

## Epilogue to ¡...*Escucha Winka...*!

Pablo Marimán, Sergio Caniuqueo, Jose Millalén and Rodrigo Levil

**What is it that we call autonomy? What is a process of national liberation?**

There is currently a group of *Mapuche* intellectuals who are developing interesting work around the concepts of *autonomy* and *self-determination*.<sup>1</sup> In this context, they have published *dossiers*<sup>2</sup> in order to expand the debate outward from these concepts. We propose, in this space, to formulate some ideas and reflections without recourse to academic jargon that might ensnare us in questions that are either foreign to our everyday lives, or that cannot explain what we see within our own reality. As a part of this work and our political activities, we have become participants in discussions that often do not appear on the Internet and that are thus relatively unknown, but which have nonetheless nourished our vision.

For us, *autonomy* represents an aspiration to recover our “suspended sovereignty”—suspended with the invasion and conquest perpetrated by the Chilean and Argentine states. *Autonomy* is a form of government, a way to exercise self-administration in our territories. It is a juridical-political instrument to generate governance that presupposes a) a territory, b) a population, c) juridical instruments, and d) a bureaucratic apparatus. *Autonomy* is a tool for *self-government* and for the exercise of *self-determination*. In the administrative field, it entails organizing the powers of the State in the territory (executive, legislative and judiciary), as well as promoting the interests of the population in matters of culture, political participation, and economic development. It also implies the constitution of an apparatus with which to exercise power: an autonomous governing body (a territorial congress or other instance) that guarantees the participation of the political forces in the territory.

*Autonomy* is a technology of social control that is legitimated by the population that lives in a given territory. Its importance lies in its capacity to guarantee the rights inherent in the concept of *self-determination*, in the right, that is, that all peoples or nations have to make decisions, in a sovereign fashion, about their political, social, economic, and cultural futures, as well as about the structure of government and form of participation they desire. In the *winka's* [white man's] case, this implies decisions regarding the type of State that is desired, as well as the governing regimes (parliamentary or presidential) and the types of democracy that they want to develop (direct, semi-direct, representative). *Self-determination*, then, implies a series of rights:

The first right is that of *self-affirmation*, which, in our case, means consciousness about the kinds of collectives we have historically created as a society<sup>3</sup>: consciousness about ourselves as a people who have exercised the right to govern ourselves and to develop our own institutionality. If we include the *winka*, who currently live in our territory, we must clarify that this is a territory that has been occupied by different ethnic groups through both peaceful<sup>4</sup> and forceful<sup>5</sup> means. In principle, these groups could commit themselves to generating a social pact that would define interethnic relations, which would give it the legitimacy of self-definition. In the Chilean-Argentine case, these nation-states have refused to recognize their own multinational character, seeking to reinforce the conceptual unity of the nation, although the Argentine State has constitutionally recognized indigenous peoples. In Chile they are only recognized as an ethnicity, and ethnicities are not considered bearers of collective rights.

Until the end of nineteenth century, *self-definition* among the Mapuche sprang from the cultural patterns that served as a basis of law in their society. Today, the population residing within Mapuche territory would be accounted for by the constitution of the autonomous government. It is clear that the *winka* who live in *Mapuche territory* cannot be expected to leave, and instead should participate in this process, as *self-determination* is characterized by the participation of the population. But how do we define what this population is, and who fits into the category of citizens? It is possible to define the subjects of rights inside an autonomous territory by way of soil, blood or “nationalization.” The same thing applies to the territory, which should be identified in its name as a *Mapuche country: Wallmapu*.

What is commonly known as the right to *self-delimitation* consists of the demarcation of territorial limits. In the *Mapuche* case, the historical territory encompassed all the land from the *Bío Bío* river to *Chiloé*, and in the current territory of Argentina, the pampas in between the *Cuarto* and *Negro* rivers. This mapping needs to be operationalized. The autonomous territory must be formulated in two planes: The first represents an ideal and corresponds to *Mapuche territory* that was recognized by the *parliaments* with the Spanish crown, and the second one is premised upon the potential of political negotiation in relation to the demarcations of territory with the [Argentine and Chilean] nation-states.

*Internal self-organization* bears a close relation to how political power is structured and to the ways in which both the territory and population are endowed with governability—whether, for example, the territory is organized along federalist or centralist lines. The same applies to the way in which power is distributed and participation exercised. In this case, if the territory we claim belongs to us, the *Mapuche*, we have to consider that there are also *winka* who live within it. This is why it is perfectly plausible to propose the idea of shared governance wherein the non-

*Mapuche* population would establish their own participatory forms within the autonomous government. *Autonomy* is premised on political participation and power sharing. One issue we need to solve is the administrative question: What will be the features of our administration and how will these be validated? *Co-government* implies sharing responsibilities with the *winka*, recognizing that they have the right to make decisions about their own futures together with us.

One possibility is that an *autonomous parliament* serves as a government of the people. This would be the optimal form in our case, considering the territorial nature of our identities (the so-called *wichan mapu* during our period of independence) and the tendency towards federalism that our people have historically demonstrated.

Intermediate mechanisms may also exist, like a *Mapuche parliament* or *congress* in which the identities and organizations of the movement can have permanent representatives such as traditional authorities, political leaders, and technical advisers (professionals). A congress with these characteristics would undoubtedly make it possible to work on different issues, enabling the participation of the different sectors and leaders that exist in *Mapuche* society. Such participation would not exclude *autonomous* political parties, regardless of their ideological affiliation. Their participation would, however, require their self-designation as *Mapuche* or their identification as part of the territory.

Regarding *external self-organization*, it is necessary to create networks with other countries and with the international political community. These must recognize our *autonomy* and respect our internal resolutions, recognizing our sovereignty within our territorial limits, as we recognize theirs. In our case, if we achieve a real *autonomy*, we must respect the territorial limits of the State as well as its structures of governance, with which we do not necessarily have to agree.

