long war conflict. However, there might be an alternative interpretation for the increase of the RUV considering the information provided by the GMH, the entanglements in the configuration of the RUV as a sociotechnical border (chapter 3), and the logic of reparation (chapter 4).

65 “El Gobierno presenta las cifras de desplazamiento con datos parciales que no dan cuenta de la real magnitud del fenómeno, para convencer a la opinión nacional e internacional del éxito de su política de seguridad, pero los hechos graves que están ocurriendo demuestran un cambio en la tendencia de disminución y un crecimiento del desplazamiento en todo el país.”
In a public interview about the challenges of the LV and the possible participation of Victims in political scenarios, Paula Gaviria, the current Director of the UARIV said:

The Law of Victims for us and the President is a kind of first step towards the peace dialogues in Havana. The Law itself is construction of peace. It is a law that strengthens the presence of the state in its territory. Today, the victims exist for the country.66 (El Nuevo Siglo 13/09/2013, emphasis added)

The statement “today, the victims exist for the country” suggests the absence of previous forms of recognition by the state, and circumscribes the existence of affected people after the implementation of the current registration system. As seen in chapter 4, the status of Victim is granted only after the fulfilment of technical criteria and the corroboration of consistency between the narratives produced by applicants and the state databases. All the applications, rejected and accepted, are successfully incorporated into the information system and accounted for as responsible actions of the state. Hence, the “presence of the State” is expanded through the RUV along the country, even in those spaces where the State had been absent, or where its only presence was comprised of members of the National Army that in some cases also became perpetrators. The “presence of the state” refers not only to the foundation of offices of the UARIV in every department since 2012, but also to the registration of people from different regions of the country from the moment they engage in administrative procedures for registration in the RUV. The allusion to “presence” in “its territory” is possible through an infrastructure of restitution that initially institutes the statements of applicants into official numbers, then prints acceptance and rejection resolutions with reference to the consistency with the official databases, and finally mobilizes the official numbers as symbols of its inclusiveness. Nevertheless, I wonder about the particularity of this infrastructure that makes it different from other kinds of arrangements.

66 La ley de víctimas, para nosotros y para el presidente, es como el primer paso para lo que estamos avanzando hoy con los diálogos en La Habana. La ley de víctimas en sí misma es construcción de paz. Es una ley que fortalece los mecanismos democráticos y busca fortalecer la presencia del Estado en lo territorial. Hoy las víctimas existen para el país.”
When addressing the materials of infrastructures, Robert Larkin (2013) argues that iron, mud, concrete, fibre optic cables, plastic stand for specific eras and produce a “sensory apprehension of existence” (p. 338). However, in the particular case of the RUV, that infrastructure is built from the narrative materials contained in the FUD of every single applicant now embodying the Colombian State (see chapter 4). As Passoth and Rowland (2010) illustrate, “the state is not a thing but […] the ongoing relational outcome of practices and processes which iteratively expand and protect it while others disband and unravel it” (p.828). Hence, the practices of quantification and codification that enact an IRR also assemble, enlarge and guard a particular form of statehood. Here, the Colombian State is not an actor per se that coordinates its own mise-en-scène. Instead, “[s]tate actors only exist in relation to assemblages of human bodies, borders and fences, tax payments and government forms, even bogs and trees” (Carroll, 2006, cited by Passoth and Rowland, 2010). Consequently, the historicity and
consistency of the Colombian State is reconfigured by ongoing assemblages disseminated in different spaces of encounter between applicants/participants and state representatives. Therefore, an expansion of the Colombian State is achieved by the IRR through artefacts like the RUV, the management indicators of restitution, and the circulation of such devices in accountability scenarios. As shown in the solved controversies around numbers, some of these scenarios include the official reports, the tensions with private organisations, and other spaces where the mise-en-scène of an inclusive state is performed.

The inclusiveness of the Colombian State is being continuously stabilized during the registration procedures, the national marches, and the wide congregations around Victims and peace. Inclusiveness appears then, not only as a constant narrative of civil servants and applicants, but also as a form of statehood that is enacted by registration procedures and the circulation of official numbers. As mentioned earlier, the mise-en-scène involves the assemblage of visibilities, objects and other elements in an orchestrated harmony. In the case of the RUV, the organisation of the scene points the lights towards the numbers promoting a notion of inclusiveness while relegating, to an almost invisible spot, its possible participation in the armed conflict and an upsurge of violence. Similarly, the displaced spot hosts rejected cases from the RUV comprised of applicants affected by BACRIM, people applying after deadlines, and perpetrations considered as crimes of the State. The last part of the statement of the Director of the UARIV addresses the spectators of the mise-en-scène: “[…] the victims exist for the country”. The expression appeals to the recent possibility of the audience to become aware of the existence of Victims through a form of awareness that inevitably requires a sensorial experience.
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67 Urban armed groups consisting of former members of demobilized paramilitary groups. See chapters 4 and 7 for more details.
68 As mentioned in chapter 3, recent legal appeals regarding the registration criteria include the Sentence C280/2013 revoking missed deadlines and the Auto 119/2013 for affectations by BACRIM. These regulations have mandated the registration of 256,788 (January, 2016, 332,149, April 2016) previously rejected applicants in the RUV.
In his reflections about the aesthetic features of infrastructures, Robert Larkin (2013) argues that the materiality of those arrangements permits a “sensory apprehension of existence” (p.338). In the IRR, such apprehension is provoked by the public and widespread deployments of the official numbers and their transformations into other objects. Figure 18 shows the Index of Risk of Victimization (IRV) calculated with the information collected through the FUD about the declarations offered by applicants over the country. The colours and distributions change as a function of the years and the Victimizing Facts registered in the FUD (see table 3). About maps as technical objects, Christine Leuenberger and Izhak Schell (2010) note that “rather than being mirrors of reality, maps are an amalgam of collected, classified, and encoded information that is inseparable from the social context of its production” (p.832). In chapter 3, I suggested that the boxes containing FUDs in the assessment offices and the App-RNI-Cifras were oligoptic forms of knowledge that simplified the experiences of pain and mobility of those contained in the sociotechnical border (RUV). But these objects, as well as the index of victimization and its visually displayed map, also make the territorial imaginaries of the armed conflict and its related mobility visible, definable, and aesthetically graspable. Leuenberger and Schell discuss how the presumed objectivity of maps makes them “powerful socializing agents into notions of space, territory” (p.833). In the case of the Victimizations Index, maps and other similar objects promote a notion of regional predominance of violence. However, the pieces of information contained in the Index do not necessarily “speak for themselves, we do the speaking” (Nelson et al. 1987 cited by Leuenberger and Schnell 2010).
Instead, the knowledge about the armed conflict and Victims is comprised of “facts” enacted by numbers and their audience.

The numbers made by unmaking embodied experiences of pain and mobility, are now also available in other objects displayed for an audience. Although the development of the map and other mobile applications is not a guarantee of divulgation, their inauguration together with the massive circulations of the official numbers in the media, the social networks, and public appearances of state representatives certainly provoke a sensorial experience of what has been achieved through registration and reparation. An oligoptic “apprehension of the existence” of Victims arises through the deployment of numbers. The practices of coding and quantifying that occur at CDRs, assessment offices and the sessions of the PAARI and the ERE act at distance through the IRR. Thus, the mise-en-scène of inclusiveness is only possible because of those practices that allow state representatives to speak on behalf of Victims and rejected applicants. However, inclusiveness, as a feature of the Colombian State enacted by the RUV, is also scrutinized by different audiences that question the nature of the technical procedures of registration while also interrogate their legitimacy. Besides inclusiveness, other scenes become necessary in the staging of post-conflict statehood.

**Second scene: a transparent state**

The assessment of the FUD of all the country is made by psychosocial professionals working in an office of the UARIV. By the time of my visits to the offices between April and July 2014, a few well known cases of “fake victims”, tramitadores, and corrupted civil servants seized the attention of the local media. Once in the office and after several security checkpoints, I manage to engage in a short interview with a civil servant working in the assessment office. My interlocutor, a functionary, claims that “95% of the Victims are registered through the FUD”, whereas the remaining percentage is included by court rulings and judicial sentences of land restitution. My interviewee also asserts that the cases of rejection are specifically for situations of domestic violence, common crimes, traffic of narcotics, and fraud. I ask about the alleged cases of fraud by people included in the RUV, which were well known by the media. My interlocutor argues that “sometimes people with low education with low access to technological tools, can easily be manipulated” and explains that they have
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69 “Trámites” are administrative procedures “tramitadores” may be understood as people with some expertise in those administrative procedures.
identified several tramitadores, people who become experts in the administrative procedures of the UARIV and orient applicants about the information to provide to increase the chances of registration. According to the official accounts of those fraudulent events, tramitadores charge fees to the applicants for this service by gaining a percentage of the compensations given by the government. An anti-fraud committee has recently been created at the UARIV to counteract those cases.

My interviewee at the office explains that after anonymous complaints, applicants already included in the RUV were accused of providing false testimonies so that a number of investigations were carried out by the District Attorney. “Making an application with a fake cédula, superseding another person, or pretending to be a victim to receive compensations is a crime and must be punished”, says my interviewee arguing that public resources must be preserved and delivered in a responsible way to the people who deserve them. In spite of their reserve towards cases of fraud, I manage to obtain information from a psychosocial professional in charge of assessment about the strategies for detecting those fraudulent cases. Consistency between dates and places in the narration of events appears again as a crucial aspect (see chapter 4). My provoking and uncomfortable question about fraud is diverted by my interlocutor with a final statement: “It has happened before, when the assessments were done in the local offices [“along the country”], and there are people in prison because of that, but it is not
happening anymore”. To the contrary, local newspapers suggest that at least 400 cases are under investigation for fraudulent applications (El-Nuevo-Siglo 2014).

In a more convincing account, one of the psychosocial evaluators of the FUD tells me how at least 40 cases that he had to assess were under investigation because the statements had been apparently “copy-pasted” by civil servants in assistance centres to fill the forms of several applicants. The only differences among the applications consisted of the names, places, dates, and some other details.

It was frustrating that the first encounter of those applicants with the state had been conducted in that way, the civil servants did not even take the time to listen to them and transcribe what they said, and they just copy-pasted the same text for every single applicant [...] I was annoyed, the only contact we have with those people is through the narration of events imprinted in those forms, so I felt it was a mere production of documents.

The words of the psychosocial evaluator are revealing for a variety of reasons. First, the actual person that makes the decision about the registration does not have any personal contact with the applicant, but with their narratives, which are actually codifications and translations of the original narratives offered in the assistance centres. Second, what the evaluator claims about the declarations under investigation as “mere production of documents” is actually true for every single FUD under expert assessment. Every narration is produced as a result of questions specifying dates, places, and events. The standardized narratives are also productions of documents and elaborated versions that fulfil the technical criteria for assessment. If such kind of production is the criterion for fraudulence, every declaration could be considered fraudulent to some extent. So, what might be the reasons for declaring the falseness of a FUD? Perhaps the homogeneity of the documents produced must not be so evident or explicit, because it threatens the main trace of the evaluation system, its alleged “objectivity” and “rigour” (Chapter 4) for detecting inconsistencies. But an evident homogeneity among FUDs also threatens the capacity of RUV to differentiate good narratives from deficient ones. In any case, the public claim of the UARIV of conducting disciplinary investigations and rigorous analysis of possible fake statements promotes a valuable idea of social responsibility and careful management by State representatives. Thus, the state remakes itself on the pain of the displacement of experiences of pain and mobility, yet its infrastructure for doing so cannot manage to properly perceive those experiences.
During my visit, the director of the assessment office spends a lot of time explaining the huge efforts of the computer engineers who seem to be really interested in developing secure routes to access the information of the applicants. When asked who might be interested in hacking the system, the director replies: “some people using the information in our databases could do it to benefit from it, can you imagine the information of the Victims in the hands of a perpetrator?” The director proudly explains how the Japanese government has provided qualified consultants to develop security protocols for accessing the databases. The plan of the UARIV is to allow other government entities to access their database because it would considerably reduce the time response for providing resources and benefits to Victims. Besides supporting the claim of carefulness towards sensitive information, the practices of security and the narratives against fraud also promote a notion of objectivity, transparency, rigour, and responsible management of the information by state representatives.

