

# The museography of disaster: Museums faced with the material traces of extreme violence<sup>1</sup>

Elisabeth Anstett

Since the publication of the book edited by Appadurai in 1986 and especially since Kopytoff's contribution, we have known that objects have a social life.<sup>2</sup> From that point on, research on material culture has taken a decidedly culturalist turn, based on the notion that objects have a social and cultural biography. Simultaneously a trace, document, and support for social memory, every object, every artefact, is indeed the product of a world. It offers the possibility of directly reconstructing practices (ways of doing), representations (ways of thinking), and value systems. But to what extent can things render extreme violence intelligible? I have chosen to focus more particularly on museums dedicated to mass crimes and genocides in order to understand the place attributed to objects and the role they are given.

Indeed, museums have also radically evolved during the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Alongside museums of art and history, Europe has indeed witnessed the birth of museums of society, characterised by the desire to reconstitute a unique social experience, whether it be of rural life or the carrying out of a profession, or even radical and often violent collective experiences such as slavery, political persecution, or genocide. And yet, in spite of the breadth and variety of experiences of extreme violence the world has undergone in the 20<sup>th</sup> century alone, and in spite of the very large number of museographic spaces that deal with mass crimes, the museography of violence and the specific questions it raises remains a relatively new field.

Yet, all museography (through the discourse used and the scenography) offers a staging of the collective representations of history; these staging enable one – or more than one – society to account for a complex and painful past. Museums are thus places where something is said and shown concerning a collective past. In Europe, as elsewhere in the world, these museums present a narration of the past which simultaneously reflects and affects collective representations of extreme violence. In this regard, the Western museums I will mention here reveal the aesthetic and moral choices made in Europe to show and represent violence.

---

<sup>1</sup> This text is the result of research that was made possible by the support of the *Gilder Lehrman Center for the Study of Slavery, Resistance, and Abolition* at Yale University, where I was in residence in 2011. My thanks to all its members, and especially to Melissa McGrath, Richard Huzzey and Richard Rabinowitz for their warm welcome.

<sup>2</sup> Igor Kopytoff, "The cultural biography of things: Commodification as process", in Arjun Appadurai (ed.), *The social life of things: Commodities in cultural perspective*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986): 63–91.

© *African Yearbook of Rhetoric* 6, 1, 2015, Online ISSN 2305-7785:

Elisabeth Anstett, "The museography of disaster: Museums faced with the material traces of extreme violence", pp. 51 - 61.

## What objects are we dealing with?

Genocides, and more generally crimes committed on a wide scale, have led to unique material cultures, very different from the material cultures of martial contexts. When it is a matter of mass violence, we find ourselves faced with a material culture that – by contrast – bears the mark of banality.

On the victim's side, this culture remains in effect marked by poverty and a lack of security, because it always involves a material culture of survival, subsistence, and resistance to annihilation, which develops within the narrow and fragile scope of an aesthetic of the insignificant. The objects that speak to us of the experience of violence are objects from everyday life, completely ordinary objects that are often entirely common and domestic: a basket, a dish, a pair of shoes. Such is the case with the series of men's combs or of the various iron keys collected from around the execution site of the Paneriai forest or in the Vilnius Ghetto, and displayed by the Museum of Genocide Victims in Vilnius, Lithuania.<sup>3</sup> Social Anthropologist Maartje Hoogsteijns reminds us, that these small things “never seem to really draw our attention, except when they are not usable or when they are missed” insisting in passing on the concern for the “humility of these objects” from everyday life.<sup>4</sup>

On the side of the executioners, when it goes beyond the usual weapons (here, a pistol or gun; there, a machete) made by the hundreds of thousands, the material culture of the perpetrators is also that of ordinary administrative or police work. The “banality of evil” pointed out by Arendt also refers to the banality of the work tools: handcuffs, typewriters, chairs, tables, or seals made of galvanized metal which may occasionally be transformed into weapons of torture. These are the mundane utensils of a bureaucracy of death (a paper shredder, a telephone made of black Bakelite, a kepi) that Lithuanian photographer Indre Serpytyte has especially chosen to show in her work, “A state of silence (1944-1991)”, dedicated to a reflection on the work of the NKVD in the Baltic countries and its social resonance.<sup>5</sup>

## What do these objects show?

These objects illustrate first the conditions of life (and survival) of the detainees and the victims of violence: there are tools, dishes, and less frequently clothing. The material with which they are made is ordinary and

---

<sup>3</sup> See the rooms dedicated to the museography of the Holocaust: <http://genocid.lt/muziejus/en/1896/a/>.

