

6. A Critique of Whiteness and Maputhusiasm in Solidarity

The following chapter will engage in the ongoing debates in critical race, decolonial, and feminist studies that critically examine the role of privileged positionalities within interethnic and interracial relations. The idea of a critique in solidarity here has two meanings: on the one hand, it aims to critique whiteness and Maputhusiasm as phenomena taking place within the practices, actions, and encounters of solidarity. On the other, it means a critique articulated in solidarity that does not necessarily delegitimise the involved actions or the engagement of certain people but rather seeks to show how both these actions and actors are entangled within and are accomplices to colonial imaginaries and racialised social hierarchies.

I will first discuss how non-Mapuche actors come into contact with and relate to Mapuche solidarity activism as a result of their privileges and whiteness. I hereby will be able to outline three particular expressions of privilege of non-Mapuche actors engaging in solidarity activism.

The second section presents a discussion about the personal motivations and political convictions of non-Mapuche actors in relation to engaging in transnational Mapuche advocacy (TMA) and solidarity activism. The absence of references to leftist ideas amongst the non-Mapuche actors will be explained through the complicated relationship between the Mapuche (and other Indigenous people) and Left parties/movements. This 'left-wing melancholia' leads, in the present case, to a depoliticisation of solidarity, but also opens up the possibility of an ecological cosmopolitanism from below, creating commonalities between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people.

Finally, the last section introduces the notion of Maputhusiasm as a representational framework activated by non-Mapuche, particularly German, actors which racialises and stereotypes the Mapuche culture and society through mostly positively connoted, romanticised, and antimodern imaginaries. An

awareness of their own stereotyping creates a desire amongst non-Mapuche actors to have an authentic encounter with the Mapuche, foremost within solidarity action. After discussing some critiques of Maputhusiasm in conversation with Mapuche interlocutors, the chapter concludes by looking at the ways in which Maputhusiasm is strategically and critically utilised by Mapuche actors and finally creates a mimetic excess.

I want to begin this chapter with an experience from my fieldwork in Europe that I briefly mentioned earlier. This experience condenses the topics that will be addressed in the following pages. In September 2015, I visited a public cultural festival in the German city of Bad Ems, where the non-Indigenous Chilean public defence lawyer Barbara Katz held a presentation as the “defender of the Mapuche Indians.” Katz gave an overview about the general situation of the Mapuche in Chile and her human rights work to a mostly white and middle-class audience. The overall festival’s programme was unconnected to the Mapuche or other political issues related to Latin America. Instead, it had a focus on literature, music, and theatre under the motto “heroes and myths,” engaging with a variety of topics. In that context, Katz had been invited due to a coincidence, being related to one of the festival’s organisers. On the evening of her presentation, he introduced her by displaying his fascination with the Mapuche as an ancient Indigenous population in Latin America.

I visited this event with Alina Rodenkirchen, a diasporic Mapuche woman living in Germany. At the end of the presentation, there was room for a discussion and Alina Rodenkirchen took the opportunity to ask Katz some questions about current legal reforms in Chile. The moment Alina Rodenkirchen introduced herself as a Mapuche woman there was commotion in the venue, and people started whispering and turning their heads towards us. However, the most interesting thing happened after the discussion: instead of approaching Barbara Katz, people from the audience got up and wanted to talk to Alina Rodenkirchen, until she was surrounded by a crowd.

There are several interesting elements in that experience that inspire this chapter’s discussions. To begin with, the event framed the Mapuche within the realm of “heroes and legends,” even though their experience is one of a very concrete sociopolitical reality of a heterogeneous society subjected to persecution and discrimination. There is thus a difference between the ways the Mapuche and non-Mapuche relate to the Mapuche struggle. This experience made me more curious about the ideological and political motivations of non-Mapuche people who become interested in the Mapuche and who eventually engage in solidarity efforts. This is because the event clearly did not

have a political framing but provided different grounds for translating the situation of the Mapuche to the German context. Finally, the intervention by Alina Rodenkirchen made a deep impact on the audience, confronting them with what they considered to be a ‘real and authentic’ Mapuche. At the same time, her intervention is an example how the presence and agency of the Mapuche critically engages within the non-Mapuche spaces in which sympathy for Indigenous people is being addressed.

Researching Whiteness in Solidarity

This section starts by introducing the non-Mapuche actors whom I encountered during my ethnography and who were willing to collaborate in this research project through (formal and informal) interviews. Whilst chapters four and five focused on the agency of the Mapuche within the solidarity network and transnational advocacy based on their cultural politics of autonomy, the present chapter takes a closer look at the non-Mapuche actors and their privileges, motivations, and stereotypes.