Some days after my visit to the offices, the media follows a case in Antioquia where 7 civil servants are arrested for having accessed the UARIV databases in order to modify the stored information and use it to include people in the RUV, supplant applicants to claim their benefits, speed-up claims of monetary compensations, and divulgate information regarding the perpetrators in applicants’ statements (Caracol-Noticias 2014, Redacción-Judicial 2014, Bargent 2014). While participating in a session of the ERE a few months later, I personally meet a group of women already registered in the
RUV who were offered the possibility of speeding up compensations in exchange for a proportional fee. When the women rejected the offer, they were threatened by the civil servants. Contrary to the expectations of those functionaries, the women, now organised as a collective due to the threats, decided to sue the civil servants at the Department Attorney with the assistance of a psychosocial professional of the UARIV. The involved functionaries were fired and eventually imprisoned. More recently, after dismantling a group of 3,000 people working with civil servants in Antioquia to speed up the administrative procedures in exchange for a proportion of applicants’ compensations, the Director of the UARIV said:

> Since the beginning, we have been articulated with the National Attorney’s office and other offices [the National Secretary of Transparency] to bring to justice this kind of people who profit from the pain of our compatriots, victims of the conflict […] the pain of the victims is not a business” (UARIV, citizen services website, 15/10/2015, emphasis added)

The expression “since the beginning” suggests the continuous fight of the UARIV against corruption, and a vigilance towards corrupted civil servants and people wanting to illegally profit from Victims. However, the IRR is also financed by the reparation fund. The claims of a continuous vigilance and the statement “the pain of the victims is not a business” both enact a public pursuit of bureaucratic transparency by State representatives. Here, the mise-en-scène points its lights towards the prosecution of people trying to hack the IRR, as an arrangement that is not only inclusive but also careful with the information of the Victims.

Figure 20 Director of the UARIV, Paula Gaviria, presenting the annual report for 2012. Urna de Cristal YouTube Channel. 14/01/2013
I find particularly interesting the use of the FUD as a tool for determining the veracity of statements, but also the narratives of vigilance of public resources offered by civil servants and the naturalization of the FUD. In the mise-en-scène of a transparent state, the narratives that are codified, signed and stamped in the FUD possess more credibility, but this also means that the stories of those who are rejected from the RUV or that do not even engage with it, lack the necessary credibility to be accounted as legitimate stories of people affected by violence. An exposure of the RUV as a factory of truth directs the lights to legitimate stories of people outside the staging of the Colombian State.

In his study of the politics of transparency in the neoliberal Paraguay, Kregg Hetherington (2011) documents how the conflicts between actors revolved around the uses of documents, the notions of how bureaucracy should work, and the rights to narrate the history and future projects of Paraguay. About transparency, Hetherington says:

Transparency is not a form of representation that fixes mistakes, deters corruption, and finally puts the state at the service of the common good. What transparency actually is [...] is a political negotiation between disparate points of reference that have become unmoored, between documents, people, bodies, laws, circulating stories, plotted ground, the intransigent material objects and processes littering the landscape, the habits of the past and the looming uncertainties of the future. Transparency is nothing more than the name for a negotiation that forges a momentary agreement about representations and that aims to facilitate future connections (p. 222)

In the Paraguayan case, the initiative of transparency resulted in tensions between different actors, including peasants who had to mobilize to resist the distinctions that excluded them as legitimate questioners. The bureaucratic procedures of registration and reparation embedded in the IRR have been perhaps a different case. Although the alleged initiative of the UARIV to make transparent the information has been widely deployed in Colombia, the spaces for questioning such information are almost exclusively restricted to follow-up commissions of the LV. Nonetheless as Hetherington (2012) further notes, transparency is also a way to “control some of the arbitrariness that slips in as bureaucrats make decisions in the space between codified norms” (p.243). Hence, considering that arbitrariness is inevitable, the narrative of transparency suggests that the bureaucratic discretion relies on the documents and the technical procedures related to documents instead of the functionaries.
In chapter 3, I described a bureaucratic bottleneck regarding the times of official communications to be emitted. Most of the applicants I met believe that rigorous investigations were conducted during the 3 months period. However, the actual evaluation of every FUD and the emission of a particular decision did not exceed a few hours of assessment. If transparency is to be pursued by representatives in the State, this bottleneck might offer a crucial starting point; the mise-en-scène of the IRR directs the lights towards public prosecutions instead of its possible fractures. About this, Hull (2012) suggests that bureaucratic semiotic technologies, like the forms and archives, can be turned against the government instead of exclusively being its means of dominance (p. 208). Hence, one of the things that the prosecuted cases have shown is that deviating from the bureaucratic logic of the RUV is possible.

Although the debates about the technical procedures of registration and their accountability remain as areas of controversy and debate in Colombia, the narratives of inclusiveness and transparency have been successfully mobilized through official numbers. Likewise, the alleged difference between the LV and other regulations (see chapters 1 and 4) make of “reparation” a persistent aspect in the derivative guidelines of the LV and a crucial element in the assemblage of post-conflict statehood.

**Third scene: a repairing state**

I have been in contact with Diana, a woman who I met in 2013 when she first arrived in Bogotá after being expelled from her farm in Antioquia with her two daughters. Her partner, the father of the two girls, was assassinated in January 2012 by an armed group, the name of which she avoids in our conversations. She applied for registration in the RUV in early April 2013, and received a notification of acceptance in the category Forced Displacement and Homicide by late July. One of her expectations after receiving the compensations was to pay for a health insurance for her youngest daughter who had been diagnosed with autism. Diana also plans to apply for land restitution and attend the SENA, a national service for technical and technological careers that recently signed a covenant with the UARIV to offer some places for Victims. Almost at the same time that Diana submitted an application for studying as part of her PAARI, the insufficiency of the governmental system of reparation was exposed in a report produced by the Human Rights Watch (HRW 2013). The report,
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A few days after the publication of the HRW report, the Director of the UARIV replied by claiming that they “had emitted 233 communications on 666 cases which represented almost 15,000 hectares of land, and 66% of the applicants had returned to live or work on their lands” (La Silla Vacía, 04/10/2013). Other representatives of the UARIV also stated that at least “a few tens of families” had already returned to their lands but that the databases were not “refined enough” for providing an exact number. Meanwhile, the director of HRW for the Americas, José Miguel Vivanco argued that the statements of the UARIV “intentionally distorted the facts confusing the public opinion” by accounting families already living in their farms as cases of effective reparation and restitution. In Vivanco’s words:

The purpose [of the numbers] is to defend the emblematic campaign of the government that, after two years of operation, has only succeeded in the return of one family to their land [… ] the government does not present other cases of reiterative displacement because they are not worthy examples of victims (Sierra 2013).

The same report by HRW (2013) establishes that there were 17,109 cases of violent displacement under formal investigation in Colombian courts, but only 28 prosecutions –which is less than 0,0017%. Sources not involved in this tension suggested that the statement by HRW was due to their sampling of approximately only 130 families, and that the families that had already been repaired with their lands were not more than 35 (La Silla Vacía 04/10/2013). Considering the stories of my interlocutors that corroborate the long waiting times for different forms of reparation (chapter 4), the extreme claim of the HRW likely matches the actual situation of people waiting for compensations and a safe return to their farms. The tension between the HRW and the UARIV was followed by the media until the end of October, but no final conclusions were drawn. In the meantime, Diana was not given any reply to her application for studying, so she had to get a job in Bogotá in domestic services – one of the most common jobs for people in her situation. One month later, President Santos announced his candidacy for (re)election. In the campaign announcement speech, he claimed:
It was outrageous for me that the state did not recognize the victims and simply told them “you are on your own”. *We have started to repair them, we have done it with more than 370,000, and we have started to give their lands back. But our biggest challenge is that there are not victims anymore and that is why we need to end this conflict [...] I want to lead a Colombia that moves from fear to hope, from backwardness to modernity, from divisions to unity. A Colombia that rather thinks about building a future than clinging to the past instead. I do not want a divided country. I want a united country. I want a Colombia in peace with prosperity for everybody.* (extract from presidential candidacy speech by Santos, November 23, 2013, emphases added)

Diana’s frustration is an unwelcomed text in the mise-en-scène of a future-driven statehood, her story does not easily reach the spotlights and becomes invisible for an audience with which Diana herself is unaffiliated. Besides locating himself as an outsider of “the State that did not recognize the victims”, the speech illustrates how the narrative of numbers and management indicators, assembled by technologies of recognition and reparation, is circulated in the public sphere. Diana, as many other people already registered in the RUV, has only received a notification of acceptance and the promise of reparation (See Jaramillo 2012). However, her experience is already accounted as part of the 370,000 people quoted by the President, and accompanied by narratives of social responsibility and ongoing projects of reparation. While numbers and management indicators are assembled through the PAARI and the ERE (see chapter 4), those same narratives of quantification configure a notion of a state effective at alleviating the consequences for people affected by violence. Likewise, in the mise-en-scène of those numbers promotes and legitimizes the “end of the conflict”, as a major project of state representatives using the indicators narrative.
A year after the tensions between HRW and the UARIV around the numbers of reparation, a favourable account of registration and reparation was presented by researchers of the Carr Center for Human Rights Policy (Sikkink et al. 2014) at Harvard University. The study, titled “Evaluation for the Unidad para las Víctimas: global and comparative benchmarking”, was commissioned by the UARIV itself and financed by US Aid to evaluate the effectiveness of the implementation of the LV since 2011. The report supports the account of the UARIV as a successful repairer for 426,000 victims since 2011 (out of 7,028,776 registered until November 2014). In spite of the optimistic tone of the study regarding the effectiveness of the procedures of the UARIV, it also argues that most comparable countries have repaired groups of recognized Victims equivalent to 1% of the population of the country, but in the Colombian case the percentage of people to repair approaches 14% which becomes an administrative challenge. The difference arises from the decision to include Forced Displacement in the RUV as a category and target of reparation. The study argues that Colombia is a leader in the implementation of international transitional justice parameters, but it also points out that the other countries “have been more effective in making commitments than fulfilling them” (El Espectador, 18/10/2014).
The Colombian State through the UARIV has to provide compensations for more than 90% of the registered Victims until 2021 by using the Fondo Nacional para la Reparación. The fund was created initially by the government in 2005 and has been recently strengthened with the initial budget of the Law 1448 and financial injections generated by confiscated properties, donations by financial groups, goods obtained from criminal sentences for corruption, drug traffic confiscated funds, and resources provided by national companies, the European Union, and the United States. The fund must also provide for the payroll of the UARIV, including the outsourced digitizers, FUD evaluators and psychosocial professionals working in the country from 2011 to 2021. Hence, it is still necessary to compensate and offer reparation measures to the remaining 6.5M people contained by the sociotechnical border of the RUV (chapter 4).

People who, at the time of writing, have not yet fulfilled the requirement of the PAARI. About this, Diana explains that if she was only registered in Forced Displacement, she would probably never get any compensation. The bureaucratic advantages of being also registered into the category Homicide are again addressed by a successful applicant (see Elias, chapter 4). Perhaps, the alleged targeting of people affected by Forced Displacement into the RUV is having an ongoing performative effect insofar as it promotes both an inclusive notion of the State and also its apparent attempt to successfully repair every registered person – something that will only be known in 2021, three years after the end of Santos’ presidential term.

Numbers are deployed in different ways to promote the state as an effective repairer. For example, the latest official report of the Presidency (Presidencia-de-Colombia 2015) to the Congress claims that “more than 480,000 victims have been compensated, something unprecedented in the world […] without weakening the presence of the State and our armed forces in the country” (p.15). Among other strategies for integral reparation, the same report also claims that 521,772 Victims were guaranteed preferential access to the SENA, who now “will have skills to be incorporated into the labour market” (p.48)
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In spite of having waited for two years to receive a notification of acceptance at the SENA, the requests of people like Diana are incorporated into a narrative of effectiveness and presented to administrative instances auditing the LV. The assemblage of management indicators in the sessions of the PAARI and the translation of experiences of pain and mobility into numbers, result in objects that are also used to promote a notion of a repairing state successfully fulfilling the LV project. In spite of the precarious living conditions of people like Diana, their registration in the RUV and the promise of reparation are transformed into devices enacting a IRR as a form of organisation. Besides imposing the temporality of the State in their lives, this infrastructure endows representatives of the State to speak on behalf of people like Diana in spaces like the Congress and the national mise-en-scéne.

The IRR mobilizes an “enthusiasm of the imagination” (Mrázek 2002: 166, cited by Larkin 2013) a term that addresses the feelings of promise that objects like bridges, water systems, or roads can also endure. Those material arrangements become symbols of participation in contemporaneous modernity, especially for developing societies. Hence “by promoting circulation, infrastructures bring about change, and through change they enact progress, and through progress we gain freedom” (Larkin 2013: 332-333). With regard to progress, Walter Benjamin and Rolf Tiederman (1999) point out that infrastructures mobilize affects and feelings that can be deeply political
with regard to the possibility of participating in modernity. About narratives of progress, Hetherington (2014) notes that infrastructure “often serves as that which holds nature and culture apart, marking a temporal break between chaos and order. As such it is also a promise, signalling the presence of some higher power” (p.195-196). The IRR mobilizes a notion of progress materialized in the effective implementation of international policies for human rights precisely as symbols of modern development. Still, in terms of the official numbers, and the numbers presented by their detractors, one might argue that rights restitution is a failed infrastructure given its lack of efficiency. In his study of roads in the Albanian-Greek cross road border, Dimitris Dalakoglou (2010) documents the unstoppable project of roads construction despite the regulatory regimes that forbid the private possession of cars. In spite of its inevitable failure, roads certainly mobilized a national feeling of progress and modernity. Such “infrastructure fetishism” (Dalakoglou 2010) is perhaps one of the reasons why the mise-en-scène of a repairing state also gathers an apparently massive support of peace in Colombia, as a commodity intrinsically related to modern notions of progress, human rights, and freedom.