### **Autonomous Mobilization**

Autonomous mobilization requires that the current *Mapuche* movement transform itself from a “social movement” to a “political movement.”<sup>6</sup> To do so, it must stop being swayed by transitory public sentiments and conjuncturesto become a movement with defined strategies and with disciplined political cadres. A social movement is articulated on the basis of vindications and social demands that are not necessarily related with gaining access to power. When a social movement’s actions are based on voluntarism, it tends to have a more open-ended character, opening up more spaces for individual rather than collective action and enabling basic coordination. A social movement is characterized by its ability to resist the tendency to unify different positions that involve divergences that cannot be managed or controlled. There exists only a general idea of what articulates them. In this respect, we might say that movements do not have defined organical structure.

It is in this sense that some have posited a dichotomy between an *ethno-sectorial* movement and an *ethno-national* movement. In our judgment, this represents an erroneous vision of *Mapuche* political history—a superficial reading focused on only social demands. These social movements have also proposed political ideas that generate self-management and self-administration through participation in the internal decision-making structures of the State. This strategy can be interpreted as integrationist, and represents a historical failure. But everything the movement has proposed and developed throughout its history also represents a political process of learning about the institutions of the State and civil society. Yet under the colonial regime, organizations had to focus on the legality of the era, assuming two basic orienting criteria: first, achieving popular cohesion in tasks requiring immediate attention, and second, gaining a degree of representation before the State.<sup>7</sup> Certain histories characterize these organizations as *campesinistas* because their social base was comprised primarily of *campesinos*. Such histories describe a social project that returns to the rural sector—a position that even the urban organization of the time supported. This was not and is not a romantic ideal: currently there are a large number of people who see their lives unfolding in the countryside. While the urban has not been negated outright, there is no long term, ongoing work that brings these two sectors together. Some of these organizations see themselves as the rear-guard of the movement whose protagonists are the [rural] communities. Even though these sectors assume their own specificity, they define themselves through their local realities and immediate needs. Lastly, it is important to point out that it is thanks to these movements that we are where we are; they have given us a certain projection, which is why we value them.

A political movement is characterized by a well-defined social project, and its principles of agreement are established to shape an attainable objective. Despite the fact that almost all the organizations share the same the historical demands, this ideal is not yet fully realized, as there have not been spaces of convergence among different *Mapuche* organizations in which to establish a unified discourse. Ideally, a non-exclusionary autonomous movement would be led by the *winka* as much as by the *Mapuche*. This movement would be oriented by a horizontal and intercultural vision for inter-ethnic relations. Currently, it is the *Mapuche* who have proposed the possibility of *autonomy*; the *non-Mapuche* have yet to pronounce themselves on the matter. If this possibility is fulfilled it would generate an interesting precedent in the Americas—the creation of an inter-ethnic social referent.

In our humble opinion, the *Mapuche* social project should be a culturally strengthened society, with the participation of all traditional, functional and technical leadership; legitimized by the participation of all persons that comprise the *pueblo*; based in

horizontal relations of power; with the development of its own values, the capacity to integrate new elements to the culture, and capability of finding complementarity with other cultures. It should, moreover, be equally respectful of both agreements and disagreements in the decision-making process within the territory. Its first priority should be the *common good* of everyone, without distinction between urban and rural, but instead in accordance with the unifying concept of a *pueblo*.

The *autonomous movement* must simultaneously develop internal dynamics that allow it to maintain militants, disciplined and professional people who can offer a long-term vision. This is important since many concerns span the spectrum from mobilization to the implementation of experiences. This imperative demands attention to economic, social (health, education, poverty), and political issues, as well as establishing individual and collective responsibilities--defining those that are internal, those that are shared, and those that are external. It also requires the generation of public sanctions for breaking agreements and establishing the overall responsibilities of those in power.

While political movements may develop different courses of action, all of these correspond to strategic objectives, which is what differentiates them from social movements. The coordination of actions centered on strategic objectives is what we could define as a framework for social mobilization. Here, both the legitimate and non-legitimate aspects of the process are established. The character of the mobilization, at the same time, also defines these. This definition should be the source of the actions to be developed. Below, we analyze some concepts that may be used to establish the character of the mobilization.

### **Movement for Autonomy vs. Ethno-Nationalist Movement**

Currently, it is not exactly clear what each of the aforementioned concepts mean. One might think that there is some relation between them, or that they mean the same thing. Here, we want to elaborate some proposals about how we conceive them in the context of a project for autonomy. A *movement for autonomy* bears a relation to a political structure yet to be established, while an *ethno-national* movement does not necessarily conceive of the issue of power within an *autonomous* frame, since it is more focused on the ideological labor of creating social consciousness that may or may not develop within the framework of *autonomy*. Ethno-nationalism could even see itself occupying the position of the State, and disputing its control with another ethnic group. *Autonomous* movements, however, are characteristically broad and seek to incorporate all the agents and political forces within a territory in a process of negotiation with the State.

An *ethno-national* movement is, by its nature, exclusionary. As in all nationalisms, it



departs from a reading of social and ethnic limits on the basis of differentiation from the “*Other*,” limiting the participation of all those who do not exclusively belong to that ethnicity. The prefix *ethno-* may identify the movement with a particular ethnicity, establishing a difference between *national* and *ethno-national movements*. While a *national movement* is explicitly founded to assume State power and implement a national project it has defined, an *ethno-national movement* may have a broader base and may not necessarily orient itself toward the takeover of power. What are the elements and limits that mark the distinction between *nationalism* and *ethno-nationalism*? While unclear, the exclusion of an “*Other*” would appear to be among them. An *ethno-national* movement does not necessarily have to advocate for the reconstruction of a culture because, as the prefix *ethno-* suggests, it is defined by the origins of the persons that constitute it rather than by the native cultural practices of the group. It could very well focus developing electoral strategies, much like a functioning political party.

