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**Abstract**
Towards the end of 20th century the Pre-Columbian archaeological heritage of Trujillo, in northern Peru, became a powerful symbol of local identity and economic development based on the tourism industry. In parallel, Trujillo’s urban growth—a process that started around 1950—provoked the deterioration and loss of several archaeological sites located in areas subject to rapid transformation by modern neighborhoods. Although the situation does not appear promising, exploring the history of ancient and modern occupations, archaeological research, and management of Pre-Columbian sites in Trujillo allows obtaining a broader perspective on the role of archaeological heritage for the inhabitants of that modern Latin American metropolis.
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**Resumen**
El patrimonio arqueológico prehispánico de Trujillo, en el norte peruano, es desde fines del siglo XX un símbolo conjunto de identidad y desarrollo turístico. Sin embargo, la expansión de la ciudad, un proceso iniciado en la década de 1950, ha ocasionado una creciente presión sobre numerosos sitios arqueológicos localizados en áreas sometidas a rápida transformación del terreno para la construcción de viviendas. El artículo evalúa los diversos reclamos visibles—comunitarios, profesionales, y políticos—en el manejo de los sitios patrimoniales localizados en la periferia urbana y examina el rol potencial de esos lugares para el mejoramiento de las condiciones de vida de las poblaciones involucradas. Aunque el panorama no se presenta prometedor, explorar sus particularidades nos conduce a una nueva y más amplia perspectiva sobre el papel de la preservación del patrimonio arqueológico para los habitantes de esa ciudad.
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1. Introduction

In areas such as the Peruvian coast, the central highlands of Mexico, or the valleys of the Iberian Peninsula the presence of remains of the past is experienced daily by the inhabitants of landscapes modeled largely by human action. However, the coexistence of modern communities and material remnants of the past frequently does not mean the preservation of the latter – instead, it is more usual its use and transformation by the new occupants of the territory. Even though archaeological landscapes are clearly visible and are carriers of a valuable and irreplaceable meaning for archaeologists and historians, those spaces do not tend to be inhabited by them but by farmers and urban residents, who in most cases have as immediate goals to achieve better standards of living and basic services. Recognition of that reality has had a major impact on the debate on policies for the protection of archaeological heritage and it has given rise to new perspectives on its role in the politics of sustainable national and local development.

Evidences for human occupation of the north coast of Peru go back to at least 12,000 BP. Each valley and desert in the region preserves sites and landscapes with remains of the different cultural periods of Andean history. On the other hand, the north coast of Peru has become an important center for agro-industrial production and commerce. The cultural tourism is nowadays one of the pillars of the re-

Figure 1. Lower Moche Valley with metropolitan Trujillo and archaeological sites mentioned in the text. Author: Jorge Gamboa.
Trujillo. The role of the state in the birth and early development of periurban areas of Trujillo was minor, with the process of colonization and capitalization of desert plains being led by multiple autonomous zonal committees. The lack of effective state intervention in the growth of Trujillo’s periphery was not a blessing for those urban communities and resulted in the existence of extensive inhabited sectors with few (or lacking of) ecological, cultural, and public recreational spaces. Rural poverty moved to the city and the political violence of the 1980s and 1990s also had an impact on the local demography.

The legal registration of the first colonized areas led to the installation during the 1980s of water connection, sewage, and electricity by the district governments with funding from the state government. Until the middle of the 1990s, the vast majority of families settled on the outskirts of Trujillo had built their homes with their own resources. From the 1990s onward those populations accessed programs of banking and state financing for housing; something that contributed to the upgrading of earliest urbanized areas and increased number of sale and rental processes for parcels and built homes. Given the rapid expansion of the inhabited areas, the installation of basic services is a process currently in progress in some of the most recent periurban sectors.