About the engagement with infrastructures, Larkin (2013) argues that “they can generate complicated emotional investments that induce a range of sometimes counterintuitive responses and distinct, if ephemeral sensibilities” (p.334). The IRR keenly demands an emotional involvement from the different audiences of the mise-en-scène, and this is a particular feature of this arrangement that surely deserves a special consideration. As seen in chapters 4 and 5, embodied experiences of pain and mobility, as raw materials, are shaped into numbers as “bricks of [an] infrastructure wall” (Lampland and Star 2009: 18) of rights restitution. Then, the deployment of those numbers encourages emotional engagements and support towards the IRR itself and the form of statehood that it assembles. Thus, the IRR transforms painful emotional experiences of applicants into artefacts that provoke emotional experiences of enthusiasm in the audience of the mise-en-scène; the arrangements within registration and reparation act at a distance and make possible the enthusiasm grounded in modern notions of human rights, an enthusiasm for an emerging post-conflict statehood.
I recall Diana and many other interlocutors, whose frustration and expectations are neglected by the IRR. The mise-en-scène renders her situation invisible, and privileges the stabilities, the apparent success, and the promises of a State that effectively repairs Victims. As mentioned before, Passoth and Rowland (2010) suggest that statehood is the “ongoing relational outcome of practices and processes which iteratively expand and protect it while others disband and unravel it”. If the mise-en-scène makes salient the practices that expand and protect the state, how to direct the lights towards those practices that “disband and unravel it”. In chapter 4, I used the term “repairing betrayals” to address the translations made by experts and participants during psychosocial assistance interventions that interfere and catalyse the design of the protocol into unexpected, uncontrolled, and revivifying rearrangements. Perhaps putting those experiences in the spotlight might contribute to debunking the notion of a repairing state as the only alternative, insofar as Reparation, with a capital R, rather occurs in ungoverned spaces (see chapter 4). However, currently the salience of the repairing role of the state is predominantly successful, especially when it comes to re-elections and narratives of peace and a post-conflict.

I have addressed public displays promoting the state as inclusive, transparent and repairing pointing out that those notions do not suddenly emerge as stable conditions, but after resolving or silencing tensions with opponents and retractors. Besides
describing such notions of statehood as relational features that partially assemble and reconfigure the Colombian State, I have described some of the tensions within the infrastructure state of restitution of rights. The successful mise-en-scène of post-conflict statehood makes its desirable features stand out while it casts a shadow over the organising logic of registration and reparation (see chapter 4). The staging of post-conflict statehood also neglects the situation of people trapped in the bureaucratic procedures dealing with endless waiting times for their requests. As part of the metaphoric attempt but with possible practical implications, I have suggested to direct the lights towards the practices that “unravel the state” (Passoth and Rowland 2010) to make salient its unfinished, and potentially re-addressable points leaving room for alternative arrangements to arise. Continuing with the theatrical metaphor, let us explore how the previous staging of inclusiveness, reparation and transparency merge into the mise-en-scène of post-conflict statehood.

“Final” scene: post-conflict statehood

In chapter 1, I described how the LV transformed the public narratives for addressing violence in the Congress and the public contexts. The rhetoric moved from “terrorism” during the Policy of Democratic Security (2002-2010) to “armed conflict” in the last presidential periods. After the assemblage of a narrative of “armed conflict”, the IRR has deployed a narrative of successful management of the consequences of violence. I have traced the assemblage of technologies enacting this infrastructure, and the uses of numbers and indicators. Hence, state representatives speak on behalf of rejected and registered applicants using the RUV and official numbers in the negotiations of peace in Havana. The firma de la paz is a crucial step towards the achievement of ceasefire and is widely promoted post-conflict; but for things like the firma to be possible, the IRR is absolutely crucial. As a metaphor, the mise-en-scène describes the ways in which actors speak for each other and on behalf of the state, but it also emphasizes the fact that those conversations have an audience, a tone, a design, and a text.

As part of the mise-en-scène, peace negotiations in Havana as a major feature of post-conflict also have a script. This script is comprised of five discussion points including agricultural reforms, political participation, drug trafficking issues, submission to justice, and reparation of Victims, the latter being still in negotiation at the time of writing. The main discussions about Victims in negotiations revolve around the extension of the sphere of recognizable Victims, the forms of reparation to be granted,
the funding sources, and the responsibility of the Colombian State as an actor in the conflict. The accounts used by the state in the negotiations are assembled through technologies of recognition, reparation and the IRR they enact. Despite their successful circulation, the accounts of the state have also been confronted by guerrillas, Victims movements, and political parties in the ongoing peace negotiations at least in three regards: the participation of Victims and leaders, an alternative form of registration, and the funding sources of reparation.

The negotiations started in November 2012, and have consisted of more than 42 rounds with the participation of delegates of the Colombian government, representatives of FARC-EP, and people registered as Victims. The minutes of the meetings would ideally allow us to trace how the accounts of the State about Victims are deployed in the negotiations but most of them are not accessible for the public and will only be released after the firma. Still, it is possible to depict some of the tensions around the participation of Victims using alternative sources. In June 2014 the UARIV and the Mesa Nacional de Víctimas (MNV), consisting of 52 people perpetrated by different armed groups, selected the first 15 people considered as Victims that would participate in the negotiations. Ten of them were chosen to represent each of the Victimizing Facts considered in the RUV. The remaining 5 places were reserved for people considered as Victims of State Crimes like the relatives of Falsos Positivos (see chapter 3). However a group of 270 people requested a public meeting with the MNV and the director of the UARIV, where they claimed:

We are the direct victims of the group involved in the negotiations. We feel that we should participate in the discussion and that, in every sphere of participation, the government has neglected us. The negotiations must not be mixed with [...] victims that should not be there [...] we don't feel represented because the real victims of all the crimes by FARC are not there.72 (Bermúdez-Liévano 2014)

After this confrontation, more delegations had to be named to include the leaders of social movements of Victims that complained about the lack of representativeness. Later in October 2014, FARC announced the agreement in the negotiations to implement a national census in the 18 months immediately following the signature of the agreement. The purpose of the census was to “measure the universe73 of victims in

---

72 “Somos las víctimas directas del grupo con el que se está negociando. Nosotros sentimos que deberíamos estar en esa discusión y que, en todos los espacios de participación, el Gobierno nos ha venido invisibilizando. Al diálogo con las FARC no se le deben mezclar otros componentes ni víctimas que no les corresponden [...] no nos sentimos representados porque no están las verdaderas víctimas de todos los crímenes de las FARC [...]”

73 Universo de Víctimas
the way most adjusted to the reality of the conflict” (El Heraldo, 24/10/2015). The insurgent group pointed out that a National Commission of the Census of Victims of the Conflict should be comprised of members of national organisations of victims, expert scholars, and functionaries working at the National Services of Statistics (DANE). By now (February 2016) there have not been any other notifications or press conferences addressing the subject and the final results of these negotiations will only be known in a few months. Nevertheless, it has become clear that the IRR was confronted by the people demanding representation in the peace negotiations, and by the FARC, who proposed an alternative technical procedure different from the RUV to account for the “universe of victims”. This latter demand has paradoxical results inasmuch as the insurgent group suggests the DANE, another body of the Colombian State, to be the entity in charge of conducting the metrology. The initiative of the census has been integrated into ongoing law projects that pursue the extension of the time periods of the LV. As Jennifer Vargas-Reina (2014) discusses, the LV introduces mechanisms to make the participation of Victims and leaders a more democratic and inclusive process, though there are still considerable abysses in the articulation of policies for such participation to be possible. According to Vargas-Reina, the state is still incapable of guaranteeing the safety of Victims and leaders participating in drawing up different political scenarios. This argument is consistent with the ongoing assassinations of human rights activists and community leaders.

With regard to reparation, in December 2015, FARC and the government achieved a partial agreement stipulating their commitment to conduct public acts of acknowledgement of responsibilities and apologies, the assistance of FARC-EP in the search for human remains of those assassinated, the careful delivery of their human remains, and the deactivation and collection of landmines (EL Tiempo 12/12/2015). Three days after the partial agreement in a widely circulated interview with the BBC, the representative of FARC-EP, Luciano Marín Arango also known as “Iván Marquez”, publically stated:

FARC has no money. It is said that we have bank accounts, that we have a lot of money in tax havens […] we have told the Colombian government in the negotiations “you can take all the bank accounts in those tax havens and use them in the National Reparation Fund, all of them”. But we don’t have anything. Simply, as a result of a media campaign, it is said that FARC have a lot, a lot of money and that it has money deposits but it is not true (Grant 2015)

A month later, a state representative reassured the public that the actions of reparation by FARC-EP would start in at least 100 towns selected on the basis of the FARC’s
prevalence in each region, but also the amount of “productive projects, reconciliation acts” and other reparation measures already implemented by the UARIV (Valero 2016) through the PAARI. About this, the General Attorney of the Nation stated that there has not any agreement been made yet that would mandate the guerrilla to “repair [the Victims] with their fortune” and that “Colombians will be the ones who in the end will have to fund the post-conflict [resolution] and not the billions of investments that [the guerrilla] have in their relatives’ names in other countries” (El Espectador 28/01/2016).

Figure 24 “Historical meeting between Santos and Timochenko”. President Santos and the current leader of the FARC-EP shake their hands with President Raul Castro at Havana. International Business Time. 24/09/2015.

In spite of the ongoing and apparently endless tensions, the mise-en-scène of post conflict statehood convenes its national audience to recognize Colombia as a state on its way to peace. Thus, the scenes of an inclusive, transparent, and repairing state, with all dressed in white, portray a post-conflict statehood (figure 25) mainly supported in the IRR as an arrangement involved in the arguments of the ongoing peace negotiations. The mise-en-scène of post-conflict statehood, as an emergent feature of the Colombian State, has already reached the international spotlights. As I pointed out in chapter 1, Colombia is being positioned as a sovereign state that “pursues the peace” (The Daily Mail 07/08/2014), “has paid a historical debt” (Revista-Semana 2014), and perhaps as part of the “infrastructure fetishism” (Dalakoglou 2010) as a country that moved from “the capital of murder to a techno electrical centre” (Gillespie 2015).
The achievement of this international recognition is partly due to the political agency mobilised by post-conflict statehood. Political agency is viewed here as a relational set of outcomes produced by contributions of civil servants, artefacts, applicants, and others in an arrangement that overcomes the distinctions between the micro and macro levels (Passoth and Rowland 2015). From this perspective, “states only become powerful through [...] assemblages, mechanisms, procedures, texts, and trained bodies” (p.20), so the study of statehood directs its attention to “how states act” (p.21). With regard to this, Rowland and Passoth (2015) also argue that an approach to how states act requires empirical studies that explore “what enables politicians to speak for [the states] as actors [...] and how political entities of all forms are constructed, invoked, and performed” (p.21). Recognition and reparation are plausible examples of political entities constructed, invoked and performed by state representatives promoting narratives of peace and post-conflict. Despite its surrounding tensions and retractors, the firma has been promoted as an apprehensible final scene, a point of arrival, an inflexion point to swift from a narrative of armed conflict and violence to one of post-conflict.

It is crucial to note that the script allowing state representatives to act as spokespersons is precisely the one provided by people like Luis, Graciela (chapter 1), Mario, Ana, Gloria (chapter 3), Elias, Maggie, Sergio, Jazmine, Marco (chapter 4), and Diana when they exchange their stories of pain for a spreadsheet, a notification of registration, and a promise of reparation that now partially controls their time. Hence, the IRR uses the objects assembled from their experiences to promote state projects. Just like in the marches and massive events I described at the beginning of this chapter, the organisation of the mise-en-scène will surely point at state representatives and the leaders of FARC when the final signing is done in 2016. Although this signing will probably expand the boundaries of post-conflict statehood, the arrangements comprised of rejected/registered applicants, quantifications/codifications, and functionaries are the ones enacting the crucial infrastructure that makes possible the signing and its related political projects.

A (partially) successful mise-en-scène

I described how the sociotechnical assemblage of recognition and reparation enact an order: the IRR, and I also established how post-conflict statehood is enacted by the IRR. The agency of post-conflict statehood is an emergent and relational achievement
(see Passoth and Rowland 2010), and its actions appear to speak when state representatives, as the President and the Director of the UARIV, claim to speak on behalf of the Colombian State. This agency becomes evident in events like the marches for the Victims and peace. Here, the numbers and indicators assembled through technologies of recognition and reparation are circulated by the IRR which also mobilizes notions of the state as inclusive, transparent, repairing, and as an effective manager. Thus, the signing of peace is possible, not only because of the negotiations but also due to the participation of applicants in the assemblage of recognition and reparation. Just as technologies of recognition and reparation assemble victimhood, the IRR translates victimhood into post-conflict statehood. This statehood depends upon people embodying pain to assemble itself. Yet in that process of assembly, post-conflict statehood necessarily cannot tolerate and must translate those experiences of pain and mobility, despite its claims to effectively represent them; the world of pain and mobility exceeds statehood so that it still renders people invisible during the emergence of the post-conflict and its mise-en-scène.

