A Contra corriente
Una revista de estudios latinoamericanos
Vol. 17, Num. 1 (Fall 2019): 42-64

A Complicated Game of Friendship: Epistolary Exchanges and Neo-Colonial Relations in Modern Chile

Joanna Elizabeth Crow
University of Bristol
Allison Ramay
Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile

Introduction

The term friendship has been approached "from a number of [scholarly] perspectives and agendas, and […] there is considerable variation and dispute concerning its nature, its meaning, and the form it takes".[1] It is, as Patience Schell remarks, an "impossibly broad" term,[2] and scholarship on it has largely focused on the elite, Anglophone world. This article explores how friendship plays out in communications between indigenous Mapuche public figures and leaders, and non-Mapuche Chileans. It analyzes friendship as a discursive act—as a public proclamation which is intimately linked to political strategy—in the specific context of intercultural relations in modern Chile. The first two sections trace the continuities and shifts

[1] Mihalis Mentinis, "Friendship: Towards a Radical Grammar of Relating", *Theory and Psychology* (2014). Mentinis touches upon "the ways in which the Mapuche indigenous people of a specific community in Chile understand and form friendships" but only very briefly. The discussion is mainly theoretical.

[2] Patience Schell, *Sociable Sciences: Darwin and His Contemporaries in Chile* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 8.

between Mapuche political leaders' references to and understandings of friendship in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, as their people lost their political and territorial autonomy, and became subjects of the Chilean state.[3] The third and final section then compares and contrasts these historical articulations of friendship with the present-day, when the word *conflicto* eclipses friendship in most discussions about Mapuche-Chilean (state) relations. Mapping out the changes in language acts from the early nineteenth century through to the twenty-first century helps us to understand how the current stalemate has come about. We thus seek to contribute to an already rich and diverse scholarship, produced inside and outside the country, on racial politics in contemporary Chile.[4] Some other scholars have taken a similarly *longue-durée* approach;[5] but they do not trace or juxtapose language acts like we do. Our contention is that such an endeavor offers productive insights into public acts of friendship, or lack thereof, today.

As intimated above, we also aim to expand the existing English-dominated scholarly literature on the slippery language of friendship, which in turn allows us to interrogate further the deep contradictions between the discourse and practice of colonialism and neocolonialism. As underscored by renowned post-colonialist scholars, such as Homi Bhabba and Dipesh Chakaparty, both colonizers and colonized can take advantage of the spaces created by these contradictions. In the following pages, we show how friendship can be used as a neo-colonial (co-opting) tool, and yet, at the same time, there is no doubt that real dependency was also part of the equation. We thus detect the fragile and difficult to pin point spaces between the struggle for power over

---

[3] The Mapuche famously managed to maintain their cultural, economic and political autonomy during the colonial period, as exemplified in the numerous treaties signed between Mapuche leaders and representatives of the Spanish crown (which recognised the lands south of the Bio Bio River as independent Mapuche territory). The Mapuche continued as an independent people during the first decades of republican rule. The Chilean state embarked on its official colonisation campaign in 1852 when it established the province of Arauco; the military campaigns began in earnest in 1862, and were concluded in 1883, when troops marched on and occupied Villarrica, the last bastion of Mapuche resistance.

[4] For example, Guillaume Boccara and Ingrid Seguel-Boccara, "Políticas indígenas en Chile (siglos XIX y XX); De la asimilación al pluralismo—El caso Mapuche", *Nuevos Mundos, Mundos Nuevos* (February 2005), available at http://nuevomundo.revues.org/594; Pablo Marimán, Sergio Caniuqueo, José Millalén and Rodrigo Levil, *Escucha, winka…! Cuatro ensayos de Historia Nacional Mapuche y un epílogo sobre el futuro* (Santiago: LOM, 2006); Eduardo Mella Seguel, *Los mapuche ante la justicia: la criminalización de la protesta indígena en Chile* (Santiago: LOM, 2007); Patricia Richards, *Race and the Chilean Miracle: Neoliberalism, Democracy and Indigenous Rights* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2013).

[5] For example, Joanna Crow, *The Mapuche in Modern Chile: A Cultural History* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2013); Florencia Mallon, *Courage Tastes of Blood: The Mapuche Community of Nicolás Ailio and the Chilean State, 1906-2001* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005); and Jorge Pinto Rodríguez, *La Formación del Estado y La Nación, y el Pueblo Mapuche: de la Inclusión a la Exclusión* (Santiago, Chile: DIBAM, 2003).

the other and mutual reliance. French philosopher Jacques Derrida, and specifically his book *The Politics of Friendship*, suggests that "radical" friendship (companionship and cooperation) can serve as a way of complicating or problematizing an overly binary or exclusively antagonistic understanding of colonial relations and colonialism. Friendship, Derrida argues, can demonstrate the capacity of "self-othering" (the ability to think of oneself as the other, and vice-versa) and the possibility of belonging together within an inclusive community.

The discursive acts of friendship between Mapuche and non-Mapuche people that we examine in this article are all written acts, although in some cases these are transcriptions of what were initially spoken acts. In many cases, we are dealing specifically with epistolary interactions. First, with letters between Mapuche leader Francisco Mariluán and two Chilean state authorities in the early nineteenth century, soon after Chile declared its independence from Spain. Second, the writings and speeches of two prominent leaders, Manuel Manquilef and Manuel Aburto Panguilef, during the 1910s-1940s. Third, the *cartas abiertas* (open letters) published by Mapuche activists Jaime Huenún and Hector Llaitul (via academic journals and the Internet) in the early twenty-first century. There is a vast body of primary source material available: hundreds of letters from the nineteenth century, hundreds of documents produced by Mapuche intellectuals and newspaper reports on their activities during the first half of the twentieth century, and thousands of publications by individual activists and political organizations since 2000. To allow for in depth analysis in each of the three sections of the paper, we use key written exchanges as snapshots of what we see as broader scenarios of interaction and negotiation.

In her work on epistolary friendships in a much earlier period and different continent (Renaissance Italy), Judith Bryce helpfully distinguishes between instrumental and affective relationships (the latter denoting shared sensibilities, passion, intimacy, and a desire to do things together).[6] In our case, we are predominantly discussing an instrumental relationship. That is not to say that we see no demonstration of affection, but that friendship mainly seems to be articulated as political strategy or alliance building, and dependent on the exchange of various things. In the early twentieth century, for example, the declared friendships that we focus on seem directly related to individual figures' increased visibility on the Chilean national 'stage'.

---

[6] "Between Friends? Two Letters of Ippolita Sforza to Lorenzo de Medici", *Renaissance* Studies 21: 3 (2007): 340-365.