<sup>4</sup> Maartje Hoogsteijns, “Bousculée par les objets”, in Alexandra Schüssler (ed.), *Villa soviética—objets soviétiques: import-export*, (Geneva: Infolio-éditions and Musée d'ethnographie de Genève, 2009): 143.

<sup>5</sup> See a presentation of Indre Serpytyte's photographs on her site: <http://www.indre-serpytyte.com/>.

perishable, such as wood or cloth, like the prisoner's fleece jacket from the Gulag next to very ordinary aluminium spoons or misshapen cafeteria mess kits in the Gulag Museum of the Memorial organisation.<sup>6</sup> They are often objects that have come from the retrieval, recycling, or re-purposing of other objects: in this regard, they represent the waste of the material culture of the dominant classes. Writer Edouard Glissant<sup>7</sup> who was interested in the slave trade, speaks of a culture of "dispossession".

These are everyday objects, but also sometimes objects that can be associated with popular events and as such take part in the restitution of particular intentions. This is the case of the dented metal plaque used to mark the tomb of Anatoli Martchenko, who died in the Gulag in 1986, and that was offered by the family to the museum of the Memorial organisation after the transfer of the dissident's ashes.<sup>8</sup> Some artefacts may thus be directly or indirectly associated with key moments in the history of subjugated populations or the victims of violence. They then refer both to singular events, which are potentially simultaneous but always unique, and to recurring processes, involving complex practices that take place over time with sometimes a possible historic evolution. This is one of the first difficulties faced by museographers, namely, having to situate these extremely ordinary objects chronologically, geographically, and socially. Yet this is not the only difficulty raised by these objects.

### **What problems do they raise?**

These objects first raise the problem of their rarity, because the material culture of extreme violence was not collected in a timely way. Indeed, it is important to stress the limited and belated nature, and even in some cases the total absence, of collection policies. It is clear that the material culture of the victims was ascribed no value at the time the violence occurred. Quite to the contrary, the system of signs, to use Baudrillard's words,<sup>9</sup> in which these objects were produced and used bears the mark of genocidal or criminal social systems. As objects used by the enemy, opponents, or those who had to be destroyed, these artefacts were often, in this regard, considered to be waste, and were marked as having a negative value.

Even more than for personal property, the lack of a heritage policy for

---

<sup>6</sup> See these photographed objects on the website of the organization in the section dedicated to the museum: <http://www.memo.ru/museum/eng/handmade/neizv990.htm>

<sup>7</sup> Edouard Glissant, *Caribbean discourse: Selected essays*, (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1989).

<sup>8</sup> For the museum catalogue, see: <http://www.memo.ru/museum/rus/handmade/neizv9912.htm>

<sup>9</sup> Jean Baudrillard, *The system of objects*, (London-New York: Verso, 1996).

immovable property should be emphasised. In Europe, there has been no global, concerted, and systematic preservation of detention, torture, or execution facilities, nor any attempt to preserve the worlds that were the target of the destruction. Whether it be the sites of violence of the Spanish Civil War or Republican villages, the Gulag camps, places where genocides and crimes against humanity were committed in Bosnia, or even the areas of the Holocaust, the shtetls and the old ghettos, buildings (precarious or not) were most often left to their inevitable decay, when they were not purely and simply subject to policies of systematic destruction. While it is true that objects are difficult to find, the places which are emblematic of terror and violence are also frequently lacking.

However, the material culture of extreme violence (of slavery, deportation, forced labour, or even torture and execution) also presents problems of preservation. Even when objects have been collected, they are not always correctly preserved, in the sense that their history is only rarely documented, and their value is often underestimated. Thus, it has not at all (or only slightly) been possible to document the social life of these objects and the symbolic spaces they supported. Little is known, therefore, about the social life of these objects. Concerning this topic, anthropologist Christine Chivallon, who has long worked on the memory of slavery in the Caribbean, is correct in emphasising a normative discord between the different value systems (those of the victims and those of the society which has to preserve the traces). The memorial and truly patrimonial scope of these objects has in this regard been largely underestimated, and Chivallon even speaks about it as a “gap of memory” in the national heritage.<sup>10</sup>

### **What status are objects given?**

As a source of knowledge and support for private and collective memories, these objects are thus treated most often as “signs” rather than “traces”, to use the terms of historian Carlo Ginzburg.<sup>11</sup> These artefacts are, in effect, most often mobilized to simply attest to a time period, and more for their illustrative value rather than their documentary nature. The specifically material, physical, and aesthetic dimension of these objects go unquestioned in the end. There is therefore a great risk of obliterating the scope of these artefacts (or even of negating a part of their intrinsic nature as “remainder”) by looking at them superficially.

