

## The Lost World: Vargas Llosa in the Andes

---

GINA SHERIFF, NORWICH UNIVERSITY

In January 1983, amidst the reign of terror provoked by daily insurgent and counter-insurgent violence in Peru, villagers from the Andean town of Uchuraccay abducted and murdered eight Peruvian journalists. The journalists had stopped briefly in Uchuraccay on their way to the village of Huaychao to investigate reports that local residents had killed seven members of the Shining Path terrorist group. But their trip to Huaychao was tragically cut short: in Uchuraccay, they were attacked with sticks, stones and axes, their bodies were mutilated and burned, and they were buried in pairs, face-down, in shallow makeshift graves outside of the village. When President Fernando Belaúnde Terry heard the Uchuraccay story, he assembled a commission to investigate the events and to attempt to explain this apparently unprovoked violence.

Novelist Mario Vargas Llosa was asked to head the *Comisión investigativa*, working alongside lawyers, linguists and anthropologists to produce the detailed *Informe sobre Uchuraccay*. In this document, the Commission concludes that the villagers of Uchuraccay mistook the journalists for members of Shining Path and that they were defending themselves from what they believed to be imminent violence (Vargas Llosa et al 15). They also described the Uchuraccay massacre as a symptom of the greater problem of political violence in Peru that had been mounting since the early 1970s. Vargas Llosa's concern about the events at Uchuraccay did not end with the publication of the Commission's report. In his own words, Vargas Llosa explains that his experiences in life "dejan un sedimento que aparece más tarde, a veces de manera imprevisible, en lo que uno escribe" (Vargas Llosa, *Contra viento* 153-4). This *sedimento* is evident in the three novels he published in the ten years after the Uchuraccay investigation, *Historia de Mayta* (1984), *¿Quién mató a Palomino Molero?* (1986), and *Lituma en los Andes* (1993), all of which express the author's mounting concerns about the violence he investigated in highland Peru.

Each of these novels deals with a different aspect of Vargas Llosa's emerging concerns about Peruvian history and culture, all of which can be traced back to his participation in the investigation at Uchuraccay. He presents three main concerns: Peruvians' distrust of authority and institutions as a disruptive force in the pursuit of justice; their history of violent revolution as an obstacle to progress and

development; and their collectivist social values as isolationist and detrimental to open cultural exchange. He places these criticisms in the context of the terror and chaos wrought by Shining Path, the Peruvian armed forces, and indigenous highland communities like the one based in Uchuraccay. By reading *Historia de Mayta*, *¿Quién mató a Palomino Molero?*, and *Lituma en los Andes* a very loose literary trilogy for Vargas Llosa in the aftermath of the Uchuraccay massacre, we can begin to understand both his political and literary movements in the subsequent years.

Critics such as Misha Kokotovic and Roy C. Boland have noted the connection between Vargas Llosa's fiction and his personal and political experiences during the 1980s and 1990s. What is lacking in this body of criticism, however, is an analysis of these three novels together, as a progressive assessment of Mario Vargas Llosa's experiences in Uchuraccay, and within the context of his more general concerns about revolutionary violence in Peru. This article is designed to relate his three novels from this time period to a larger political project, and to examine his use of popular literary genres as a method of imposing his neoliberal values on indigenous Peruvians. Readers are challenged to set aside their reactions to his widely publicized political opinions and consider the experiences that inspired them, as well as the critical dialogue he establishes between his roles as author and public figure.

### **A Writer's Demons: When the Political is Personal**

The choice to use the Uchuraccay case in his fiction is not unheard of for Mario Vargas Llosa, as he is known both for using personal experiences as inspiration for his writing and for transforming historical events into fiction. Yet even his most historically-based novels liberally infuse the historical with the subjective, allowing the author a vehicle for intense personal engagement with the past. Vargas Llosa freely adds and subtracts from the historical record for the sake of his story. In his essay *La verdad de las mentiras*, he explains that he considers literature and history two sides of the same coin:

*¿Qué diferencia hay, entonces, entre una ficción y un reportaje periodístico o un libro de historia? ¿No están compuestos ellos de palabras? ¿No encarcelan acaso en el tiempo artificial del relato ese torrente sin riberas, el tiempo real? La respuesta es: se trata de sistemas opuestos de aproximación a lo real. En tanto que la novela se rebela y transgrede la vida, aquellos géneros no pueden dejar de ser sus siervos. (Vargas Llosa, Verdad 6)*

Vargas Llosa's intention is to unmask the boundary between history and fiction as arbitrary and unnecessary, and his literary work gains critical strength from the intentional transgression of that boundary and its effect on readers.

My reading of Vargas Llosa's literary work, and in particular the three novels dealing with the Uchuraccay massacre, employs Linda Hutcheon's concept of historiographic metafiction as a theoretical framework. As a device most common to postmodern fiction writing, historiographic metafiction mixes historical and fictive representations of the past in a way that self-consciously calls into question the factual basis of historical narrative. Hutcheon uses Vargas Llosa's *The War of the End of the World* as a prime example of this device in literature, explaining how the author uses parody to show "how traditional narrative models—both historiographical and fictional—that are based on European models of continuous chronology and cause-and-effect relations are utterly inadequate to the task of narrating the history of the New World" (*Politics* 50). In *A Poetics of Postmodernism*, she posits that "to re-write or to re-present the past in fiction and in history is [...] to open it up to the present, to prevent it from being conclusive and teleological" (110). Vargas Llosa's novels open up to the present a number of events in recent Peruvian history in order to foreground the consequences that the past can have on the present and the future of his country.

In his 2010 Nobel Prize speech, Vargas Llosa cast himself as a defender of liberal democracy, an ideology that supports, in his words, "everything that has been taking us out of a savage life" (np). The racial tinge to this statement has not gone unnoticed by the public: the author has been criticized for his refusal to support Peruvian indigenous groups, whose way of life would certainly not survive Vargas Llosa's vision of modernization and globalization in the country. Also galvanizing are his unwavering support for free market capitalism and very public criticisms of socialist regimes in Latin America and around the world. This article will begin to trace the development of this philosophy through his fiction, offering a crucial perspective on Vargas Llosa's politics and his relationship with Peru.

It is his unique political and literary position that makes Vargas Llosa's novels particularly worthy of interpretation, especially in the context of postmodern literature and postcolonial politics in Latin America. While much postmodern literature can be read as a critique of power and domination in and of western societies, Linda Hutcheon argues that this critique is bound up "with its own *complicity* with power and domination" (*Politics* 4). She goes on to re-frame postmodernism as a "paradoxical postmodernism of complicity and critique, of

reflexivity and historicity, that at once inscribes and subverts the conventions and ideologies of the dominant cultural and social forces of the twentieth-century western world" (11). *Historia de Mayta, ¿Quién mató a Palomino Molero?*, and *Lituma en los Andes* embody the literary and political paradox that Hutcheon presents. Just as his narrative genre-bending calls a sort of nostalgic attention to the conventions that he presumes to subvert, Vargas Llosa employs the rhetoric of political liberation to express his desire to reinstall models of western domination and development.