With regard to the configuration of statehood, in her analysis of the sovereignty of the Colombian State in the beginning of the 20th century Victoria Sanford (2004) explains how different academic sectors and policy analysts addressed Colombia as a failed project. Sanford ethnographically explores the opposite argument by documenting how the reconstitution of the state infrastructure was achieved through the use of surveillance and state-sanctioned violence, including the use of paramilitary forces. Sanford’s results are relevant for the purpose of the present chapter insomuch as it describes infrastructures and “practices that expand and protect the state” (Passoth and Rowland 2010: 828). Although the IRR employs bureaucracy instead of armed strategies, the boundaries enacted by the RUV as sites of pain (see Walkerdine 2006), the unmaking of experiences of pain (see Scarry 1985) and the displacement of people like Diana from the mise-en-scène constitute other forms of reconfiguration of the state “at great cost to its citizens” (Sanford 2004: 253-254). Both the practices described by Sanford and the ones embedded in the IRR expand the boundaries and margins of the state, but they also enact forms of violence. I do not suggest that both sets of practices are equivalent, I rather claim that both state interventions deploy forms of violence; post-conflict statehood is not as successful as displayed by the mise-en-scène.
The impressive numbers about Victims and violence that are deployed in the mise-en-scène mobilize affect while enacting post-conflict statehood. Numbers can be shocking and invoke unity around Victims and peace. Numbers are irremediably reductive of the experiences of pain and mobility embodied by applicants and Victims. But at the same time, numbers mobilize an account of post-conflict statehood on the grounds of successful recognition of Victims. Still, the peace and post-conflict agreements achieved in Havana will be submitted to a national referendum for their acceptance or rejection. The final success of the mise-en-scène of post-conflict is still to be decided in the upcoming referendum. In a recent study Angélica Rettberg and Daniel Quiroga (2016) characterize the support of peace negotiations by current political parties in Colombia with reference to the results of the legislative elections of 2014, and the local elections of 2015. The authors describe how, in most of the country, the winning parties are in favour of the peace negotiations and the agenda of the current government. Rettberg and Quiroga stress though that it is not possible to determine a total support for the agreements in Havana, but they assert that there will likely not be serious resistance against it. They ground their argument in the unfavourable election results of the Centro Democrático, led by former President Uribe and the “strongest retractor of peace negotiations” (p.20). Even if the firma occurs, post-conflict statehood will not necessarily be the final scene but probably the first scene of a longer play using similar scripts and texts in the upcoming years. Post-conflict statehood is not a sealed black-box yet.

So far, this thesis addressed how practices and artefacts embedded in state interventions of rights restitution make possible the expansion of post conflict statehood. For doing so, I reframed recognition as sociotechnical assemblages that unmake embodied experiences of pain and mobility to construct official numbers and enact a sociotechnical border like the RUV. I described how technologies of reparation and psychosocial assistance also enact an emerging order displacing embodied experiences of pain and mobility. I have portrayed this order as an IRR, an infrastructure allowing state representatives to act at a distance in the very spaces where recognition and reparation occur. In this chapter, I outlined how this happens through the IRR – in spaces mediated by artefacts like the FUD, the sociotechnical border of the RUV, the PAARI, and the ERE – in cases where state representatives mobilize and speak on behalf of people registered, rejected and displaced by recognition and reparation.
I also explored how the numbers that enact the IRR are used by state representatives. While doing so, I outlined some of the tensions around inclusiveness, transparency and reparation that have been partially stabilized in the assemblage of post-conflict statehood. Some of the emergent agentic features of the IRR have been outlined and I have focused this study on the way its stability is widely performed. However, I have continuously suggested that such statehood also displaces other forms of organisation that exceed its boundaries. Besides accounting for how statehood is assembled, a relational approach to the state can also offer potential insights into the practices that disintegrate and unravel it. In the next section I will explore some of the alternative infrastructures and forms of organisation that emerge from the boundaries of post-conflict statehood that also challenge and exceed its assemblage. Through the metaphor of the mise-en-scène, I explored the backstage of the public deployment of post-conflict statehood in Colombia. In the next and final chapter, I will trace what exceeds the lights and the stage of the mise-en-scène.
CHAPTER 6: EXCEEDING

Reparation beyond statehood as interstitial mobility

During the weeks before the presidential elections of May 2014, the Plaza de Bolivar in the old centre of Bogotá was occupied by people already listed in the Registro Único de Víctimas (RUV) who claimed to be owed compensations dating back to 2012. For three weeks people were strategically camping in the place where the President, the Mayor of Bogotá, several politicians and their families usually vote while posing for the media during Election Day. Because of the importance of the polling place, the initial number of 390 people participating in the occupation was drastically reduced by the riot police using tear gas on the night of May 20. However, the next morning, at least 180 people still remained there waiting for a response to their claims from the Mayor, the Director of the UARIV, or President Santos.

My constant visits to the occupation site before the police intervention gave me some familiarity among with the occupiers, so during the morning of May 21 they promptly shared their complaints about police brutality, the negligence of the government representatives in ignoring their claims, and especially their dissatisfaction in not having received any compensations or housing benefits in spite of being registered as Victims. My
attention was rapidly caught by Julio, leader elected by the occupiers who energetically explains the reasons for the occupation:

The government thinks we have no idea, but we know they receive a lot of money from “gringos” and Europe. This is why the president keeps travelling around the world with our money collecting more money on our behalf. But we don’t receive any of it, and we need it, we live in precarious conditions and we can’t keep on going like this. All that money is being used to pay the ones who are supposed to serve us, those who are at the offices, but they have a job because of us you know? But we don’t receive our compensations, we wasted our time registering and getting all the documents, they will have to do something or, or they won’t be able to vote here on Sunday.

In the above statement, Julio summarizes the general claims of occupiers that I have met in the last few weeks. The first part of the statement addresses government actors engaging in activities on their behalf, the performativity of the reparation system, and the mobilizations of state representatives. Particularly, the last two sentences highlight his disappointment with the system, the occupiers´ intention to resist their neglect by government actors, and their demands for more from the Colombian State. While being in the Plaza, the statements offered by Julio inspire other occupiers who continue shouting for a formal reply to their claims paraphrasing Julio´s words. Unfortunately, a second intervention in the afternoon of May 22 would crucially reduce the number of occupiers in the Plaza. Instead of tear gas and police officers with shields, this time the public administration used civil servants equipped with forms to register occupiers assuring them that the list would give them privilege in the attribution of resources once the protests ended.
In a few minutes, the Plaza was nearly empty and the former occupiers were forming a queue in front of improvised desks where names, cédulas, and FUD numbers were being requested. Only a few protesters split their family groups between the queue and the occupation site with a certain scepticism about the situation. As the sceptics suspected, the police quickly secured the Plaza with fences preventing people in the queues from returning to the occupation site. Some of the protesters outside the fences shouted insults at the police, others maintained contact with the few remaining occupiers using their mobile phones and eventually hand-signals that were barely visible. People outside the fence strategically threw food and blankets over the fence to the remaining occupiers still in the centre of the Plaza demanding an official response. I can overhear some of the conversations of the evicted occupiers, some contacting lawyers for NGOs, others answering the questions of journalists just arriving in the scene from the local channels but also from Argentina, Venezuela, Spain, and Ecuador. Though the intervention of the riot police and the registration queue had been largely effective, the protesters’ mobilization still persisted, even outside the fence. After the massive media coverage on Friday (May 23), the Director of the UARIV and representatives of other offices finally spoke with the leaders of the occupation and signed an agreement for the delivery of compensations. However, some of the dissenters outside the fence were certain that the signed agreement was just a temporary strategy to recover control of the Plaza, and manifested their intention to carrying out a different occupation in the following month. By Saturday afternoon, the polling station was installed and the elections took place in the Plaza as scheduled.
Besides demonstrating that bureaucratic technologies of recognition can be as useful as riot police and fences for dissolving protests, the outcome of the occupation of the Plaza is an example of the effectiveness of the Colombian State in using an expert system to control and tame even the most energetic movements of people. We have explored similar efforts in the previous chapters, as well as the conjugations of those attempts at containing people in an IRR translating victimhood into post-conflict statehood. But the objection of certain dissenters towards the registration of occupants in the Plaza, the strategies of support between people inside and outside the fence, and the distrust about the honourability of the agreement that was reached, suggest that the efforts and forms of organisation we have examined so far are limited and constrained. In spite of the abrasiveness of legitimized mechanisms of recognition and reparation by the Colombian State, there still seems to be room for mobility, scepticism, and organisation exceeding the demarcated boundaries of post-conflict statehood.

In this chapter, I explore some of the material forms of cooperation developed by people within and beyond the sociotechnical border of recognition (the RUV). I portray some of these arrangements as generous infrastructures (Papadopoulos, 2016) that emerge within and beyond the boundaries of state interventions. I also describe other arrangements designed and used by people to commemorate alternative accounts of the conflict that divert from the official versions. I suggest that when the IRR and alternative arrangements overlap, interstitial spaces are produced. In this sense, besides being a matter of numbers, monetary compensations, and legal narratives of rights restitution, I claim that Reparation (with a capital R) is also interstitial mobility that occurs between the IRR and the arrangements that exceed it.

Sharing at Altos

Some weeks after the occupation of the Plaza, I visit Julio, a man in his late 40s, a father of three, a husband, a person registered as Victim, and (fortunately for me) a community leader. He lives in what he calls “La tierra de nadie”- no man’s land”- a hill in a slum of a town called Soacha located in the South West of Bogotá which is officially known as Altos de Cazucá. Although there is no agreement about the number of people living in Altos it is estimated suggest that about 68,000 people have settled there, of which at least 17,000 are escaping from violent confrontations between guerrillas, the Army, and paramilitary groups especially in the rural areas of the country (El Espectador 31/10/2014). Julio asserts that those numbers are probably wrong because it is impossible for functionaries to access all the
houses in Altos because of the limited transportation and the insecurity of the slum. I corroborated his statement on repeated occasions when I first took a bus from Bogotá to Soacha, then another bus from Soacha to the bus stop known as Tres Esquinas, a jeep to go through the unpaved roads from Tres Esquinas to Altos, and finally a steep walk of 20 minutes accompanied by Julio and his son. Three months of morning visits made me familiar with the drivers of the almost 18 jeeps serving this route, and sympathetic to the mandatory routines of people living in Altos and frequently travelling to Bogotá.

Julio lives with his wife Ligia and their three boys in a two-story house made with visible concrete blocks74, aluminium tiles, metallic doors, and barred windows. The divisions between the rooms have recently been made by Julio and Marco, his oldest son, and some other parts of the house are under construction. In their free time and as the budget allows, they get some materials and build a new part of the house. However, they need to receive state compensations to make all the necessary home improvements and pay off the informal moneylenders that gave them the money to start building their house. Thanks to the money that they managed to save, they recently opened up a humble restaurant in a rented garage in Soacha. Because of her wide experience in cooking for a family of five, Ligia is the official

74 Orange construction blocks are considerably cheaper than bricks.
cook of the business. Meanwhile, Marco is in charge of the finances since he is the only one who finished high school. Marco’s brothers still attend school so they can only help as waiters in the afternoons. Besides being an expert in building parts of his own house and managing his memories of being assaulted and threatened, Julio has developed a variety of skills while working in Soacha and Bogotá. Before the restaurant and since his arrival from Tolima in 2007, Julio has worked in different jobs as a construction worker, street cleaner, cotero - a person carrying sacks of food in the market -, and from time to time, gardener. Julio tells me “when you are in the rebusque, there are no bad jobs.” The rebusque — a continuous search for income through any kind of profitable activity - becomes constant in Julio and his friends’ narratives about their working experiences in the city.

During my visits I meet some of Julio’s closest friends who frequently come to his house and the restaurant. Julio met most of them in Altos, but he made his closest friends working as cotero in Corabastos, a large market and warehouse in Bogotá where food supplies from all over the country are stored, sold, and distributed. There, Julio learned where to buy good quality food for the lowest price, so he still goes to Corabastos to get supplies for the restaurant. Some of Julio’s friends work in ongoing constructions in Bogotá whereas their partners are usually employed by wealthy or middle class families to provide cleaning services also in the capital city. Others, the ones who arrived more recently, sing in the buses, clean windshields at the traffic lights, and some others have just got their chazas and work as street vendors around Soacha and Bogotá. Most of Julio’s friends describe him as a community leader who “cares about people who need assistance”.

I notice that Julio receives several phone calls during our encounters that I can’t help but listen to. Most of the calls are related to administrative procedures to apply for the RUV, claim compensations, submit complaints, search informal job opportunities, and obtain information on the different ways of coping with the bureaucratic system of rights restitution, or with the fieras en corbata - beasts wearing ties - as Julio calls functionaries. It is evident that Julio is a valued information source for claimants and recently arrived applicants who are given his mobile number by other leaders in Cazucá and Ciudad Bolivar, another nearby area from where a large number of people have arrived in Bogotá after violent situations in rural areas. Ligia tells me how some of the people that contact Julio usually come to the restaurant as a meeting point, and the ways Julio manages to help them.