Here, the controversy from a few years ago that opposed art historian Georges Didi-Huberman and writer and documentary director Claude

---

<sup>10</sup> Christine Chivallon, “On the registers of Caribbean memory of slavery”, in *Cultural Studies* 22, 6, (2008): 870-891.

<sup>11</sup> Carlo Ginzburg, *Threads and traces: True, false, fictive*, (University of California Press, 2012).

Lanzmann concerning the photographic and filmic representation of the Holocaust can serve as an illustration. The historian, in defending the very legitimacy of scholarly commentary, recalled that every object – which includes photography – is simultaneously a veil and a tear that of course obliterates reality, but also opens a window onto lost lives<sup>12</sup>, and he makes a plea for taking the documentary nature of the image into account. The director, on the other hand, who resisted the simply illustrative use of images and claimed in various interviews given to French newspapers<sup>13</sup> that the horror of mass violence (speaking specifically of genocide) could not be expressed visually or materially, asserted that any representation of this violence would fall short of reality and would be a lie that filled up the void left by the death of the victims. The very possibility of causing objects to speak is not, therefore, so straightforward.

Paradoxically, while the second half of the 20th century has seen the spread of a veritable frenzy of national heritage, it should still be recognized that some historical facts have resisted or escaped this frenetic activity. It is therefore interesting to ask, why? Why have the enslaving of human beings, their abduction, and the systematic torture of thousands of persons or even the murders committed on a wide scale not automatically caused frenetic museum activity everywhere, in the same way that wars have been treated, for example? To try to answer this question, I would note that there are a few museums that have chosen to say something concerning extreme violence. What are thus the goals and challenges that museum spaces that precisely deal with extreme violence seek to answer? We have seen that these places represent, first of all, spaces for the formalization of collective memory, and in so doing they play – it seems to me – a dual role.

## Reconstituting a social experience

First, these museums act as a mirror of society by giving an “emic” point of view<sup>14</sup> concerning the trials of suffering, and by showing the systems of representation and values as they were perceived and lived from the inside. These objectives are often advanced by eco-museums<sup>15</sup> that encourage the reconstitution of a local experience (historically, geographically, or socially

---

<sup>12</sup> Georges Didi-Huberman, *Images in spite of all: Four photographs from Auschwitz*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008).

<sup>13</sup> Claude Lanzmann, “La Question n’est pas celle du document, mais celle de la vérité”, *Le Monde*, (19 January 2001).

<sup>14</sup> Thomas Headland, Kenneth Pike, and Marvin Harris (eds.), *Emics and etics: The insider / outsider debate*, (London: Sage, 1990).

<sup>15</sup> The concept of eco-museum was forged by George-Henri Rivière and Hugues de Varine at the beginning of the 1970s to account for the birth of a new kind of local museum, by adopting a holistic approach to the notion of heritage.

framed). To this end, it should be emphasised that museums that deal with mass violence and genocides are often institutions that favour a local approach by emphasizing a specific place. One of their main objectives is also to recount the history of a precise community. Two methods then tend to be mobilised to reconstitute a collective experience of suffering: the appeal to art and the mobilisation of virtual spaces.

Indeed, in the vast majority of the museums concerned, the reconstitution of the experience of extreme violence is done through works of art. These works (paintings, drawings, stained-glass, or sculptures often monument-sized) display the work of surviving artists as well as the work of renowned artists affected by these experiences, such as the imposing wood and metal sculpture by Camilian Demetrescu entitled “Homage to political prisoners” and shown at the Sighet museum, in Romania,<sup>16</sup> or the large installation by Israeli artist Menashe Kadishman, entitled “Shalekhet” (the dead leaves), which includes several thousand faces cut out of metal plates littering the floor of a hallway in the Jewish Museum Berlin.<sup>17</sup> Exhibiting works of art or crafts never corresponds as such to an attempt to aestheticise the horror, rather to an attempt to elliptically evoke the disaster and extend the metaphor of the unspeakable and ineffable.