The 20th century migrations to the periphery of Trujillo gave rise to a new social landscape formed by the districts of El Milagro, La Esperanza, Florencia de Mora, and El Porvenir and several new settlements around the already urbanized zones of Huanchaco and Laredo. Those areas are now home to an estimated population of 500,000 people, that amount to 51% of the metropolitan population of Trujillo and 27% of the La Libertad Region population (INEI 2007, 2012). Despite the formation of an emerging middle class in Trujillo, around 20% of the metropolitan population is still considered by the NGOs working in the area as within the levels of poverty. The consolidation in the region during the last two decades of an export economy model, the consequent generation of jobs in agro-industrial facilities, and the economic capitalization of marginal lands prompted further the periurban popula-
tion growth. In 1998 a strong ENSO (El Niño Southern Oscillation) provoked a new cycle of displacement of the periurban populations of the Lower Moche Valley and the nearby rural hinterland. The consequences of that natural event consolidated the emergence of the Alto Trujillo sector, the urban district of more recent formation in the area.

Through this complex process of demographic growth and municipal reordering, several dozen archaeological sites became part of landscapes claimed and disputed by numerous periurban communities (Gamboa 2015). The transformation and destruction of archaeological sites on the periphery of Trujillo included, as other main agents, the agricultural and industrial development and the extraction and processing of construction materials. The development of residential and recreational infrastructure for Trujillo’s groups with high-income economy also led to the destruction of several archaeological sites, a situation visible in Urbanización La Merced (where once stood the Huaca La Merced, see Pinillos (1977: 130-132), and the area between the Las Delicias, Huamán and El Golf sectors.

3. Pre-Columbian Societies of the Moche Valley and Examined Sites

The Moche River forms in its lower section and near the Pacific Ocean a narrow valley surrounded by mountains and arid plains. Earliest human occupations in the area have been dated at the Late Pleistocene-Early Holocene and belong to the Paiján Tradition. First farming societies in the area appeared in the fourth and third millennium BC as part of the general process of emergence of agricultural communities and elaborated ceremonial places through the coastal and highland Andes. Between 1600 and 400 BC, the Cupisnique society established several settlements in the Lower and Middle Moche Valley. After 400 BC the valley saw the development of the Salinar and Virú cultures, whose settlements have been reported in sites as Cerro Oreja, Huanchaco and Cerro Arena. From AD 300 to 800, the majority of north coastal organizations adopted the Moche style, which incorporated new exchange networks, ceremonial behaviors, and visual communication codes (Benson 2012; Chapdelaine 2003; Pillsbury 2001; Quilter and Castillo 2010). After AD 900 the Lower Moche Valley was the center of the Chimú polity, a state-like organization that expanded from Lambayeque to Casma. Chan Chan, the Chimú main settlement, was one of the largest urban centers of the Andes from AD 1000 to 1470.

Along the first millennium AD, the northern margin of the Lower Moche Valley was the scene of a long-term process of agricultural colonization and landscape transformation through the use and expansion of the Moro, La Mochica, and Vichanzao irrigation canals (Billman 2002; Gamboa and Nesbitt 2013). The next paragraphs present data on several of the Moche sites located in that area. I also include information on Quebrada San Idelfonso, an early pre-ceramic site, and El Milagro de San José, one of Chimú settlements that reoccupied the zone from AD 1100-1400.

Huaca Vichanzao

The Huaca Vichanzao site constituted one of the major Moche settlements in the northern margin of the Lower Moche Valley. In 1973 the Chan Chan-Moche Valley Project (1969-1974) of Harvard University documented the site and recorded the presence of Moche IV and V ceramic (Pérez 1994: 228). A decade later, in a context of national economic and political crisis, Eulalia Ramírez and María Wong (1984) from the Universidad Nacional de Trujillo’s Archaeology School undertook a first campaign of excavations at the site and documented part of an adobe platform. The materials recovered by Ramírez and Wong included a remarkable Moche IV vessel representing a human character with fox head (Fig. 2a-b).