A second way to approach the *ethno-national* would be through cultural reconstruction. An ethno-national movement may embrace its cultural practices as a way to make itself politically and ideologically legible across expanding social spheres. Essentially, it would take up the forms of political action that existed prior to the military invasion of the Chilean State, with modifications if it is to incorporate the new actors that emerged during the twentieth century (functional leaders, professionals etc.). The danger of a movement with these characteristics is that it can lead to a crystallization of Mapuche culture. We believe that culture is dynamic and thus able to respond to new contexts. Otherwise it is gradually thrust aside. The tendency towards the crystallization of culture is used as a mechanism of differentiation, where the “*Other*” is not identified through self-identification, but instead through his or her cultural and ceremonial practices.

A *national movement* is founded through a process of recruitment that is based on a shared consciousness in which identity is the principal element. This is what imbues it with its ideological character and it is here that its initial battles are fought. If it needs to force history it will, which is why nationalisms often possess features similar to those of fanaticism. Many of them fall back upon chauvinistic positions, because the end-goal of all nationalisms is to strengthen identity, whether it be politically constructed or culturally defined. In our case, defining ourselves as an *ethno-national autonomous movement* entails the risk of excluding the *winka* who live in the territory, and ultimately represents the danger of an ethnic dictatorship depending on the level of fanaticism. This means that, parallel to our own historical experience, we would impose our own social vision on the *winka*, and negate the possibility of building a mutually constructed social project. In short, it would imply the installation of a

*Mapuche* government. But, are we, the *Mapuche*, in any condition to assume an autonomous government even though we are a demographic minority in the territory? Are we not to respect the right of all Chileans to govern themselves in our territories? This is why we believe that the movement we must build needs to be autonomous, in the broadest sense of the concept. It must also have a liberatory and national character for the persons who are in our territories, which would make it inter-ethnic in nature. It is clear that we, the *Mapuche*, must propose our own project for society, to then develop it together with the *winka*. It is possible that they will participate in our project, a possibility that can only be fulfilled through active and positive engagement. It is the case, however, that many *winkas* are unfamiliar with autonomy, because the State and the governments of the *Concertación* have practiced a form of participation that is more informative and consultative, but that ultimately is not respected (the Ralco case, landfills, cellulose plants, and so forth). In an active and positive participation it is the people who build the institutions and, in the process, their own project, generated on the basis of creating experiences jointly, that is, inter-cultural projects that enable long-term working proposals. Through active and positive participation, it is *the people* who build institutions and, in the process, their own projects. These are generated through the creation of collective experiences—intercultural collaborations that enable long-term working proposals. In order to generate intercultural relations, the Chilean population must put an end to their monocultural practices. In order to generate inter-cultural relations, the Chilean population must put an end to their monocultural practices.

#### **National Liberation, Historical Reconstruction, and Social Recruitment**

A *movement for national liberation* seeks to vindicate a nation that is in a colonial situation. This is why we, the *Mapuche*, have the right and obligation to speak of national liberation, and demand the rights of *self-determination* that were suspended at a certain historical moment. A movement like this may be broad and may coincide with autonomist aspirations, yet the most significant elements are the rights that are in question. Such a movement may often produce fear as different forms and strategies of struggle are developed, even as actions are shaped alongside changing political contexts. The escalation of conflict is avoidable if the political will exists among the actors in question.

Historical reconstruction is one of the aspects that most calls our attention, because every process of emancipation appeals to *history*; it is an ideological mechanism that serves to generate loyalties and make the collectivity meaningful. This is why it is necessary to analyze how we understand *history*. History itself does not necessarily grant us rights, since it is the people who are the bearers of political rights. Colonialist nations who have perpetrated human rights violations that have been proved before

*history*, like Germany or France, have not lost their rights as a people. It may be painful to accept the *history* of *Wallmapu* with Chileans and foreigners, but it is the only way to move forward because history is not a determining condition of the development of a people (*los pueblos*). In fact, it can become a limiting factor when it is used with ideological ends.

Today it is necessary to develop values that enable *Mapuche* unification inside the territory. The use of *history* to this end and the use of our world-view, as a discourse, must be pursued with the utmost care so that these do not become limiting factors in the long term. Fanning hatred does not lend itself to the creation of mutual political trust with the *winka* that is needed to facilitate autonomy, nor does it enable the will to establish concrete products. *History* must tell what happened in the past, make us reflect upon the present, and project us forward towards the situation we desire. We believe that these distinctions move us closer to the development of a social project. If it is *autonomous* we must take into account the forces in the territory that will define it. If it is *national* in character, it implies the generation of an internal struggle within the territory and an external struggle with the State.

### ***Mapuche* National Unification**

If we decide to advocate for an autonomous process, then we also need to embark on a process of national unification. We must approach this very carefully because it can lead to another political definition—independence. Historically speaking, until the nineteenth century, we constituted a nation with a territory of approximately 120,000,000 hectares. Currently our population lives in Chile and Argentina, which is why we cannot renounce the reunification of our nation. Today, much of the history of the *Mapuche* people in the *Puelmapu* is unknown. Even though organizations have been working to reconstruct this history since the 1990s, using a variety of media technologies, their efforts have been slow and unorganized. In spite of these efforts, the history of the *Mapuche* in Argentina circulates in very limited circles. This is why it continues to be very difficult for us, the *Guluche*, to have a fuller understanding of this history.