---

75 Wooden box used by street vendors to sell products. It is usually carried in the chest or has wheels in order to easily change the location.
by finding temporary jobs in Soacha or Bogotá. Julio also has extensive information about the NGOs operating in Altos, their managers, affiliations, resources, and the kind of assistance they offer. Julio circulates such information in his calls giving specific guidelines on how to proceed to get assistance. Not all the people contacting Julio are applying for registration in the RUV or claiming compensations, some of them have recently arrived in the city and just want some help and are referred to Julio by word of mouth. “Tell the guys in charge you are going on my behalf,” “take note of the following”, “go to this address”, “dial this number and ask for…”, ”ask for the form named…”, “make sure to get it signed and get copies…” are some of his most frequent expressions during the constant phone calls.

Julio and his family applied for registration in 2011 but were only given an official response until 2013. They assume that the long wait was probably due to the changes in the regulations from 2011 to 2012 after the passing of the LV. Julio introduces me to Flor, another community leader who also participated in the recent occupation of the Plaza. Julio describes Flor as his mentor who taught him everything there is to know about state administrative procedures. Flor explains the delay in Julio’s application as a “bureaucratic transition” and as “something to be expected from civil servants because they don’t know how to make decisions on their own and always try to find the answer in the forms”. The familiarity shown by Julio and Flor with the FUD, and the PAARI is undeniable. Their description of the form and the sessions are almost identical to the sequences that I have observed in other spaces (chapters 3 and 4). However, they make sure to explain to me and to their friends who are constantly calling and coming to the restaurant, the information that must be provided, the kind of documents to submit, and the details about dates and places that must always be highlighted. Julio says that during his application, his FUD was returned to him several times because of certain imprecisions in the dates or because of missing documents so he learned to identify these, partly with the help provided by Flor and other people in the queues. Flor and Julio tell me about a recent complaint they submitted to the UARIV about “sassy” people at Altos who have charged applicants for that kind of information, or have asked them for a percentage of their compensations.

Flor and Julio know about the existence in Altos of the Bloque Capital de Autodefensas de Colombia an urban armed group consisting of former members of Autodefensas Unidas de Colombia (AUC). The members of that group marched in AUC blocks known as Rastrojos, Águilas Negras, and Urabeños that surrendered during the period of former President
Uribe, but have been apparently active in Altos since 2010 (Defensoría-del-Pueblo 2013). Julio tells me how he has informed the relevant authorities how the Bloque, officially known as a criminal band (BACRIM), blackmails and displaces people from their houses in Altos, recruits teenagers and young adults by constantly threatening with “limpiezas sociales” – “social cleansing” -, owns the drugs business in the slum, assassinates community leaders, and imposes generalized curfews. Julio explains that people perpetrated in Altos by the Bloque, are disregarded in their applications as Victims of the armed conflict. The reasons for this rejection rely on the technical argument that BACRIM are defined as common criminals so their actions cannot be considered part of the armed conflict. Julio and Flor are organising a collective of people affected by these mutated forms of urban violence that cannot be covered by the regulations for demanding compensations. When thinking of staying in Altos, Julio fears for Marco since young men are usually recruited by the Bloque or become chirros, young people addicted to crack which is an increasingly common tendency among Marco´s friends.

While away from Colombia writing these paragraphs, I find out that Flor has been assassinated in Altos – a crime that was attributed to common delinquency. According to Flor´s friends who claim having accessed the reports, the gang responsible was led by a former militant of AUC and Flor’s assassination followed her recent denunciations at the Council of Soacha. Her perpetrators have been prosecuted, but according to the current technical criteria of the RUV, the members of her family cannot be registered as Victims. Although I only met Flor a couple of times, her assassination evokes a profound feeling of helplessness, along with an indescribable anger. Becoming an expert in coping with technologies of recognition and encouraging people to report perpetrations are highly dangerous activities in Colombia. The ongoing assassinations of community leaders like Flor who promote collective organisations radically challenge the notion of a post-conflict statehood and the IRR. An unbearable worry about Julio’s safety adds to my helplessness and anger. By the time I heard about Flor, Julio´s mobile had been disconnected. I had to wait for a second trip back to Colombia before I could go to the restaurant and was very glad to see him still attending to many phone calls. Julio totally avoids speaking about Flor, and I respectfully embrace his silence. However, he persists in the idea of founding a collective movement to carry out denunciations against BACRIM, something that lessens my feeling of helplessness.
The practices of Julio, Flor and other community leaders in which they share their experiences of engaging with forms, administrative procedures, and seeking sources of assistance resemble what Dimitris Papadopoulos (2016) has recently called material literacy. These practices are “community attempts to radically democratise literacy” (p.174) through a distribution of “cooperation without consensus” (see Star 1993). The cooperation offered by Flor, Julio and their communities about engaging with the IRR was neither accidental nor a product of any formal training. Their literacy was precisely the result of engaging with the materiality of forms and other technologies of recognition and reparation while exploring their routes, constraints, and alternative resources. As Papadopoulos (2016) explains “constraints in instituted technoscience are always a matter of secrecy, while in community technoscience and material experimentation the knowledge of constraints becomes common property, the fuel of material literacy” (p.171). Although in the case of Flor and Julio, Material Literacy is not necessarily related to technoscientific activity, the limits and restrictions of the IRR do indeed become a matter of secrecy for functionaries (Chapters 3 and 5). But for people like Julio, Flor, other leaders and their communities, these same restrictions are inputs for their literacy, leadership, and widely acknowledged expertise. Their shared material literacy transforms the world of people in mobility.

The practices of shared literacy shown by Julio and Flor in their communities can also be understood as mobile commons (See Papadopoulos and Tsianos 2013) defined as “the ability to cultivate, generate and regenerate the contents, practices and affects that facilitate the movements of mobile people” (p.191). Thus, Julio and Flor developed and shared strategies for collecting, updating, and evaluating knowledge, in this case mainly through word of mouth interactions (an infrastructure of connectivity). Also, Julio and Flor, like other community leaders, circulate information about a range of economic activities and services that are rarely available in situations of mobility like access to health services, jobs, and legal assistance (informal economies). Additionally, Flor, Julio and other well-known community leaders from Altos and Ciudad Bolivar activate their care for others by promoting cooperation, and other forms of community exchange (politics of care). Even though the political organisation of the collective was a recent project, the friends of Julio that I managed to meet told me about the ways they try to share their knowledge of the bureaucratic system, useful NGOs, and different social movements (communities of justice) with the newcomers coming into the city from rural areas. “Hoy por ti, mañana por mi”-“I’ll scratch your back and you’ll scratch mine”- goes their recurrent motto.
The practices encouraged by people like Flor and Julio to challenge and cope with the IRR protect the forms of life of their mobile and expanding communities. Papadopoulos (2016) suggests that such community practices “restore justice step by step through everyday material practice” (p. 32). Here, two notions of justice coexist in the lives of people in mobility arriving in the city after violent experiences. First, there is justice understood as a restorative action allegedly offered by the IRR conditional to containment by a sociotechnical border used to make numbers out of their experiences and speak on their behalf. This is a promise of reparation, the implications of which have already been explored. Conversely, there is a notion of justice as something achieved in daily practices that, besides coping with the bureaucratic procedures, pursues alternative available resources that are not necessarily provided by the IRR.

In the second notion, restoring justice exceeds post-conflict statehood and this is something evident for Flor, Julio and their material communities who produce alternative or generous infrastructures that create new forms of existence for people in mobility and restore justice through alliances between committed groups of humans and accessible material objects (Papadopoulos 2016: 31-33). Those alliances and commitments prevail even when the very practices of sharing result in new injustices like the painful assassination of Flor and other leaders. It is precisely the shared materiality of these arrangements that makes it possible for other community leaders and members to continue expanding their literacy about forms, state bureaucracy, and other sources of assistance. Flor is terribly missed by Julio and other friends. Nonetheless Julio and their other mentees persist in their practices of sharing and insist on founding a collective for denouncing the ongoing perpetrations, so that they manage to make “La tierra de nadie” their home.

“Grinding” compensations

Julio’s friends often tell me stories about their home towns and farms, the richness of their soils, the comfortable weather, and the kindness of their people despite the frequent violence. Some of them come from “zonas rojas”76 and explain how they arrived in Bogotá and Soacha after living in the major cities of their regions. There, they were constantly accused of being “fachos”, “elenos” or “paracos” - members of FARC, ELN, and AUC respectively. They tell me how the millions of inhabitants and the huge size of Bogotá make it a bit easier to avoid these same accusations although everybody in Altos is aware of everybody’s regional origins. Some of them constantly vacillate between staying in the city

76 Red zones: areas of frequent confrontations between armed groups
and going back to their home town, especially following the recent rumours of state support for productive projects in the region. Far from an attempt to establish a taxonomy of arrangements and infrastructures but inspired by the stories shared by Julio’s friends, I decide to move to a rural area with the expectancy of gaining a wider understanding of other arrangements in spaces different from the capital cities.

Thanks to psychosocial professionals of the UARIV, during one of my visits to a CDR in the South West of the country I get in contact with the community in a small town located in the region. The circa 2000 people living in this small town have recently been considered part of a larger Collective Subject of Reparation (SCR)\(^{77}\) by the UARIV since they belong to a community that was systematically perpetrated by armed actors. Differently to registered applicants or families in the cities, the 303 existing SCRs are given compensations in their own lands and houses, and a different strategy of psychosocial assistance is used in which the professionals hired by the UARIV go where the SCR reside. The small town was formerly occupied by guerrillas until the early 2000s when paramilitary groups gained control until their demobilization in 2006. After this, armed groups similar to the one in Altos considered as BACRIM took control of the zone until 2013, so most of the inhabitants abandoned their lands and houses at some time during these occupations to settle in nearby cities. Some of the people who decided to stay in the town tell me how they used to live cultivating coffee, plantain, sugar cane, corn, and coca for medicinal use before the armed occupations. However, the cultivation of coca was the only profitable activity during the occupations inasmuch as armed groups required the leaves to produce coca paste, the industrial base supply for cocaine, the main business of armed groups besides kidnapping, land exploitation and animal production. As most of them agree, the cultivation of coca was usually accompanied by persistent threats to life, sexual abuse, and public executions of members of the community accused of collaboration with armed groups different from the one in power at the time.

Similarly to Julio’s friends in Altos, the inhabitants of this town tell me about the stigmas of being a peasant from a zona roja they have to face when moving into the cities to apply for assistance, and how their protests in public squares for being recognized as peasants affected by armed confrontations have been curtailed by riot police interventions. After the election

---

\(^{77}\) Sujetos Colectivos de Reparación are specific communities in towns, villages, or indigenous communities, among others, that are registered as groups of Victims, and are granted with communitarian compensations and reparation strategies. These communities do not follow the usual route for registration although they are visited by functionaries of the UARIV to assess their claims.
of a representative, several administrative procedures, different visits by functionaries of the UARIV, and long waiting periods this community was given the status of SCR in 2014. They frequently avoid my questions about how they have lived after the occupations and before the promise of reparation; however I manage to extract a version that I find particularly relevant for the purposes of my visit. Some of them who had been individually applying for compensations since early 2000s returned in late 2013, pooled portions of their financial compensations, and bought an industrial coffee grinder to be used by anyone in town. One of the community leaders tells me about the differences between home-made and industrial coffee grinders, and the ways in which they had to learn to use it by reading the instruction manual, watching online videos, but mainly through test-trials. While having a cup of their tasty and aromatic product, the leader explains how they learned to create different textures and concentrations of powdered coffee by altering the standard procedure using different kinds of beans, adding aromatic plants, cinnamon, dried fruits, and others. Those alterations mixed with their previous knowledge about cultivating, collecting, and drying coffee beans have created many different types of coffee that they sell in the cities and towns of the region.

They are aware that they do not seek to achieve the standards promulgated by the National Coffee Federation, but they are proud of the quality of their product that has allowed them to pay for the cultivation and production of the packed coffee, as well as the maintenance of the community grinder. Antonio, the person currently in charge of its maintenance, tells me about the initial establishment of shifts for using it with reference to the days of the week, the public dissemination of the results of their experimentation, the distribution of the income among the cultivating families, and the resulting cooperative firm that was built around the coffee grinder. Antonio also proudly explains that none of their innovations with the coffee are specified in the instruction manual for the grinder. Before the promise of reparation by the state, the official recognition as a SCR, and the increased interest of the media in their stories of pain, they configured the grinder, not as a machine that magically equipped them with a means of production, but as an object that allowed them to better organise their material practices. These practices included gathering their harvest, experimenting with it, and transforming it into something different. One might understand this experience as a productive project or a business opportunity facilitated by resources given by the state through the IRR. Instead, I think of their material practices with the grinder as a form of material literacy; as an ontological arrangement that, besides pulverizing coffee beans into powder, also diverts monetary compensations into shared
opportunities for slowly recovering justice. They are not only grinding coffee beans. They are also “grinding” the administrative character of compensations and transforming it into a different material.