Encounters of solidarity constitute a hierarchised and racialised field in which unequal and different positionalities come together. A critical and decolonial approach to solidarity demands a critical consideration of these encounters by focusing on how whiteness and privileges are mobilised and activated (Ahmed 2004; Alcoff 1998; Land 2015; Mahrouse 2014; Pratt 1992). In that way, this chapter aims to take whiteness out of its privileged comfort zone of the apparently unmarked and unseen and put it in a critical spotlight.

Such perspectives demand a particular “self-understanding” from non-Indigenous supporters in order to gain “a clearer view of the workings of race and of white privilege, and of complicity at a personal level and at a structural level” (Land 2015, 163). The non-Mapuche actors are not unmarked or neutral but “bring their own multifaced identities and knowledge of a range of struggles to bear on their political relationships” (Ibid., 263). Such a positionality can be approached by looking at how non-Mapuche actors connect and relate to the Mapuche as a form of their “self-making practices” (Mahrouse 2014, 95). Their engagement in solidarity action thus becomes constitutive for their identity and positionality.

Researching whiteness in transnational solidarity thus means questioning who the non-Mapuche actors are, who they did projects with, what they planned to do, and who has actually been to these communities (Ibid., 93–95).

It may further include questions about their biographical and cultural background, their material and immaterial privileges, and ethical considerations towards racism and coloniality, amongst others (Land 2015, 163). Critical questions might also tackle the issues of ownership, benefit, agency, and interest of solidarity action (Smith 2008, 10).

These are the questions I discussed with fifteen non-Mapuche interview partners between November 2015 and June 2016 in coordination with activists from the Mapuche diaspora. What these people have in common is that their positionality can be understood as white, hence non-Mapuche, that they have a biographical background in the Global North, mostly Germany, and that they were engaged or were about to engage in solidarity work or awareness-raising regarding the Mapuche. These interviews and discussions with other non-Mapuche solidarity actors were delegated to me and reflect a motivation by the Mapuche diaspora to critically get to know the people who want to join the solidarity efforts (Andrea Cotrena, interview with the author, June 6, 2017).

A decolonial perspective challenges us to consider knowledges and ways of knowing the world beyond Eurocentric ideas. Hence, a critical, decolonial perspective towards (potential) allies might also include a series of questions from a different, in this case Mapuche, cosmology, such as questions about the (potential) ally's spirit, good-heartedness, emotional baggage, etc. At the same time, critical questions might tackle more practical issues, such as the person's technical abilities (e.g., to fix the electricity supply in the community) (Smith 2008, 10).

Such questions were directed at me during my ethnography. The different ways I answered these questions opened but also closed opportunities in my research and activism. I also experienced critical questions about others' or my own spiritual state of mind and good heartedness. In fact, in one case, a visit to a Mapuche community by a German person was denied on this basis.

The first question towards the non-Mapuche supporters was how they became aware of the Mapuche and their struggle in first place. This question assumes conceptualisations of international solidarity as a political solidarity between different groups of people, where agents in the Global North declare and/or act in solidarity with social groups or a political collective in the Global South. These groups can be ethnic minorities, displaced people, women, racialised groups, and refugees, amongst others. The important factor here is that these kinds of political solidarities share the presupposition that the groups who come together in solidarity are in, a fundamental way, so-

cially, culturally, and/or geographically separated from each other before the act or relationship of solidarity takes place. If this is true, how do Mapuche and non-Mapuche come into contact with each other?

Solidarity activists in Europe (Mapuche and non-Mapuche alike) basically presented five different answers regarding how they became aware of the Mapuche and the conflict in Wallmapu. These include biographical factors, personal or private factors, coincidence, academic interest, and finally political interest. In sharp contrast to the Mapuche, the non-Mapuche actors rarely named biographical factors as reasons for engaging in solidarity action. Whilst the Mapuche explained their motivations through their ethnic belonging, non-Mapuche Chileans mostly frame their engagement in solidarity action by amplifying the injustice frame of human rights violations that have affected their families in times of dictatorship. Contrary to that, non-Mapuche Europeans did not name explicit biographical reasons through which they might explain or legitimise their activism.

Two interviewees said that they came into contact with the Mapuche through interpersonal relationships and became interested in their culture and society. One interviewee notes that her best friend is a non-Mapuche Chilean, who “gave her a rough idea” (Eva, interview with the author, December 1, 2015b) before she engaged in solidarity work. Another lived with two Mapuche in a shared apartment in La Plata/Argentina and thus came into contact with their “worldview” (Verena, interview with the author, December 6, 2015).

Four other interviewees highlighted that it was mere coincidence that they learnt of the Mapuche and their struggle (Peter, interview with the author, December 1, 2015; Clarissa, interview with the author, January 22, 2016; Sabrina, interview with the author, February 4, 2016). For example, Amanda, who started working with the Netherlands-based Mapuche organisation *FOLLIL*, notes that “it was really just by chance that I stumbled upon them online” (interview with the author, July 1, 2016) whilst she was looking to volunteer for an NGO.

A majority of the non-Mapuche interview partners mentioned an academic interest or a specific academic project as the main factor through which they came across the Mapuche culture and society. They are located in different disciplines, such as Latin American Studies, Film Studies, Romance and Linguistic Studies, Development Studies, Social and Cultural Anthropology, and International Law. My own engagement with the Mapuche solidarity network is also related to an academic project. One major commonality of the

white Mapuche supporters is their positionality as researchers and/or young academics. This fact not only reflects the relatively privileged position of these actors, but also echoes the Eurocentric tradition of Indigenous people as a popular object of study (Krotz 2004). Finally, political and ideological motivations were also made explicit in the interviews and will be analysed in more detail below.

Investigations on political expressions of solidarity or transnational advocacy rarely critically examine the reasons and motivations of the nonaffected group for engaging in such activism. On the contrary, insights from decolonial perspectives and critical race studies shed some light on a series of critical aspects regarding how non-Indigenous supporters connect with Indigenous struggles.

How Mapuche and non-Mapuche activists relate differently to solidarity was addressed critically by actors from the Mapuche diaspora. Particularly in one informal conversation, one young Mapuche woman notes with criticism that she has no choice but to engage in a struggle for her people, whilst white people can choose to go to a different rally for a different minority each weekend. In a similar statement, Llanquiray Painemal says—based on her own experience—that the personal engagement by white Germans in a particular cause has particular cycles and works “like a thing to consume, [...] it is consuming [as if the issue is a commodity] whatever is current” (interview with the author, June 16, 2017). Land (2015, 208–11) describes this difference in how people get involved with Indigenous struggles as one between inheritance and choice.

A decolonial account of interethnic solidarity thus requires a sensitivity towards the different relationalities and motivations the involved actors present as reasons for engaging in that cause. Here, the possibility of being able to choose to engage in a certain struggle is highlighted as a privilege, whilst the reasons for Indigenous people to fight for their cause is presented as an inherited burden.

Whilst the non-Mapuche interview partners did not seem to be explicitly aware of that privilege, some addressed the different vulnerabilities and the very abstract nature of their relationality. For example, Eva notes that she had read a lot about “ethnic conflicts” and, knowing that she, her family, or her friends would probably never suffer their consequences, these conflicts exist for her only as “black letters on white paper” (interview with the author, December 1, 2015b). But it is the coincidental nature of how non-Mapuche actors came in contact with solidarity and advocacy with the Mapuche that

particularly reflects their privilege of choice. Without any prior relation or engagement, they became involved in solidarity action.

Another privilege became manifest in narrations about non-Mapuche actors generally having easier access to the Mapuche in Wallmapu or Europe. In those accounts, non-Mapuche European supporters are especially presented as more trustworthy in comparison to non-Mapuche Chileans. This privilege is a result of the long history of discrimination and domination of the Mapuche by the white Chilean state and society. For example, Madelaine (interview with the author, December 6, 2015) reveals that through the participation of international, non-Chilean collaborators, she and her research collaborators had a much easier time accessing Mapuche communities.

This ease of access for non-Chileans is further intensified by a series of positive stereotypes about white people from the Global North, which were reproduced and activated in some statements by Mapuche interlocutors. For example, they presented white Europeans as more experienced in questions of solidarity cooperatives and thus more trustworthy (Gloria Marivil, interview with the author, February 23, 2016), more appreciative of Indigenous cultures (Victor Carilaf, interview with the author, February 23, 2016), or more respectful in their everyday, interpersonal behaviour (Cecilia Necul, interview with the author, March 10, 2016) compared to Chileans. These statements contribute to essentialising stereotypes about non-Mapuche Europeans as more trustworthy and granting them more access to Mapuche society and communities than to non-Mapuche Chileans. In summation, they grant non-Chilean solidarity actors a privilege of trust. However, this trust represents a risk for Mapuche organisations and communities if it ignores the possibility of paternalism by non-Chilean actors or organisations.

Another privilege concerns the fact that non-Mapuche activists always have the opportunity to abandon their commitment and engagement in international solidarity and transnational advocacy. I was challenged in that matter myself after I finished an interview with a Mapuche leader during a public rally. After the interview, I was approached by a Mapuche who observed the situation and asked in a challenging tone if I was leaving already. I did not feel that he actually wanted to know if or when I was leaving (the rally or Wallmapu) but rather if I was abandoning the situation now that I had done my interview.

His intervention confronted the privilege that for me there is always the option to leave if things get uncomfortable. The option of leaving makes the choice to engage in solidarity much easier. This privilege of leaving was ar-

t articulated by non-Mapuche and Mapuche alike as a factor that most clearly reflects the different and unequal positionalities involved in this kind of solidarity work.

However, there is another angle to the ways the privilege of leaving is challenged. For example, one non-Mapuche supporter shared a story of wanting to take pictures of a Mapuche political prisoner inside the prison. She describes the anxiety that this situation caused for her and she was scared of being detained or that her photographic material might be taken. Addressing this feeling to the political prisoner she took pictures of, he answered that the question is not if she will be able to leave, but rather if she will be able to come back¹ (Sybille, interview with the author, June 26, 2016).

Another interesting question in that regard is what happens after the non-Chilean, non-Mapuche supporters have left. Llanquira Painemal, for example, highlights this fact: “[...] for them it means that they are kicked out of the country and they can move on with their lives” (interview with the author, June 16, 2017). Moving on in this case includes abandoning one’s engagement with the cause of the Mapuche and—to continue the line of thought from above—moving to the next weekend’s rally for some other oppressed minority.

From Left-Wing Melancholia Towards an Ecological Cosmopolitanism from Below

The question of on what ideological grounds and based on what political motivations or convictions do non-Mapuche legitimise (their interest in) engaging in solidarity action deserves particular attention. In this section, I will make the argument that a critical research on whiteness within advocacy and solidarity action cannot only focus on the white actor’s motivations and ideologies, but has to examine how these connect with, interlink, or contradict the political beliefs of the group they aim to support.

The engagement of white people in transnational advocacy or international solidarity towards People of Colour or in the Global South has been critically addressed with the idea of the “White Saviour Complex” (Cole

1 This refers to those cases of European solidarity activists who have been expelled from Chile and are not allowed to visit the country again.

2012). Within this complex, structural injustices are ignored whilst individual agency and enthusiasm is emphasised and suffering and oppression is sentimentalised. Finally, it is about “having a big emotional experience that validates privilege” (Ibid.).

Based on my conversations with non-Mapuche actors, it is possible to develop a critical account of this White Saviour Complex by turning “the critical analysis toward the West” (Frey 2016, 188) and examining the “white double consciousness” (Alcoff 1998). This can be achieved here by turning the critical analysis towards the motivations and ideological justifications of the non-Mapuche solidarity actors.

The interviews with non-Mapuche actors thus became critical interventions into their motivations and justifications by “asking non-Indigenous people to see their own interests reflected in a struggle that is much broader than seeking justice for Indigenous People” (Land 2015, 208). These interests might include the quest for happiness in general, personal ethical growth and enforcement of general ethical principles, ecological justice, or fighting against intersectional oppression (Ibid., 215).

Historically, international solidarity in the Global North with revolutionary or Indigenous movements in the Global South has been a domain of the Left. Nevertheless, the political beliefs of the non-Mapuche interviewees show an ambivalent relation to leftist values and convictions. On the one hand, some describe themselves as a “rather left-thinking person” (Peter, interview with the author, December 1, 2015) or even “definitely rather on the left spectrum” (Sybille, interview with the author, June 26, 2016), and critical of capitalism and “big corporations” (Peter, interview with the author, December 1, 2015). Others have been engaged in political rallies “against the Right” (Verena, interview with the author, December 6, 2015) or in antiracist or refugee solidarity contexts (Madelaine, interview with the author, December 6, 2015; Sabrina, interview with the author, February 4, 2016). For Peter (interview with the author, December 1, 2015), it is rather obvious that people from the Left support the Mapuche. However, only two interviewees addressed anti-capitalistic convictions as their linkage to the struggle of the Mapuche (Kira, interview with the author, February 29, 2016; Sabrina, interview with the author, February 4, 2016). One woman highlighted her feminism as a reason to engage in minority and Indigenous rights (Maike, interview with the author, June 9, 2016).

On the other hand, some, though considerably fewer, interviewees define themselves as apolitical (Karin, interview with the author, January 22,

2016), “politically neutral,” or politically nonactive (Clarissa, interview with the author, January 22, 2016). Rather, they referred to abstract or seemingly universal values: they explained their motivations through “lots of idealism,” positive references towards projects of global justice (Verena, interview with the author, December 6, 2015; Amanda, interview with the author, July 1, 2016; Sybille, interview with the author, June 26, 2016), or in terms of “dignity” and “mutual respect” (Amanda, interview with the author, July 5, 2016).

These statements clearly show that Leftism is not the main motivation and ideological linkage between Mapuche and non-Mapuche. This is a consequence of the historically ambivalent and contradictory relationship between the political Left (in Chile) and the struggle of the Mapuche. Whilst the earliest political expressions of the Mapuche within the Chilean state were ideologically heterogeneous (Kaltmeier 2004, 116–28; Marimán et al. 2006), the Chilean Left traditionally conceived of the Mapuche people as their natural allies. This conviction led to paternalistic attitudes towards the Mapuche by classifying their particular colonial experience under the umbrella of class struggle (Andrea Cotrena, interview with the author, June 6, 2017).²

Regardless, leftist governments (social democratic and socialist) in the 1960s and ‘70s did pursue progressive agrarian reforms and pushed forward considerable improvements in the living conditions of some parts of Mapuche society. However, they were still considered to be a part of the peasantry and not as a colonised nation. Also, besides the two terms of Sebastián Piñera (2010–2014, since 2018–present), since the return of democracy in 1990 Chile had only centre-Left governments, who share a major responsibility for the current conflict and human rights violations in Wallmapu (Garbe 2016b).

Besides the general suspicion towards Chilean political institutions, these experiences explain why many Mapuche do not want to collaborate with people, organisations, or parties from the Left within Chile or beyond (Andrea Cotrena, interview with the author, June 6, 2017). The historical experience of paternalism by the Left led to a critical stance towards exclusively leftist

2 In other Latin American countries, the political Left, inspired by a Marxist analysis of social classes and capitalism, developed a sensitivity towards their societies’ historical-structural heterogeneity. Examples include the works of the Peruvian sociologists José María Mariátegui and Aníbal Quijano, in Bolivia the works of René Zavaleta and Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui, and some actors of the Mexican revolution from 1910 onwards. Such reflections were mostly absent in a country like Chile, whose political and intellectual class perceived the nation as rather exclusively white and monocultural (see also Pairican 2021, 180).

organisations or actors by the Mapuche today, particularly within solidarity action. This sometimes even leads to statements by Mapuche activists claiming to be neither from the Left nor from the Right but foremost Mapuche. Llanquiray Painemal, nevertheless, criticises this as a tendency towards a depoliticisation of their claims (interview with the author, June 16, 2017).

This creates a scenario in which not only the paternalism from the Left is criticised, but also the critical potential of leftist traditions of thought are rejected as Eurocentric. Indeed, there are harsh critiques from Indigenous movements, amongst them the Mapuche,³ of Marxist-inspired analysis as Eurocentric and irreconcilable with Indigenous cosmologies and cultures (Means 2011). In contrast, other Mapuche interlocutors highlight that there is a complementarity between Western anticapitalistic thought and Mapuche thinking. In their view, “the Mapuche struggle is an anticapitalistic struggle” (Andrea Cotrena, interview with the author, June 6, 2017), “because it is a philosophy of life, where the issue of private property did not exist and human relations were completely different” (Llanquiray Painemal, interview with the author, June 16, 2017). They put more emphasis on arguing for an epistemological horizontality by putting anticapitalistic ideas within Mapuche thinking and within leftist traditions on equal terms.

This contradictory relationship with the Left complicates the entire setting of transnational advocacy and international solidarity with the Mapuche. It foremost produces a friction between leftist Mapuche in diaspora and between Mapuche who engage with more politically uncompromising, ideologically liberal, and centre-leaning NGOs like the UNPO or the GfbV. In that way, for example, Llanquiray Painemal feels excluded by some organisations and actors, “because when you have an antineoliberal, anticapitalistic discourse they are not going to invite you” (interview with the author, June 16, 2017). She sees her experience as an expression of those NGOs’ paternalism by inviting only those Indigenous actors who “comply” (Ibid.).

At the same time, this complicated relationship produces a friction between non-Mapuche actors from the Left and diasporic Mapuche. Because of their historical memory of paternalistic experiences with the Left, many Mapuche do not see non-Mapuche leftists as their natural allies, though the latter might think of themselves as such. Moreover, the autonomist Mapuche

3 For example, one Mapuche scholar once mentioned sarcastically that his grandfather did not need to read Marx.

movement is very eager to prevent acts of ideological appropriation of their cause by non-Mapuche leftists.