If we *Mapuche* have a national history, we also have local histories. Up to now, our historiographic production has been rather poor on both accounts, often focusing on ideological and political aspects rather than on the elucidation of historical reality. The absence of a policy of unification has been quite clear; the initiatives undertaken are little more than isolated efforts that are not part of a broader strategy defined by the *Mapuche* movement. It is necessary to work on a policy of unification that surpasses the mere exchange of information from one sector to the other. We do not deny the existence of organizations that are working on this matter, but we see a need for



greater coordination.

The use of history as an ideological discourse enacts the first phase of the decolonization process, in which what is ours and what is foreign are defined as a means of repositioning. While this phase has begun to run its course in so far as today the demand is for the implementation of experiences (educational, economic, social, political etc.), it does require us to undergo a process of professionalization. This implies the disciplining of a *Mapuche movement* that has not yet been achieved, but which would lead us towards the creation of a political movement that would involve the *Puelmapu*. These experiences may initially clash with the limitations of national states, particular with regards to legal frameworks, the cognitive structures of the *non-mapuche*, and the economic interests of power elites whose influence is manifest throughout. In this context, we will have to develop new juridical bodies that ensure our collective rights, work on the sensibility of the *non-Mapuche*, and present an ever-more encompassing social project in which *Mapuches* and Chileans participate to dispute the spaces of local and transnational economic groups.

### ***Mapuche* Diaspora and the Process of Repatriation**

From a political perspective, we might refer to the *Mapuche* diaspora as the population forced to abandon the *Wallmapu*, their national territory, primarily through political and economic means. This self-identified population that today goes by an urban *Mapuche* identity is located in the cities to the north of the *Biobio* in the *Gulumapu*. There are groups among them who have chosen to develop and highlight common features that articulate them the *Mapuche*, be it because they self-identify, because they want to re-embrace the *mapuzungun* [*Mapuche* language], or because they seek to come together and establish a sense of community. Other sectors that live in the city are awaiting the opportunity to return to their communities to work and live on their land. There is currently no project that brings these sectors together as a people, nor is there an effective answer to their demands, yet they persevere all the same.

One answer for these groups could be a process of *repatriation* in which the population in this situation would be identified in order to implement relocation policies and strategies that assess the possibilities both in the city and the countryside and measure existing aptitudes and skills. It is necessary, moreover, to gauge the economic potential of this population in relation to the investment, and to the broader lens of economic development through which repatriation must be understood. It is possible that in some cases repatriated populations will resettle in their own communities or in areas that belong to their territories of origin. In other cases, they may establish themselves in cities; their lives and livelihoods are oriented towards to urban worlds.

For the people who live in the city, inside and outside the *Wallmapu*, it is necessary to create conditions that enable them to practice their culture and establish bridges of communication for the development of inter-ethnic experiences and for their economic integration. It is crucial to consider whether this population will be able to vote from outside their territory on issues proposed by the *autonomous government*. The results of these actions must be established within a collaborative framework, in which the diaspora must make its proposals in an organized fashion and negotiate them with the *autonomous government*. The *autonomous government* must, in turn, negotiate with the States in order to safeguard its population with regards to rights, social welfare, and conditions for the development of their culture.

### **Organic Processes vs Autonomist or Ethno-national Parties**

Other elements that must be considered are the types of organizations that need to be developed to promote a particular social project and framework for mobilization. Among these are those that are broad in character, such as instances for coordination, as well as representative parliaments or assemblies that can articulate smaller organizations around principles of unity and shared objectives. On the other hand, there are political parties, which organize the participation of individuals. Under a federalist logic, parliaments or assemblies enable the autonomy of their member organizations, but this does not mean that political responsibilities disappear. These organizations are also able to articulate themselves and exercise power horizontally, running the danger of the rise of personalistic leaders when in the absence of adequate controls. Even if autonomous, organizations must establish working guidelines based on agreed upon principles and commitments to be followed. They must also establish clear sanctions for breaking such commitments. These organizations should work on the basis of agreements and, in case of disagreements, they must establish a mechanism for mediation. Such organizations will become more responsive as a political movement is consolidated.

Regarding political parties, these may be part of the expression of a political movement, based on developing and divulging its particular vision. These parties may be liberal, conservative, religious, integrationist, and, in an extreme case, fundamentalist in character. Political parties have a vertical structure, an internal organization that stems from the development of power. An *autonomist party* must be broad and express a national self-identification. It must also present an ideological option. Parties represent a specific segment of the population, characterized by being militants or sympathizers of the idea that the party represents.

A *nationalist* or *ethno-nationalist party* has a more restricted character as it only accepts people of a single ethnic origin in its rank-and-file and in leadership positions. While

this “exclusive” aspect might be disguised, is eventually always becomes visible in practice. The *national parties* only represent a majority when they express a social project that the population wants to see implemented, which is why it matters that their strategies be oriented around the needs of their electorate, as a party is evaluated in relation to the votes that are cast and the candidates that are elected. While parties conceive of political participation through electoral means, for an *autonomous movement* political participation can unfold through diverse spaces beyond the electoral arena and can focus on social, rather than purely electoral, objectives. We believe more in a socially based process that is based on the interrelation that can be generated between diverse *Mapuche* territorial units. We conceive the unification of these units as a federation that can organize a *Mapuche Parliament*. Within this structure, traditional authorities would have a space to contribute value-centered and spiritual elements, participating together with political leaders with experience in management and administration, as well as with professionals and intellectuals that can handle information and analysis. If we, the *Mapuche*, could have an intermediate unit of government—one that sits between the central and the local powers, Chileans in general could also develop similar instances in order to define the social project that they aspire to.

### **The Framework for Mobilization**

These frameworks are established on the basis of the elements that we consider legitimate within a process of mobilization; a list of items are agreed upon by a collective, which implies generating strategic objectives in order to achieve particular outcomes or generate desired situations. Currently, there is an absence of long-term strategies. Thus, while different organizations have developed their own strategies, there exists no strategy as a *Mapuche People*. It is necessary to identify the different issues we need to confront and establish specific strategies: communicational, economic, cultural, and so forth. It is clear that intercultural concerns traverse the majority of these issues, especially as governance unfolds within the context of a broader *autonomous movement*. If addressed as an *ethno-national movement*, then governing will simply be based on the *Mapuche*.