Vargas Llosa's novels also explore the ideological complexity and paradox of the detective genre. From its early days, ideology was inscribed in the narrative arc of detective fiction: the story was that of "[d]isorder being brought into order, order falling back into disorder; irrationality upsetting rationality, rationality restored after irrational upheavals" (Mandel 44). This order and rationality referred, of course, to the intervention of the police or a private detective, and to the imposition of justice, formal or informal. As a product of 19th-century innovations in thought such as empiricism and ratiocination, and the development of new sciences like sociology, psychology and forensic medicine, detective fiction reflects a renewed belief in the power of knowledge to resolve problems and cure social ills like crime.

In *The Novel and the Police*, D.A. Miller points out that detective fiction only amplifies the theme of surveillance that is already heavily present in the novelistic genre itself. Using examples from Balzac, Dickens, Trollope and others, he explains that from the inception of the novel, "omniscient narration assumes a fully panoptic view of the world it places under surveillance. Nothing worth knowing escapes its notation, and its complete knowledge includes the knowledge that it is always right" (23). The detective genre, then, highlights the role of surveillance in everyday life, especially in the narrative representation of the private lives of the characters. The work of the detective finds its parallel in that of the novel, in which every act is observed and inscribed, and the "facts" of the plot are laid out and organized for the reader.

Yet while the act of detection is temporary, and ceases once the crime has been solved, novelistic surveillance is perpetual, and the power to present the "facts" of the case (that is, the plot) is always in the hands of the narrator, who controls the representation of the story. Miller ultimately compares the constant surveillance of the novel to the nearly imperceptible social structures that serve as a priori forms of control and punishment within society. As such, detective fiction becomes "a parable of the modern policing power that comes to rely less on spectacular displays of

repressive force than on intangible networks of productive discipline” (51). This ideological framework and reliance on literary surveillance are alternately employed and subverted in Vargas Llosa’s three detective novels, simultaneously questioning the underpinnings of the genre and fulfilling them.

### ***Historia de Mayta and the Seeds of Revolution***

Published in 1984, *Historia de Mayta* is the first novel that Vargas Llosa released after the investigation into Uchuraccay and the first iteration of his growing obsession with violence and revolution in Peru. The novel is loosely based on an obscure moment in the early history of leftist insurrection in Peru: a prison break and subsequent bank robbery that took place in the city of Jauja in May 1962. Francisco Guillermo Vallejos Vidal, a military officer, stole weapons from the local police station and helped Vicente Mayta Mercado escape from the city jail. The two men were involved in a bank robbery and deadly shootout with the police (Kristal 140). In *Historia de Mayta*, Vargas Llosa changes the date of events to 1958, and allows one of the leftist insurrectionists, Alejandro Mayta, to survive the shootout in order to tell his story. Finally, the novel is set against the backdrop of an apocalyptic present-day Peru, which is being invaded by Cuban and Bolivian troops that want to establish the Socialist Republic of Peru. Vargas Llosa presents this scenario as the inevitable consequence of the violence unleashed by Mayta and his comrades in the Jauja revolutionary insurrection of 1958.

In *Historia de Mayta*, the mirroring of past and future is a central issue. The author explains in an interview that although he first read about the Jauja insurrection in 1962, he did not feel the impulse to write this novel until 1982, “cuando en el Perú comenzaban los síntomas de lo que hoy en día es la violencia política ... que ha tomado unas características que a mí no me parecían posibles” (Salazar 2). Just as Vargas Llosa felt that he was living in an impossible present, in his novel he exaggerated those present realities in order to craft a dystopian future for Peru. In this novel, it was not his goal to reproduce historical events faithfully, but rather to exploit those events within his alternate, fictional universe. His narrator repeatedly assures others that his story is not history but fiction: “En una novela siempre hay más mentiras que verdades, una novela no es nunca una historia fiel. Esta investigación, esas entrevistas, no eran para contar lo que pasó realmente en Jauja, sino, más bien, para mentir sabiendo sobre qué mentía” (Vargas Llosa, *Mayta* 320). The historical events do not determine Mayta’s storyline any more than they dictate the story being written by this fictional narrator.

The late 1950s was a time of revolutionary incubation, as Abimael Guzmán began teaching a militant Maoist doctrine that would become the political manifesto of Shining Path (Degregori 34). Both the ideology and activities of Shining Path are clearly reflected in Vargas Llosa's depiction of Alejandro Mayta and his comrades as they plan their armed revolutionary insurrection. With *Historia de Mayta*, the author creates a fictionalized biography of Shining Path, the revolutionary group that figured heavily in his investigation at Uchuraccay and would become synonymous with violence and terror in Peru.

*Historia de Mayta* employs some basic conventions of the detective novel, placing the novelist in the role of investigator who must reconstruct history in order to write fiction. Yet the events of the Jauja robbery are difficult to pin down because nearly all of the witnesses and participants have conflicting stories. Mario Vargas Llosa notes that in his own research into the real events at Jauja, the people who he interviewed often attempted to change the past "to justify what they had done, sometimes to take revenge on adversaries [...] to justify the present, to justify what they were, to justify their evolution" (Vargas Llosa, *Writer's Reality* 151). Likewise, in *Historia de Mayta*, many of the collaborators try to take credit for the idea of the rebellion, but none take responsibility for its failure.

The narrator also attempts to compare differing perspectives and declare a single version of the truth; he fails, however, generating more questions than answers. For example, among the most intriguing unsolved mysteries are the circumstances surrounding Vallejos's death. After interviewing nearly every living witness, the narrator concludes that

*este punto de la historia [...] tampoco se aclarará. Ni cuántas balas recibió: no se hizo autopsia y el parte de defunción no lo menciona. Los testigos dan sobre esto las versiones más antojadizas: desde una bala en la nuca hasta un cuerpo como un colador. (Vargas Llosa, Mayta 300)*

Also unsolved is the mystery of the whereabouts of the cash stolen from the Jauja bank: while "La abundancia de mentiras enturbia el asunto," the narrator finally decides that the bank employees probably over-reported the amount of money that was stolen, presumably to appropriate some of the bank's holdings for themselves (303). The host of unanswered questions calls into question the power of investigation, especially in relation to acts of large-scale terror.