I find the above experience as a good example of Repairing Betrayal (chapter 4) that challenges the IRR. It is a translation enacted in the daily practices of processing coffee. It is also a rejection of the managerial character of compensations. In their reflections on the regime of life control, Papadopoulos et al. (2008) describe this kind of betrayal as imperceptible politics that “refuse to accept the pressure to adopt and operate with the given representations operating in the formation of emergent life” (p.142). The authors address these betrayals as taking place “in the heart of the regime” operating with “existing representations” while exceeding and annulling them. Like the potential detours within the ERE, as a technology of reparation constitutive of the IRR, the arrangement exhibited by the community is a subversion that “escapes from the regime” and “create[s] new forms of sociability beyond and below” (p.143) the regime of reparation assembled by the IRR. The boundaries of official recognition of Victims resemble the fence displayed in the occupation of the Plaza that I described at the beginning of this chapter. The spontaneous forms of cooperation displayed by the people outside the fence on the Plaza were not only momentary, as the people in Altos and the town in the South of the country have demonstrated. Their efforts to protect and preserve their mobility while coping with and betraying state interventions transform and challenge the purpose of the sociotechnical border. The sociotechnical border and the IRR are objects around which subversive betrayal is organised in alternative and material forms.

There is another aspect of alternative arrangements that deserves further exploration. As argued before, the materiality of the RUV as a sociotechnical border is grounded in the standards and official numbers made by unmaking embodied experiences of pain. In this chapter I have pointed out how generous infrastructures like the ones in Altos and the small town in the South of Colombia enact forms of existence for people and comprise an attempt to betray the state’s reparation to restore justice. In these betrayals, a plausible line of enquiry has to do with how embodied experiences of pain (see Scarry 1985, see also Das 1996) might comprise the materials of alternative arrangements.

**Mobile memorials**

I find myself again walking in the city centre of Bogotá, very close to Plaza de Bolivar. This area of the city has hosted an endless list of historical events since the foundation of the city.
I am standing in the exact location of the commemorative plaque of El Bogotazo (see chapter 1) the date of which has recently been declared the National Day of Victims of the armed conflict. I start thinking of all the connections between the events of 1946 and the ongoing armed conflict, which is apparently also about to become part of Colombian history after the peace negotiations at Havana. I see myself as a kid walking those same streets around the Plaza almost at the time of the siege of the Palace of Justice by the M-19 guerrillas in 1986. That occupation resulted in the assassination of people whose families are currently applying for registration and claiming compensations from the Colombian State. Perhaps, there is not a single Colombian who cannot tell a similar story in their cities, towns or villages. Though not all of us can claim to have experiences of pain even mildly comparable to the ones I have been privileged to share during this journey; violence and habituation to its unthinkable and ongoing atrocities have inevitably become part of our daily lives.

Almost like a coincidence, my reflections about the ongoing situation in Colombia are interrupted by a particular arrangement. Only a few meters away from the commemorative plaque of El Bogotazo, several pictures of protests, occupations, riot police interventions, assassinated politicians, assassinated human rights defenders, marches, and other similar events are being exhibited in front of crowds of people. This incredible street exhibition is quite successful in recruiting walking spectators including myself, fascinated by the disposition of the images, the captions accompanying them, and the thematic sections. In my particular case, the disposition of the arrangement becomes especially attractive: two lampposts, a rope, multiple pictures, printed quotes protected in plastic hanging from the rope, and a constantly changing audience who make a pause in their walks to read and appreciate the hanging material.

---

78 As mentioned in chapter 1, M-19 took over the Palace of Justice in Bogotá as an attempt to hold a trial of President Belisario Betancur. See footnote 18
Besides transforming my own perspective about Colombia and its possible future, the last few years of research have made me an expert on publically circulated images of armed confrontations, occupations, and protests. But the images in the street exhibition are different since most of the angles and views suggest that the author is someone who was given privilege. The pictures are taken by a photographer who seemed to be part of the ongoing events. There does not seem to be any curator or organiser of the exhibition in the street but a few minutes later Manuel, a man in his late 40s, approaches me asking if I like the visual display. My affirmative tone does not hide my fascination for the content of the exhibition so he starts telling me about how they were taken. “I took this one in 2010 when we were protesting for the victims of Patriotic Union”, “that one was when we were kicked out of the Plaza with a group of victims of crimes of the State”, “this is when I marched with a movement of peasants in 2013” were only some of his descriptions of a long list of events mostly absent from the news.

After being violently displaced when he was a teenager, Manuel belonged to different peasants’ movements and was a member of a guerrilla group that surrendered in the 1990s. While living in a rural area, he was again displaced by paramilitary forces in the early 2000s, and has lived in Bogotá ever since. For Manuel, instead of actually helping people,
the administrative procedures of registration have become increasingly restricting. He avoids my questions about his status in the RUV, but I manage to understand that he gathered enough money after a few months in Bogotá to buy a camera. “Nobody was willing to hire me so I decided to take the camera and show a different lens on reality”, he explains adding: “because the eye and the lens don’t lie” quoting the motto of his Memory Gallery. A digital collection of the gallery can be purchased for almost 5000 COP (£1.1, November 2015). Manuel claims that his pictures are so good that he has managed to sell enough copies to survive, pay the bills, and take care of his family.

The gallery has existed for several years and Manuel assures me that he exhibits new pictures every time he installs the gallery in a different place. I visited him twice a week for three months and can corroborate this. Although most of the pictures were taken by himself, he has also included pictures donated by people from the movements that he accompanies. He does not sell those pictures to the public though, he only commercializes his own pictures. Manuel tells me how he has continuously moved his gallery to many cities where he has been invited by protesters, communities, and social movements. He has also installed his gallery in other countries like Ecuador, Venezuela and Perú to “stimulate people’s conscience, eradicate mental poverty, and reduce the lack of memory in Colombia and Latin America”. However, Manuel also describes the many times that the police have unsuccessfully tried to remove his gallery from the public space and how he has cleverly used those moments to enrich it with more pictures.
The attempt to create a divergent account of violence, the blurred lines between the identities of victim and perpetrator that lack of sense in Manuel’s life, and the positive reception of his pictures by different types of audience make me think of this gallery as a particular kind of memorial. When analysing the commemorative practices around the London bombings in 2005, Matthew Allen and Steve Brown (2011) explain how a particular kind of arrangement, described by one of their participants as a living memorial, differs from others since it makes connections at the level of life rather than around symbols. Living memorials are not entirely finished since they manage to exist precisely by “changing and evolving” (p.316), partly because they rely on artefacts and sites; they strongly depend on the living labour of people whose ongoing activities constitute the physical basis of the memorial. Similarly to living memorials, mobile arrangements like Manuel’s Memory Gallery also have the capacity to establish connections between lives and bodies. Although the Memory Gallery is neither a charity nor does exist in formal documents, it makes connections around ongoing events of protests, marches, and occupations. The Memory Gallery is never the same and is not finished; instead it also “commemorates through transformation” (Allen and Brown 2011: 323) by the continual addition of new artefacts and only exists due to its constant reconfiguration. If such constant transformation ever stopped, the Memory Gallery would simply cease to be. Besides the connections with...
ongoing events and constant transformation, a further definitional feature of this kind of commemoration is mobility. Such mobility allows the Memory Gallery to escape from becoming institutionalised or dismantled: even the strongest efforts of the police to shut it down result in its enrichment. Hence, alternative arrangements like the Memory Gallery comprise forms of mobile memorials. Besides cultivating and generating the contents and affects that facilitate movement, mobile memorials collect, circulate, share, and protect accounts that do not attempt to unmake the experiences of pain and suffering into numbers. This does not mean that mobile memorials do not transform such experiences into pictures or similar artefacts, but differently from the IRR there seems to be an acknowledgement of people’s pain (Das 1996) and a positive valuation of their mobilizations instead of an attempt at contain and control these.

Instead of victimhood and statehood, the events commemorated in this memorial are mobilization and the construction of alternative accounts of ongoing struggles with the State, of which the armed conflict happens to be a part of. While the official accounts insist on the armed conflict as a past event that will be definitely terminated with the negotiations in Havana (chapter 5), the images exhibited in this mobile memorial contradict and challenge official accounts predominant in post-conflict narratives, by positioning the Colombian State as one of the active actors. Such alternative commemorations surely differ from the institutional ones, but as Paul L. Arthur (2009) claims, the question is not about
the adequacy of the commemorations but the type of connections that they make possible and the "new modes of capturing, storing, presenting and sharing data in people’s daily lives" that have an effect on "the way that lives are recalled, reconstructed and represented" (p. 46). With his Gallery, Manuel has become responsible for facilitating commemorative practices about people struggling with the borders of statehood. Such responsible commemorative work might be properly addressed by what Brian Conway (2010) defines as “memory choreographers” to describe people who either voluntarily or because of a sense of obligation create arrangements in which collective memories can exist. Mobile memorials embed practices of care towards forms of mobility and the ways people challenge the borders of official recognition; mobile memorials enact a form of Reparation that occurs beyond post-conflict statehood.

In a recent study about the memory galleries employed by the Movement of Victims of State Crimes (MOVICE), David González-Caballero (2016) suggests that these galleries seek the transformation of the “political culture of those who observe”, in a process that he describes as a “cognitive, emotional, and moral resocialization against the meanings, emotional rules and moral principles supporting [...] relations of domination” (p.157). I previously suggested that social technologies are assemblages of humans and things (see Latour 2005) that enact the social world while transforming the subjective state of affairs of humans (see Brown, 2012). Mobile memorials assemble mobile audiences, pictures, ropes, lampposts, and a choreographer. These assemblages enact a social order comprised of protests and other situations of mobility. This order, also displaced by the mise-en-scène (chapter 5), challenges the IRR and post-conflict statehood while possibly reconfiguring the experiences of those who decide to become the audience.

When addressing the detours made by psychosocial professionals and participants of the ERE from the protocols in chapter 4, I argued that rather than being concerned with designing rigorous interventions, experts participating in the IRR should reflect on what they should simply "let be”. In this final chapter I have addressed three different arrangements: sharing at Altos, the coffee grinding machine, and mobile memorials as consisting of practices of sharing, supporting, caring, and commemorating that occur beyond the boundaries of recognition and reparation arbitrarily demarcated by the Colombian State. Here, an important question arises with regard to the intersections between the IRR and these kinds of alternative arrangements and generous infrastructures. As forms of order that inevitably coexist in the lives of applicants and other people embodying experiences of pain and mobility, how might the IRR “let be” other
arrangements? I wonder if the sensitivity to “let be” is a plausible achievement. To tackle this question it is necessary first to establish how orders emerging from different sets of practices intersect.

**Intersecting infrastructures**

In his reflections about technoscience and generous infrastructures, Papadopoulos (2016) argues that these are comprised of an “involution between material and sociality” (p.176) in which the material is inherently political. The preservation of this feature is what makes alternative material arrangements of them. When there is a division between the material and the political, infrastructures stop being generous and autonomous. Autonomy, Papadopoulos further explains, refers to the idea that “social conflict and social mobilisations drive social transformation instead of just being a mere response to (economic and social) power” (p.175). Hence, when there is a split between the material and the political, infrastructures “become instituted, territorial and managed as tools” (p.175). The arrangements presented in this chapter betray the regime of the IRR that would seek to institute them. Thus, in spite of being recognised as a CSR, the members and leaders of the community organised around the coffee grinder continuously claim the grinder as part of their lives, even before the abrasive promise of reparation was made.

At least two forms of intersection between the IRR and alternative arrangements can be drawn from the above reflections. First, the continuous and reductive attempts of the IRR to institute alternative arrangements and generous infrastructures. This is evident when state representatives reclaim efforts like the grinder machine as successful productive projects sponsored by the state - not every productive project is necessarily a generous infrastructure. In the case of the grinder as in the bureaucratic material literacy in Altos’ communities, the emerging organisation is not the result of a strategy of the state, but the social mobilisation of participants. A second form of intersection becomes evident when alternative arrangements and generous infrastructures betray the IRR and transform its objects into material and cooperative arrangements. Examples of the latter consist of transforming individual compensations into a communitarian device for processing the harvest or translating psychosocial assistance devices as encounters for sharing experiences of pain. Although institutionalised infrastructures enjoy the state’s legitimation, the struggles between the IRR and generous infrastructures can take both directions. Both institutionalised and generous infrastructures are emerging orders that make the world through material practices. The IRR and generous infrastructures are also orders that
struggle and betray. However, there is a way to understand how these infrastructures intersect each other that might be relevant for reframing reparation.

Following Richard Rottenburg’s idea of interstitial spaces as “emerging between different elements and practices involved in composing worlds” (Rottenburg 2009 cited by Morita 2015), Atsuro Morita (2015) argues that such spaces emerge between various practices of knowing and managing the world. The author claims that “the universality of worldly phenomena often depends significantly on negotiations taking place in and around such spaces” and that those spaces are “particularly important for the ontological exploration of uncommon worlds” (p.4), because the latter are usually understood as closed and bounded orders. I find Morita’s idea of interstitial spaces provocative for at least three reasons. Firstly, it invites us to think of the relations between infrastructures not in terms of directions but emerging spaces that emerge when overlapped. Secondly, it adds to alternative arrangements and infrastructures the feature of being open and unbounded. And finally, it assumes that both the IRR and generous infrastructures are worlds that can negotiate. I do not pretend to pursue the ontological question remarkably developed by Morita about the coexistence of one or many worlds. Instead I can build on his suggestion concerning interstitial spaces as places of negotiation among orders and world-making material practices. Between the material practices embedded in the IRR and alternative arrangements like generous infrastructures, there is at least one important bifurcation and friction of particular relevance for the purpose of this thesis: their respective accounts of reparation.

For both orders reparation is inherently related to the recovery of justice. The notion of justice portrayed by the IRR is something granted by the judicial system and the state. In her reflections about the relation between expert knowledge and justice, Jenny Reardon (2013) suggests the creation of spaces in which “social scientists, engineers, natural scientists, and humanists can come together to understand, reflect on […] the ways of making and enacting the world” (p.192). These collective efforts, Reardon claims, might constitute inputs for the construction of commonalities between expert knowledge and justice. Reardon’s reflections surely suggest a necessary space of negotiation between different social groups for science-informed policies. For the case of rights restitution, the kind of justice achieved through agreements between social scientists, humanists, engineers as expert functionaries about reparation, is precisely the one assembled in recognition and reparation as objects of expertise within the IRR.
However, a second form of justice promoted by generous infrastructures and other alternative arrangements like mobile memorials is beyond the agreements and negotiations of experts, and therefore, beyond the boundaries of post-conflict statehood. Even in the case of betrayals occurring within the IRR, the resulting arrangements like the material literacy around bureaucracy and the material grinder notably exceed the expert and bureaucratic design of recognition and reparation. As Papadopoulos (2016) notes, the purpose of generous infrastructures consists of “restoring justice step by step through everyday material practice”, and this restoration is built by material communities of justice (p.175). Although the IRR and alternative arrangements surely intersect, the question about how the IRR might ‘let be’ remains unsolved. Building on this question I ask: (how) might the notion of justice/reparation of the IRR “let be” the recovery of justice by generous infrastructures and alternative arrangements? And (how) could these notions of justice negotiate and coexist? Consistently with the logic of this STS ethnographic study, let me tell you a final story while trying to address these questions raised by the present chapter. After doing so, I will proceed to the conclusion of this journey.

‘Entrelazando’ infrastructures: Reparation as interstitial mobility

In chapter 1, I described how different social movements and NGOs participated in the discussions about the law projects of the LV and how the promulgation of the LV demanded the conformation of a network of professionals from different disciplines. Some of the professionals working at different NGOs, to my great surprise, are now hired by the psychosocial team of the UARIV in charge of the ERE and other strategies. One of those professionals is Jimena, who has a background in art and pedagogy and has worked as a functionary for two years. She is in charge of a psychosocial strategy proposed for Collective Subjects of Reparation (CSR): Entrelazando (weaving79). Jimena describes Entrelazando (henceforth EL) as a strategy that involves “body, emotions, a relationship with the other” and as “a performance in which people can bring their experience, and transform the meaning of their current feelings and thoughts”. Following Augusto Boal and the Theatre of the Oppressed, Jimena understands the forms of art involved in the strategy as “emancipatory actions that involve the whole person”.

79 According to psychosocial professionals in charge of EL, the social relations that are assumed to be tattered due to violence can be partially repaired by facilitating the spaced for new social relations to be woven or “entrelazadas”.
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I accompany Jimena to a vereda\textsuperscript{80} near a small town located in the north of the country. The people living at this vereda have been recently reregistered as a CSR. Jimena tells me that most of the invitations for the meetings of EL are made through community leaders, radio advertisements, and word of mouth. One of the most important items in the first meeting is identifying the leaders and the cuidadores and cuidadoras\textsuperscript{81}, people who most of the participants identify as problem solvers and who are also well known for supporting and helping the community. Once they are identified, Jimena starts calling them tejedoras and tejedores\textsuperscript{82} because they are the ones who, after voluntarily accepting the role, should attend the meetings on a regular basis and lead the development of the agreed activities. In Jimena’s words, tejedoras and tejedores are in charge of “promoting the reconstruction of social tissue”. During the first session, Jimena explains 4 components of the strategy. Firstly, collective mourning\textsuperscript{83} which identifies the coping strategies of pain and suffering that the community has been using to make them aware that “they already know how to deal with the emotional pain”. When Jimena asks the participants about something that they used to do when experiencing fear during the guerrilla occupation a few years ago, different answers are voiced:

**Participant:** There were frequent curfews in the town, so we sneaked through the backyards in that night and met at one of the houses to have some coffee in silence

**Jimena:** You see? Perhaps you didn’t see it like that but you were accompanying each other while dealing with the pain and making things different.

**P:** But, it didn’t change anything at all! They [the guerrilla] kept coming and doing whatever they wanted

**J:** You are right, it did not change what they did, but your strength to deal with such a difficult situation would not have been the same if you hadn’t gathered during the nights, even if just for a coffee.

The above conversation illustrates how, instead of displacing the expertise of people dealing with the consequences of violence in their lives, the use of EL by Jimena seems to position and legitimate such strategies as proper rituals and techniques for dealing with their experiences of pain. The second component of the strategy is collective imaginary\textsuperscript{84} which consists of reviewing, questioning and transforming beliefs and thoughts that legitimate
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\textsuperscript{80} municipal rural settlement
\textsuperscript{81} Male and female caring people
\textsuperscript{82} Male and female weavers
\textsuperscript{83} Duelos colectivos
\textsuperscript{84} Imaginarios colectivos
violence. Jimena explains the component by telling a story of a small town named La Libertad (Santander) which was occupied by a paramilitary group until 2004. Due to the national negotiations for their demobilization, the paramilitary group agreed to withdraw from the town. However, the leader of the group wanted to assassinate a person of the town before leaving. But people confronted him and started chasing and punching him in the direction of a bridge outside the town, where they forced him to jump to his death. – “Well done!” - cheered one of the participants in the session. Jimena stated:

Yes, one might think that guy deserved it, or that it was the only way, but if we really want to do things differently for ourselves, or for the kids you have at home, you may resist, fight back in some ways when it is necessary, but killing a person is perhaps repeating their mistakes. Don’t get me wrong, it was necessary to resist, but killing that person is not necessary. This is the kind of things we try to discuss in this component of the strategy of collective reparation.

Jimena will explain later that Entrelazando attempts to debunk those beliefs that legitimate murder and violence by explaining that those newly dead people are also “someone’s son or daughter”, but she will also remind me that it is always a choice of the people involved. Back in the session, Jimena explains the third component of the strategy: local initiatives of memory85. In the presenter’s words, the purpose of this component is neither building an official history of the conflict, nor creating archives or documentaries like the CMH. Instead, the aim of those activities consists in transforming the meaning of some scenarios of fear for the collective group in their own towns. Jimena narrates the story of torture houses at La Gabarra and towns close by (Norte de Santander), in which paramilitary groups tortured almost 1,000 people during the occupations between 1999 and 2004. Jimena tells the people from the vereda how the people from La Gabarra and nearby regions decided to use those spaces to remember their relatives. Different from legal and therapeutic institutional practices of collecting memories, these activities of commemoration have the initial purpose of transforming the meaning of spaces and communalizing the experiences of a group in the form of shared symbols.

By the time Jimena introduces the last component of EL some people have already left the session because they had to return to their farms. Others have just arrived and engage by

85 Iniciativas locales de Memoria
raising their hands to intervene or taking a few notes. Jimena finally explains social pedagogy:

You don’t need to do anything to earn rights, they are yours to keep and look after, so with this component we will share with you how to take care of them by knowing where, how and from whom to claim from and complain to, you must stop thinking of us, functionaries, as doctors or people with a tie who you must serve, it is actually the opposite. So you must feel free to claim and demand

A functionary was actually motivating people to demand things from other representatives of the state and was actually willing to share information to navigate the bureaucratic sociotechnical border. When asked if they wanted to embrace EL in their communities during the following three years, most of the people raised their hands as sign of approval. She then asked participants what components they wanted to develop and they rejected collective mourning and local initiatives of memory. At the time of writing, sessions of EL are still held in the community every month.

When recognizing participants’ experiences of pain and their resources as legitimate forms of expertise and knowledge, EL seems to produce a different kind of mobilization in people. The possibility to engage in the design of the activities also represents a potential feature of this strategy. In spite of the flexibility, tensions arise when indicators become an issue to justify the invested resources. Jimena and other functionaries claim that “there are changes and transformations that you simply cannot measure in people, that is what really counts, so let them count what they want […] the question shouldn’t be how to count but what for?” However, a monthly report about EL usually describes the number of tejedores and tejedoras (approx. 1,300 in July 2014), the number of CSRs accepting EL (around 130), designing an action plan (70/130), and already carrying out activities of reparation (40/70). Like the reports of the ERE (Chapter 4), the reports submitted to Congress “make the money keep coming” according to a member of the psychosocial team in charge of EL (composed of 2 psychologists, 1 anthropologist, 1 social communicator, 1 educator, 1 lawyer, 1 political scientist, 2 artists).

My experiences of the deployment of EL in different regions were not always as stimulating as the one described above. In most of those sessions, the negotiation between the
psychosocial professional and the community was nonexistent or reduced. Instead, a noticeable script was a frequent feature of the sessions. But this inconsistency precisely suggests that the successful deployment of EL cannot be reduced to its guidelines, the interpersonal skills of the psychosocial professional, or the engagement of the community. It is an emerging arrangement similar to the Repairing Betrayals (chapter 4) as potential spaces of encounter between communities and state representatives. This is an emergent feature that cannot be forecasted or designed. Instead of pre-established protocols, EL consists of scripts that apparently leave room for improvisation and flexibility from its users. The managerial notion of reparation still leaks into EL through the production of indicators. However it is also an innovative initiative of state representatives promoting a different notion about functionaries, the legitimacy of violence, and the demands that can be made from the state. In particular situations where deployments of arrangements like ERE and EL turn out to invite participation, it is likely that a different form of statehood is assembled since its proposed script permits encounters to occur.

In 2015 I was invited by the community of the coffee grinder to a peasants’ fair in Pasto. The fair is the result of negotiations between the community and the psychosocial team of the UARIV as part of the collective imaginaries component of EL. The event is used by various leaders of the region to establish a wider collaborative network and to make important demands to state representatives in the city. The city chosen as the venue is strategic for them to “protest against the stigma of Zonas Rojas” that their adult children have to face when studying or applying for a job in the city. During the night before the fair, I take a walk in the main square of the city where the fair is being held. To my surprise, the place is full of psychosocial professionals, some of whom I have accompanied in the sessions of ERE and EL. The reason for their presence: the installation of tents for the fair.
Different from the mise-en-scène (chapter 5), there are no cameras or media covering the event and management indicators are neither collected nor circulated. There is no clear assignation of responsibilities and there are no consequences for anybody if the tents are not erected. Still, the tents are being rapidly assembled to guarantee a space in the main square for the fair. “It will probably rain tomorrow, you know?” was the recurrent answer to my question about the reasons for erecting tents. I end up assembling a part of a tent myself with some of the psychosocial professionals that I had met before.

The next day, the fair opens several stands of different kinds, all manned by peasants of the region. Some of them are dedicated to commercializing their products and harvests whereas others explain the history of occupations in the region to the audience, mainly people from the city curious about the purpose of the event. One of the stands is in charge of María, one of the leaders of the social movement organising the event. The only functionary present in the place, Lucia, is assisting María with the use of a computer as part of a strange arrangement of chairs, audio systems, headphones, peasants, and participants of the fair.
I sit in one of the chairs in the centre of the wooden cubicle and María brings me a pair of headphones that I must wear. She promptly instructs me to listen to the audio very carefully while I try to maintain eye contact with her who is now sitting in front of me. The audio is a narration made by María about her experience of pain 6 years ago in her farm. Its contents are powerfully moving and I picture María in the situation described by the audio. I start to embody strong emotions of pain, sorrow, anger, and despair. Though I have listened to many other stories over the last few years I can barely refrain myself from crying. “I am from a Zona Roja, but I am not a militant, I am just a peasant” is the final message of the audio. After removing the headphones, María asks me if she can hug me and I gladly accept. She ends our encounter saying “thanks for sharing my story”.

I spend the rest of the day seeing how people initially participate in the arrangement without a clear idea of its purpose. After the audios finish, some of the participants cry, others thank the person in front of them, and others express their sorrow for the story. “When people feel your story, they will stop labelling you” says María while telling me how she proposed the idea to the community in sessions of EL a few months ago, and a psychosocial professional helped them to recording the audios and coordinating the logistics.
of arranging the chairs, the computer and the headphones. “I suggested to María that the person narrating the story should be in front of the audience during the audio” explains Lucía. The “empathy chair” emerges as a possible name in our conversation.