Mobilization implies political participation that can be exercised through electoral means. This is why *autonomous* or *national parties* are created, depending on the objectives they seek to achieve. Another form of political participation is placing representatives in the State, a strategy that up to now has not borne fruit because the representatives are only accountable to the State. While we value the efforts of some functionaries to generate favorable situations for their people, the rest act as lackeys of the powerful, never hesitating to come to their aid. We must also consider different

means of exercising pressure, from a simple demonstration of civil disobedience to positions of self-defense that are not necessarily violent.<sup>8</sup>

Clearly we, as *Mapuche*, cannot renounce our rights, not as whim or conceit, but because it is a necessity for us to attain a baseline level of welfare and development as a *Pueblo*. It would be important for the *winka* to accompany us, because it would offer them a space to do the same, as well as the possibility of defining their own development in an interconnected rather than a unilateral fashion. Today, we cannot claim that this or that political bloc is our potential ally. At one point we thought that the *Concertación* could be an ally, because the Right (*Alliance for Chile*) has openly displayed its intolerance as well as its ignorance of our history and of the rights that we possess as a people. But the *Concertación* learned well from the dictatorship—particularly how to repress social movements, undermine their bases and delegitimize their demands. It has learned how to administrate populism and keep the population ignorant. The arrogance and self-importance of its presidents and functionaries has intimidated people. Political “pyrotechnics” such as inaugurations and media spectacles have diverted the discussion from the issues that are most relevant to the population. With respect to the political left, we have never surpassed the status of the “*Mapuche front*,” a place where political groups can intervene to pursue their own social agendas. Nevertheless, it is more strategic to make a call to the common citizen and invite them to reform things from their own spaces, to generate demands from their everyday reality. It is plausible that such a call will emerge to transform into a political movement, especially as more organized sectors work to incorporate and amplify their voices. We need to talk, discuss, agree, and recognize our own prejudices and ignorance about each other. It is possible that a shared project that shakes off those who oppress us will bring us closer to the social and collective wellbeing that we seek.

### **Economic Autonomy and the Social Project**

To think about an autonomous project without contemplating economic issues is to perpetuate a neocolonialism characterized by chronic economic dependence, a dependence that would determine political decisions and therefore condition popular participation. It is necessary to understand the economy not only as a structural factor, but also as a structuring one. This means that in an ideological sense, the economy also produces subjectivities, a phenomenon that can be seen in the organization of labor and in the logic underlying exchange. The economy creates values and perpetuates them through its development. It shapes people within particular ways of conceiving the world. In an economy that stimulates competition between people, individualism will persist despite the development of collective projects. This logic

leads to a conception in which human beings are measured by their functionality, and not by their integrity.

For us, an autonomous movement has to formulate a series of values congenial with its own economy. One of the pillars of human beings is their integrity, and this why we must define what we mean by the term development. Currently this concept is understood in terms of variables and measurable indexes: schooling, income, access to goods, and so forth. Undoubtedly, every social project seeks the “*wellbeing*” of its population, although the variables mentioned above are not enough to measure the satisfaction of a population or its life aspirations, even if they are necessary for the artifice of public policy.<sup>9</sup> From our autonomist perspective, we must ask ourselves what type of *being* we want to form, because the fact that people are highly successful and educated, with large incomes and acquisitive power, does not guarantee that they are good people, respectful and tolerant people, lovers of wisdom and the like.<sup>10</sup> A current problem is the absence of economic studies that deeply and rigorously consider the *Mapuche* and its regional issues. Granted, there are ethnographic descriptions and government statistics, but they are insufficient to explain chronic poverty; most decisions have been made on the basis of common sense rather than on the basis of serious research. There is no study that investigates the *historical debt*—what we, *the Mapuche*, lost by being forcefully incorporated into the nation-state has yet to be fully established. The loss of lands, cattle, mining, forests, rights to water and the subsoil has not been quantified. Without these studies, it is difficult to negotiate any reparation. This is indeed a strategic question, since reparations from the Chilean State could potentially generate the economic base that would finance the *autonomous government* during an initial period.

There are no reliable studies about the underground markets in which the *Mapuche* have historically participated, even while the concept of a subsistence or survival economy has been applied as a strategy to understand *Mapuche* poverty. Ethnographies have denied their inter-ethnic relation with the *winka* with regards to commerce, going as far as to argue that the *Mapuche*, for cultural reasons, have failed to integrate to markets except to gain access to things they cannot produce themselves.<sup>11</sup> Nonetheless, there is a *Mapuche* cultural vision about the use of resources within a broader conception of the relation between humans and nature, economic relations, and the way that power itself is understood. The articulating feature here is “*reciprocity*,” a concept that describes social relations among humans as much as between humans and nature. The economy to be developed in an *autonomous territory* must be understood as one that is constructed in the process of attaining *autonomy*. To achieve this, different relevant aspects have to be developed. The first is research into macro and microeconomic structures from a historical perspective. The second



has to do with access to the economic information necessary that is related to participation and decision-making. Currently, only particular economic agents possess such information, and are therefore able to influence territorial planning for the region. A third aspect is the development and acquisition of technology. The fourth is transformation of the productive sector that has to deepen the relevant modalities of production such as associations, cooperatives, and commercialization.