During the 1980s Huaca Vichanzao was surrounded by several periurban neighborhoods. The partial demolition of the platform originated in 1986-87 the intervention of the Instituto Nacional de Cultura (INC, current Ministerio de Cultura de Perú), which organized two season of excavations funded by the central government through programs of temporary work. This allowed recording part of a massive Moche building dated by its associated materials.
The San Idelfonso site was initially recognized by the anthropologist Víctor Rodríguez Suy Suy as one of pre-colonial settlements associated with the Vichanzao canal. Years later, San Idelfonso was included in the *Inventario Nacional de Sitios Arqueológicos* by Ravines and Matos (1983). The main structure of the site was a low wall, 980 m in length, which extended between the Vichanzao canal and the base of the San Idelfonso hill. The south half of the wall was made of stones. The north section was entirely built with adobes, some of which presented incised marks. The slope of the hill is covered by concentrations of ceram-
ic fragments and organic debris. The domestic and ceremonial ceramics in the surface of the site share formal and technical characteristics with the Moche IV style of Huacas de Moche and evidence an occupation between AD 500 and 750. Although the majority of the decorated fragments belong to the Moche IV style, some of them share features with the Moche V style from Galindo in the Middle Moche Valley (Fig. 4). The presence of fancy Moche IV and Moche V ceramics at San Idelfonso and Huaca Vichanzao suggest both sites would have participated in the exchange networks that connected Huacas de Moche with its hinterland, the Galindo’s sector, and other regional settlements (Gamboa and Nesbitt 2013).

**Río Seco**

The Río Seco site, in El Milagro sector of La Esperanza District, covers an area of 260 m by 60 m extended along one of the main Pre-Columbian roads that connected the north margin of the Lower Moche Valley with the Chicama Valley (Beck 1979: 82-89, figs. 14-15). The main occupation of the site dates from the Mo-
juelo in 1997 and by the author, Cesar Gálvez and Andrea Runcio in 2008. Flakes and other debris from the manufacture of lithic bifaces made from quartzite, quartz and dacite, as well as concentrations of land-snails (Scutalus sp.), cover several sectors of the ravine's bottom and alluvial terraces. Those materials are diagnostic of the Paiján Tradition (10,000-6,000 BC) and evidence the presence at QSI of camps and lithic workshops belonging to one of the earliest Trujillo's populations.

**Pampas La Esperanza and El Milagro de San José**

The Pampas La Esperanza-El Milagro is an extensive area in the north extreme of the Lower Moche Valley that preserves several archaeological sites dating from the Late Pleistocene on the Chimú period. In 1997 the Universidad Nacional de Trujillo carried out a season of excavations in Pampas La Esperanza and documented a Moche rural settlement (Cossio *et al.* 1997). The main Moche building was a stone structure with open forecourt, inner patio and
smaller rooms; evidences for grinding, cooking and consumption activities indicated its nature as a household with living and public areas.

From AD 1200 to 1400 the Pampas La Esperanza-El Milagro sector was part of the Chimú rural landscape. The Milagro de San José site was surveyed in the 1970s and 1980s by the Chan Chan-Moche Valley Project and the Proyecto Riego Antiguo (Pozorski 1987: 113-115). El Milagro de San José functioned as a small administrative center where agricultural production could be controlled. The main structure was a building with patios, courtyards and storerooms, all built with cobble stones and plastered with mud. In spite of its modest constructive materials, that building replicated the form and symbolism of the royal Chimú administrative spaces. The area was connected to Chan Chan through a walled road, which was also excavated by the UNT project (Valle et al. 1998).

4. Migration, Population Growth, and Preservation of Minor Archaeological Sites

Let us take a look at what happened in the last years with the archaeological sites above presented. After the archaeological interventions and official delimitation of the protected area, Huaca Vichanzao started to be affected, once again, by the surrounding population. Although the area appears on the maps of the regional government as a “special treatment area” (MPT 1999), the northern half of the Pre-Columbian site was occupied along the years by adobe and brick houses of new settlers. The south and southeast sides of the platform (that currently appears as a mound covered by sand and rubble) have been partially occupied by houses (Fig. 6). Several parts of the site are covered up by waste dumped by nearby residents or transported from other parts of the city. The presence of a power transmission line (built when the area was less densely populated) that crosses the archaeological area and presents one of its supports on the Moche platform is another risk factor for both the preservation of the site as for the local population.

Over the last decades the demographic growth of Huanchaco produced the formation of a large populated area between the traditional center of that district and the Trujillo Airport. The urbanization process led to the archaeological area of Pampa La Cruz to be progressively settled by low and high-income groups, with the platforms becoming the main visible testimonies of the archaeological complex (Fig. 6).
Continuing a tradition locally rooted since the beginning of the 20th century, the mounds are still used by the population of Huanchaco as places for religious processions and social meetings. At present, Pampa La Cruz is the only Moche settlement of metropolitan Trujillo subject to research; in this case through an assessment and rescue project led by Gabriel Prieto (2012). The excavations of Prieto have allowed to record a complete new set of residential and funerary contexts belonging to the Virú, Moche and Chimú occupational periods at the Huanchaco’s area.

In 1998 the San idelfonso site started to be affected by extraction and reuse of adobe bricks. The southern and central parts of the parts of the ancient wall were severely deteriorated by the removal of adobe and stones and are currently covered by a modern community (Fig. 8). The north section of the archaeological wall and surrounding areas have not been occupied, but the constant passage of the settlers causes damage to the archaeological materials on surface. The zone is marked as belonging to the CHAVIMOCHIC Project, a work of the Peruvian state intended to drive water for irrigation of the Moche-Chicama interbasin. Although the archaeological site has not yet been officially delimited, the area has been considered by local authorities as appropriated to the construction of El Porvenir District’s industrial zone. In the El Milagro sector, the Río Seco site and the nearby Pre-Columbian roads have been affected by quarrying—an activity with high levels of demand because of the housing industry boom in the city. Two additional risk factors for the archaeological area are the nearby landfill of El Milagro and the vehicular traffic (which has come to be done directly on the archaeological roads).

A special case of ongoing destruction of Trujillo’s archaeological heritage corresponds to the situation of the Paiján sites at Quebrada San Idelfonso on the edges of El Porvenir District. Inside the quebrada several sand and stone quarries have been established. Quarrying and the expansion of residential areas not only threaten the earliest heritage site of metropolitan Trujillo but occur within an area of high risk for the formation of floods during El Niño. At present the Quebrada San Idelfonso site has not been registered or delimited by the Ministry of Culture and runs the risk of being severely altered by the aforementioned factors.

As a testament of the ancient Chimú agricultural frontier, the Milagro de San José site conserves evidences of Pre-Columbian productive...
technologies and landscape management. In the 1990s, the site was recorded by the INC, which placed a sign with information about its protected status. In spite of those protective procedures, the area has been affected by urban and development activities conducted in El Milagro sector. Threats to the preservation of the site include new roads, the quarrying of sand and gravel, and the accumulation of debris—the same factors that caused the destruction of the Pampas La Esperanza’s Moche settlement excavated in 1997 and that now affect the walled Chimú road located there.

The expansion of the metropolitan periphery driven by local actors (until a few decades ago largely untied to state planning) is only one of the factors at play in the process of destruction of archaeological sites. The deterioration of Pre-Columbian settlements in the margins of Trujillo coexists with a high demographic density, environmental pollution generated by poor management of industrial and domestic wastes, and the lack or inadequate implementation of educational policies aimed to evaluate and offer solutions to the difficult living conditions of the peripheral urban communities. In this context, the work of the regional branch of the Ministry of Culture has been even more laborious by the scarcity of economic or logistical resources to carry out inspections and enforce the resettlement of groups that have invaded the archaeological areas. Municipal authorities and representatives of local populations have usually lacked of proactive responses to official claims. In addition, the INC-Ministry of Culture research works at Pampa La Cruz and Huaca Vichanzao, which in past decades contributed to the public recognition of the Pre-Columbian past of the city, were not continued.

In contrast with the situation of the archaeological places seen above, the Huacas de Moche site (5 km to the southeast of downtown Trujillo) and El Brujo site (in the Chicama Valley) started in 1990 and 1991 to be managed by multidisciplinary projects funded and conducted by the Universidad Nacional de Trujillo and state and private institutions (Franco et al. 2001; Uceda 2015). In the long-term, both projects became research and conservation enterprises oriented to research and cultural tourism. A comparable situation occurs with Chan Chan, protected and managed by the Ministerio de Cultura and currently subject to an important economic investment by the Peruvian state.

An effect seemingly feasible of the *puesta en valor* (a term that in Peru denotes a modality of social and economic valuation of heritage places through research, conservation and tourism) of the mentioned archaeological sites would have been its replication in other parts of the Moche Valley. However, this was not the case. The reasons for this seem to lie in factors such

**Figure 8.** Periurban community at San Idelfonso site. Photo by J. Gamboa, 2010.
In Peru, the possibilities of public or private investment, at a small or large scale, are linked to the Certificate of Non-Existence of Archaeological Remains (CIRA in Spanish, see MC 2014: Arts. 54-58). Created to simplify the process of CIRA, the Decreto Supremo 054-2013-Presidencia del Consejo de Ministros established a short deadline for the approval or denial of applications and replaced, in a variety of cases, the execution of excavations by surface inspections (MC 2014: Arts. 29, 30). The D.S. 054 also considered unnecessary the CIRA process on land with already existing modern infrastructure and consolidated urban areas, an issue with special repercussions for sites such as the ones here reviewed (MC 2014: Arts. 57, 63). The same decree stated the obligation for those who obtain a CIRA to finance and implement a plan of archaeological monitoring (MC 2014: Arts. 11.5, 58, 59-66).

Available information on situational analysis and development plans of the peripheral districts of Trujillo reveals the lower impact of cultural heritage policies in the planning of metropolitan growth. For example, development plans from 1995 to 1999 available on the website of the Municipalidad Provincial de Trujillo, included few references to archaeological sites situated on the outskirts of Trujillo. Otherwise, the 1995 document mentioned both the value of the “monumental archaeological remains” as the relationship between their conservation and the goals of urban development (MPT 1995), while the 1999 plan –aimed to guide the metropolitan growth until 2015– contained only references to the “monumental” or primary sites (Chan Chan and Huacas de Moche).

In Peru, the support that the mentioned projects got from public and private institutions, the combination of physical monumentality and artistic values inherent to the primary sites, and their accessibility for urban tourists. The continuity of the problems regarding the preservation of the “non-monumental” sites demonstrates also the lack of an adequate model to counteract the appropriation of the archaeological spaces by the settlers of the emerging districts, a situation so far answered by the state, mostly through the official recognition (declaratoria) of the intangibility of archaeological areas (Congreso de la Republica 2004: Arts. II-IV, VI-VII, 2, 15).

Available information on situational analysis and development plans of the peripheral districts of Trujillo reveals the lower impact of cultural heritage policies in the planning of metropolitan growth. For example, development plans from 1995 to 1999 available on the website of the Municipalidad Provincial de Trujillo, included few references to archaeological sites situated on the outskirts of Trujillo. Otherwise, the 1995 document mentioned both the value of the “monumental archaeological remains” as the relationship between their conservation and the goals of urban development (MPT 1995), while the 1999 plan –aimed to guide the metropolitan growth until 2015– contained only references to the “monumental” or primary sites (Chan Chan and Huacas de Moche).
the failure to achieve immediate results in a national context of fast growth in productive and urban infrastructure.

All of the foregoing is referred to the archaeological heritage in the territorial and socio-economic margins of Trujillo. However, what is life like in those peripheral urban zones? After five decades of existence, the peripheral districts of Trujillo show signs of internal diversification. Equipped with municipal administration and basic services since the 1960s and 1970s, the earliest urbanized sectors are areas with formalized systems of home ownership and a dynamic commercial activity; however, those areas continue to lack an appropriate proportion of health and police facilities and public areas (Fig. 9). Peripheral urban districts are also plagued by low levels of municipal tax compliance rates. The demographic and territorial growth of peripheral districts intermittently gave rise to new neighborhoods in the border of the settled areas (Figs. 10 and 11).

As in other Latin American countries, in Peru, ethnicity has been a key element in the dynamics of migrant integration into urban spaces. In Trujillo and other large urban concentrations of the Peruvian coast, some of the practices of discrimination that gave rise to the processes of inequality in modern Andean societies were reproduced –through manifestations of prejudice towards residents of rural or indigenous ancestry–, especially during the early decades of the new communities. Low living standards, economic disparity, and a scarce state presence are related to recent increase in crime in Trujillo’s periurban sectors. In spite of that reality, Trujillo’s peripheral districts have not become fenced neighborhoods; indeed, those areas show multifaceted patterns of persons, information, and economic mobility to and from the city center.

5. Challenges and Perspectives for an Inclusive Social Use of Periurban Archaeological Heritage

What will be the results of the loss of the metropolitan Pre-Columbian heritage of Trujillo? The answer to this is doubly adverse. For archaeologists and historians this will imply the impossibility of studying the organizational characteristics or the ideology of the first societies settled in the area. The process of destruction of archaeological sites also involves the risk of the tacit acceptance of a landscape deprived of traces of the past and of the possibilities to implement a community development based on the management of the local historical legacy, something relevant for the sustainable development of the Latin American cities in the twenty-first century.
How much surprising or inevitable is the occupation of archaeological sites by urban communities? The case of San Ildefonso at El Porvenir is illustrative. Near the San Ildefonso ancient wall are several extensive plots of unoccupied or only partially settled areas. The main attractive of the archaeological site for its new occupants was the existence of thousands of adobe bricks in a good state of preservation and “available. The modern population prefers to situate their houses near archaeological sites, even in the presence of nearby areas apparently without archaeological remains, in order to avail themselves of construction materials. Another attractive factor is the recognition that the location of the Pre-Columbian sites provides an advantageous position against the risk of flooding. The occupation of archaeological sites by new communities is not inevitable, but we must recognize that it is a frequent and predictable reality.

In areas affected by shortcomings in housing, education and health the conservation of historical monuments is not easily perceived as an immediate goal of the local socioeconomic development. The result of interviews conducted among the adult population of the urban periphery of Trujillo frequently varies between emerging expectations and a low interest with respect to the history and value of the local archaeological sites. For the occupants of the heritage places the official declaration of an archaeological monument is not a measure usually followed by research and conservation works, but it is instead a preamble to the withdrawal of the state supervisors. The scarce involvement of the periurban communities in the preservation and management of the local cultural heritage also evidences an obvious difficulty of archaeologists to break the academic/official circle and transmit their knowledge to the majority of city’s inhabitants beyond the academic and official circle.

The described situation reveals the need for a convergence between fields of action currently separated or whose integration has not been strengthened. The challenge of preserving the archaeological spaces incorporated within the peripheral districts of Trujillo, certainly implies the search of local participation in the solution of the problem. As several recent experiences have demonstrated, that strategy should, firstly, occur in adaptation to the social, economic and cultural conditions of each place, and, secondly, have as primary goal enabling the local community to take an active role in the diagnosis and management of the local heritage site (Castillo 2015; Ortega 2003; Pacifico and Vogel 2012; Robles and Corbett 2009; Vogel and Pacifico 2004). Trying to put forward those plans directly touches the issue of education as a vehicle for strengthening identity and
community values in areas facing problems of environmental degradation, urban insecurity, and high rates of unemployment and underemployment.