More and more museums are also mobilising virtual spaces that make use of a dominant visual dimension and that open onto sound spaces (those of literary works, autobiographical testimonies, as well as musical cultures). Thus, the creation of a virtual Gulag Museum on the scale of the entire former USSR, beginning with an ambitious project entitled *Virtual Gulag Museum; Necropolis of the Gulag* developed by the St. Petersburg branch of the Memorial organisation,<sup>18</sup> the virtual museum of the occupation in Lettonia,<sup>19</sup> or even that the *Museo virtual de la Memoria Republicana de Madrid*,<sup>20</sup> tend to make it seem as though virtuality is in many cases – and especially in the post-Soviet context – the only way to reconstitute the experience of extreme violence. We might then ask whether these virtual spaces have not progressively become substitutes or stopgaps for a museography that is in many ways impossible.

---

<sup>16</sup> See a presentation of all the art works exhibited at the museum-memorial at Sighet: [http://www.memorialsighet.ro/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=525&Itemid=159&lang=en](http://www.memorialsighet.ro/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=525&Itemid=159&lang=en).

<sup>17</sup> See a presentation of the installation on the museum’s website: <http://www.jmberlin.de/main/EN/01-Exhibitions/04-installations.php>.

<sup>18</sup> <http://www.gulagmuseum.org/showObject.do?generalSearch=true&textValue=&language=2>.

<sup>19</sup> [www.occupation.lv](http://www.occupation.lv).

<sup>20</sup> <http://museomemoriarepublicana.blogspot.fr/>.

## Offering a reading / making meaning

Museums that deal with extreme violence are in fact responding to a second objective, as they also serve to offer an analytical reading (historical, sociological or geographical) of the institutions of death they are describing. In this regard, cultural institutions also reconstitute an “etic” point of view – primarily political in nature – developed outside of the close experience of violence, one that is likely to be supported by comparative analyses and thus nuance or bring some measure of relativism to the presentation of facts, data, or opinions that the larger public holds as certain or given.

These approaches are generally the ones adopted by state museum institutions whose job is to recapitulate a subject at the scale of (and intended for) an entire country. Yet quite remarkably, we have to admit that there has been a sustained absence of a national museum or a state museum specifically dedicated to mass crimes that were conducted by (and in) the country. This is at least the case in Russia (for the Gulag), France (for slavery or the slave trade), Spain (for the Civil War), and in Poland (for the Holocaust). The historical knowledge and museographic expertise are not lacking; instead, it is the possibility of ensuring the reconstitution of the collective experience of violence in a dispassionate context that seems to be missing. Here again, it is a matter of social experience and political consensus. For the moment, the material culture produced by extreme violence is most often used for a peripheral discourse, out of sync with its subject, and objects are often invoked to speak of things other than the collective experience of violence. They are used to speak of community identity, local history or symbolic events. This has occurred to the point that the Canadian historian Carlo Celius has spoken of a “process of repression”.<sup>21</sup> I will now try to shed light on the motives for this repression when it takes place in the museum.

## Structural problems

Museographic reconstitution of mass crimes remains structurally complex. Beyond the specifically moral question related to the exhibition of suffering and the fundamentally voyeuristic nature of this type of exhibition as opposed to the negationist dimension of their hiding it, the complexity of reconstituting the experience of subjugation, torture, or execution at / by the museum is related to several elements. The first element is the disappearance of victims, as well as of the material traces of their suffering, of the places where they were abused or imprisoned, as indicated above. Let me make a remark in passing. This same lack of evidence, this same absence of traces, opens the

---

<sup>21</sup> Carlo A. Celius, “L’Esclavage au musée. Récit d’un refoulement”, in *L’Homme*, 38, 145, (1998): 249-261.

way for the denial of the Holocaust and will lead some to claim that the gas chambers never existed. In the museum, this recurring lack of traces often leads to staging what remains, like a reconstruction and sometimes of "re-creation" enabling the larger public to see and understand the violence experienced.

Overcoming this absence, the structural lack of artefacts, thus poses very particular ethical and practical problems for the general treatment of violence in museums. These problems are particularly linked to the fabrication and the use of "fakes" (fake woods, fake doors, fake tracks, and fake watchtowers) that might be compared to a falsifying practice of memory if it were not history. They are also linked to the harm they may cause to victims and their descendants by the potentially parodic or caricatured nature of some of these staged scenes.