Today, the greatest obstacles to *Mapuche* development lie in the process of exchange, as the existing intermediaries base their actions on speculation. Many of these middlemen have much more information about the markets and possess the infrastructure to concentrate greater volume, granting them access to the markets of their choice. If changes in the markets occur, they use their resources to buy and sell other products, or to channel their resources towards different investments. This is why the *Mapuche* and *winka* producers absorb all the costs of crises or of the saturation of markets, both in the rural and urban arenas. *Mapuche* and *winka* workers, whose production is oriented towards primary and tertiary sectors, are dependent upon external markets and capital flows, respectively. An autonomous economy cannot promote this kind of fragility in relation to markets and capital, because it leads to the fragility of labor and production. This is why it is necessary to develop a non-dependent economy. Without a doubt, it is necessary to strengthen the internal market, generating an economic base that seeks the accumulation of internal capital in order to enable an equitable distribution. Additionally, it is important to develop technology that corresponds to reality, which implies generating infrastructure that harmonizes cultural aspects with ecological diversity. This includes four key elements: a) research, b) studies for the feasibility of investment, c) training and formation of specialized labor, and d) investment projects.

It is also necessary to generate forms of exchange, such as barter, that provide an alternative to a mercantilist logic. These can enable access to goods on the basis of exchanges of goods rather than monetized transactions, which would imply price controls. Along the same lines, it is necessary to establish price margins or thresholds to buffer the devaluation of products. It is also necessary to establish the financial infrastructure for the development of an internal market as well as mechanisms to better engage external markets. For small-scale farmers, the credit system does not function according to their ability to pay, which is why the small *campesino* is marginalized, lacking a monthly income to make their monthly payments, which are no doubt compounded by interest. This is also the case with small and medium businesses and the lines of investment credit available to them, beyond which there is little in the way of advising or monitoring for these investments. With regards to exchanges, it is necessary to encourage a strong process of association and

commercialization that allows us to intervene in exchanges in order to reduce operational costs and increase profit margins, as well as developing plans that stimulate accumulation through savings.

In the case of consumer credits, it is indispensable to break the population's chronic cycle of debt. This implies intervening these agencies, regularizing interest rates, and making forms of payment more flexible. These companies speculate with and profit from the wages of the lowest-paid workers, both *Mapuche* and Chilean. They also generate false expectations of life and consume the resources acquired by the working masses. The only way to maintain equitable living standards is to impose raises on the lowest salaries, and initiate regulatory controls on the highest ones in order to produce a better distribution of earnings.

The educational and vocational centers, moreover, should be oriented to the labor needs of the region: it is necessary to regulate the educational supply to the needs of the labor market in the *autonomous territory*, preparing excellent cadres for public service and selection by political quotas. This is not a populist argument: an *autonomous government* needs professionals more than it needs activists in order to establish a technically solid structure. The training of these professionals must be oriented by the needs of the *autonomous territory*, and the same should be the case with their graduate specialization. This implies investing in the formation of professionals, in Chile and abroad, that are committed to the autonomous cause, and in our case, the *Mapuche* cause.

The *autonomous government* must ensure social welfare in three key areas: education, health, and the system of social security and pensions. Its economy, therefore, must not center exclusively on the economic growth, but must focus in equal measure on human development indexes. Likewise, the *autonomous government's* taxation policies should not be excessively centered on the taxation of people, but rather on the creation of multiple companies that will enable a permanent income. It is necessary to "nationalize" the companies in the territory, such as the hydro-electric plants, as well as expelling the companies that cause grave damages to the environment and that limit economic capacity in the long-term, like cellulose plants and forestry companies. Likewise, it is important to attract investment that guarantees the infrastructure for sustainable development, which entails a possibility for studying external markets. All *autonomous* economic infrastructure must be oriented towards creating social cohesion through the integral development of persons, their values, their incomes, their education, and their access to goods. Nevertheless, this can only be achieved if people change their attitude, transforming themselves from passive receptors to active participants in the process. This attitude might be subjective, but it can also transform itself into an attitudinal disposition towards life and society; ultimately, understanding

the responsibilities of citizenship, the shared responsibilities, and the responsibilities that pertain exclusively to the government. A society that grows is one that possesses a critical attitude towards itself and is capable of committing itself to the changes that it requires.

### ***Mapuche* Territorial Reconstruction is an Autonomous Process**

We are currently undergoing a process that some have denominated the reconstruction of *territorial identities*. The *Lafkenche* and *Nagche* movements are certainly part of this, but there are a numerous identities experiencing these processes. They span the gamut from the repositioning of traditional *Mapuche* leadership, to a process of cultural reconstruction that embraces ceremonies in their more original meaning and structure, in order to create a public space where *Mapuches* can express their religiosity and transmit modes of learning as a People. This process of recovery has led to the more prominent participation of young people and the elderly, for example, in the rebirth of *mapuzungun* [the *Mapuche* language]. This phenomenon includes urban and rural groups that participate in these ceremonies, which themselves become an important recruitment mechanism. On the other hand, participation in these practices engenders an identity that is simultaneously global and local, which is something that those *Mapuche* intellectuals who question the importance of these processes have not experienced.

Without a doubt, the ceremonies and *Mapuche* public spaces represent an important mechanism for recruitment, and for *repatriation* as well, in the sense that they inculcate belonging and a yearning for a return to their place of origin. We promote these elements because the social fabric is strengthened, enabling a sense of a larger collective that makes a strong first impression with regards to recruitment and also leaves an indelible mark on the public spaces where these ceremonies take place.

When speaking of territorial reconstruction, one argues for the reconstitution of several territorial units that can be interwoven together into a large fabric that allows for different levels of self-definition and adherence. Today we see the recomposition of families. When one enters a public space, one does so as a member of a larger unit, although the ceremonial space represents a greater unit still, which differentiates it from other territorial units. This is where the distinctions between one *lof* and another emerge: the number of families that it brings together, the roles that they assume, and the characteristics of how the ceremonial space unfolds, which is closely related to the context, the physical space, and the spiritual symbols that are present there. All of this represents a cultural-historical synthesis of thousands of years.