Vargas Llosa ends *Historia de Mayta* with a strong political statement about the deeper meaning of revolution—or lack thereof. In the novel's closing chapter, the narrator meets Alejandro Mayta a number of years after the rebellion. Through the stories told by his acquaintances, Mayta has become something of a mythical character for the narrator. The contrast between the man and the myth, however, is disillusioning:

*[Alejandro Mayta] es un hombre destruido por el sufrimiento y el rencor, que ha perdido incluso los recuerdos. Alguien, en suma, esencialmente distinto del Mayta de mi novela, ese optimista pertinaz, ese hombre de fe, que ama la vida a pesar del horror y las miserias que hay en ella. (338)*

Mayta has been soured by failure and no longer able to articulate the revolutionary ideals that prompted the insurrection in the first place.

For such an impulsively planned act of rebellion, its consequences were both profound and enduring. At one point, Mayta pauses his interview to puzzle over “lo misteriosas e imprevisibles que son las ramificaciones de los acontecimientos, esa complejísima urdimbre de causas y efectos, reverberaciones y accidentes, que es la historia humana” (185). Thus begins Vargas Llosa's projection of the nascent revolutionary movements of the late 1950s onto the abject terror of Shining Path terrorism in the 1980s and 90s.

*Historia de Mayta* also begins the process of pitting a rational detective figure against an irrational populace, one that will progress significantly in subsequent novels. Near the end of the novel, the narrator concludes that “es imposible saber lo que de veras sucede, los peruanos mienten, inventan, sueñan, se refugian en la ilusión” (274). Though *Historia de Mayta's* narrator is Peruvian as well, he distances himself from his compatriots both intellectually and spiritually. In this way, the author lays the groundwork for his subsequent novels, in which he will cast doubt on the capacity to evaluate objectively political and cultural realities.

### **Cynicism and Satire in *¿Quién mató a Palomino Molero?***

Published two years later in 1986, *¿Quién mató a Palomino Molero?* deals more directly with the events that Vargas Llosa witnessed in Uchuraccay and builds on his increasing anxiety over the issue of political violence in the Peruvian context. *¿Quién mató a Palomino Molero?* opens to a dead body later identified as Palomino Molero, a young bolero singer and recent Peruvian naval recruit. Readers view the scene

through the eyes of the police investigator as he first assesses Molero's dead and mutilated body: "tenía la nariz y la boca rajadas, coágulos de sangre reseca, moretones y desgarrones, quemaduras de cigarrillo, y [...] también habían tratado de caparlo, porque los huevos le colgaban hasta la entrepierna" (5).

This vivid first passage in the novel recalls the murder and mutilation of the journalists at Uchuraccay. Indeed, Mario Vargas Llosa uses *¿Quién mató a Palomino Molero?* to contemplate some of the obstacles he encountered during his investigation. As Roy Boland notes, in his experience as an investigator in Uchuraccay, Vargas Llosa "comprobó por cuenta propia el cuestionamiento, la relativización, la tergiversación a la que 'la verdad' se ve sometida por aquellos entes y personas para quienes ella es inconveniente o peligrosa" (163). This novel can be read on two very different levels, depending on the reader's knowledge of the author's personal experience. The casual reader can take it as an almost farcical detective novel; but those familiar with the author's background will likely read it as a re-evaluation of Vargas Llosa's participation in the *Comisión investigativa* in Uchuraccay.

As the only Civil Guard officers stationed in Talara, Lieutenant Silva and Private Lituma must investigate Molero's death despite strong opposition by Colonel Mindreau, head of the naval base. When they meet with the Colonel to begin their investigation, he informs Lieutenant Silva that "Mis superiores han recibido un informe detallado y están satisfechos. Usted no, por lo visto. Bueno, es problema suyo. La gente de la Base está limpia de polvo y paja en este asunto" (Vargas Llosa, *Palomino Molero* 36). The Colonel is not the only obstacle in the investigation: it appears that no one is really interested in the death of Palomino Molero except for the investigators and the victim's mother. As Lituma comments to a friend early on in the novel, "La que no coopera es la Aviación. Y como el flaquito era avionero, si ellos no cooperan, quién carajo va a cooperar" (10). From the beginning, the odds are against the two detectives in this murder case.

In contrast to the deductive method that is often the organizing principle in detective fiction, in *¿Quién mató a Palomino Molero?* Silva and Lituma make their two major discoveries by strokes of luck. First, the Civil Guards happen upon an inebriated Lieutenant Dufó. In his drunken state, Dufó lets slip that he has inside information about Molero's death, telling Silva and Lituma that the singer died "Porque se metió en corral ajeno. Esas cosas se pagan" (69). It is clear, then, that despite Colonel Mindreau's claims to the contrary, the Navy was somehow involved in Molero's murder. The next clue offers itself up to the Civil Guards in the form of a



brief note: “A Palomino Molero, los que lo mataron lo fueron a sacar de casa de Doña Lupe, en Amotape. Ella sabe lo que pasó. Pregúntenle” (90). More useful and more serendipitous than the first, this clue leads the investigators to learn that Molero’s murder was committed by Lieutenant Dufó on behalf of Colonel Mindreau.

The details of the crime are too outrageous for the investigators to ever deduce on their own and are revealed to them in the voluntary confessions of Alicia and Colonel Mindreau. Alicia informs Silva and Lituma that Palomino Molero was her secret lover, and that her father had him killed in order to keep them apart. She also claims that the Colonel forced her into an incestuous relationship with him. Subsequently, the Colonel confesses to the contract murder but not to the incest, claiming that his daughter suffers from “delusions” (156). In a fitting ending to such a hasty storyline, Colonel Mindreau kills himself and his daughter, thus closing off any further lines of investigation for Silva and Lituma.

On the surface, the investigators seem to have done their job, answering the question presented in the title of the novel. In reality, their solution is unconvincing and unverifiable. For example, there is no way for investigators or readers to confirm the story of incest told by Alicia Mindreau or that of her delusions told by her father. Even if it is evident who killed Palomino Molero, it is not clear who is really guilty in this novel and, consequently, Silva and Lituma cannot serve justice. It may be for this reason, or for no reason at all, that both Silva and Lituma are demoted and transferred to less desirable positions in the Civil Guard, in remote and rural areas of Peru. The solution to the mystery is overshadowed by the swathes of doubt that surround it and the obvious discontent of the investigators’ superiors.

The unconvincing conclusion of *¿Quién mató a Palomino Molero?* has direct parallels with the outcome of Vargas Llosa’s investigation in Uchuraccay. Like Silva and Lituma, the members of his *Comisión investigativa* had a difficult time reconstructing the crime in detail. As is evident below, Lieutenant Silva’s conclusion in the novel mirrors this statement that Vargas Llosa makes in his Informe sobre Uchuraccay:

*“Pero, aunque algunos detalles estén todavía oscuros, creo que las tres preguntas claves están resueltas. Quiénes lo mataron. Cómo lo mataron. Por qué lo mataron.” (Vargas Llosa, Palomino Molero 153)*

*“La Comisión cree haber esclarecido de este modo lo esencial del suceso, aunque algunos detalles y aspectos de la tragedia permanezcan en la sombra.” (Vargas Llosa et al 39)*

Both Vargas Llosa and his fictional counterpart feel the need to assert their authority as investigators and the legitimacy of their conclusions, as inconclusive as they may be.