In summation, all these factors contribute to a disencounter between transnational advocacy and international solidarity from the Global North, historically a domain of the Left, and the Mapuche movement, which consistently resists being subsumed under non-Mapuche leftist projects. This explains the ambivalence towards ideological Leftism of the non-Mapuche interviewees. Furthermore, it seems like Mapuche organisations and actors apparently do not favour non-Mapuche solidarity activists from the Left.

Thus, as a consequence of the Mapuche's experience of leftist paternalism, it is fair to say that international solidarity with the Mapuche suffers from a "Left-Wing Melancholia" (Traverso 2017). Whilst this notion describes a state of mind to mourn and self-reflect upon the failed and defeated left-wing political projects throughout the twentieth century, which nevertheless continue to inspire future political action, I want to expand its meaning towards a melancholia regarding the failed encounters between a (Eurocentric) Left and Indigenous liberation movements. In that way, a decolonial left-wing melancholia goes beyond a "postcolonial melancholia" (Gilroy 2006) because it also mourns the colonial and racist bias of leftist projects throughout the twentieth century that ignored or even erased the very different historical experiences of oppression and domination of People of Colour, Indigenous people, migrants, and other minorities. Such a decolonial notion of melancholia needs to critically reflect the unsuccessful alliances of the Left with racialised groups and colonised societies in order to regain mutual trust for a potentially shared emancipatory project.

This type of decolonial left-wing melancholia makes a gap in the ideological commonality between Mapuche and non-Mapuche visible. International solidarity with the former's resistance thus might take place within an ideological limbo and become depoliticised. Some statements of non-Mapuche actors explaining and legitimising their engagement reflects this danger.

To begin with, Amanda explains her ideological influence as coming "from people around me," including values like "being kind, helping when you can, being involved in your community, local but global as well" (interview with the author, July 1, 2016). Also, Rike (interview with the author, May 27, 2016) claims to be politically "not thoroughly defined," without a "clear stance towards most of the political parties." Furthermore, Clarissa declares herself to be politically "neutral," having a "open world-view" (interview with the author, January 22, 2016). These statements from non-Mapuche solidarity activists from Germany

are stunning in the context of the success of right-wing and neo-fascist political projects all over the world. During my fieldwork in Temuco, I addressed my shock about the increase of votes for the right-wing AfD in Germany to Alma, a solidarity activist from Germany. I was even more shocked when she did not even know what I was talking about.

Such apolitical understandings also impact particular solidarity events. For example, in order to raise funds for her microfinance project, Eva (interview with the author, December 1, 2015a) aimed to organise a solidarity event in the form of a salsa party in Munich. She explained to me that the political angle of the evening should be minimal and having a nice evening is much more important. She had the idea that people are going to be asked to donate to the Mapuche, but they should not be bothered with the political and historical background, “since they are not really interested in that.” Rather, people should “relax from their stressful day at work” and enjoy the salsa music. According to her, it is fine for the audience to celebrate Latin American culture (in the form of salsa music), but they should not be bothered with information about the political conflicts in the region. It seems that, according to her, there is a contradiction between having a good time and informing oneself about a political conflict and human rights violations.

Instead of politicising their solidarity, some non-Mapuche prefer to articulate their motivation through depoliticised topics which are less controversial, such as health, religiosity/cosmology, consumerism, and ecology. For example, some non-Mapuche actors expressed their fascination with how Indigenous societies deal with illness and health issues (Greta, interview with the author, December 12, 2015; Sybille, interview with the author, June 26, 2016; Luis and Nadia Paineñil, interview with the author, March 10, 2016). The talk in Bad Ems was also not framed in explicitly political terms but rather mythologised—and thus depoliticised—the struggle of the Mapuche.

An interesting commonality that non-Mapuche claim to have with the Mapuche is a critical position towards consumerism. For example, Verena frames her motivation within a general interest for consuming consciously and critically, as well as a rejection of consumerism over handicraft. She notes that producing just the necessary amount of goods is something that Indigenous societies apparently do (Verena, interview with the author, December 6, 2015). In another conversation, critical consumerism was articulated as a parameter for being left-wing (Madeline, interview with the author, December 6, 2015).