Second, the complexity of a museographic treatment of violence stems from a plurality of temporalities, in other words, of the difficulty in reconstituting facts referring to events (one time) and processes (historic, sometimes very long), as discussed earlier. These facts can lead to different readings (community or ethnic, political, religious, and moral) that may at times be completely contradictory. A treatment that simultaneously involves the synchrony of the event and the diachrony of the historic process therefore requires, on the one hand, determining what took place, through the support of the work of historians to identify causes and effects, but also, on the other hand, establishing a social consensus on the nature of the facts themselves. The time of the museographic treatment thus always attempts to be, if not contemporary with, then at least close in time to that of the violence, for the risk remains that it may ignite (or reignite) polemics and reawaken divisions. Here again, the discourse of museum specialists assumes a fundamental significance, at the same time that it needs to be used in spite of the sparse presence of objects, or even in their absence.

### **Museographic impasses**

It should be noted, however, that in the face of the significant challenges posed by the museography of mass violence, not all attempts at dealing with the issue have been met with resounding success. It is now possible to identify a certain number of impasses in the attempt of reconstituting the experience of collective suffering through a museum display.

A first limit is represented by the use of allegory and its corollaries, hyperbole and metaphor. This type of approach can also be found in many a museum staging. In light of the lack of evidence and traces, there is a great temptation to appeal to the work of museum specialists or visual artists who have the benefit of using an abstract and symbolic dimension of language and avoiding the figurative or narrative elements usually mobilised by other



media. This is the case, for example, of the general scenography of the Jewish Museum Berlin, generally impacted by the choices of architect Daniel Libeskind, who designed the buildings of the museum around the definition of three major axes symbolising the fate of the Jews: the axis of exile, the axis of the Holocaust, and the axis of continuation.<sup>22</sup> The pitfalls represented by the staging of an “architecture of the void or an aesthetic of disappearance”, to use the terms of the French anthropologist J. Assayag,<sup>23</sup> reside in avoiding dealing with the specifically geographic, historical, and sociological dimensions of the facts of extreme violence through a direct effect of de-contextualization. The treatment by allegories thus unquestionably lessens the real and material aspect of violence.

The philosopher Maurice Blanchot noted in regards to this context that “there is a limit at which the practice of any art becomes an affront to affliction”;<sup>24</sup> in the case of collective violence, these limits are sometimes hard to grasp and respect. These works or installations lead, in effect, to an abstraction of violence. By holding more readily to a moral reading (through sentiment or emotion) this abstraction does not allow understanding the crime from a specifically analytic perspective. By participating in a metaphoric treatment of the subjugation or destruction of human beings, allegorical discourse brings with it, in a certain way, a denial of historicity.

A second limit resides, furthermore, in the aporia of a strictly pedagogical museography. Indeed, the retrospective reconstitution of the contexts (sociological, cultural, and historical) that presided over the advent of large scale violence, gives the facts an almost inevitable nature by establishing links – which are in a way necessary – between causes and effects, especially through the use of linear chronological friezes that substantiate a chain of successive causalities. Paradoxically, the pedagogical approach thereby participates in giving the facts of violence a certain validity (the facts are explained and seem to be linked in an inevitable way). Beyond the presentation of historical objects and artefacts, we can thus only emphasize the failure of systems that rely solely on the premise of prior empathy with the victims insofar as – precisely – these installations can still be understood by visitors as a process of legitimization of the violence committed.

The last of these pitfalls, but certainly not the least, deals with the problem of “concentration camp kitsch” as expressed by writer and survivor

---

<sup>22</sup> See the 8-minute introductory film presenting the architecture of the entire Jewish Museum Berlin and its exhibits: <http://www.jmberlin.de/main/EN/00-Visitor-Information/05-film.php>.

<sup>23</sup> Jackie Assayag, “Le spectre des génocides”, in *Gradhiva*, 5, 9 (2007), Accessed October 9, 2014 from <http://gradhiva.revues.org/658>.

<sup>24</sup> Maurice Blanchot, *The writing of the disaster*, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1986): 83.

Ruth Klüger<sup>25</sup> who, in discussing the issue of Holocaust museums, fundamentally questions the representational systems of an institution of extermination. Every museographic staging in its own way raises the issue of focus and the proper distance, since the risk of transforming calamities into spectacles,<sup>26</sup> at a time when the industrialisation of the representation of extermination (through cinema especially) shows that it is very easy to turn violence into simply an object for consumption. In the museum, the need to reconstitute, to make use of reproduction, comes up against this pitfall concerning kitsch created through unintentional gaps, parodies, or excesses, such as the reconstruction of the entry to the camps, installed at the entry to the National Museum of the History of the Gulag,<sup>27</sup> made out of barbed-wire barriers and mini watchtowers (due to spatial constraints). These failed scenographies, a kind of “apocalypse of falseness” according to literature professor Catherine Coquio,<sup>28</sup> thus represent the counterpart to the aesthetics of abstraction staged by artists’ installations and works, and constitute the other rock around which museum representations of extreme violence must navigate.