In the novel, the residents of Talara undermine both the investigators' authority and their conclusions about the case. The townspeople have their own a priori suspects, a group of people they refer to as *los peces gordos*, an unidentified group of people that wields absolute power over the town, its politics and the justice system. As he begins the investigation, Lituma is informed that "Si no descubren los asesinos, todo el mundo va a pensar que han recibido platita de los peces gordos" (Vargas Llosa, *Palomino Molero* 49). The *peces gordos* are a figment of the townspeople's collective imagination, but that does not keep them from interfering in the investigation with their theories or second guessing the detectives' solution to the mystery.

Once they have finished their investigation, Silva and Lituma find that no one believes their story: "No hay un solo talareño, hombre, mujer o perro, que se trague el cuento ése. Ni el gallinazo que está ahí se lo traga" (176). Cutting through the investigators' "cortina de humo" (177), the townspeople fabricate their own theories on the deaths of Palomino Molero, Colonel Mindreau and his daughter Alicia. The ideas range from contraband—Molero and the Mindreaus were all killed because they found out about it—to a top-secret spy mission to Ecuador headed by the Colonel.

There is nothing that Silva or Lituma can say to change the minds of the townspeople, especially since the real solution is barely more believable than the ones they invent. The Talareños' version of the story is more real to them than any form of truth that the investigators can offer, especially because the principal culprit is now dead and cannot be brought to justice. They were unlikely to have accepted any solution that did not involve the *peces gordos* in the first place, pointing to a culturally based skepticism of institutions and preference for local forms of justice. Therefore, by providing a solution to Molero's murder that does not involve the *peces gordos*, Silva and Lituma have aligned themselves with those same shady and unidentified forces in the minds of the townspeople.

Vargas Llosa's *Comisión investigativa* faced similar public skepticism in response to their conclusions about the Uchuraccay massacre. Not long after the publication of their Informe sobre Uchuraccay, a trial was held to determine the fate of some of the villagers involved in the journalists' murder, but it was the *Comisión* members who were really under scrutiny. The local judge presiding over the case, Judge Ventura

Huayhua, used it to voice his theory about what happened in Uchuraccay. Enrique Mayer summarizes the judge's argument as the following:

*[...] the journalists had been lured out of Ayacucho by members of Shining Path (some lived in the Hostal Santa Rosa) under the pretext that they would see something very important [...] Once out of town, the journalists then met the guerrillas who showed them 'this something' that was so tremendous, so frightening, and so damaging to the government that the army had no choice but to kill the journalists and then foist the bodies and the guilt onto the comuneros of Uchuraccay. Had 'this something' come to light, the Belaúnde government would have failed. Judge Ventura Huayhua [...] supposed that it must have been the latest and technically most advanced military installation put there under U.S. auspices. (489)*

The judge's theory mirrors those put forth by the townspeople of Talara in *¿Quién mató a Palomino Molero?* However, for the *Comisión* the accusations would have a more negative effect because the case had become so well known throughout the country. In fact, once Judge Ventura presented his alternative theory about the murders in Uchuraccay, it became acceptable as a possible version of the story. In an essay, Vargas Llosa cites a 1983 national poll in which 21% of Peruvians said that they believed that the government, not the villagers of Uchuraccay, was responsible for the murders (*Contra viento* 133).

*¿Quién mató a Palomino Molero?* builds on the issues brought up in *Historia de Mayta*, especially Vargas Llosa's concerns about the feasibility of investigation in the Peruvian national context. Drawing from his experience as an investigator in Uchuraccay, the author depicts a case that seems doomed to failure and detectives whose work is called into question at every turn. Efraín Kristal explains that the novel conveys "a deep sense of irritation and bewilderment like the one Vargas Llosa must have felt when he was personally maligned and slandered by journalists and academics" (156) during and after his investigation into Uchuraccay. As in *Historia de Mayta*, *¿Quién mató a Palomino Molero?* ends with its protagonists mired in frustration. As they attempt to progress from mystery to solution—the very structure of the traditional detective narrative—those around them challenge, contradict, and deconstruct the very idea of empirical investigation. Yet these two novels only set the stage for the manifold critique of Peruvian culture to come in Vargas Llosa's next work.

### **Lituma en los Andes: a Decade in the Making**

*Lituma en los Andes* is one of the few Vargas Llosa novels set in the Andean region of Peru, and the one that deals most directly with the events in Uchuraccay. Civil Guard Corporal Lituma and Tomás Carreño are stationed in Naccos, a small village in the Andes, investigating a missing-persons case. Three men, Casimiro Huarcaya, Demetrio Chanca, and Pedro Tinoco, have vanished without a trace. The investigation into the men's disappearance is slow and difficult, in large part due to the villagers' mistrust of outsiders. Although Tomás Carreño is originally from the highlands and speaks Quechua, Lituma is from the coastal city of Piura and has little in common with the villagers of Naccos. Throughout the investigation, Lituma feels foreign and strange, asking himself at one point:

*¿Se burlaban de él? A ratos le parecía que detrás de esas caras inexpresivas, de esos monosílabos pronunciados con desgano, como haciéndole un favor, de esos ojitos opacos, desconfiados, los serruchos se reían de su condición de costeño extraviado en estas punas, de la agitación que aún le producía la altura, de su incapacidad para resolver estos casos. (Vargas Llosa, Lituma 37)*

However, as uncomfortable as Lituma feels in the company of the villagers, he is much more concerned about the presence of Shining Path in the surrounding area. The guerillas recently kidnapped and murdered various innocent people and Lituma suspects that they were responsible for the disappearances of the three men in Naccos; he also worries that he and Tomás will be their next victims.

The direct references to Shining Path in the novel foreground the conflictive relationship between the revolutionaries and highland Peruvians in the 1980s and 90s. While nominally working for the good of rural peasants against landowners and other members of the bourgeoisie, the group was highly authoritarian and rarely took into consideration the needs or requests of those they claimed to represent. Some communities also felt the economic sting of *Sendero's* presence: as part of their political strategy, the group prohibited all forms of capitalism, including any market or trade activities in rural areas, which were some of the few forms of income for many rural highlanders. In his *Informe*, Vargas Llosa notes that the villagers in Uchuraccay “acusaron ante la *Comisión*, en repetidas oportunidades, a los terroristas de robarles sus alimentos y sus animales. Esto fue motivo de choques y fricciones” (29). For many, the authoritarian and violent methods of Shining Path were far from an improvement in their economic situation or in their daily lives.

*Lituma en los Andes* depicts very vividly the tense atmosphere that Shining Path created within the Andean regions of Peru during the 1980s and early 90s. Much of the novel is dedicated to examples of *Sendero's* brutal, terrifying and seemingly random violence. They would attack any individual or group that could be construed as representing capitalist ideology or, more vaguely, anyone who did not perceptibly take their side in their "People's War." In the novel, *Sendero* members slaughter a herd of vicuñas in a nature reserve in order to send a message to their owners. One member explains: "Ésta es una reserva del enemigo... Una reserva que inventó en imperialismo... Para que sus científicos las estudien, para que sus turistas les tomen fotos" (Vargas Llosa, *Lituma* 56-7). The group also kills a team of scientists for their supposedly imperialist work, disregarding the fact that their research is focused on the preservation of natural areas in the Andes and would improve the lives of many highland Peruvians. After speaking to members of *Sendero*, one of the scientists laments, "Oyen, pero no escuchan ni quieren enterarse de lo que se les dice... Parecen de otro planeta" (119). As it is presented in the novel, *Sendero's* ideology is both vague and unforgiving: the guerrilla attacks seem almost random, linked only through their perceived relationship with capitalist society. They alienate positive influences such as science, culture, conservation and law enforcement. The well-meaning but misguided revolutionaries of *Historia de Mayta* become, in this novel, fearsome national terrorists with little to no human dimension.

As menacing as Shining Path may be in *Lituma en los Andes*, the detectives learn that the group was not responsible for the three disappearances in Naccos, but rather that the men were killed and their bodies disposed of by other villagers, as a sacrificial offering to the apus, or indigenous gods of the Andes. Ironically, this improbable solution is presented to the detectives at the beginning of the novel. Adriana, the fortune teller, had prophesized one victim's fate: "lo iban a sacrificar para aplacer a los malignos que tantos daños causan en la zona. Y que lo habían escogido a él porque era impuro" (41). Lituma makes a joke of Adriana's story, parodying his own unbelievable report to his superiors: "Sacrificado de manera aún no identificada para aplacar malignos de los Andes, punto. Escrito en las líneas de su mano, dice testigo, punto. Caso cerrado, punto. Atentamente, Jefe de Puesto, punto. Cabo Lituma, punto" (46). Lituma's sarcasm illustrates the conflict between the Peruvian police's narrow worldview and local indigenous practices.

The solution to this mystery is deeply unsettling for Lituma. As he did in *¿Quién mató a Palomino Molero?*, the detective attempts to solve the case, but the entire process of detection turns out to be meaningless because the solution is one that he

could never have deduced on his own. It is only through his conversations with Adriana, as well as his more conceptual discussions with the scientist Paul Stirmsson, that Lituma is able to recognize what has happened in Naccos. Despite his strong desire to solve the case independently, he ultimately has to accept the explanation given to him by others. His traditional deductive skills and logic are a liability in this case. Unfortunately for him, Lituma is a classic-style detective trapped in an anti-detective novel.

While the irrational character of the villagers' actions in *Lituma* would seem the stuff of fiction, this too found its inspiration in Vargas Llosa's real-life investigation. In spite of the fact that President Belaúnde envisioned the *Comisión investigativa* as an objective fact-finding mission, the investigators found ways to insert their own conjectures and opinions into the *Informe*. One of the more startling examples of the *Comisión's* subjective evaluations is its commentary on the religious nature of the burials of the journalists. Its conclusion that the journalists' burials were ritualistic in character, or possibly based on some kind of magical religious beliefs, is based on conjecture and little to no anthropological scholarship. In the following excerpt from the *Informe*, I have italicized the phrases that highlight the imprecision of the *Comisión's* conclusions, as well as its shallow basis for judgment:

*Los antropólogos que asesoran a la Comisión han encontrado ciertos indicios, por las características de las heridas sufridas por las víctimas y la manera como éstas fueron enterradas, de un crimen que, a la vez que político-social, pudo encerrar matices mágico-religiosos... De otro lado, casi todos los cadáveres presentan huellas de haber sido especialmente maltratados en la boca y en los ojos. Es también creencia extendida, en el mundo andino, que la víctima sacrificada debe ser privada de los ojos, para que no pueda reconocer a sus victimarios y de la lengua para que no pueda hablar y delatarlos, y que sus tobillos deben ser fracturados para que no pueda retornar a molestar a quienes le dieron muerte. Las lesiones de los cadáveres descritas por la autopsia apuntan a una cierta coincidencia con estas creencias." (37-8)*

This section illustrates what Kimberly Theidon describes as "ethnic absolutism," or the essentialist view of cultural difference. In particular, the vague wording and anthropological generalizations suggest the prevalence of conjecture and wild imagination over fact.

However, while the *Comisión* can only go so far as to vaguely point out the possibility of ancient religious beliefs as a motive for the Uchuraccay murders,

Vargas Llosa has more freedom to assert this idea in *Lituma en los Andes*. While there are many questions about the character of the journalists' murder in Uchuraccay, there is no doubting that the Naccos murders are a form of ritualistic sacrifice. In the novel, Vargas Llosa emphasizes the importance of ritual sacrifice and magico-religious beliefs to the point of making them fundamental to the Naccos murders.

In the novel, the murders fall outside of any logical, rational paradigm that is familiar to the detective. In the Andes, Lituma finds himself in a world lost in time, still steeped in ancestral beliefs and superstitions that are so deep-seated that not even the Conquest could eradicate them: "Cuando llegaron los españoles y destruyeron los ídolos y las huacas y bautizaron a los indios y prohibieron los cultos paganos, creyeron que esas idolatrías se acabarían. Lo cierto es que, entreveradas con los ritos cristianos, siguen vigentes" (Vargas Llosa, *Lituma* 174). For Vargas Llosa, Naccos is precisely the "savage life" that he mentions in his Nobel Prize speech.

Yet despite the author's reductive view of highland life and practices, he acknowledges the ways in which these events did not develop *sui generis*. The villagers' emphasis on ancient religious practices in *Lituma en los Andes* is rooted on a collective fear of economic collapse and the destruction of a way of life. Naccos endured one economic disaster when the Santa Rita mine closed, leaving many villagers without work. The national highway has become the village's new economic lifeline, but throughout the novel the villagers continue to fear that they will lose their jobs and their livelihoods once again. The general atmosphere, then, is one of desperation and lack of control over the future. In such a precarious economic situation, the workers will do just about anything in the name of self-preservation; in this case, they turn to a pre-modern form of violence.

The village barkeeper Dionisio and his wife Adriana take advantage of the villagers' feelings of helplessness and despair, promising to solve all their problems and to maintain their way of life. Adriana assumes the role of leader and advisor to the villagers, telling them what they need to do in order to take control of their lives again:

*Ustedes no tienen que pagar nada a nadie por vivir inseguros y miedosos y ser las ruinas que son. Eso se da de balde. Se parará la carretera y se quedarán sin trabajo, llegarán los terrucos y harán una carnicería, caerá el huayco y nos borrará a todos del mapa. Los malignos saldrán de las montañas a*

## Polifonía

*celebrarlo bailando un cachapari de despedida a la vida y habrá tantos cóndores revoloteando que quedará el cielo tapado. A menos que... (272-3)*

Adriana's speech trails off in this way, referring obliquely to the murder and sacrifice of the three men. Adriana makes the consequences of inaction very clear to her audience, taking advantage of their fear of unemployment, stagnation, starvation and death. By drastically limiting the villagers' options for survival in their own minds, she gives them no choice but to take part in the violence.

Adriana's role in the crime is complex. On the one hand, she instigated the killings and convinced the villagers to commit a crime they otherwise may not have considered or even imagined. On the other hand, she herself did not commit murder. She provided the impetus, but it was the collective group that committed the acts of violence. In his study of scapegoat rituals, René Girard explains that this kind of violence is impossible without

*[...] an eminently manipulable mass to be used by the manipulators for their evil purposes, people who will allow themselves to be trapped in the persecutors' representation of persecution, people capable of belief where the scapegoat is concerned. (40)*

To carry out this act of violence, Adriana needs the villagers of Naccos as much as they need her. To Lituma's dismay, it is obvious to him that the villagers carried out these murders under duress and that no individual actor may be held responsible, not even Adriana.

### A Reimagined Bacchanal

Running alongside the theme of Andean mythology are Vargas Llosa's thinly-veiled references to Greek myth, especially those relating to Adriana and her husband, Dionisio. Earlier in her life, Adriana helped her then-boyfriend Timoteo to kill a *pishtaco*<sup>1</sup> that had been terrorizing their village and killing young women; subsequently, she and Timoteo moved to Naccos, where Timoteo deserted Adriana and she met Dionisio. In the corresponding Greek myth, Ariadne helps Theseus to kill the Minotaur, a monster that demanded regular sacrifices of young men and women. After killing the Minotaur, Ariadne and Theseus move to Naxos, where he

---

<sup>1</sup> A *pishtaco* is a mythical monster that attacks Andean Indians to rob them of their fat in order to make church bells, lubricate industrial machinery, or even pay down Peru's large foreign debt.



abandons Ariadne and she meets Dionysus. In the adventures of Adriana and Timoteo, the *pishtaco* takes the place of the Minotaur, placing this ancient Greek myth squarely within a Peruvian cultural context.

Some critics have censured Mario Vargas Llosa's juxtaposition of Greek myth and Andean society in this novel as another expression of anti-indigenous sentiment. Misha Kokotovic argues that the author's allusion to Greek myth "draws a sharp contrast between the barbarism overcome by the West, and that which still prevails in the Andes" (161). While Kokotovic makes a fair point within the context of his reading of the novel, my view of the significance of the references to Greek mythology differs somewhat. Vargas Llosa's references are not to Greek mythology in general, but more specifically to Euripides's tragedy *The Bacchae*. These references establish the novel's essential tension, that of the struggle between the order imposed by the national government and the lawlessness of the people of Naccos.

*The Bacchae* tells the story of the Greek god Dionysius's punishment of his mortal cousin, King Pentheus, for refusing to worship him as a deity. The play focuses on the antagonistic relationship between Dionysus and Pentheus, as the latter attempts to staunch the power of the Dionysian cult. Vargas Llosa borrows thematically from *The Bacchae* to create the character of Dionisio who, like Dionysius, has a reputation in the highlands for spreading moral degradation and social disorder wherever he goes: "más que patrón de un putarral ambulante. Sí, sí, clarísimo. Pero ¿qué más? ¿Demonio? ¿Ángel? ¿Dios?" (Vargas Llosa, *Lituma* 244). Dionisio lives up to his name, embodying divine and diabolical qualities, and showing himself capable of bringing entire villages into his ritual bacchanal.

In *The Bacchae*, Dionysius's cult suddenly turns on Pentheus and kills him, tearing his body to pieces. In much the same way, the villagers of Naccos abruptly decide to kill Pedro, Casimiro and Demetrio, men who have committed no crime against them. René Girard highlights the spontaneous and histrionic nature of this kind of collective violence:

It would not have been a case of premeditated assassination. Everything suggests a crowd whose intentions were initially pacific; a disorganized mob that for unknown reasons... came to a high pitch of mass hysteria. The crowd finally hurled itself on one individual; even though he had no particular qualifications for this role, he served to polarize all the fears, anxieties, and hostilities of the crowd. His violent death provided the necessary outlet for the mass anguish, and restored peace. (140)

From this description, the distinctions between individuality and collectivity become startlingly clear. Separately, the villagers may have been pacific and incapable of murder, but as a group they allow the collective needs to consume individual reason.

The central theme of *The Bacchae* is the struggle for power over the people of Thebes. As heir to the Theban throne, Pentheus must view the world in political terms. Dionysus only seeks more members of his spiritual community and has no need for the politics of the mortal world. Pentheus uses all of his power to rid the town of Dionysus and his followers, from interrogation to arrest to threats of murder. However, Dionysus cannot be dissuaded and in the end, Dionysus and his bacchae rise up and kill Pentheus. Friedrich Nietzsche describes the absolute and terrifying power of the Dionysian force in *The Birth of Tragedy*:

*Is the Dionysian entitled to exist at all? Should it not be forcibly eradicated from Hellenic soil? Certainly, the poet tells us, if only that were possible: but the god Dionysus is too powerful: his most intelligent opponent—such as Pentheus in the Bacchae—is unsuspectingly caught in his spell and subsequently plunges to his doom under its influence. (68)*

The struggle between Dionysus and Pentheus, and the threat it poses to society, is played out in Lituma en los Andes, with the villagers of Naccos playing the *bacchae* and Lituma as Pentheus. As the representative of state-sanctioned justice, Lituma uses reason and law in his struggle against Dionisio, but is defeated. He admits this loss in the form of regret: “Me arrepiento de haberme entercado tanto en saber lo que les pasó a éstos. Mejor me quedaba sospechando” (Vargas Llosa, *Lituma* 312). This reaction illustrates Nietzsche’s description of “the tremendous horror which grips man when he suddenly loses his way among the cognitive forms of the phenomenal world, as the principle of reason in any of its forms appears to break down” (22). In a broader sense, *Lituma en los Andes* is not just about a failed murder investigation: the struggle between Lituma and Dionisio, like the one between Pentheus and Dionysus, is Vargas Llosa’s take on the universal conflict between order and lawlessness.