The protection of heritage areas at risk by periurban expansion through the active and consensual inclusion of archaeological/historical sites in urban planning policies should not mean a simple transfer of responsibilities between officials and local representatives, something that without conditions of previous preparation and multilateral consultations would be counterproductive. A rethinking of governmental strategies in this regard should influence both the extension of capacities for action of the professionals in archaeology, conservation, and heritage management, and in addition, the promotion of an active participation of the population in the benefits, obligations and conflicts generated by the preservation of the sites and their inclusion in metropolitan urban planning (Castillo and Ménendez 2014: 58, 64-67; Espinoza 2015; Gamboa 2015: 73-85).

It is necessary that the heritage sites at risk are seen as a viable component of policies of planned and inclusive renovation of urban areas. However, the social use of archaeological sites should not mean permission for interventions aimed at the spectacular or involving the introduction of elements with design and meaning incompatible with the historical evidence (for example, massive infrastructure or modern installation detached from the cultural and natural contexts of the place). The social use of local archaeological sites in some sectors of metropolitan Trujillo—currently an extractive practice that leads to their destruction and suppression of the local memory—should be driven to the margins of the protected areas, which, as a result of prior assessment and zoning, could become public spaces placed between modern neighborhoods and archaeological areas. The installation of community museums in some of the examined sites is a possibility to be taken into account given their potential positive role in the educational programs conducted at local level (Jameson and Baugher-Perlin 2007; Montenegro and Rivolta 2013: 29).

Reaching common parameters of control of the landscape use will be crucial for the sustainability of cultural heritage threatened by urban growth. The proposed modality of use of heritage sites affected by urban fringe populations could be put forward through a new appreciation of those spaces as historic-ecological protected areas, where the archaeological evidences may be investigated, preserved, and displayed to (and by) the surrounding community. Of course, such a strategy will involve the establishment and implementation of funding, action, and control parameters legally recognized. On the other hand, the conduction of interviews, surveys, and workshops should be understood as essential for the recognition of the appreciation and local expectations about the heritage places (Pacifico and Vogel 2012).

Under this perspective, the administration of archaeological places at risk should become an axis for the integration between the management of historical spaces, the involvement of the local stakeholders, and the renewal of the municipal urban landscape. Continuous monitoring and the mutual recognition of the multivocality inherent to the relationship between society, archaeologists, and managers will be needed to prevent the heritage places to be converted into places of territorial dispute or in spaces for the installation of modern facilities able to alter negatively the protected zones. Such a goal will be only achieved through a permanent articulation between researchers, administrative authorities, and the local population—a difficult point to achieve in the present but crucial to provide a social consensus for the preservation of the archaeological heritage sites.

This strategy in the management of urban archaeological heritage has been put into practice—adapted to the regional economy and development plans—in Lima, where sites as Mateo Salado, Huaca Huantile and Huaca Pucllana are subject of research and conservation projects and insertion in the tourism industry through projects funded by the Ministry of Culture and some district governments (Espinoza 2014). In parallel, other Pre-Columbian sites in Lima have become subject to attention by the neighborhood and civil associations aimed at preserving and promoting the local archaeological heritage. One example of this option occurs in the Fortaleza de Collique site,
whose defense as a place of local identity is promoted by grassroots and educational organizations (https://sites.google.com/site/colectivocolli/somos).

In metropolitan Trujillo, we can also find various examples of integration between archaeological research and community participation. At Gramalote, Huanchaco District, the local community has been involved in the preservation of a Formative site (1500-500 BC) menaced by urban growth (G. Prieto pers. com. 2015). The Unidad Ejecutora Chan Chan, of which we will discuss below, has also developed programs of support to artisans and local youth (promoting the active participation of the last group in the architectural restoration of the site). In the south margin of the Lower Moche Valley, the Proyecto Huacas de Moche has sponsored local artisans and school teachers. An indirect outcome of that heritage project is found in the numerous restaurants located next to the road to the archaeological site; buildings whose appearance reflects the progressive urban development of that rural area. The fourth case is conducted at the rural settlements of the Middle Moche Valley by MOCHE Inc. a non-profit organization aimed at improving educational and community facilities in exchange for participation in the defense of Pre-Columbian sites affected by looting or dismantling.