This has controversial consequences for transnational advocacy and international solidarity with the Mapuche. Maïke, who works in the public rela-

tions department of a human rights advocacy NGO, explains how they strategically use critical consumerism for raising awareness. This is because their work requires to “pick up people in their everyday life” (interview with the author, June 9, 2016) by politicising individual consumerist choices. They make campaigns, for example, denouncing precarious and hazardous working conditions on tea plantations or sweatshops by challenging the consumption of tea or clothes. The problematic aspect is that the particular injustice only matters as a result of an unethical consumerist choice from the Global North. Potential supporters of this NGO are not addressed as politically conscious subjects, but foremost as conscious consumers.

Such expressions of depoliticising solidarity can be further explained by the critical analysis of contemporary (Western) democracy as postpolitical or postdemocratic.⁴ This is because, as it seems, these statements suspend a culture of political debate and conflict in favour of questions about individual lifestyles and consumerist choices. For example, Amanda does not justify her engagement within the framework of a particular political project, organisation, or ideology. Rather, she claims to be inspired by her personal surroundings and reorganises individual ethical behaviour as a political belief. This ultimately leads to the depoliticisation of solidarity activism and solidarity events by favouring consensuality over political conflict. The statements about critical consumerism further transpose questions of political reasoning and deliberation into the sphere of individual consumption.

This depoliticisation not only transforms the focus of solidarity, but the very ways in which solidarity is carried out with problematic consequences. This development allows to transform “the Mapuche topic as a cultural issue” into a commodity that can be sold (Llanquiray Painemal, interview with the author, June 16, 2017). In that context, Llanquiray Painemal had an experience in which someone in Berlin claimed to raise money for the Mapuche

4 The term postpolitical is inspired by post-Marxist thought and especially the work of the French philosopher Jacques Rancière. He counterposed his ideas of a radical democracy with the diagnosis of the present times’ postdemocracy. The latter consists of the establishment of a “consensual democracy,” where political dissent and dispute is suspended in favour of a smoothly running governance. In this way, the political becomes a “flattened form of calculation” (Bohmann 2018, 82–83; my translation) that suspends the political “culture of dissensuality” (Hildebrand 2018, 12; my translation). Rancière warns that this postdemocracy would lead to a “civilizational catastrophe” of “consumerist democracy” and “supermarkets of lifestyles” (Bohmann 2018, 78; my translation).

without any transparency about his organisation or the beneficiaries of the donations. This person was able to transform the political struggle of the Mapuche into a commodity that can be exchanged for donations and transformed into personal benefit. Furthermore, this commodity can be consumed by non-Mapuche actors through their privilege of choosing their object of solidarity. It thus becomes just one of many commodities in the supermarket of solidarity and depoliticises its historical context and political struggle.

But the ideological void, made visible through a decolonial left-wing melancholia, also presents the opportunity to create ideological linkages and commonalities between Mapuche and non-Mapuche actors beyond the Eurocentric left-right divide. In particular, it might facilitate a connection that non-Indigenous actors can establish with the Mapuche through their (shared) struggle for ecological or environmental justice or—in less abstract terms—their respect for nature (Land 2015, 215).

By referring to their concern about ecological issues, non-Mapuche actors create a commonality between them and the Mapuche. At the same time, these issues were used to identify problems that are relevant both in Europe and in Wallmapu. In other words, these statements simultaneously expressed a shared positive feeling of caring about nature and a shared negative feeling towards ecological destruction. Concretely, non-Mapuche activists articulated their convictions and engagement with critiques of extractivism (Amina, interview with the author, November 27, 2015; Peter, interview with the author, December 1, 2015; Sabrina, interview with the author, February 4, 2016; Sybille, interview with the author, June 26, 2016) and land-grabbing in Latin America (Madelaine, interview with the author, December 6, 2015), their own and the Mapuche's respect for nature (Greta, interview with the author, December 12, 2015; Verena, interview with the author, December 6, 2015), and even alternative practices of (urban) gardening (Verena, interview with the author, December 6, 2015).

Organisations of TMA like the GfbV also establish a connection between the defence of Indigenous rights and of nature, whilst being aware of differences between Eurocentric and Indigenous cosmologies and epistemologies regarding the nonhuman (Isabell, interview with the author, June 9, 2016; Maike, interview with the author, June 9, 2016). Simultaneously (and not unproblematically), the stereotype of the ecologically conscious and respectful Indigenous people is strategically mobilised to gain sympathy for their Indigenous rights advocacy (Maike, interview with the author, June 9, 2016).