### **Conclusion: Vargas Llosa on the “other” Peru**

In many ways, Vargas Llosa casts himself as a descendant of D.F. Sarmiento, and there can be no questioning the influence of the latter’s 1845 essay *Facundo* on

Vargas Llosa's politics and work.<sup>2</sup> Sarmiento's assessment of nineteenth-century Latin America's cultural maladies helped lock much of the region in an imagined struggle between *civilización y barbarie*, a binary opposition that has become central to the Latin American consciousness. Like Sarmiento, Vargas Llosa portrays his national culture as threatened by an atavistic and invasive sort of barbarism that could only be conquered through a dedicated push towards modernity. And despite the myriad differences in the political landscape of 19th century Argentina and 21st century Peru, the concept of modernity looks quite similar for these two: a break with the indigenous past, greater influence of institutions and national government, and stronger ties to Europe and the United States, geographical spaces that are representative of civilization and progress.

Vargas Llosa's work also owes much to Sarmiento in literary terms. As in Facundo, the intertextuality in Vargas Llosa's work is directed at an audience of his fellow intellectuals and readers who would recognize his references and points of comparison. Just as Sarmiento reached well outside of Argentina towards the Middle Ages and the Orient to make clear his point about this national culture, Vargas Llosa deploys 19th century thinkers and Greek mythology in his work, employing the vocabulary and imagery most readily available to the intellectual elite of Latin America. At times, such as his 1990 article in *Harper's* magazine, the echoes of Sarmiento are evident: "It is tragic to destroy what is still living, still a driving cultural possibility, even if it is archaic; but I am afraid we shall have to make a choice" (Vargas Llosa, "Questions of Conquest" 53). He goes on to argue that while indigenous Peruvians live within their closed societies in the geographically isolated Andean regions, they will never achieve this goal of integration:

*It is only when they move to the cities that they have the opportunity to mingle with the other Peru. The price they must pay for integration is high—renunciation of their culture, their language, their beliefs, their traditions and customs, and the adoption of the culture of their ancient masters. (52)*

He defines integration in absolute terms, as the rejection of one culture and the adoption of another, with little scope for compromise.

One central aspect of Vargas Llosa's concept of progress and modernization in Peru is the value of the individual above that of the collective. He establishes a binary to pit the individual, as the source of rational and intelligent thought, against the

---

<sup>2</sup> Deborah Cohn, Francisco Lasarte and Misha Kokotovic have all drawn convincing parallels between Vargas Llosa's political project for Peru and Sarmiento's definitions of *civilización* and *barbarie*.

collective, as ruled by passions and easily manipulated. The excessive reliance on collectivity is the source of many of Peru's problems, even contributing to the downfall of the Inca Empire:

*Those Indians who let themselves be knifed or blown up into pieces that somber afternoon in Cajamarca Square lacked the ability to make their own decisions either with the sanction of authority or indeed against it and were incapable of taking individual initiative, of acting with a certain degree of independence according to the changing circumstances. (49)*

He questions the ethics of collectivity by noting that within the Inca empire, "the individual could not morally question the social organism of which he was a part, because he existed only as an integral atom of that organism and because for him the dictates of the state could not be separated from morality" (51). He points to what he sees as a moral deficiency in Inca culture because, in contrast with modern and Westernized cultures, the Incas did not conceive of individual thought or dissent. For Vargas Llosa, this is the origin of closed, insular, hierarchical communities and institutions in Peru and, by extension, the origin of the violence that has afflicted the country for so long.

This belief in the inherent value of individualism is apparent in all three of Vargas Llosa's detective novels. In *Historia de Mayta*, the failure of the Jauja insurrection is caused by the revolutionaries' concern for allegiance at the expense of independent thought. In *¿Quién mató a Palomino Molero?*, it is the Peruvian Navy that displays the group mentality and passion for obedience that is so antithetical to Vargas Llosa's worldview. It forms a closed community that shuns outsiders and outside intervention, creating obstacles to the investigative process. The naval officers in *¿Quién mató a Palomino Molero?* clearly consider themselves above the law, even in the case of the brutal murder of Palomino Molero. In *Lituma en los Andes*, Vargas Llosa regards closed communities as vulnerable to manipulation by strong and persuasive leaders. After the murders were committed in Naccos, one villager notes that the entire situation "fue una gran engañifa, [Dionisio y Adriana] nos metieron el dedo a su gusto" (310), emphasizing the event's negative effects on the participants of the murderous acts as well as the victims.

Mario Vargas Llosa's faith in the principle of individualism may also be his reason for using the detective novel. He capitalizes on the conventional ideology associated with detective fiction to reinforce his prioritization of individualism and western concepts of rationality and progress. However, these novels offer this political

perspective on a slightly more subtle level than his essays from the same period, providing more questions than answers for readers. As detective stories, they are built on the practice of investigating and re-evaluating facts and sources of information, and they aid the author in his constant probing of the current issues in Peruvian politics, economy and culture. To return to Linda Hutcheon's description of historiographic metafiction, the rewriting of the past within the context of fiction can be a way to open that past to the present, and can prompt readers to re-evaluate what they believe they know about that past. At the same time, these novels frustrate reader expectations by disrupting the progression from mystery to solution. For differing reasons in all three novels, the cases remain open, unsolved or unresolved in some way; the guilty parties go unpunished, justice is not served and no one can be satisfied with the outcome of the detective work.

In Sarmiento's 1845 essay about the struggle between civilization and barbarism in rural Argentina, he presented the need for civilization (defined generally as European cultural, economic and political systems) to combat and decimate the barbarous native population. In *Historia de Mayta, ¿Quién mató a Palomino Molero?* and *Lituma en los Andes*, Mario Vargas Llosa presents a similar struggle between a civil police force and transgressors who break civil laws and moral codes. However, the forces of civilization do not necessarily win out in these three novels. As he learned in his investigation into the massacre at Uchuraccay, when two unyielding value systems clash, both sides lose. In *Historia de Mayta*, the narrator never writes his story because he will never fully understand the tragedy of Jauja or its effect on Alejandro Mayta. In *¿Quién mató a Palomino Molero?*, both the guilty and the innocent are punished, and many of their secrets will go with them to their graves. In *Lituma en los Andes*, like in Uchuraccay, the only justice served is poetic, as the murderers come to regret their actions and are indirectly punished with the loss of their community and their livelihoods.