Bryce refers to four subsets of meanings attached to the term friendship, one of which is "patronage related".[7] The notion of friendship as essentially self-interested and self-promoting emerges loud and clear in many of our epistolary exchanges; there is no disinterestedness. There would not be a friendship if there were not an essential exchange at stake. In almost all the letters that we look at Mapuche activist-intellectuals are 'doing business'; they are not talking about pleasure. They are cultivating friendships as part of a political strategy centred on surviving and trying to negotiate the realities of colonial or neo-colonial relations. What we are discussing, in sum, is—to use Bryce's words—a "game of friendship",[8] which takes place on an uneven playing field. The Mapuche actors we include can be understood as either facilitating or obstructing a neo-colonial agenda, and thereby taking on the role of the *indio permitido* or his "dysfunctional Other" the *indio insurrecto*—a distinction developed, in the context of neoliberal multiculturalism, by Charles Hale and Rosamel Millamán, drawing on the work of the Bolivian subaltern theorist Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui.[9] These terms are helpful in explaining generally the degree to which each Mapuche actor works with or against the dominant thinking, however, through the use of language we get a closer look at how the Mapuche actors actively work to establish the limits of what they deem "fair" in the relationship of exchange. In other words, by looking at each author's expectation in this game of exchange, we also learn about the kinds of agency that were and are possible within the neo-colonial context.

Our approach to discourse assumes that speech acts lead to actions in the world and that the relationship between speech and action is not always stable, particularly in the realm of friendship.[10] By analysing the action, including that which is exchanged, we can also better understand the different meanings that friendship takes on for those involved, as well as the ways in which broader Chilean-Mapuche relations change over

---

[7] Ibid., 349.

[8] Ibid.

[9] The "indio permitido" is perceived as one who enjoys the (mainly cultural) rights that the neoliberal multicultural state grants them, on the basis that they do not demand more far-reaching (economic, political, territorial) rights. Others who refuse to accept these limited developments, who challenge the legitimacy of the state and sometimes engage in violent protest, are excluded from the benefits of multicultural reform; these are the "undeserving, dysfunctional, Other" Indians. See Charles Hale, "Rethinking Indigenous Politics in the Era of the 'Indio Permitido'", *NACLA Report on the Americas* 38: 2 (2004):16-21; Charles Hale and Rosa Millamán, "Cultural Agency and Political Struggle in the Era of the Indio Permitido." In Doris Sommer, ed., *Cultural Agency in the Americas* (Durham NC: Duke University Press, 2006), 281-304.

[10] Our understanding of "speech acts" draws on the distinction made by J.L Austin between locutionary acts (that which is said) and perlocutionary acts (that which occurs as a result). Austin, J L. *How to Do Things with Words.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962).

time. In the letters of the early nineteenth century it seems that friendship was highly contingent on the exchange of tangible goods. Behind the Mapuche leaders' requests for multiple goods and favours was a sense of entitlement; perhaps because they understood that their Chilean counterparts' power and authority greatly depended on their ability to establish "friendship" with more Mapuche groups, which was only possible through the leaders with whom they were dealing. By contrast, in the early twentieth century (at least in the cases that we have explored), friendship as loyalty was primarily expressed through favours associated with knowledge and networking. Linking both periods was a sense of necessity from all participating in the exchange: there was a mutual and crucial dependence even if only momentary or ephemeral. As we move into the late twentieth century, and particularly in to the early twenty-first century, with the escalating land conflict in the southern provinces, which comprise historic Mapuche territory, and government attempts to imprison Mapuche activists on charges of terrorism, the process of dialogue and exchange seems to have become more one-sided, and public proclamations of friendship less common. Indeed, the dominant-made-normative view—propagated via mainstream newspapers, for instance, as well as much scholarship—is one of violence and tension between Mapuche and (non-Mapuche) Chileans.

The micro histories illuminated in this paper suggest that in the early nineteenth century, when there was official recognition that Mapuche people and territory were independent of the Chilean state, the language of friendship was consistently and frequently employed for negotiating political alliances between Mapuche and non-Mapuche actors. It was the written language of direct interaction; it was how the writers addressed one another, rather than a third person description (although it could be used in this way too). It continued to be relevant, we argue, for Mapuche political activists, as subjects of the Chilean state, in the twentieth century, although it was used in different ways and sometimes precisely to denounce what they were *not* getting from Chilean authorities. Finally, as the twentieth century turned into the twenty first, declarations of friendship became increasingly unusual – a sign of weakness for some Mapuche, a desperate plea for others; or, on the part of the state, an attempt to assert Chilean authority and modernity.

Our interrogation of how friendships with Chileans work from a Mapuche perspective, builds on existing scholarship on the "sociality of exchange" within

traditional Mapuche society.[11] In *Becoming Mapuche*, anthropologist Magnus Course refers to "three institutions of formalized friendship": *trafkintun*, a relation established through exchange of objects or gifts (of any kind), for example the swapping of a sack of oats for a sack of wheat; *konchotun*, which refers to the reciprocal slaughter of lambs; and *compadrazgo*, the institution of godparent-hood.[12] The vast majority of friendships, however, fall outside these formalized institutions. One of the paradigmatic activities of informal friendship (and often formal friendship too), as Course sees it, is the exchange and sharing of wine. The key point he makes is that such activities involve two people: "complex social processes and institutions involving many people are nearly always ideologically transformed into a direct exchange between just two persons".[13] This is particularly relevant to our focus on the articulation of friendship, and, crucially, it also relates to relationships between Mapuche *and* non-Mapuche, and particularly between Mapuche leaders and representatives of the Chilean state. We found that a preoccupation with (naming) individuals—acknowledging the role of specific individuals—applies to Mapuche political discourse in the nineteenth, twentieth and twenty first centuries; these personal relationships, between two people, oftentimes also had repercussions on a larger collective or institutional relationship.

Friendship can therefore be a way of thinking productively about the individual *and* the collective. It is a way of linking the study of individuals to the study of groups, as Nicholas Christakis and James Fowler urge us to do in their best-selling book *Connected*. They argue that for several centuries scientists have focused on looking at the smallest elements of a system in order to understand the larger whole.[14] But now, they explain, there is an interest "across many different disciplines […] to put the parts back together—whether macromolecules into cells, neurons into brains, species into ecosystems, nutrients into food, or people into networks".[15] Our initial explorations of the notion of friendship in the context of Mapuche-Chilean relations were triggered by an interest in the detail of the social networks of three well-known Mapuche political activists in the early twentieth century—Manuel Manquilef (1887-1950), Manuel Aburto Panguilef (1887-1952) and Venancio Coñuepán (1906-1968)—and putting the parts of

---

[11] Magnus Course, *Becoming Mapuche: Person and Ritual in Indigenous Chile* (Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2011), 36-43.

[12] Ibid., 37.

[13] Ibid., 39.

[14] Christakis and Fowler, *Connected: The Surprising Power of Social Networks and How They Shape our Lives* (London: Harper Press, 2009), 303.

[15] Ibid., 304.

these networks back together.[16] By exploring these figures' public uses of the term "friend" and their individual public efforts to establish lasting relationships with non-Mapuche, relationships that were part of a political strategy, we are able to view "simultaneously their individuality and their participation in a larger social endeavor".[17] We could even go so far as to question the given-ness of this "larger social endeavor" if we take on board Bruno Latour's Actor Network Theory (ANT). In *Reassembling the Social*, he argues "that 'society' far from being the context 'in which' everything is framed, should rather be construed as one of the many connecting elements circulating inside tiny conduits."[18] He continues: "'social' is not some glue that could fix everything […]; it is *what* is glued together by many *other* types of connectors".[19] The root of the word 'social', Latour says, is "seq, sequi and the first meaning is 'to follow'. The Latin *socius* denotes a companion, an associate. From the different languages, the historical genealogy of the word 'social' is construed first as following someone, then enrolling and allying and, lastly, having something in common".[20] All of these meanings are present in the Mapuche-Chilean interactions discussed here, and—in line with what we have found in the primary source material, and the ideas raised by ANT, not least that "everything begins with the individual"—we aim to trace the building of the modern Chilean nation-state, as a whole, through some of its constitutive, "minute elementary acts" of friendship.

In the Nineteenth Century: Friendship as the Written Language of Exchange

In the letters of the nineteenth century, the word *amigo* is used to pledge and demand loyalty in the context of conflict and widespread lack of trust; the language of friendship is used to force the interlocutor into a discursive relationship that has practical implications. In the early 1800s, the Mapuche were still an autonomous people, and many sided with Spanish royalists against the insurgents fighting for independence. Francisco Mariluán was someone who switched allegiances: initially he fought with the

[16] In 2015, we were the recipients of a grant from the British Academy ("International Partnership and Mobility Scheme") and another from CONICYT in Chile (Newton-Picarte Fund). Both focused on building international and institutional links, which we did between the University of Bristol and the Center for Intercultural and Indigenous Studies (CIIR) at the Universidad Católica de Chile, and allowed us to interrogate together the social worlds of these Mapuche intellectuals and political leaders.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Bruno Latour, *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor Network Theory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 4-5.

[19] Ibid., 5.

[20] Ibid., 6.

Spanish, but in the early 1820s, once independence had been consolidated in central Chile, decided it was in his best interests to join sides with Chilean authorities,[21] and thus, in some ways, assumed the position of the *indio permitido*.

Here we focus on two of Mariluán's epistolary conversations: one with military commander Pedro Barnechea (two letters of 1823, shortly after or before the Parlamento of Yumbel, and one letter of 1825) and the second with captain Juan de Dios Luna (one letter in 1826). On 22 September 1823, Mariluán wrote to Barnechea, addressing him as "amantísimo amigo" [beloved friend], and thanking him for the two letters he had just received: one that arrived via Ortiz, a "capitán de amigos" who Mariluán describes as his "brother",[22] and the other directly from Barnechea.[23] Immediately the focus is exchange, a two-way epistolary conversation, even though we don't have access to the other side of this conversation. Mariluán wrote to Barnechea because latter had written to him: he wrote once he heard from Barnechea; he wrote because he knew Barnechea would reply. Furthermore, Mariluán told Barnechea that his letters were read aloud in a "junta" [gathering or meeting] that he had just organised with his "caciques." The letters were thus made public among the Mapuche. Mariluán used the word "amigo" seven times in this letter, asserting an already achieved relationship as friends, but also insisting that he would do everything possible to maintain this friendship: "My wish is for you, sir, to be my friend; the aim of my work is to help you in your endeavor since we shall end up as great friends."[24] As narrated here, Mariluán pledged to work to make the friendship exist; it was an active process in which at least two participants were needed. At the end of the letter he signed off "su amigo y compañero" [your friend and brother], and just prior to this, he asked for a sabre (that Ortiz's son had borrowed) to be returned; he also requested Barnechea's help to fend off some of his Mapuche adversaries.

---

[21] For an overview of this period, see Joanna Crow, "Troubled Negotiations: The Mapuche and the Chilean State (1818-1830)", *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 36: 3 (2017): 285-298.

[22] On friendship and family—especially the use of the term brother and brotherhood, and its prominence in official government discourse in the early nineteenth century—see Pablo Mariman in the first collection of essays published by the Comunidad de Historia Mapuche in 2012: "La República de Chile y los Mapuche: 1819-1828" in *Ta Iñ Fijke Xipe Rakizuameluwün: Historia, colonialism y Resistencia desde el país Mapuche*, 79. To be a brother was to be part of the same "gran familia chilena", and at the same time allowed for difference and autonomy within that family.

[23] The letter is reproduced in Jorge Pavez, *Cartas mapuche* (Santiago: Ocho Libros/ CoLibris, 2008).

[24] Ibid., 165.

The next letter, of 26 September 1823, begins "Mr. Don Pedro Barnechea, friend and beloved brother". Herein Mariluán celebrated Barnechea's safe arrival in the Yumbel region for the "junta" that was about to be celebrated. He specifically asked for a donation of wine from Barnechea ("ocho cargas de vino") to take to his people on the coast. On the coast, Mariluán's intention was to speak of his friendship with Barnechea ("a tratar con los costinos de nuestra amistad") which would help to increase the reach of Barnechea's network of "peaceful" Mapuche groups. He had also given Barnechea his two sons ("yo he mandado dos pedasos [sic] de mi corazón que son mis dos hijos") one of which was Fermín, who would eventually become a Captain in the Chilean military.[25] On 20 November 1825, Mariluán wrote again to "my beloved brother" asking for "12 cargas de vino i 12 yeguas" for an upcoming "parlamento." He stressed that "tradition dictated" such food and wine be provided, and signed off "su amigo y compadre," thereby (again) explicitly linking friendship and kinship. It is important to note the large number of individuals mentioned in this letter. As perceived by Mariluán, these were all individual rather than institutional friendships and as such he seeks to establish concrete, tangible bonds—which would seem to reinforce Course's argument outlined at the beginning of the article—and yet these individuals often take on the role of official representatives of their broader collectives.[26] The best example of this is the fact that the Treaties of Yumbel (1823) and Tapihue (1825), which acted as a peace deal between various Mapuche groupings and the Chilean state, and were published by the government-sponsored press in Santiago, were signed by none other than Mariluán and Barnechea.

Speaking of contemporary Mapuche society, Metinis argues that unlike marriage, family and other contractual relationships, friendship remains outside the reach of the legal system. However, in this early nineteenth century context it *was* like entering into a contract: it was a pledge of loyalty, celebrated by government officials, documented for the record, and corroborated by the exchange of gifts. As outlined by

---

[25] See José Bengoa, *Historia del pueblo mapuche* (Santiago: LOM, 2000), 86.

[26] In her book, *The Mapuche in Modern Chile: A Cultural History* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2013), Joanna Crow argues that the Chilean state is not a unitary force, but rather a contested space, comprising internal political divisions, antagonistic personalities and contrary interests. The letters published by Pavez suggest that Mapuche leaders saw the Chilean and Argentine nation-states in the same way, for they addressed (and thereby highlighted the importance of) certain individuals within the state machinery. When they wrote to church, military and political authorities they always named them individually. For example, in a letter of 3 September 1878, Domingo Melin did not write to "Señor Ministro de la Guerra y Marina" but rather "Señor Don Cornelio Saavedra."

Andrea Ruiz-Esquide and others, such formalities dated back to the colonial period, when it was official policy of the Spanish crown to collaborate with "indios amigos". This position or role was enshrined in law in 1612,[27] and further endorsed by the Treaty of Quilin in 1642, which recognised Mapuche sovereignty south of the Bío Bío River, but allowed missionaries to cross the border and endorsed the establishment of churches. For at least two hundred years, then, the institutionalization of friendship between Mapuche leaders and colonial authorities was intimately connected with and dependent upon reciprocity. Another significant point that Ruiz Esquide makes is that friendship, in this form, was not "a mechanism of cultural assimilation"; it was about giving and taking of material and non-material goods.

It is difficult to imagine the friendship articulated in these letters of the nineteenth century along the "radical" lines that Derrida does, i.e. as companionship and cooperation, as a way of "self-othering" and overcoming colonial relations, as to be an "indio amigo" often meant co-option and domination of the colonized or to-be-colonized. However, Pavez is right to underscore what he sees as a "non-hierarchical dialogue between the sender and the recipient" of the letters, and thus in some instances between Mapuche leaders and Chilean state authorities. Moreover, when the reply of the recipient—a coronel or general in the military, a cleric, or provincial governor—is included in Pavez's book, we can see they often used the same vocabulary of friendship (and brotherhood, comradeship or alliance) that the Mapuche authors use.

In the specific case of Mariluán and Barnechea, we find that—despite the signing of treaties and the many epistolary declarations of devotion and respect—their friendship was not to last. They had fallen out by 1826.[28] On 20 November 1826, Mariluán wrote to Juan de Dios Luna imploring that their "amistad y alianza" (and thus friendship is directly connected to political alliance) not be like the one with Barnechea, who only acted as a friend for the time sufficient to "catch me unawares": "I thought he would never betray me but he did." It was now the friendship with Dios de la Luna

[27] We also have the creation of the post of "capitán de amigos" by the 1620s, Spaniards who were close to the indigenous. "Indian friends" were given a regular salary. See Ruiz Esquide, *Los indios amigos en la frontera araucana* (Santiago: DIBAM, 2006).

[28] Rodrigo Araya offers two possible causes of this falling out: the first is that Barnechea did not actually respect Mariluan, as indicated in a letter that he sent to a war minister (Rivera): "La experiencia tiene acreditado que [el mapuche] es incapaz de abeniencia mientras se mira próspero y triunfante, porque solo los golpes fuertes lo hacen arredrar y diferir a las negociaciones de paz." The second is that Barnechea did not hold up his end of the deal: "las acciones hostiles realizadas por los abajinos y la negativa de Barnachea y Rivera de influir entre estos últimos para que dejasen de hostilizar a los arribanos." See 'Mariluán, el lonko olvidado de la Guerra a Muerte', *Cyber Humanitatis*, 27, 2003.

that Mariluán—moving on from one individual to the next—prioritised, and he sought to formalise it through gifts. At the end of the letter Mariluán added in a post-note, saying that the hat Dios de la Luna had sent to his brother (Mariluán's brother) did not fit or suit him very well. He sent it back and asked for another, of very specific type. We can interpret this as a metaphor for their friendship: (for his brother) Mariluán wanted not only a hat but a hat that fitted; they needed to work at their friendship until they got it right.

In the Early Twentieth Century: Friendship as Intellectual and Political Networking

In first decades of the 20th century, we find a very different scenario: with Mapuche lands officially incorporated, as of 1883, and the first state-sponsored missionary schools installed, a colonizing apparatus now operated through institutions as well as through the specific individuals working within them. Manuel Manquilef and Manuel Aburto Panguilef—the focus of this section because they were two of the most prominent Mapuche political organisers during the early 1900s—were bought up in Mapuche communities (Manquilef in Quepe and Aburto in Loncoche) but schooled in Chilean or non-traditional institutions. Manquilef spent secondary education at the Liceo de Temuco and Aburto attended the Araucanian Mission of Maquehue. They had different and also conflicting ideas about how to guarantee Mapuche rights and recognition in the 20th century: Manquilef is most remembered for the law he proposed, and that was passed, to turn reservations (*reducciones*) into private property rather than preserve them as "communal lands", since in the post-occupation period they no longer reflected the traditional organization of land. By contrast, Panguilef is remembered for his proposal for an autonomous republic and the work he did that consistently supported community understandings of land and ownership.[29] In this light, Manquilef seems to adopt the role of the "*indio permitido*" and Aburto Panguilef the "*indio insurrecto*", but, as we will see below, both used the language of friendship when referring to their relationships with non-Mapuche, thus opening up our understanding of their modes of negotiation through representation. Manquilef and Aburto were leaders of two of the main Mapuche political organizations in the early twentieth century: the Sociedad Caupolicán and the Federación Araucana respectively. Manquilef was also elected to

[29] "Emergencia de la tercera columna en La Faz social de Manuel Manquilef", Anales de Desclasificación, 1: 2, pp. 927-948; Menard, André y Jorge Pavez, *Mapuche y Anglicanos: Vestigios fotográficos de la Misión Araucana de Kepe, 1896-1908* (Santiago: Ocho Libros, 2007); Menard, André y Jorge Pavez, "El Congreso Araucano, Raza y Escritura en la Política Mapuche", *Política* 44 (2005): 211-232.

the National Congress, as representative of the Liberal Democratic Party in 1926. They both organized mass political events and they represented the interests of Mapuche groups through speeches, interviews and essays to a larger public audience, including the government in power. Both most likely, made lasting friendships with Mapuche and non-Mapuche people at their schools, but what most stands out in their public discourses and private writings (letters in Manquilef's case and a diary in Aburto's) is their different styles of making and managing friendships with non-Mapuche, as well as the perceived purpose of such friendships. In both cases, the act of writing had public dimensions. In Manquilef's case, we analyze his epistolary exchange with German philologist, Rodolfo Lenz, as well as a well-known speech that he gave in Santiago. The content of these letters concerns the public writing of Manquilef, and Lenz's role in those publications; thus, the private writing has immediate public implications. In Aburto's case, we hone in on a newspaper interview and some excerpts from his diaries. His first diaries were confiscated by the government, most likely because they contained information about his political work as leader of the Federación Araucana. The later diaries also detail his political work and include the names of hundreds of people with whom he interacted. The editor of Aburto's published diary, André Menard, states that the Federación Araucana wanted to document and therefore prove "the actual number of Mapuche, since they were continually represented as being on the brink of extinction",[30] and including people's full names was one way of doing that. The diaries were also a way of creating a legacy for himself and his organization. The private and public dimension of the letter and diary thus blur somewhat.[31]

One of the most studied relationships that Manuel Manquilef maintained with a non-Mapuche was with Rodolfo Lenz. The first traces of their relationship are found in a text that Manquilef submitted to an essay contest, organized by the *Anales de la Universidad de Chile*, in the context of Chile's centenary celebrations. There was to be one award for "a work that studies an aspect of Araucanian life". Manquilef's essay won, and it was read out in public on 9 October, 1910, during one of the meetings of the Sociedad de Folklore. Following the acceptance of Manquilef's text for publication by the Sociedad de Folklore, an epistolary exchange began between Lenz and Manquilef, which sheds compelling light on the many tangible and intangible benefits

[30] Menard, André, *Libro diario del presidente de la Federación Araucana, Manuel Aburto Pnaguilef.* (Santiago: Colibris, 2013), xxxiv.

[31] In the words of Menard, *"se trata más bien de una escritura y de un archivo en el que la relación entre lo público y lo privado está totalmente desdibujada. Vida y obra, biografía e historia, intimidad y política se van confundiendo hasta volverse indiscernibles*" (ibid., xvi).

that their declared friendship could afford each of them. Manquilef asked Lenz for advice, for example, about whether or not he should show his collection of "artículos" to Ramon Laval, who was also part of the Sociedad Folklore.[32] In another letter, Manquilef mentioned lending Lenz an original text he had written on Perrimontun,[33] which he had intended to publish somewhere but we have yet to find the text itself, and Manquilef asked him to return it.[34] The concept of friendship is repeated often as if to remind each participant in the epistolary exchange that they need to give and, in turn, will receive. Those who were "friends" such as Valetín Letelier,[35] and not friends such as Tomás Guevara, also seemed to help define and reassure the existence of a friendship in which exchange was safe and beneficial to both involved, similar to the case of Mariluán and Barnechea in their letters in the 1820s.

Florencia Mallon argues that Lenz fashioned Manquilef as an "anthropological informant" and sought to maintain his colonial position as "the expert-ethnologist".[36] Part of his angst toward Manquilef, she asserts, was precisely because he "escapes from his grasp". In his publications, Manquilef demonstrated that he knew the rules of the intellectual game and that he both adhered to and challenged those same rules. But what seems to be an abstract play for authority over the text (specifically Manquilef's book *Comentarios* here) becomes a nuanced relationship through the letters exchanged, revealing Manquilef as a vigorous advocate for his text, which makes his subjectivity, as well as the restraints involved, clearer and we see that Lenz sometimes assumed a submissive position. In the only letter to which we have access from Lenz to Manquilef, the former openly acknowledged Manquilef's authority regarding written Mapudungun. Lenz was in the process of reviewing some of Manquilef's translations of Samuel Lillo's *Cantos Araucanos*, which were to be published as a *folleto* in the journal of the Sociedad de Folklore. These were transcribed by a third person ("el cajista"). In stating, as he does, "I have corrected a few sentences that surely were badly read [by the cajista], but I still have many doubts and I wouldn't want to impose my opinion,"[37] Lenz recognized Manquilef's superior knowledge of the language. This seeming inversion of a hierarchy

[32] Letter dated 22 October, 1912. Archivo Rodolfo Lenz, UMCE (Universidad Metropolitana de Ciencias de la Educación).

[33] Meaning a "vision" or "to dream."

[34] Letter dated 16 September, 1913.

[35] Letter dated 24 June, no year recorded.

[36] Florencia Mallon, 'La "Doble Columna" y la "Doble Conciencia" en la Obra de Manuel Manquilef', *Revista Chilena de la Antropología*. 21 (2010): 63.

[37] Letter dated 5 November, 1915.

contrasts, then, with Lenz's attempts to establish his intellectual authority over Manquilef in the publications.

In line with José Ancan's comment, that Rodolfo Lenz becomes the "discrete epistolary confidant of the Mapuche author", it seems that Manquilef set the pace of the friendship and some of the terms of the publications. For example, in 1912, Manquilef wrote Lenz: "Mr. Matus was at my home in the countryside and left a text about Araucanian physical exercise and he said you would not publish my work until he finished his. If this were the case, I would appreciate it if you would tell me because it would certainly not please me very much." In a respectful yet forceful tone, Manquilef insisted that Lenz publish his second essay immediately and not wait for Leotardo Matus to finish his own essay on the same topic first. Manquilef's text was published six years prior to that of Matus so, in that sense, Lenz seems to have acted upon Manquilef's request. However, Manquilef included several quotations by Matus (more than by any other author) in his book *Jimnasia nacional* and these quotations are found in Matus's posterior 1920's publication *Juegos y ejercicios de los antiguos araucanos*. So, although Manquilef's text was published first, it is likely that he felt it was important to cite Matus, signaling the difficulty of pinning down the matter of authority.

Finally, through these letters we also detect the break-down of the relationship, the neo-colonial context at work, and Manquilef's last move to maintain some of the power he initially acquired through the declared friendship. In one letter of 1914, he expressed disappointment about the few copies of *Jimnasia nacional* Lenz sent to him.[38] Furthermore, Lenz clearly did not heed to his request to add the sub-title "Contribución al Estudio de la Historia Patria" to *Jimnasia nacional*, which would have publicly recognized the value of the text as a historical study; it would have given it the status of (national) history as well as ethnography. We sense a shift in Manquilef's tone in this last letter. He began, for instance, by stating that Lenz failed to understand the importance of his *Jimnasia nacional*. It was not just about making sure that the sports are not erased from our memory, he said, implying his own desire to make physical exercise and sports an important part of the present. In addition, he informed Lenz that he had been working on another text (presumably *¡Las Tierras de Arauco!*) but that he had decided not to send him a copy because it did not include "anything new or anything in Mapudungun." Manquilef said he would give Lenz copies once it was published to "distribute to friends." This letter thus reflects Lenz's (unconscious) acts of colonizing

[38] Letter dated 13 November, 1914.

authority as well as the position that Manquilef had gained. For example, we are only aware of the uneven reciprocity because Manquilef reported it through the letters; in other words, he asserted his interest in a fair exchange on multiple occasions. And second, although the epistolary conversation seemed to come to an abrupt halt, Manquilef was keen to keep Lenz within his network; he had now forced a "debt" onto Lenz who, as Manquilef stated, should disseminate his next piece of writing among his friends.

The sweet and sour ending to the epistolary exchange helps us appreciate the significance of Manquilef's speech at the Catholic Araucanista Congress that was held in Santiago in December 1916. On this occasion, Manquilef publicly urged the audience, which included the then President Juan Luis Sanfuentes and the Archbishop, to acknowledge the hypocrisy of the vows of friendship made by the Chilean government:

> while the brave conquistadores treated us frankly as enemies, we could defend our land; but when some bad rulers of the Republic became our friends, their friendship weakened the vigor of our race, alcoholizing us, and it sunk us into poverty, taking away our lands. It is far less sad and painful, señores, to die fighting against an enemy in an open battle, than it is to die poisoned by the person who says they are our friend...[39]

The contemporary situation as Manquilef saw it was somehow more violent than war with the Spanish, for the Mapuche had been "poisoned" by people who had avowed friendship. Some of the ideas put forth in this speech are also present in one of Manquilef's published essays entitled *¡Las Tierras de Arauco!,* including the proposal to divide Mapuche communal lands, which ultimately led the Sociedad Caupolicán to retract their public support for Manquilef, who by the 1920s had become a prominent congressman.[40]

Manquilef's contemporary, and political rival, Manuel Aburto Panguilef, sent very different public messages about his friendships with non-Mapuche, beginning with an interview in 1923 and, later, parts of his diary (1940, 1942, 1948-1951). For example, in the 1923 interview with *El Mercurio*, he showed how his life path had been influenced

---

[39] 'Ecos del Congreso Araucanista', *El Diario Austral*, 23 December 1916.

[40] José Ancan states: "Este nombre [el de Manuel Manquilef] no figura ya en la más prestigiosa institución araucana, cual es la Sociedad Caupolicán", afirmaba tajante en diciembre de 1926 el entonces presidente de la SCDA, Arturo Huenchullan Medel (ver Nota 12). Aquel fundamento, el del comunitarismo, trascendería en el tiempo hasta la promulgación, por la vía de los hechos consumados, de parte de la dictadura pinochetista, del conocido DFL 2568 de 1979, que terminó dividiendo las reducciones que aún se regían por los Títulos de Merced." (See 'De küme mollfüñche a "civilizados a medias": liderazgos étnicos e intelectuales mapuche en la Araucanía fronteriza (1883-1930)', *Polis* 38 (2014): 1-18).

by the specific advice of individuals: H.L. Weiss, head of the Evangelical church in Valdivia who wanted to train him to be an evangelical missionary; Alberto Dawson, with whom he lived in La Unión and who taught him theology; Carlos Guillermo Iribarra, who motivated him to take some traditional Mapuche weavings and jewellery to Valparaíso. He also emphasized the recognition that he received from others, thereby confirming that he was "honourable" or trustworthy ("los abogados Medardo 2° Jaque y Franklin Gallegos de quienes gocé siempre de la mejor estimación"). Crucially, all of these relationships/friendships were framed by the notion that his ancestors consistently aided the government.[41] In other words, these friendly relations were presented as further evidence of his and his family's loyalty to the government in 1920s Chile.

The notion that Aburto Panguilef had an extensive network of friends and supporters gained him much sympathy when parliamentary representatives discussed his imprisonment on 21 November 1927. In this sense, friendship was like a reference system. Part of the debate in the National Congress that day focused on his trustworthiness. In response to Manquilef's accusations that Panguilef was a dirty trickster, Nolasco Cárdenas (representative of the Democratic Party for Valdivia) told the other members that he went specifically to Loncoche to ask the indigenous people there if Aburto had ever asked them for money and that they had responded, "in unison", that he had not. Cárdenas himself did not agree with Aburto Panguilef's ideas regarding Mapuche sovereignty[42], but he defended Aburto as an honest man, who did not deserve imprisonment: "There is no other way to explain how he has become president of so many indigenous communities, making up 90 percent of our indigenous race. I don't know how he has managed to gain such a following, but the fact is that it exists. Not for nothing, has he so often visited the Government, demanding protection and salvation for his race." [43]

The vast number of connections Aburto Panguilef had with others thus gained him recognition and respect. This theme was maintained, even more forcefully, in his diary entries. Throughout the more than 700 pages, there are countless examples of

[41] "Mi abuelo y su citado hijo, tío carnal mío según tradición y antecedentes que debe tener el Supremo Gobierno, por medio de la Intendencia de Valdivia, les cupo un gran papel en la planificación de la Araucanía en esta provincia de Valdivia y jamás permitió que los indígenas faltasen el debido respeto al gobierno" (*El Mercurio*, 21 January 1923).

[42] Aburto Panguilef argued that the Mapuche were still the rightful owners of the lands between the Bio Bio and Tolten Rivers (according to the 17th century agreement with the Spanish that was abolished with the end of the Pacification in 1883).

[43] Congreso Nacional, Sesion Ordinaria 4a, 21 November 1927.

how Aburto went out of his way to meet with people, Mapuche and non-Mapuche, providing favors and receiving favors in return, some of which were related to his work for the Indian Courts and others not, such as his Theatre Group's tours and the work he did for the Araucanian Federation. His diary is full of the names of individuals whom he encountered and worked with during approximately six years (in the 1940s), reflecting his own network, as well as a "Mapuche network" or Mapuche "juridical field", according to the diary's compiler, André Menard. As Menard states, documenting Mapuche "law" was, in part, the purpose of the immense detail Aburto Panguilef included in the diary.[44]

In contrast to Manquilef, whose public reference to inter-ethnic friendships in 1916 was often negative, and whose private friendship with Lenz was rather short-lived, Aburto seemed invested in constantly increasing and updating his networks. In this way, Aburto's approach to friendship more closely resembled a traditional Mapuche approach; one that Manquilef, ironically, described in his first volume of *Comentarios* regarding the building of a house ("Rukan"): "I hope that you, as a friend, will give me the honor of your presence, since there will be all that is needed to serve you. The invited chief responds 'Good friend, we all have a *rukan*, *nillatun*...and it would be a dishonor to not attend. Additionally, my friend, for friends, words should not be wasted; they only need to be told 'on this day it is my party'. All responsibilities should be left aside for those that come once in a while, with the purpose of gaining friends and increasing our kin."[45] The *rukan*, as Manquilef described it, was a moment where everything else is put aside to focus on helping those who were building the house, a metaphor for community and one that was surely important to both Manquilef and Aburto Panguilef. However, publicly, the second of these two leaders was much more interested in emphasizing the strength of these bonds than the first, which could directly relate to the kinds of political positions they held throughout their adult lives: Manquilef's public role was most associated to his work with the state, as parliamentary representative and governor, and Aburto Panguilef's public role was focused on representing and working with Mapuche communities.

---

[44] Menard, introduction to Aburto Panguilef's recently published diaries, xxxvi.

[45] "Espero, como amigo, que tú me has de honrar con tu presencia, pues no me ha de faltar como servirte. Al mismo tiempo te ruego que traigas a toda tu familia i a todos tus parientes i amigos. El cacique invitado contesta en el tenor siguiente: 'Buen amigo, todos tenemos rukan, nillatun…i sería una deshonra mui grande no asistir a ella. Además, amigo mio, para los amigos no se debe gastar muchas palabras i solo debe decírsele 'tal día es mi fiesta'" "Todos los demás cumplimientos deben dejarse para aquellos que se ven por primera vez, con el objeto de ganar amigos i aumentar nuestra parentela." Manquilef, *Comentarios: Faz social*, 423-424.

In both cases we are reminded that friendship is an act and not a given. In the politically-charged environment in which Manquilef and Panguilef were circulating, this was especially the case. Through the cited texts, we notice that Manquilef attempted to move out beyond Mapuche communities by building a lasting alliance with Lenz, which surely increased Manquilef's network and benefited his political career. But we also have a sense that there was not enough at stake, for both sides, for the friendship to continue. In the case of Aburto, representing his life as being filled with meaningful relationships with individual non-Mapuche seems to also be a strategy to enter in and out of non-Mapuche circles.

In Contemporary Chile: Is Friendship Possible?

Of the hundreds of open letters written by Mapuche activitsts and intellectuals, in this section we focus on two letters by Jaime Huenún and Héctor Llaitul. In many ways, these public figures could not be more different: Huenún is a renowned poet and recipient of prestigious literary awards, currently working for the government in the Ministry of Culture and Heritage. By contrast, Llaitul is the leader of an organization known for its militant stance regarding Mapuche territory: the Coordinadora Arauco-Malleco (CAM). He is consistently outspoken and has previously been imprisoned on charges of terrorism. By focusing on these two figures, we consider both ends of the binary described by Hale and Millamán—a sanctioned Indian, in the first case, and a rebellious, reprimanded Indian in the second—to show that while their discourses and political agendas do differ, their approaches to the game of friendship includes similarities.

On 12 May 2010, Huenún read out his "Carta Abierta desde el País Mapuche" in the Casa America de Cataluña, Spain, and it was subsequently published in a journal of Latin American literary criticism.[46] Huenún was participating in a roundtable on the subject of indigenous peoples and the bicentennial celebrations in Latin America, together with Rosalba Jímenez (ethno-linguist and one of the leaders of the National Indigenous Organisation of Colombia), Fernando Nava (Mexican anthropologist) and Alberto Velozo (psychologist of Guaraní descent, living in Spain). Huenún began by addressing the audience in Mapuzungun, and then asked (in Spanish): "Friends, will we be able to journey to those lands where the violent actions of the police and the

[46] Jaime Huenún, 'Carta Abierta desde el País Mapuche', *Revista de crítica literaria latinoamericana* 71 (2010): 271-275.

landowners escalate unimpeded, [will we be able] to make a journey […] to the so-called 'High Frontier' in the region of Araucanía, southern Chile?" He thus spoke of friendship and sought out friends straight away. He did so again on two other occasions in this short speech, and at the end reached out to his "dearest and most respected friends." This was at a time of heightened tensions and violent conflict in southern Chile.[47]

After urging people to make this journey of discovery of the 'other', which points to the decolonizing potential of friendship discussed by Derrida, Huenún narrated the tragic events of October 2009, when 200 military police raided a small primary school in Temucuicui, Ercilla (one of the communities in conflict with local forestry companies and with the Chilean state). Seven children suffered serious injuries. The poet followed this with details of 3 May 2010, when a local landowner René Urban, accompanied by police, stopped and assaulted Mariano Millanao Millape, his wife (Elvira Escobar) and their two children, as they were out collecting wood.

Huenún spoke of the challenges facing friendship in the current context of conflict: "It is impossible to love or respect that which remains hidden, just as it is impossible to build the basis for cultural and political co-existence from fear, prejudice, manipulation and marginalization." He also underscored the importance of indigenous contributions to Chile: "their blood and determination to survive in even the most adverse conditions; their physical and symbolic territories, their imaginaries, their labour and their creative energy."[48] And he made a direct reference back to Manuel Manquilef of the early twentieth century: "The Mapuche teacher, writer and political leader, Manuel Manquilef González, already said as much—with utmost clarity and sincerity—in a talk that he gave in the Chamber of Deputies in February 1927." Huenún spotlighted one particular comment that Manquilef made on this occasion:

> The Araucanian population spilt their blood to irrigate the tree of liberty that went on to shelter others who govern this country today. The Araucanian warrior never thought too much about the number of Spanish he had to fight, nor their weapons. He simply fought to the death […]. As a result of that open (albeit uneven) struggle, [the Araucanians] held on to the Independence that they deserved, and passed this legacy on to the illustrious people of Chile.

---

[47] Less than a year earlier, in August 2009, Jaime Facundo Mendoza Collío was killed by police after participating in a take-over of ancestral Mapuche lands. This happened in the Requén Pillán community in Ercilla, the same community where Alex Lemun was killed one year prior, in 2008. In his letter, Huenún describes the violent raids, including injured children, at the time of these murders and links them to ongoing violence by police.

[48] Huenún, "Carta abierta", 274.

As narrated by Manquilef and then re-narrated by Huenún, this is what the Mapuche gave to Chile, and yet they received nothing but abusive, exploitative treatment and social exclusion in return. There had been no reciprocity.

Nonetheless, Huenún sought to rebuild these relations, rather than condemn them to long-term or indefinite failure: "what stimulates our art and our activism is not war or confrontation," he said, "but rather the ongoing construction of a space of communication, a meeting point, dignity and mutual and true respect." Huenún was proclaiming a willingness to be friends at a moment of escalating violence, just as many of the Mapuche leaders were doing in their letters to Chilean state authorities during the occupation campaigns of the nineteenth century.

In Catalonia, Huenún spoke predominantly of the collective, but also pointed to specific communities and sometimes specific people. In doing so, he undermined the dominant state-sponsored narrative that largely refused to name individuals and depicted, instead, two homogenized groups in conflict with one another. In the mainstream press, reports on "the conflict" largely spoke of "encapuchados" [masked people] or the "Mapuche community". After narrating the fear and resentment sown by the aforementioned police raids, Huenún wrote: "A Mapuche child cries and runs after the police van, which is taking his mother away. What is that child called? What is his mother called?". He was pleading with people to think of the individuals behind the collective imaginary of "trenches, ditches and graves". He seemed to be suggesting that it would only be possible to break out of the current stalemate of conflict, when people were willing to name individuals, see individuals and recognize individuals (i.e. real people and potential friends).

A similar problem, but a different reaction, is found in the discourse of Mapuche political activist Hector Llaitul. We focus here on interview that he did with *Diario Austral* in 2016, which was published under the title 'The new life of CAM leader, Hector Llaitul' on the webpage www.cartaabierta.cl.[49] Llaitul had just been released from prison, after being held for several years on charges of terrorism.[50] The article begins: "The Mapuche community leader […] revealed plans to promote the political project of the Coordinadora Arauco Malleco, and ruled out dialogue with the Government." The overarching narrative of the piece is thus Llaitul's refusal to engage

[49] It was posted approximately 18 months ago: http://cartaabierta.cl/la-nueva-vida-de-hector-llaitul-lider-de-la-cam/

[50] The CAM has been declared a terrorist organisation by the Chilean government, but has secured the support of many international human rights organisations.

in conversation, and yet this is not the story that emerges in the detail that follows. "In dialogue with" the main newspaper of Temuco, *El Diario Austral*, Llaitul explained how he saw the communities' struggle to recuperate their lands, and their fight against the forestry companies in southern Chile. "Certainly", he said, "the CAM has become known for its participation in territorial and political restitution, meaning acts of resistance, and these have generated a lot of publicity. But little is known about the CAM's political project." Here we detect a desire to communicate, a desire to be heard. Llaitul wanted people to know about the CAM's "political project", as well as its violent acts of resistance.

Asked whether CAM would "sit down and talk with" state authorities, Llaitul replied: "It seems impossible at the moment; they would have to recognize us as a political force." He continued: "The authorities are obliged to take a stance; but we will always put the reconfiguration of our territory first, and the recognition of our autonomy as a basic prerequisite for any conversation. We are still a long way off this." Llaitul lamented the state's refusal to acknowledge CAM as a "valid movement"; instead "what it validates is the suppression of our demands and voice." He demanded that the state abolish decree "701 de fomento forestal," which he described as a "punch in the face" to the Mapuche movement, and concluded by saying "there is no way out of this situation; if the State passes this decree, it is to all extents and purposes a declaration of war."

This is far from a discourse or discursive act of friendship; instead, we note the continual threats. But even though Llaitul talked of not engaging in dialogue, and even though he seemingly presented the continuity of conflict as the only possible future (there seems to be no alternative to conflict), he does in fact ask for certain things: recognition of CAM as a political organisation and the derogation of degree 701. Moreover, he seemed to be saying by default that if these were granted the CAM would sit down and talk with the government. In this sense, underneath Llaitul's narrative of violent rebellion, lies a willingness to take part in dialogue. What he seems to highlight, like Huenún in his 'open letter', is—conversely—the unwillingness of the Chilean state to recognize the Mapuche as equals. As they have told it, the state will not acknowledge the harm inflicted on innocent Mapuche by the police (Huenún) or recognize Mapuche political organizations (Llaitul).

Conclusions

A discourse that creates an imaginary of inter-ethnic relations in Chile as primarily violent and tension-filled can be frequently found in *El Mercurio*, the same newspaper that explicitly supported the military occupation of Mapuche territory in the late nineteenth century. In the 2010s, that violence manifests itself in front-page headings that eliminate the specific actors of violence and that represent the primary victims as non-Mapuche Chileans. On 23 September 2016, one front-page newspaper title read "Cattle, stolen from the Luchsinger family, appear on a Mapuche community." Within the article itself, the exact location of the missing livestock is included (the community Juan Catrilaf 2) but not in the title. The police response seems entirely exaggerated: "after an intense search operation, that included land and air patrol," the livestock were identified. The urgency for the search, as implied in the article, was that the owner happened to be the nephew of the Luchsinger-Mackays who, in 2013, died as a result of an arson attack on their house by a group of Mapuche who had long been demanding the return of their lands. If the Juan Catrilaf community had political demands (justifying the stealing of the livestock), these were not included; their story was instead lumped together with another, from which all details of Mapuche perspectives on events were obliterated. Later that same month, on 30 September 2016, another front-page heading was "Dead Assailant in Vilcún Previously Condemned for Damages to Luchsinger Family Property." In the article we read that two people have died (the son of the family whose house was broken into and the robber, both of whom are Mapuche) in an attempted burglary. In the body of the article, the family involved and the police confirm that there is no relationship between the break-in and demands for land, yet the title focuses only on this; it equates the attempted robbery with the singular, most extreme case of violence against non-Mapuche Chileans in relation to land demands. There thus seems little space in newspapers such as *El Mercurio* for friendship (between Mapuche and non-Mapuche Chileans) as a discursive act; it gets drowned out by the dynamic of conflict.

There is, at the same time, another discourse that emphasizes that the Chilean state has a "historical debt" with the Mapuche; this discourse is used by Mapuche and non-Mapuche with different tones and purposes. As Rolf Foerster (2002) has pointed out, the essential problem here is similar to what seems lacking more broadly today: specific details about the past and specific proposals for the future. [51] Foerster neatly

[51] Rolf Foerster "Sociedad mapuche y sociedad chilena: la deuda histórica", *Polis*, 2 (2002): 7.

outlines the different uses of the term "historical debt" and proposes that "creditors" and "debtors" be defined since one problem is that sometimes the "debt" is associated to an undefined, colonial past, which cannot be repaid. Likewise, without a realistic "pay-back," the discourse leads to a practice that perpetuates an indefinite relationship of colonizer/colonized. This is precisely what the Araucania Advising Commission to the President attempted to do in the last months of Bachelet's second presidency, but some members of government have opposed concrete proposals. For example, on January 20, 2017, Jacqueline van Rysselberghe, president of the UDI party, opposed its suggestion to create quotas for Mapuche representatives in the Chilean Congress.[52]

Today both affective and instrumental friendships exist between Mapuche and non-Mapuche (Chileans), but public manifestations of these are uncommon. In addition to little willingness to talk of friendship, there seems to be a refusal to recognize indigenous actors protesting against the state as legitimate adversaries and equals.[53] As Marisol de la Cadena says, quoting Mouffe, "Politics are [...] those practices through which the antagonistic differences between friends and enemies are tamed, dealt with (ideologically and institutionally) and transformed into the agonisms- the relationships among adversaries-that characterize hegemonic orders, with their inclusions and exclusions".[54] De la Cadena adds to Mouffe's assertions by noting that some humans are "not even [deemed] worthy of enemy status"[55] (in the Andean context, she argues that this is because these people are perceived as too close to "Nature"). In the cases we have analyzed, potential inter-ethnic relations of friendship or adversaries (as equals) seem absent while demands for lands and basic rights (from Mapuche perspectives) and terrorism (from non-Mapuche perspectives) are heard loud and clear.[56] The horizontal communication we saw in Mariluán's epistolary conversations with military commander Pedro Barnechea now seems anachronistic. We must look to other spaces, then, to find communion, exchange and the language of friendship.

---

[52] See http://www.soychile.cl/Temuco/Politica/2017/01/20/442192/Jacqueline-van-Rysselberghe-se-opone-al-cupo-parlamentario-para-pueblos-originarios.aspx

[53] On this as a broader Latin American reality, see Charles Hale and Rosa Millamán, "Cultural Agency and Political Struggle in the Era of the Indio Permitido." In Doris Sommer, ed., *Cultural Agency in the Americas* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006), 281-304.

[54] Marisol de la Cadena, 'Indigenous Cosmopolitics in the Andes: Conceptual Reflections beyond "Politics"', *Cultural Anthropology* 25: 2 (2010): 343.

[55] Ibid.

[56] Sources detailing state terrorism against the Mapuche can be found, but have not circulated as widely. The online journal *Radio UChile* provides multiple articles detailing the children abused by *carabineros* in 2017. See, for example, http://radio.uchile.cl/2017/01/16/joven-mapuche-baleado-en-la-araucania-los-carabineros-matan-ninos-no-los-protegen.