From the point of view of management policies and recalling that each community has its own agenda (Lane 2013), any response to the difficult situation of the heritage sites placed in areas of urban growth must fulfill two conditions to go beyond the discourse: political support and availability of funds reverting in the populations involved. In the urban margins of Trujillo both possibilities, even though not being unattainable, are still far. The northern region of Peru provides the experience of the Unidades Ejecutoras, agencies with state funding created in 2006 to promote, through massive state investment, the management of monumental archaeological sites and the socioeconomic development of rural and periurban populations. This strategy of state investment has not been universally applied. The majority of sites in charge of the Unidades Ejecutoras (Chan Chan, several complexes at Lambayeque, and Marcahuamachuco) can be considered monumental places with impressive architecture, elaborated tombs or mural decoration; not surprisingly those places are also targets for the tourism industry and the official and private promotion of a selected range of cultural values (Asensio 2012).

The social use of sites such as those mentioned cannot operate under the same parameters of major archaeological places. The Pre-Columbian sites of the margins of Trujillo—minor in scale or located in zones “not recommendable for tourism”, with the possible exception of Pampa La Cruz at Huanchaco—do not seem to be on the waiting list for large state investments. However, was it not during the period of the largest economic recession in modern Peruvian history that the research and rescue works in some of them were conducted?

6. Final Comments

As several of the contributions in this volume have demonstrated, it is increasingly necessary to involve the urban and rural communities in the processes of appreciation and management of the archaeological sites located in the territory they occupy. The particular social and political conditions seen in the current approach of periurban population to archaeological sites of the Peruvian north coast show that cases such as those here reviewed will not be solved through applying the models of more extensive and tourism appreciated sites. In that scenery, the construction of a shared sense of archaeological heritage built through dialogue among the different local stakeholders becomes not only necessary but also urgent.

The inhabitants of Trujillo’s urban periphery and the archaeologists have been continuous actors in the claims and debates on conservation of local archaeological monuments and cultural landscapes, a context in which the first group has usually prevailed through its permanence around and within the protected areas. Having mentioned that outcome of the urban growth of Trujillo, it is necessary to point out that the (re)emergence of research and management works at the examined heritage sites should lead to the inception of an updated and more democratic version of public archa-
ology, one able to surpass the limitations of knowledge dissemination and participation of involved communities shown by the traditional rescue and delimitation projects.
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This research would not have been possible without the support of a large number of people at Trujillo, among them Sergio Aguado, Genaro Barr, Tomas Campos, José Carcelén, Maria Chiroque, César Gálvez, Ricardo Morales, Niel Pajuelo, Victor Piminchumo, José Pineda, Ricardo Toribio, Santiago Uceda, Percy Vilchez, Aldo Watanave, and Enrique Zavaleta. An early version of the work was presented in the XIX Simposio Román Piña Chán (September 30, 2014) thanks to the invitation of the Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia de México (INAH). That event provided an invaluable opportunity to discuss the problems faced by heritage sites in Latin America. I am thankful to Pedro Francisco Sánchez Nava, Antonio Huitrón, Ruth Landeros, Miguel Ángel Cruz González, and Daniela Tovar, and to Nelly Robles and José Huchím, my co-speakers in the Foro de Gestión del Patrimonio Arqueológico. I also wish to express my gratitude to Guadalupe Espinoza (Dirección de Operación de Sitios-INAH), Verónica Ortega (Zona Arqueológica Teotihuacán-INAH), and Ashton Sinamai (University of York), who generously shared their experiences regarding the interaction between heritage preservation, archaeology, and modern communities.
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