Yet Mario Vargas Llosa is not alone in his view of the indigenous people of the Andes; the region has been ripe for misinterpretation by authors and artists who take a similar view of their world as primitive and backward. This view is highly evident in Claudia Llosa's 2006 film *Madeinusa*, which takes place during Holy Week in the Andean highlands and focuses on the relationship between the young female title character and a Limeño visitor named, unsurprisingly, Salvador. Juli A Kroll points out the cultural fantasy portrayed in the film, that illustrates an "enduring tendency to show indigenous religious practices as fetishistic, even animistic indo-Catholicism, following the colonial-era stereotype characterizing indigenous peoples' behavior as *ocio-embriaguez-idolatría*" (114). It appears that even as we

move into the twenty-first century, one of the greatest threats to the culture of the Andean people comes not from the primitive nature of their own society but from critical and destructive misinterpretation of it from their fellow Peruvians.

As one of the most significant and polemical figures in Peruvian literature and politics, Vargas Llosa has received intense critical attention even before winning the Nobel Prize for Literature in 2010. Unfortunately, it is novels such as *La ciudad y los perros* and *La guerra del fin del mundo* that interest most reviewers and critics, while *Historia de Mayta, ¿Quién mató a Palomino Molero?* and *Lituma en los Andes* remain relatively overlooked in his literary oeuvre, even described by one critic as “minor, more or less throw-away works” (Larsen 176). Yet by viewing these three novels in progression and as a critical and literary response to the events at Uchuraccay, as I have done in this article, we capture a unique image of the relationship between the author and his work. The cathartic process of writing allowed Vargas Llosa to explore his responses to the Uchuraccay massacre, his participation in a challenging investigation, and the intense public scrutiny he faced as a consequence; the end result is a series of novels that crystalize the neoliberal platform that fueled his failed bid for the Peruvian presidency in 1990. The experience seems to have left a strong impression, along with his failed bid for the presidency of Peru, and Vargas Llosa subsequently distanced himself somewhat from the minutiae of Peruvian politics in both his actions and writing. In the twenty-first century, he has embraced Spain as his new physical and spiritual homeland, entering into Peruvian politics only to critique or endorse candidates. His writing from the late 1990s to the present is the work of a literary nomad, traveling from the Dominican Republic to Ireland to French Polynesia, and engaging political issues such as dictatorship and nationalism in a broader and more theoretical sense. One might argue that since the publication of *Lituma en los Andes*, Vargas Llosa’s view of Peruvian society and politics shifts: like his titular character, he is looking in from the outside.

Reading these three novels outside of their relationship to the events at Uchuraccay, one might find them lacking in substance. To read them in context and as a progressive group, however, allows readers and critics to take into account the complex relationship between reality and fiction. In his 2010 Nobel Prize lecture, the author reiterates one of his common themes, that a writer must lie in order to tell the truth: “The lies of literature become truths through us, the readers transformed, infected with longings and, through the fault of fiction, permanently questioning a mediocre reality” (“In Praise”). *Historia de Mayta, ¿Quién mató a Palomino Molero?*, and *Lituma en los Andes* fulfill this literary mission, transforming

readers into witnesses on behalf of the author and illustrating for them that a lie, a fictional account is often the most direct path towards finding the truth.

## Bibliography

- Boland, Roy C. "Demonios y lectores: génesis y reescritura de ¿Quién mató a Palomino Molero?" *Antípodas: Journal of Hispanic Studies of the University of Auckland* 1 (1988): 161-82. Print.
- Cohn, Deborah N. "Regreso a la barbarie": Intertextual Paradigms for Peru's Descent into Chaos in Lituma en los Andes." *Latin American Literary Review* 28.55 (2000): 27-45. Print.
- Degregori, Carlos Iván. "Return to the Past." *The Shining Path of Perú*. Ed. David Scott Palmer. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992. 33-44. Print.
- Girard, René. *Violence and the Sacred*. Trans. Patrick Gregory. London: Continuum, 2005. Print.
- Hutcheon, Linda. *A Poetics of Postmodernism*. New York: Routledge, 1988. Print.
- , *The Politics of Postmodernism*. New York: Routledge, 1989. Print.
- Kokotovic, Misha. "Vargas Llosa in the Andes: The Racial Discourse of Neoliberalism." *Confluencia* 14.2 (2000): 156-67. Print.
- Kristal, Efraín. *Temptation of the Word: The Novels of Mario Vargas Llosa*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1998. Print.
- Kroll, Juli A. "Between the 'sacred' and the 'profane': Cultural fantasy in Madeinusa by Claudia Llosa." *Chasqui* 38.2 (2009): 113-125. Print.
- Larsen, Neil. "Mario Vargas Llosa: The Realist as Neo-liberal." *Journal of Latin American Cultural Studies*: Travesía 9.2 (2000): 155-179. Print.
- Lasarte, Francisco. "Mario Vargas Llosa en el laberinto: mito y modernización en Lituma en los Andes." *Reescrituras*. Ed. Nagle, Luz Rodríguez-Carranza and Marilene. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2004. 97-113. Print.
- Mandel, Ernest. *Delightful Murder: A Social History of the Crime Story*. London: Pluto Press, 1984. Print.

*Polifonía*

- Mayer, Enrique. "Peru in Deep Trouble: Mario Vargas Llosa's "Inquest in the Andes" Reexamined." *Cultural Anthropology* 6.4 (1991): 466-504. Print.
- Miller, D.A. *The Novel and the Police*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988. Print.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *The Birth of Tragedy*. Trans. Douglas Smith. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. Print.
- Salazar, Jorge. "Historia de Mayta: La nueva novela de Mario Vargas Llosa." *Caretas* November 19 (1984). Print.
- Theidon, Kimberly. "'How we learned to kill our brother'?: Memory, Morality, and Reconciliation in Peru." *Bulletin de l'Institute français d'études andines* 29.3 (2000): 539-554. Print.
- Vargas Llosa, Mario. *A Writer's Reality*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1991. Print.
- . *Contra viento y marea* (1964-1988). Vol. III. Barcelona: Seix Barral, 1990. Print.
- . *Historia de Mayta*. Biblioteca breve. 1a ed. Barcelona: Seix Barral, 1984. Print.
- . "In Praise of Literature and Reading." *Nobelprize.org*. Nobel Media AB 2014. Web. 15 Sep 2014.  
<[http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel\\_prizes/literature/laureates/2010/vargas\\_llosa-lecture\\_en.html](http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/literature/laureates/2010/vargas_llosa-lecture_en.html)>
- . *Lituma en los Andes*. Barcelona: Planeta, 1993. Print.
- . "Questions of Conquest: What Columbus Wrought, and What He Did Not." *Harper's* December 1990: 45-53. Print.
- . *¿Quién mató a Palomino Molero?* Barcelona: Seix Barral, 1986. Print.
- . *La verdad de las mentiras*. Madrid: Alfagura, 2002. Print.
- Vargas Llosa, Mario, Abraham Guzmán Figueroa, and Mario Castro Arenas. *Informe de la comisión investigadora de los sucesos de Uchuraccay*. Lima: Editora Peru, 1983. Print.