As mentioned before, not all my experiences of EL are as stimulating as the ones I am narrating here, but I do think it offers potential spaces of encounter between people embodying experiences of pain and mobility, state representatives and other audiences. Particular and fortunate results of EL like the “empathy chair” occur in interstitial spaces produced when the IRR and alternative arrangements overlap. In these possible spaces, the order-making material practices of both infrastructures can negotiate. In these interstitial and probably infrequent spaces the IRR might ‘let be´ the notion of justice and Reparation in alternative arrangements. A crucial commonality can be drawn from the Altos experiences, the grinder, the mobile memorials and EL described in this chapter: Reparation emerges in the mobility within the gaps between the IRR and alternative arrangements. Reparation is then a relational achievement accomplished through mobility where the IRR does not function as a legitimiser. In contrast to reparation within the IRR, Reparation emerging from betrayals, generous infrastructures, and interstitial spaces is mobility beyond the sociotechnical boundaries of recognition and cannot be designed. Unlike recognition and reparation enacting the IRR, Reparation is recovery of justice that comes from recognizing voices usually neglected and displaced by the assemblage and the mise-en-scène of post-conflict statehood. Reparation is a claim for the redistribution of agency enacted through betrayal and generous infrastructures. This claim is materialised in ungoverned and interstitial spaces beyond the boundaries of post-conflict statehood.

What this thesis assembled and what remains

This thesis traced the assemblage of technologies of recognition and reparation. I started this journey reconstructing the negotiations around the LV and its guidelines about the technical procedures of rights restitution currently implemented in Colombia. I claimed that the promulgation of the LV constituted a starting point to understand the configuration of recognition and reparation in the agenda of the Colombian State. Later, recognition and reparation were reframed as sociotechnical assemblages and plausible areas of inquiry for STS-oriented ethnographies. The first technology I traced was the FUD and its mediations in the determination of veracity in the statements offered by applicants. I examined the production of standardized narratives for assessment, and the translation of applicants’ pain
into codes and official numbers. I also described the encounters between applicants and civil servants at CDR, and the expert assessment of the FUD at the offices of the UARIV that resulted in the registration as Victims or the rejection of applicants. I interrogated the RUV as an assemblage unmaking embodied experiences of pain to create codes and official numbers. I suggested that the RUV enacts a sociotechnical border that, similarly to other borders, attempts to control and tame mobility. Although the main claim of the LV is that its procedures openly acknowledge the responsibility of the state in the armed conflict, the technical materiality of the RUV suggests this is not the case. The RUV legitimizes a particular notion of Victim that must be consistent with the official account of the armed conflict offered by the Colombian State.

This journey then continued with the experiences of successful applicants in the assemblage of reparation, its predominant notion of compensation, and the trajectories of psychosocial assistance as a particular form of reparation. I suggested the term repairing betrayals to address the potentiality of the ERE inasmuch as its translation might enact arrangements transforming the logic of the state into ungoverned spaces. Hence, the numbers and indicators assembled by technologies of recognition and reparation enact material order that mediates actions at a distance. I addressed this emerging order as an Infrastructure of Rights Restitution (IRR). Then, the thesis interrogated how the assemblage of recognition and reparation, and the emerging IRR make possible the expansion of a particular form of statehood: a post-conflict statehood. The staging of the latter is possible through the IRR that allows state representatives to speak on behalf of registered and rejected applicants. I described how the numbers that enact the IRR are used by state representatives but also how they have been confronted and challenged by private and international organisations.

Finally, I explored some of the material forms of cooperation developed by people within and beyond a sociotechnical border (RUV). I portrayed some of these arrangements as examples of generous infrastructures. I concluded that a different form of Reparation emerges in three possible spaces: as repairing betrayals of state interventions, as the recovery of justice through generous infrastructures, and as interstitial mobility within the inbetweenness produced when the IRR and other alternative arrangements overlap. While following the forms, protocols and numbers, different kinds of displacement enacted by those same objects became evident. These displacements include the translation of pain into numbers, the embrace of the promise of reparation by applicants and Victims, and the invisibility of the precarious situation of applicants from the staging of post-conflict
statehood. Rather than irremediably flawed, I portrayed the logic of state interventions in rights restitution as inevitably based in numbers and quantification practices. I interrogated what these practices and technologies of quantification mean for people embodying experiences of pain and mobility. But at the same time, I described technologies that, as relational arrangements involving users other than state representatives, manage to perform a detour from the abrasive logic of quantification. Still, these latter interventions are perhaps not predominant. This relational understanding of technological objects, widely explored in STS, should particularly enrich studies of the state, bureaucracy, and ethnographic approaches to the configuration of numbers and quantification practices.

The exploration of registration as a sociotechnical border could offer a parallel perspective for borders and transnational migration. Crossing or trespassing across borders usually consists of multiple administrative and technical procedures that enact boundaries of recognition and rights. Migrants develop a variety of strategies to cope with those procedures or challenging them. Although the mobility of migrants has been documented by migration studies, especially the Autonomy of Migration perspective, reframing borders as sociotechnical arrangements could offer potential insights into the role of expertise and technologies in transnational attempts to deal with migrants’ mobility. Relatedly, what started as a description of the configuration of boundaries through technologies also became an attempt to understand the world that exceeds those boundaries. Moving across the trajectories of technologies and the experiences of people became a crucial aspect of my reflexive journey. Similarly, the order emerging from the use of technologies of recognition and reparation intersects with other social orders. Here, understanding both emerging orders as infrastructures has been particularly useful for depicting the spaces created by their overlapping. By building on the idea of interstitial spaces, this study offers insights into how infrastructures coexist. Likewise, understanding narratives of pain and mobility as materials for infrastructures also contributes to the existing line of enquiry for scholars in science and technology studies concerning infrastructures.

Reframing Reparation as betrayal and interstitial mobility that exceeds the logic of quantification constitutes a suggestive initiative to reframe the study of technologies embedded in state interventions. This invitation can enrich different areas of research such as studies about rights restitution, Human Rights policies, and ethnographic documentation of psychosocial assistance and mental health devices. Similarly, revisiting psychosocial assistance protocols as social technologies builds on growing attempts to outline the
technologies developed by forms of knowledge like the social sciences as objects of interest for STS. Hence, this thesis offers inputs for fields like social studies of human sciences and critical psychology. Particularly in the case of Colombia, this study provides important reflections about the role of social science professionals in state interventions.

With regard to post conflict statehood, this thesis presented two divergent and coexisting accounts about the IRR in Colombia. On the on hand, I portrayed post-conflict Colombia as a successful relational achievement performed by the IRR. On the other hand, I also depicted post-conflict statehood as an assemblage that, on the grounds of quantification, has difficulty in acknowledging the sensitive dimensions of experiences of pain and mobility. Rather than presenting post-conflict Colombia as a point of arrival or a societal change resulting in the absence of violence and perpetrations, I claimed that post-conflict statehood is actually ambivalent. It can be success and failure, quantification and displacement, states’ achievement and people’s betrayal, legal reparation and Reparation as interstitial mobility. My tone of criticism towards state interventions matches my perception of quantifying practices, displacement of pain and a legal notion of reparation as predominant features of post-conflict Colombia. I want to think that such predominance could be undone through claims for redistribution of agency enacted by people embodying experiences of pain and mobility. Beyond my particular shadow in the picture (see the Prelude), a relational description of the assemblage of statehood constitutes valuable inputs for conflict and peace studies, ethnographic studies of the state, and recent fields derivative of STS like social studies of politics and research inspired by Actor Network State models.

The present assemblage comprised of discourses–languages–writings–methods is inevitably reaching its limits; and its end. As any other assemblage this thesis is exceeded by the objects that it has tried to approach exhaustively. During this ethnography, my main interests rested in accompanying applicants and establishing the assemblage of recognition and reparation through their experiences. Persisting in these interests I could not pay as much attention as I wanted to a possible actant relevant to the RUV and the circulation of indicators: the databases condensing the information of applicants and previous forms of registration. This decision was also motivated by the difficulty of accessing the current spreadsheets and the team of experts in charge of the databases. I was informed by my interviewees of the ongoing activities of cleaning up databases like the RUPD, the registration database created after the Law 975/2005, and others. The purpose of this cleaning activity consists of integrating that information with the current RUV to eliminate
overlapping applications and thus determining the correct number of compensations to be granted. The criteria used for cleaning up the databases, as well as the technology itself, represent an aspect that would deserve further enquiry.

During the sessions of the ERE that I attended in certain regions of Colombia, a constant worry of my interlocutors revolved around the fact that their perpetrators, mainly militants of the AUC were about to complete their time in prison due to the transitional mechanisms of the Law 975/2005. As the IOM has reported, at least 442 former militants and proven perpetrators might have been released between 2014 and 2016. The registered Victims of those perpetrators according to the National Attorney amount to no less than 426,856. Besides being worried about the safety of some of my interlocutors, I wonder about the strategies for following-up the conditions of safety for registered Victims. This kind of situation is likely in post-conflict scenarios and will surely be the object of state interventions worthy of examination. Apart from databases and following-up strategies, other line of enquiry has to do with the EL given that some of its components have recently been included as an agreed aspect of the peace negotiations in Havana. This means that EL will be deployed on a larger scale in the country but also that its components will be used as psychosocial strategies for members of demobilized members of the guerrillas. This is another upcoming challenge that would merit broader attention.

This has been a transformative and inspiring journey for me, as I sincerely hope it was for my readers too. But as any other journey it must eventually come to an end. However, since Reparation also exceeds this journey, its end is only a necessary but arbitrary cut off point. On the grounds of this ethnographic experience, I want to believe in a possible future for Colombia. In that future, Reparation beyond statehood becomes the predominant feature of our post-conflict society.
In spite of the criticisms by Amnesty International against Plan Colombia (a plan created by the US in 2000 to combat drugs and contribute to peace, mainly through military means), this collaborative strategy was renewed in February 2016. Headlines of US and Colombian newspapers address the renewal as something expected considering the success of the peace agreements and the implementation of effective human rights policies. The name of the strategy is now *Peace Colombia*. Financial international relations as the ones embedded in *Peace Colombia* and recent free trade agreements have been importantly favoured by post-conflict statehood.

It is April 2016 and the negotiations in Havana seem to be reaching an end with the signature of peace that will then be voted on in a referendum. Some of the discussions revolve around how to protect the former members of the FARC once reinstated as civilians, demining different regions in the country, and the financial responsibility towards reparations and compensations by the FARC. The resolution of the three year negotiations is accompanied by the initiation of peace dialogues with the ELN in Ecuador. The almost completed negotiations coincide with the appointment of the current director of the UARIV, Paula Gaviria as the High Commissioner of Human Rights for the Presidency. With the latter promotion, the psychosocial team at the
UARIV will face administrative changes. Psychosocial professionals are concerned about the continuity of strategies as the ERE and Entrelazando.

At the same time, state representatives publically acknowledge the responsibility of the Colombian Army allied with drug cartels in the massacres of Trujillo, Valle between 1988 and 1992. In Barranquilla, Atlántico dismembered bodies appearing in the streets remind the region of the repertoire of former paramilitary groups. Those dismembered bodies are alerting the authorities to the increasing presence of BACRIM in the city. Similarly, the ACNUR claims that at least 486 indigenous and African-Colombian families have abandoned their lands due to armed confrontations between ELN and the army and increasing threats by BACRIM in the pacific region of the country.

Meanwhile Luis (chapter 1) and his son, who were never registered in the RUV, still manage to live in the city by singing in the buses. Luis’ son has started studying at the SENA. Graciela has recently received a second rejection from the RUV because of her previous registration in the RUPD and still works providing cleaning services in Bogotá. Through a mutual friend, I know that Mario (chapter 3) has been hired to look after a farm in the South of the country where he lives with his family. Maggie, Sergio, Jazmine and Marco (chapter 4) are still waiting for their compensations. Diana has also started studying at SENA and has got a job. In spite of the assassination of Flor, Julio (chapter 6) persists in organising a collective for denunciations in Altos. I have not been able to contact him since my last trip to Colombia (September 2015). The community in the South of the country (chapter 6) continues producing coffee, although compensations have not been delivered yet. I keep in touch with Manuel (chapter 6) who promised to keep me updated with his latest pictures by email in exchange for the findings of this journey. I have not been able to get in contact with Ana, Gloria (Chapter 3) and Elias (chapter 4). I especially miss our conversations with Elias. The last time we spoke, he reminded me of my promise to share my findings with him, a promise that I surely want to keep.

Over and above the achievement of peace, post-conflict in Colombia is largely a matter of a reconfiguration of international financial relations and the national political landscape. Conversely, the implications of post-conflict for the people that make it possible with their applications remain uncertain. Peace in Colombia, in the language
of numbers and indicators, continues to mediate the certification and signature of projects like Peace Colombia.

*********

Figure 34 "Historic: Santos and 'Timochenko' seal the end of the conflict" Photo: Alejandro Ernesto. Revista Semana. June 23/2016

It is June 2016. The definite and bilateral cease of fire between FARC-EP and the government has finally been signed in Cuba almost at the same time of submission of this thesis. Still, the promise of reparation will remain de-signed. Specific peace agreements will surely be signed. More and diverse financial relations between Colombia and other countries will be signed. More applicants and functionaries will sign FUD applications. Evaluators will continue to sign official communications. More Victims will sign attendance records. Ongoing perpetrations will remain unsigned. Most people will remain resigned. Hopefully, among the ambivalences of post-conflict Colombia that will continue to coexist, some people will also sign up for Reparation. And at this point, your author will sign off.
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