The reconstruction of a *lof* involves a series of conflicts, many of which may be imperceptible. These are generated by the rearrangement of the structures in the

territory—imposed organizations such as neighborhood councils, for example—which have displaced the *Mapuche* leadership. Processes of ideological decolonization emerge and antagonisms with existing institutions, such as churches and others, are often expressed. New strategies and modalities not present in the culture are developed, on the other hand, making it so that discussion must accompany each new experience. What is important here is that we are imagining new strategies to safeguard our experiences and practices, making them sustainable in over time, and socially validating those cultural practices that prove most effective.

The reconstruction of a *lof* entails the recomposition of both internal and external relations, assuming the tensions inherent in these processes as well as confronting tensions of previous processes that were left in an almost static state as a result of the process of forced resettlement (*reducción*) that followed the invasion by the Chilean state. In other words, the different types of conflicts that exist in communities would be further exacerbated by the new tensions that would accompany territorial reconstruction. This is not necessarily a negative scenario in the long run, as communities could find solutions to resolve conflicts in the context of greater stability. We can visualize this situation in the following way: Great waves of migration were the result of the Chilean-Argentine invasion, which lasted approximately 20 years and which was exacerbated by constant military skirmishes between 1883-1900. These migrations influenced the composition of the territorial units (*lof*, *rewe*, and *ayllarewe*) because when the original communities received outsider (*akunche*) families, a process of adaptation ensued that eventually generated conflict. These were obviously dealt with in some way, because the new arrivals had to adapt to the practices and customs of the receiving group and accept that for a long time they would not be able to intervene politically, because political leadership remained with their hosts (*aniümche*). Social integration requires a process of local ethno-genesis in which the differences that define the other as *other* are overcome. The natural course of this process was interrupted by re-settlement, making it difficult to overcome these tensions. In this context, receiving communities were thus not able to see this migration as an asset. In many cases, rivalries remain to this day and in others, they are further exacerbated as traditional leadership is replaced by functional leaders who only need to be literate to exercise these roles and receive the State's recognition as legitimate interlocutors. Territorial reconstruction will encounter these unresolved processes and will have to approach them with a delicate hand, underscoring the importance and magnitude of the process and its final objectives, as it transforms territorial unity into a single representative body.

In this territorial work, one can appreciate how the proposal of constituting a single body generates a local identity that is based on the right to decide how this unity will

be developed. Territorial work allows people in the community to decide how they want to live, and to generate initiatives in the spheres of production, organization, and education, as well as in the way they relate to State agencies. This, in turn, presents the opportunity to exercise self-management and to break, or at least undermine, the relationship of dependency through the creation of our own structures. On the other hand, the State also benefits from this situation because it can focus its investments and obtain better results in the realm of production, decrease administrative burdens, and maintain social stability through popular satisfaction in the short term. For the *Mapuche* territorial units, this represents the challenge of professionalization and the development of the necessary technical expertise to carry forth their proposals. In other words, they must create specific kinds of expertise and generate a division of labor that enables participation. This also requires assigning a role to the traditional leadership whose function is to generate the cultural resources needed to make the unit function. On the other hand, the functional leadership must generate expertise for external and internal negotiations. The professionals and technicians, on their part, must provide diagnostics and analysis for the advancement of negotiations. The community must be informed and decide how to approach different situations in an organized manner.

In this process of reconstruction, this opens the possibility for the territorial units, rather than illuminated theoreticians, to generate the discourse and practice of autonomy, particularly in the face of emerging problems that will no longer be in the hands of municipal governments or other local powers. On the other hand, these units will have to turn to the old system of territorial alliances to generate transformations and undertake the process of *Mapuche national unification*, as all these territories define themselves as *Mapuche*. The use of instruments like political parties or other organisms of a federal character, such as parliaments, will be part of the decisions that these units have to make in the process of reconstruction. At most we *Mapuche* professionals, can contribute our analyses towards the making of informed decisions, presenting options, which will be undoubtedly limited by our training. While these contributions are received as such by the communities, their decisions are often based on considerations that professionals are simply unable to see. Under the current conditions, the movements of *territorial identities* represent a more effective approach towards creating future autonomy. Whether these are administered through governments or co-governments, power is sustained through the decision-making capacity of collectives. The professionals and technicians are those who render these decisions viable.

To those who see *urban Mapuche* as being alien to these processes, we say that this view is tainted in prejudice, as the majority of them are still in contact and



collaborating with their communities of origin. We could make the most out of these relations to generate a number of collective initiatives. This could even be a mechanism of social recruitment, because if a significant portion of these *Mapuche* saw the possibility of development in their *lof* or in the countryside, they would return. For the extreme cases where people have lost all links with their places of origin, it is necessary to implement initiatives that can reconstitute the meaning of community. These groups cannot be isolated and powerless with regards to decisions that pertain to their society or to an *autonomous government*. We must remember that the *lofs* emerged on the basis of bonds between families that gradually created a process of local fusion, which gave their members the particular identity that they carry. A process along these lines can be taken up once again today, understanding however these processes are long and depend on the will of the group in question. Ultimately, *Mapuche national unification* entails the reconstruction of the social fabric that does not take place in an extemporal moment or in a vacuum, but within a specific historical moment and space—our *territorial identities*. Recomposing family ties leads to an ontological process aimed at defining what kind of people we want to be. This is determined both by our own cultural constitution as well as by the changes wrought by globalization. This territorial process does not mean isolation from Chilean society. On the contrary, it means deciding the type of relations that we want with it. It does not entail an exclusion of the *winka*, who is welcome participate if the community accepts it, so long as he fulfills the duty of sharing his ideals and practicing them. The *winka* will have the option of choosing the society they prefer for themselves and their children. We want to point out, lastly, that these processes depend heavily on Chilean society opening up to democracy, leaving aside centralist and asymmetrical positions, and on the capacity of Chileans to decide on matters concerning their own society. This is the only way to generate the conditions that will allow us to negotiate the autonomy of the *MAPUCHE COUNTRY*.