### **What does the future hold for the museography of extreme violence?**

It now seems clear, in light of the impasses and uncertainties that different systems have come up against, that museographic discourse cannot advance without bringing together the voices of historians and those of witnesses. Academic discourse brings a factual, analytic and objective dimension to the museum which alone enables the visitor to grasp the breadth and complexity of configurations of mass death. As for witnesses, they bring an indispensable dimension to the museum, certainly a subjective one but one that also provides a human side to these cultural institutions. However, this essential weaving together clearly does not suffice. “The era of the witness” also has its impasses and limits.

In my estimation, new perspectives will be provided in the near future by archaeology, the only science able to simultaneously reconstitute the materiality of facts and their historicity. In this regard, the archaeology of the

---

<sup>25</sup> Ruth Klüger, *Still alive: A holocaust girlhood remembered*, (New York: The Feminist Press, 2001).

<sup>26</sup> Norman G. Finkelstein, *The holocaust industry: Reflections on the exploitation of Jewish suffering*, (London: Verso Book, 2000).

<sup>27</sup> In spite of its title, this museum is a municipal museum under the aegis of the Department of Culture of the city of Moscow. See images of its exterior and the watchtowers on its website: <http://gmig.ru/o-muzee>.

<sup>28</sup> Catherine Coquio, “Envoyer les fantômes au musée?”, in *Gradhiva*, 5, (2007). Accessed on 9 October 2014: <http://gradhiva.revues.org/735>.

contemporary has a great future ahead of it. This is because an object brought to light by archaeologists possesses the status of a fully-fledged social actor, a unique ability to act (agency) and cause reactions, as emphasized by sociologist Bruno Latour,<sup>29</sup> and an ability to account for the complexity of social relations that produced it. Archaeology will also – most notably through the (re)discovery of burial sites and neglected or hidden spaces – allow for the creation of a place for the victims and those who are absent, and thus, perhaps, allow the collective mourning that has been put off far too long to finally begin.

The ultimate challenge that remains to be met for these museums resides in the place to give to human remains, to the bones or skulls, to the “singular objects” that are very tangible and yet so difficult to think about. Paradoxically, while bodies and human remains are shown throughout the world in art museums (as mummies) and in science or natural science museums (in the anatomy and medical sections), they are systematically absent from museums dedicated to mass violence, except in a few notable cases such as the Kigali Memorial Genocide Centre in Gisozi, Rwanda (which includes a room where a series of skulls and long bones are exhibited behind glass),<sup>30</sup> and the World War II Museum in Minsk (which – at its former location – included a Plexiglas case in the museography dedicated to the Maly Trotsnets Camp containing several kilograms of human ashes collected from the very site of the camps in 1944).<sup>31</sup>

It should be noted that disaster, in its most material and radical form – the destruction of human beings – is always treated by our museums in an elliptical form that privileges the use of litotes or metaphor. The place accorded to bodies, to bones, and to the remains of the remains is strangely uniform, even when placed at a distance through photography (as at the Museum of Genocide Victims in Vilnius, Lithuania, which displays a huge photograph of scattered human bones along one of its large stairways).<sup>32</sup> Everything happens as if we are still struggling to account for what violence truly inflicts on a society, and to accept recognition of the inevitably material dimension generated by the destruction.

~ *Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique* ~

---

<sup>29</sup> Will Wheeler, *Bruno Latour: Documenting human and nonhuman associations* (Libraries Unlimited, 2010).

<sup>30</sup> See the museum site: <http://www.kigaligenocidememorial.org/old/centre/exhibition/burialchambers.html>.

<sup>31</sup> This museography was in place until the museum moved in spring 2014. It can still be seen on the museum’s former website: [http://www.old.warmuseum.by/rooms/room\\_3](http://www.old.warmuseum.by/rooms/room_3).

<sup>32</sup> See it on the site that presents the museums of Lithuania: <http://www.muziejai.lt/Vilnius/nuotraukos/genocido15.jpg>.

*THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK*