

8. Conclusion

This study aimed to discuss the limitations and possibilities for international solidarity and transnational advocacy with and of the Mapuche in Chile from a critical race and decolonial angle. It thereby focused on the relationships that are created and produced in the encounters of solidarity between Mapuche and non-Mapuche people in Chile and Europe by looking at their different positionalities, resources, privileges, and motivations for engaging in solidarity efforts. For that purpose, this research engaged in different arenas of solidarity action: its networked aspect (chapter four), strategies and tactics (chapter five), the role of stereotypes and privileges (chapter six), and finally the everyday praxis and interpersonal encounters of solidarity, understood as assemblages (chapter seven).

A central aim of the present research is to update notions of solidarity by engaging with decolonial perspectives. But what do I understand by such perspectives? In short, in my view those political, cultural, and intellectual (but not only academic) perspectives and movements can be described as decolonial that are not only critical towards colonial relations of power, but actively strive to overcome them (Garbe 2020, 151). The usage of the term 'decolonial' requires a special sensitivity towards the fact that decolonisation should not be used as a metaphor, e.g., for social justice, human rights, or epistemic alternatives beyond Eurocentrism, but rather that it implies and demands the reconfiguration of material, territorial, and sociocultural conditions rooted in historical injustices created through European colonialism (Tuck and Yang 2012).

On an epistemological level, 'decolonial' has become generally accepted in academic debates as a term to describe critical and historically subjugated perspectives, mostly articulated by actors from the Global South, who produce knowledge in favour of or in complicity with contemporary anti- and decolonial political struggles. In contrast to mostly anglophone postcolonial debates,

decolonial perspectives further became associated with Latin American discussions about coloniality (Escobar 2003). Against the grain of an already well-established academic field of postcolonial studies, decolonial arguments have intervened by warning how such research “can lose its political edge as a position of critical social inquiry” by being “reduced to rhetoric, easily consumable as part of an educational package without promoting transformative practice” (Gutiérrez Rodríguez 2016, 62).

Now, similar criticisms towards the increasing popularity of decolonial perspectives in academia are brought forward. According to the Bolivian sociologist Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui, a rupture with colonial relations of power can only happen through concrete actions, gestures, and practices. For her, “there is no discourse of decolonization, no theory of decolonization without the corresponding practices” (Rivera Cusicanqui in Garbe, Cárdenas, and Sempértegui 2018, 15). Similar to postcolonial studies, not only can decolonial perspectives therefore become defanged of their critical transformative potential, but even further contribute to reproducing, recentring, and stabilising the Eurocentric hegemony in global knowledge production (Rivera Cusicanqui 2018; Moosavi 2020). Against such “dangers of intellectual decolonization,” Leon Moosavi (2020, 19) proposes five compelling strategies:

- (1) engage with decolonial theory from the Global South so as to avoid decolonisation without decolonising, (2) recognise that intellectual decolonisation requires momentous effort and may not even be possible, (3) avoid essentialising or appropriating the Global South, (4) explore the complex ways in which coloniality produces multiple forms of marginalisation, (5) avoid ‘nativist decolonisation’, and (6) avoid ‘tokenistic decolonisation.’

Intellectual decolonisation therefore requires engaging in a productive (in the best case, horizontal and reciprocal) dialogue with scholars and intellectuals (both academic and nonacademic) from the Global South and with non-Eurocentric perspectives, to recognise the limitations or even impossibility of decolonising efforts, and to reflect on and challenge the “materiality of knowledge” (Gutiérrez Rodríguez 2016, 57–59) organised along the colonial, racialised, and gendered axes of power expressed in access to content, privileges, and positions within academic institutions.

What do these reflections on the ‘decolonial’ imply for my research? What does it mean to understand solidarity through decolonial perspectives? In the case of the present study, the aim was to establish a dialogue between decolonial perspectives and the efforts of transnational advocacy of and with the

Mapuche. This endeavour does not necessarily seek to ‘decolonise solidarity,’ because, at least from my positionality as a privileged academic working in the Global North, it would hardly avoid the dangers of intellectual decolonisation outlined above. Of course, I would argue that several of the practices and statements presented in my study, particularly those of the Mapuche interlocutors, contribute to decolonising relations of solidarity. In contrast, my situatedness requires a humbler engagement with decolonial perspectives and my object of study—expressions of solidarity—for which the dialogue seems fitting. Through this dialogue, I aimed to make visible the limitations as well as the possibilities of disentangling solidarity from its complicity with white paternalism and dependency and of supporting the decolonial struggle of the Mapuche in Wallmapu. At the same time, this study constantly sought the conversation with particular expressions of decolonial thought, that is, critical Mapuche thinking. In that way, my research aimed to dialogue both with the political and the epistemological decolonisation efforts of the Mapuche in Wallmapu without appropriating them. Rather, researching solidarity through decolonial perspectives in this case means trying to understand solidarity from a radically different perspective than my own. This is because “[c]hallenging the colonial world is [...] the impassioned claim by the colonized that their world is fundamentally different” (Fanon 2008, 6). In that way, it was possible to design this research as a platform to learn from the critical decolonial perspectives on solidarity from Mapuche authors, intellectuals, and activists.

This condition was created with a research methodology that is equally sensitive to the power imbalances within and situatedness of knowledge production. That includes recognising both the partiality of perspectives from privileged actors like me and the epistemic potential of insights by subjugated, committed, and affected actors. The notion of an ethnography of and in solidarity describes the effort of putting both positionalities into dialogue. In that way, the relations, encounters, and experiences of solidarity between Mapuche and non-Indigenous supporters were set as objects of my research—hence, an ethnography ‘of solidarity.’ In parallel, throughout the research process I constantly positioned myself ‘in solidarity’ with the struggle of the Mapuche—whether as a supporter of the Mapuche diaspora in Europe or a human rights observer in Chile. Such a positionality, I argue, manages to gain more insights about my research topic than any acclaimed neutral or allegedly objective inquiry.

Thus, the results of this research are the outcome of a networked, activist ethnography of and in solidarity that I conducted between 2014 and 2017 in Europe and Chile. This ethnography created the terrain for discussing the limitations and possibilities for solidarity with Mapuche interlocutors from their epistemological and cosmological perspectives. This methodological approach not only allowed for but demanded my active participation in international solidarity action with the Mapuche, which was guided by the ideals of a horizontal and reciprocal relationship within the research process.

This investigation sought to make sense of and conceptualise the contemporary experiences of international solidarity with and of the Mapuche by using the historical and contemporary experiences of their struggle for autonomy, as well as the interlocutors' different references to Mapuche cosmology and epistemology, as a starting point. These experiences and insights were discussed using a series of theoretical approaches from feminist, post-colonial and decolonial, and critical race studies about solidarity and (new) transnational social movement studies through the process of transcultural translation.

These theoretical perspectives further boost the potential of critical self-reflexivity within the research process, which goes beyond merely disclaiming one's identity and positionality. Rather, such perspectives demand to ask the researcher how his or her positionality has actually contributed to making particular statements, setting out the goals of the research, and analysing certain situations. In the case of the present study, I only referred to three methodological challenges that a critical self-reflection helped to uncover: the difficulty of balancing academic and political interests during the research; the different vulnerabilities of the involved actors; and finally, the discussion about possibilities and limitations of redistributing the research results. These challenges have been crucial to the further development of my research and, specifically, of my proposal for a critical notion of solidarity in dialogue with decolonial perspectives.

I therefore suggest an empirically and theoretically informed notion of (international) solidarity through the concept of 'weaving solidarity,' which describes solidarity as conflictive, creative, and communal. It is conflictive because it understands solidarity, first, as a critical moment of encounter between different positionalities of the involved actors and as the co-presence of different understandings of solidarity that these actors bring along. Second, it is creative because it makes the different results of solidarity practices, in the form of rhizomatic network structures and assemblages, visible. Finally, it

is communal because it highlights the various possibilities of ethical relations of solidarity across and beyond differences.

Therefore, 'weaving solidarity' describes the production of new social assemblages as contingent, rhizomatic, and unfinished relations. These are the result of the conflictive, creative, and mutually constitutive dynamics of their corresponding practices and encounters. The metaphor of 'weaving' is hereby inspired by the cultural practices and knowledges about weaving amongst the Mapuche.

The conflictive dimension of this concept stems from the critical understanding of encounters and practices of solidarity between actors with different positionalities, privileges, resources, and motivations. Contrary to traditional and hegemonic debates in solidarity studies, postcolonial, decolonial, critical race, and feminist perspectives manage to highlight this conflictive dimension and therefore help to theorise differences within solidarity. In that way, solidarity does not become predefined and precluded as a relationship amongst equals. Rather, solidarity is understood in its political and social dimension as a conflictive moment of encounter, which connects different people and groups through their political activity. Within these encounters, the involved actors negotiate their hierarchies, agencies, and knowledges and eventually create new political or social assemblages. In this conflictive dimension of solidarity, the notion of *compromiso* becomes particularly relevant. This is because the mutually binding commitment of the involved actors creates enduring spaces in which potential conflicts can be negotiated and mediated. This type of commitment demands a radical form of passivity and a respect for the autonomy of the affected group by the privileged actors within such encounters. Despite their conflictivity, these encounters can also involve a high level of intimacy, mutual trust, and sustainability. This means that the conflictive dimension within relations of solidarity should rather be inhabited and made productive for eventual transformation instead of ignored or swept aside.

This is because encounters of solidarity bear a rich creative potential, which is the second dimension of the concept of 'weaving solidarity.' As shown in this study, relations of solidarity connect actors across and beyond differences and transform their relationship by taking into consideration their historically and structurally heterogenous sociocultural and political experiences. Solidarity as a transformative and creative relationship is thus open and without guarantees, but has the potential to creatively produce relationships that are based on mutuality, reciprocity, and horizontality. If these re-

relationships are sustainably perpetuated in close interaction, they generate new and heterogenous social assemblages amongst the involved actors. The practice of sharing, *compartir*, corresponds with this creative potential and includes exchanging gifts and spending time together. Such gifts can also have an immaterial dimension, if, for example, we accept the deconstruction and critique of the non-Indigenous actors' whiteness as an "act of gift-giving" (Yancy 2018, 95). Therefore, relations of solidarity, in the case of Mapuche and non-Indigenous actors, involve practices of sharing, which bring both parties into a permanent, reciprocal, and—in the best case—horizontal relationship. The creative dimension of solidarity is thus expressed in the multiple ways and outcomes of exchanges of time, tokens, and territories between those who come together in solidarity.

The third dimension of 'weaving solidarity' looks at the "communal effects without assuming them" (Tsing 2015, 23) and makes visible the social and communal bonds that are created in relations and encounters of solidarity across and beyond differences. This communal dimension of solidarity is owed to the Mapuche notions of *keyuwvn* and *mingako*, describing mutual aid or communal work on a horizontal and reciprocal basis. These notions demand to understand relations of solidarity as part of—and not as taking place outside of or independently from—social relations. Particularly those practices which are usually described as international solidarity only become possible once this communal dimension between actors from different geographies is established.

It is paramount to give the notions of *keyuwvn* and *mingako* more prominence because, first, they constitute a crucial decolonial intervention in debates about solidarity. On the one hand, they help to shed a critical light on Eurocentric notions of solidarity that inform contemporary solidarity practices, legitimise paternalism, recentre white agency, or reproduce colonial stereotypes. On the other, they challenge us to think of solidarity beyond Eurocentric categories and instead based on other cosmological and epistemological notions. Second, *keyuwvn* and *mingako* have an essentially non-instrumental character and therefore counter Eurocentric understandings of solidarity as supererogatory, which is, commendable but not binding. In contrast, the communal dimension makes practices of solidarity binding, since its ultimate end is the reproduction of communal bonds and, in the words of Chilean singer Violeta Parra, choosing to stay with the people. There is further great potential in uncovering the similarities in debates about solidarity between Mapuche cosmology and heterodox Marxist and anarchist thought. To

begin with, highlighting the force of mechanic forms of solidarity is an idea that has already been proposed by the Peruvian sociologist José Carlos Mariátegui (2007) at the beginning of the twentieth century. Mariátegui argues for a possible historical passage from mechanic forms of solidarity towards a non-Eurocentric socialism. Also, in a European heterodox Marxist and anarchist tradition, “solidarity in praxis becomes a partial utopia” in itself (Bayertz 1998a, 47–48; my translation). What is more (and following Albert Camus), political or militant solidarity is elevated to a metaphysical force as “the creation and the source of all commonality” (Ibid.). The third reason *keyuwvn* and *mingako* deserve special attention is because they frustrate the teleological and Eurocentric assumption that organic forms of solidarity slowly overlap mechanic forms. In contrast, my study shows that the social experience of organic solidarity by non-Mapuche actors is slowly transformed as they are woven into the social Mapuche networks.

Therefore, it is possible to conclude that different understandings of solidarity can co-exist and that political relations of solidarity morph into social relations of solidarity. This dimension has largely been overlooked within solidarity and social movement studies alike. In contrast to historical gaps or sequences between relations of solidarity, I rather observe a “historical-structural heterogeneity” (Quijano 2014b) of solidarities. This co-presence consequently creates a multiplicity of new social and communal bonds and assemblages between the involved actors.

Finally, the concept of ‘weaving solidarity’ achieves criticality towards relations of power, theorises and recognises (colonial, racialised, and gendered) differences, and spotlights the social dimension of solidarity. On the one hand, it accomplishes the understanding of how paternalistic practices, unequal positionalities, and colonial stereotypes limit the potential of relations of solidarity. On the other, it shows how truly ethical relations of solidarity can be forged. This foremost concerns processes of transcultural commonality, in which concrete practices and self-binding commitments create moments of mutual recognition.

Besides the contribution of the concept of ‘weaving solidarity’ to critical social research on solidarity, this study addressed discussions in (new) social movement studies in dialogue with decolonial and critical race/whiteness perspectives.

Particularly chapter four and five suggested to understand international solidarity and transnational advocacy in support of the decolonisation efforts

in Wallmapu on the basis of the agency and political philosophy of the Mapuche. This approach seeks to de-centre the agency of white, mostly privileged actors from the Global North in support of the struggles of minorities, oppressed populations, Indigenous people, or refugees. Instead, it makes their protagonism the point of departure for understanding their own struggles without the need of a Western subject entering the scene. Transnational and new social movement studies rarely explore translocal struggles without any linkage to dominant groups in the Global North, e.g., solidarity movements amongst migrants, refugees, or Indigenous people that are not backed by resourceful actors. Such approaches resemble a colonial representational strategy, which only “brings the Other into the Self’s history” (Coronil 1992, 9). The Other without the Self, in contrast, is rarely of interest for further inquiry.

This was exactly the original approach of this study: international solidarity with the Mapuche must be solidarity by non-Indigenous actors, I thought. Quite on the contrary, at the beginning of my ethnography I began to understand that international solidarity with the Mapuche is foremost solidarity amongst the Mapuche. This is the reason why it was possible to reconstruct the field of solidarity action in Europe since the 1970s through the agency and protagonism of Mapuche actors, whether living in exile or visiting Europe. They hereby manage to maintain their autonomy from (non-Indigenous) international organisations and supporters, weave a decentralised and rhizomatic support network, and transnationalise the struggle in Wallmapu. Mapuche actors are thus not only participants or protagonists within an already existing solidarity network, but are rather its architects. This counters colonial ideas about Indigenous people being assimilated by or incorporated into the dominant society or culture. On the contrary, the solidarity network with/of the Mapuche is an expression of their successful struggle for autonomy and their own transculturalising force towards outsiders.

These experiences and practices of the Mapuche show that they are able to maintain their autonomy within a political struggle and at the same time to weave alliances with non-Mapuche supporters. Consequently, the autonomy of an affected group in a political struggle does not exclude, but rather enables the possibility of solidarity with others. And a (new and transnational) social movement study perspective that seeks to be sensitive to colonial, racialised, and gendered power relations and differences needs to put the affected group’s agency and protagonism at the centre of their research.

One way of achieving such a sensitivity, as suggested in this study, is by entering in a dialogue with the political and philosophical perspectives

the affected group brings along. Instead of enforcing the researcher's gaze upon such struggles, my approach to critical social movement studies rather suggests privileging the epistemological and cosmological perspectives of the movement itself and to work with their theorisations. In the case of the Mapuche, I identified (struggles for) autonomy as the underlying theoretical key concept. I proposed a conceptualisation of autonomy in the reconstruction of the history of the Mapuche society, particularly against the Spanish Crown and, later, the Chilean state. Also, contemporary Mapuche mobilisations and intellectual discussions have autonomy at their core. Therefore, I argued that ideas of/for autonomy are at the centre of Mapuche cultural politics and equally shape the organisational logic of their transnational solidarity network. Critical and decolonial approaches to (new) social movement studies thus not only need to depart from the agency and protagonism of the affected group, but also from their political philosophy and cosmology, which form the basis of such struggles.

The efforts of transnational Mapuche advocacy (TMA), presented in chapter five, were introduced by focusing on the agency and autonomy of Mapuche actors and organisations. This chapter discussed a wide array of advocacy strategies and tactics according to whether they empower Mapuche communities and organisations or reproduce dependencies on non-Indigenous actors and organisations (for example, through donations). In that sense, I suggested evaluating transnational advocacy by asking whether it enables or prevents the autonomy or agency of the affected group. Accordingly, I found those advocacy strategies most successful which confirm or support the capacity of Mapuche organisations and/or communities to act autonomously.

Particularly two strategies showcase such autonomous efforts of Mapuche actors within transnational advocacy. One strategy is the digital activism of Mapuche organisations, collectives, and individuals in Wallmapu or in the diaspora. Since the turn of the century, this type of activism has become a central instrument to pluralise information about human and Indigenous rights violations globally and to raise sensitivity about the situation of Mapuche communities beyond Wallmapu. Another strategy that makes the autonomy of Mapuche actors in transnational advocacy visible is how they manage to transculturalise this field of action. They hereby recreate cultural practices, such as the *jejiñun*, *trawwn*, the playing of the *trutruka* and *kultrun*, or the *mate-tun* within encounters of solidarity action and protests in Europe. Not only do such strategies challenge a (self-)representation of Europe as mostly white and monocultural by 'indigenising' and 'mapuchising' the cultural politics of

protests and rallies, these transculturalising elements contribute to weaving and strengthening the social fabric between non-Indigenous and Indigenous allies and between Mapuche living in Wallmapu and in the diaspora.

Finally, my analysis of transnational mobilisation and advocacy strategies argues that a mere focus on the politics of recognition and on denouncing human and Indigenous rights violations does not correspond with the struggle for decolonisation in Wallmapu. Of course, the limited margin for political articulation of Mapuche organisations and communities in Chile is the main reason and motivation for transnational advocacy. But in contrast to traditional strategies of transnational advocacy, in the present context the Mapuche movement and its international allies do not necessarily aim for their recognition or acceptance by powerful and symbolically meaningful actors. This approach follows critical decolonial interventions against (state) politics of the recognition of Indigenous peoples or against Eurocentric human rights politics because they fail to accept the radical alterity of the oppressed and excluded group, “the Other as Other” (Dussel 2011, 90). In contrast, I showed how support strategies within TMA rather assist the capacity of Mapuche organisations and communities for autonomous transformation, emancipation, and liberation and ultimately decolonisation.

A decolonial approach to transnational advocacy therefore not necessarily examines the question of recognition (within a human or Indigenous rights frame) or legal change within the existing structures, but rather the potential for a radical reorganisation and transformation of the sociopolitical, economic, territorial, and constitutional order of the context in question. In the present study this means that transnationalisation efforts can contribute to rebuilding the sociocultural fabric and political institutions of the Mapuche society as an autonomous nation.

While critical race and whiteness studies have managed to establish a critical research practice that makes whiteness the object of its inquiry, (transnational and new) social movement research has rarely focused on the interracial relationships involved in translocal mobilisations, protests, and solidarities. This is problematic, as chapter six showed, because transnational support by white actors rarely happens unfiltered or unimpeded from historically rooted, colonial, and racial stereotypes. A critical focus on whiteness in transnational movements therefore sheds light not only on the problematic representations white actors and organisations bring into the scene; it also enlightens the ways in which struggles that take place at a distance from whiteness (by geography or positionality) are externalised as projection sites for white desires or prob-

lems. This is why, along with other critical race and whiteness research on solidarity and social movements, I argue for more thorough and systematic studies about the ways in which white actors and organisations relate to the struggles of minorities, Indigenous peoples, refugees, oppressed and subaltern groups, and so on. Only on that basis, I suggest, is it possible to discover commonalities and shared frames of reference for political struggles, such as an ecological cosmopolitanism from below, which connect actors across different positionalities and territories.

Due to its ethnographic and therefore inductive approach to international solidarity and advocacy of and with the Mapuche, this study aimed to build its case around those topics that were raised by the involved actors and organisations. In the course of the investigation, I remained rather cautious about bringing up possible topics that were not explicitly observable within the discourses and practices involving international solidarity. This is why, in the following pages, I want to address two additional important topics (there could be more) which could have further enlightened critical and decolonial perspectives on international solidarity of and with the Mapuche.

The first issue concerns the possibilities and limitations of critical interventions within solidarity that scrutinise certain actions and positions of Mapuche actors and organisations. But instead of suggesting a critical analysis and evaluation of certain practices and discourses surrounding international solidarity by myself, I rather opted for a research design that uncovers those critical discourses that already take place within TMA. A more systematic approach to the question of a critique within solidarity, e.g., in a chapter of its own, would have nevertheless been beneficial for the overall discussion of this investigation. For example, I could have chosen a more direct approach and critique towards cases in which certain Mapuche actors were delegitimised within the movement because of their apparent racial 'impurity.' On the other side, a critical discussion about certain political positions within the Mapuche society, such as the Mapuche journalist Pedro Cayuqueo's flirtations with the political right and economic establishment in Chile or the critique of the more autonomous Mapuche communities towards the Mapuche party *Wallmapuwen*, could have contributed to a better understanding of the heterogeneity of the Mapuche society and, in addition, the limitations of and possibilities for solidarisation. In the European context, I did not explicitly engage with some critiques towards Indigenous advocacy organisations, such as the GfbV, which has been repeatedly accused of a limited, romanticised, and es-

sentialised understanding of Indigenous societies and cultures. The debate about the GfbV alone deserves a critical investigation of its own.

My approach of letting critique speak through the statements of my interlocutors was therefore limited. It would have been insightful in any case to enter into dialogue with possible critiques of non-Indigenous actors towards positions of the Mapuche, but only a few had sufficient in-depth knowledge about the movement in order to make such critical remarks. Within my approach of making critical voices heard, of course, I favoured certain opinions over others and wove them into my arguments; particularly the chapter on Indian- and Maputhusiasm should be understood as a reaction towards problematic representations of Indigenous people by non-Indigenous solidarity and advocacy organisations. I also discussed how identification as a Mapuche can be tied to a political positionality that is anticapitalistic and ecologically sensitive and is therefore hardly a category of racial 'purity' or in favour of exploitative dynamics. In other instances, I showed how solidarity campaigns, particularly those that work with financial aid, can contribute to reproducing local and global dependencies and therefore need to be seen critically. In a similar vein, I critically elaborated how some actions of international solidarity and especially transnational advocacy, e.g., in the case of Aucan Huilcaman, detach themselves from the everyday life of Mapuche communities and therefore might lose legitimization.

With such critical interventions into the solidarity scene of and with the Mapuche, this study connects with critical reflections about past experiences of North-South solidarity such as the international solidarity campaigns with the Sandinistas in the 1980s. A more systematic dialogue between the past and present expressions of international solidarity analysed in this study could have been fruitful. Nevertheless, in this text I chose to articulate my critical views on certain practices and positions within the solidarity scene and not towards an academic and political public. As demonstrated with the case of the willingly false translation of the interview of Hector Llaitul, a critical intervention might cause more damage than benefit. An internal critique, based on one's *compromiso*, mutual trust, and intimacy, might therefore be a better option. This is because an external critique from non-Indigenous actors and organisations towards Indigenous societies has proven to rather reproduce its hegemonic position through the "totalitarianism of the public sphere" and therefore "continues and deepens the colonising process" (Segato 2010, 15).

The second matter that this investigation did not tackle as a separate subject is the gendered aspect of international solidarity and the outstanding

role of Mapuche women within transnational advocacy and community building. One reason is that such a research strategy, at least from my positionality, would easily reproduce the colonial violence of “white men saving brown women from brown men” (Spivak 1988, 296). But to analyse international solidarity from a gendered and feminist perspective by focusing on the agency of Indigenous women is both epistemologically and politically urgent. The former, because theoretical contributions (in different expressions and forms) of Black, Indigenous, migrant, and subaltern women have long been ignored, subjugated, and dismissed as adequate knowledges. The latter, because even during the COVID-19 pandemic “Latin America [...] continues to be the most dangerous area for environment defenders in the world” (Svampa 2021, 90; my translation); Black and Indigenous women in particular have become the target of state, police, and paramilitary repression by defending their communities and the environment. To understand these women’s resistance and courage in their political struggles and their knowledges as theoretical contributions to decolonial discussions is a subject for ongoing and future debates. For now, I will briefly outline a final reflection on the gendered aspect of international solidarity of and with the Mapuche.

In recent years, several Black and Indigenous women from Latin America became internationally prominent figures in the defence of nature, their communities, and alternatives to neoliberal and patriarchal capitalism in the region. The success of their resistance was proven by the fact that soon they became the key target of state repression or death squads. The most prominent cases include the murders of the Honduran activist Berta Cárceres in 2016 and of the city councillor of Rio de Janeiro and queer-feminist activist Marielle Franco in 2018. While social and feminist movements in Latin America and beyond fight to keep their memory alive and bring the people responsible to justice, particularly two cases of remarkable Mapuche women activists deserve attention, which were only briefly mentioned in this investigation. One is the case of Macarena Valdes, a community and ecological activist and mother of four children in the community of Tranguil in Wallmapu who was murdered in 2016, probably by mercenaries. Her husband Rubén Collío, with the support of local organisations and some international contacts, still seeks justice for her. Another important female figure in the struggle of the Mapuche in Wallmapu is *machi* Francisca Linconao, who was not only the first person to successfully invoke the ILO 169 convention concerning Indigenous people’s rights in Chile, but was also one of seventeen Indigenous delegates elected for the Chilean constitutional convention in 2021. Also, during her im-

prisonment from 2016 to 2018 in the context of the Luchsinger-Mackay case, she mobilised a nationally and internationally powerful solidarity campaign.

Given the importance of these women for contemporary Indigenous, Black, and popular resistance in Latin America, some special treatment regarding the gendered aspect of international solidarity from a critical feminist perspective would not only have given these cases their deserved prominence, but it would also have enriched the general debate about the limitations and possibilities of international solidarity across and beyond difference, in that case by focusing on the experience of Mapuche women. An analysis of their challenges in advocating for their rights as women and as Mapuche shows how “Mapuche women are able both to theorize what makes their rights different from women’s rights and to articulate demands for changes in their own communities and within the Mapuche movement” (Richards 2005, 216). Furthermore, “they demonstrate that women’s rights and Indigenous rights are not static or oppositional; their meanings can be reinterpreted and extended to simultaneously respect cultural difference and honor universal principles” (Ibid., 217). This is also a crucial contribution to the debate about particular and universal interests and commonalities in the quest for solidarity brought forward by the struggle of Mapuche women in Wallmapu and Chile.

On a more concrete level, a gender-sensitive approach to international solidarity with the Mapuche showcases the Mapuche women’s role within TMA. First, Mapuche women in the diaspora often had a prominent role as *werken* in European solidarity campaigns and were at the forefront of several protests. The best expression of this fact is the image of three Mapuche from the Mapuche diaspora (in traditional dress) protesting the awarding of the *Doctor honoris causa* to Michelle Bachelet at the University of Leuven. The question of if and in which way gendered community positions, such as the *werken* or the *longko*, might become transformed not only in Europe but also in Wallmapu, can be the topic of further inquiry. Second, the critique of an androcentric Maputhusiasm, employed not only by non-Indigenous organisations but also strategically mobilised by Mapuche actors, could benefit from a gender-sensitive and feminist approach. Possible critical interventions could, for example, address how particularly male and patriarchal images of the Mapuche culture, such as the image of the warrior—the *weichafe*—are activated within Maputhusiasm and therefore exclude not only female but also gender-diverse representations of being Mapuche.

Finally, it is worth highlighting the crucial role of Mapuche women in community building efforts in Wallmapu and beyond. The central part Indigenous women in Latin America play in the (re-)construction of communal and social ties—connected to the defence of the territory but unrecognised within a colonial and postcolonial public sphere—is the topic of a vivid and ongoing debate amongst critical female scholars (Cabnal 2010; Rivera Cuscanqui 2018; Segato 2010; Tzul Tzul 2018). For the Chilean context, an analysis on the cultural practices of Mapuche women in the diaspora in Santiago de Chile shows how they “maintain social configurations and ways of inhabiting public and private spaces that emphasize community solidarity, indigenous knowledges, and reciprocity” (Becerra et al. 2017, 15). These insights echo the ways in which Mapuche women weave bonds and communal ties in the context of international solidarity and transnational advocacy. Ultimately, weaving is a gendered praxis and most commonly employed by Mapuche women. Their practices of solidarity, particularly *keyuwn* and *mingako*, strengthen and (re-)create the cultural and social fabrics not only amongst Mapuche, but with non-Indigenous actors and well beyond Wallmapu. Together with the contemporary discussions about the (re-)construction of communal and social ties by Indigenous women, these observations open an immense field for further inquiry, in which the practices and knowledges of Indigenous women not only contribute to the transnationalisation of their cultures, but to forms of a “creolized conviviality” (Gutiérrez Rodríguez 2015) in other latitudes.