Feley

*Translated by Miguel Winograd*

### Notes to the “Epilogue to *¡... Escucha Winka...!*”

- 1 There are currently three known autonomous positions: the *Mapuche Liwen* Center for Studies and Documentation, the *Ad Mapu* Organization and the *Aukiñ Wallmapu Güllam* (Council of All the Lands). A series of articles have elaborated commentaries on these proposals. Tirúa’s *Identidad Lafkenche* is the only document that has demonstrated a shift in mentality for the *Mapuche movement*, placing the territorial theme front and center, in a much more

accessible level for *Mapuche* social reconstruction and more conducive to a focus on *autonomy*. This document is not formulated as an autonomous proposal, although it declares itself in favor of *autonomy*.

- 2 See the case of the journalists of the *Azkintuwe* newspaper.
- 3 It bears pointing out that we, *Mapuches*, have always had concepts of self-identification. For Boccara, the category of *reche* [the originators] was created as a way to distinguish natives from the *winka*, a concept that then became the self-identification of *Mapuche*. Both concepts make sense within the *Mapuche* world, in epistemological (as construction of knowledge) as well as ontological (in the social being that is sought) terms. In the twentieth century, the concept used by the leadership was *raza* [race], to accentuate the differentiation with the *winka*. Over the last 30 years, the concept of *Pueblo* has made solid inroads, and since the nineties, the same has been the case with the concept of *Nation*. Likewise, the demand for *collective rights* has been present from the beginning of the twentieth century, even though today these rights are conceived more systematically in a global context than they were 100 years ago. Clearly there is a consciousness that, due to our culture and history, we are neither Argentine nor Chilean, but *Mapuche*, and that we were forcibly incorporated into these Nation States. Coñuepan and Panguilef (in the first half of the twentieth century) made more concrete proposals to achieve a level of autonomy, such as the development of our own institutions, in the first case, and the idea of an Indigenous Republic, in the second.
- 4 Between the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries a large number of *winka* settled in *Mapuche territory*, fleeing from the miserable lives they led with peninsular and creole Spaniards. Once the military conquest of the *gulumapu* was consummated, the Army displaced a significant part of this population, which was then forced to wander and eventually settle in “fiscal” lands as tenants of the new *latifundia* that were gradually being formed.
- 5 From the war’s outset, a population of foreign colonists and large landowners [*latifundistas*] start to settle in the territories, except for Llanquihue, where the process of colonization began earlier, but always sponsored by the State. The difference in the case of the Araucanía is that the State delegates the task to private agents, thus giving birth to the large *latifundia* owned by the businessmen who signed these contracts. Of the colonists who arrived, many abandoned their lands due to the extreme life conditions. The ones who remained had to learn the rules of the game: only the strongest survive.
- 6 The *Mapuche movement* in itself has never been a completely political movement, but neither has its character been completely social, since it has articulated

explicitly political vindications. This situates the movement in an intermediate position. What it has not done is to take the great leap to establish a strategic organization, nor has it effectively defined its social project, although it has sketched out certain outlines. We have written this paragraph to emphasize the extremes, but the *Mapuche movement* finds itself currently in a period of transition.

- 7 It bears keeping in mind that the first *Mapuche* organizations were of a mutual character, and only later would they become sectorial organizations. Currently they are Indigenous Associations, a figure that allows them to function legally and therefore prevents them from being catalogued as illicit associations.
- 8 *Civil disobedience* has been used in contexts of colonial repression and one of its main representatives is Gandhi. It is necessary to conclude clearly that an imposed normative framework is illegitimate in order to exercise it. A form of civil disobedience can be calling young people to resist military recruitment, considering the role played by the Chilean Army in imposing and sustaining the colonial situation. Another way could be calling for the non-payment of taxes because we, the *Mapuche* have been impoverished by the State; or not singing the national anthems of the states involved in taking away or sovereignty; or not to respect the sentences of the tribunals against leaders who are convicted of crimes in the effort to silence their political voices. *Self-defense* is the right and the duty to defend one's self of all the repressive acts, such as involuntary searches or seizures realized for political motives or for reasons of intimidation. Actions against plants that contaminate the environment or make people sick are legitimate when the authorities do not act after proper complaints are presented. All of these measures should stem from a process of popular consultations that validates them, after considering all the proposals that the population of a given territory make. These issues are difficult for the state to take on because they imply its very reformulation, a possibility opposed by the governing class as well as the majority of the functionaries. All of this can be solved peacefully, although the State, its functionaries, and the governing class can also exacerbate it.
- 9 It bears pointing out that public policies correspond to government policies, which is why they focus in emphasizing the work of governments and the successes of political conglomerates. In the evaluation of programs, the population generally participates indirectly and with very few evaluative criteria. On the other hand, the population or the citizens, in the state's nomenclature, do not participate in the decision-making process, which means that the continuity of a program depends on the decisions of the conglomerate in power. Communicational

strategies are used to mitigate the possible effects or reactions of the population, which is why no one is fully informed about the programs. Public policies seek to manage conflicts, even reaching the point of lengthening or exacerbating them according to their purposes.

- 10 Generally, only people of working-age enter the calculations of development, which constitutes a limiting vision because an old person is not considered part of the developed group. We must remember that the pensions that the people of our *pueblo* currently receive are a misery. In fact, the pensions are well below the cost of daily essentials, even though an elderly person who receives that pension might be a *lonko* with a deeper wisdom and far more honorable attitude than any man inside any branch of the State. An analysis employing the concept for the *Mapuche* case can be found in the works of Milan Stuchlik.