In accordance, several Mapuche interview partners identified shared ecological concerns as the major linkage between them and European non-Mapuche supporters (María Teresa Loncón, interview with the author, March 3, 2016). More precisely, ideological connections and commonalities are argued on the basis of a “love for life,” the “protection of mother earth,” an “ecological intelligence” (Alex Mora, interview with the author, November 28, 2015), or an equal respect towards nature (Cecilia Necul, interview with the author, March 10, 2016). In addition, political representatives of Mapuche organisations and communities identified potential allies in Europe based on their ecological agenda (Isabel Cañet, interview with the author, February 24, 2016; Jaime Huenchullán, interview with the author, March 20, 2016).

But this ideological commonality of a supposedly shared ecological conscience is not without its contradictions. One reason is that this apparently shared concern for nature is based on different, and maybe even competing, underlying cosmologies and epistemologies about what nature actually is. At the same time, there is a strong tradition of reproducing the colonial stereotype of Indigenous people as guardians of the environment. Finally, the actions of environmental organisations need to be understood within global power dynamics with sometimes competing interests. For example, in 2017, the *Red por la Defensa de los Territorios* (RDT) criticised a series of international environmental organisations like WWF, Greenpeace, and Rainforest Alliance for awarding ecological certificates to Chilean companies despite their responsibility for and complicity in land-grabbing and deforestation, as well as water and soil contamination (Mapuexpress 2017).

Despite these contradictions, the shared reference to resisting ecological destruction across the globe constitutes a major injustice frame through which non-Mapuche construct their ideological linkages with the Mapuche.⁵ The shared feeling of the imminent threat of the irreversible destruction of the planet can be understood as an important resource for a human commonality because of a shared dependence on the environment: “Yet climate change,” and the general climate crisis under the Capitalocene,⁶ “poses for us a question of a human collectivity, an us, pointing to a figure of the universal that escapes our capacity to experience the world. It is more like a universal that arises from a shared sense of a catastrophe” (Chakrabarty 2009, 222).

5 See chapter five.

6 The term ‘capitalocene’ describes the capitalist era and type of human relations towards nature. For more on this term, see Moore (2016).

In that way, the shared sense of an immediate ecological catastrophe is what could be the point of departure for an ecological cosmopolitanism from below.⁷ Such linkages on ecological grounds between Mapuche and non-Mapuche are a specific expression of this quest for an ecological cosmopolitanism that connects actors across different positionalities and territories.

A Critique of Maputhusiasm in Solidarity

A series of investigations in literary, cultural, and history studies have described the very peculiar imaginary relationship between Germany and (North) American Indigenous people as “Indianthusiasm,” in which Native Americans are essentialised and stereotypically depicted in an essentially positive light (Berkhofer 1979; Calloway, Gemunden, and Zantop 2002; LaFramboise 2017; Usbeck 2015). Within that complex, Indigenous people are not seen as inferior but rather “through a positive racial lens” (Usbeck 2015, 208), including “a yearning for all things Indian,⁸ a fascination with American Indians, a romanticizing about a supposed Indian essence” (Lutz quoted in Usbeck 2015, 2).

These studies describe and deconstruct the particularly German Indianthusiasm from the fifteenth century until the present day as “a socially constructed German national(ist) myth” (Ridington 2004, 403) and as a “part of the national fabric, embedded in national discourses of ‘Germanness’” (LaFramboise 2017, 33). German Indianthusiasm claims a special bond between the Indian and white males, but nevertheless “the heroes of their [the German’s] dreams are not real Indians, but fictional ones” (Bolz and Davis 2003, 194). Similar to postcolonial and decolonial approaches, deconstructing Indianthusiasm thus does not demand to conceive of Indigenous people more authentically or to substitute these stereotypes with supposedly real knowledge. Rather, it means

7 The idea of a “cosmopolitanism from below” is critical towards exclusively elitist notions of cosmopolitanism and transcultural contact (Robbins and Lemos Horta 2017, 9).

8 With the term ‘Indians,’ these authors refer to the stereotyped figure and the racialised image.

to understand the racial aspects of the profoundly meaningful desire many Germans possess to want to be Indian, because being a good Indian means being a good German. These racial and national ideologies are intrinsically interesting, but are also part of a larger, historical discourse of essentialism and racism. (LaFramboise 2017, 33)

As part of a broader history of German racism, contemporary critical race studies, for example, show that German Indianthusiasm is even connected to stereotypes within anti-Muslim racism (Attia 2009, 39).

Discussing Indianthusiasm means navigating between discourses about the real and the fake, the closeness and distance of Indigenous people, their presence and absence, as well as between modernity and antimodern ideas. Engaging critically with Indianthusiasm thus allows to question “what this phenomenon tells us about Europe and European cultures” and “to what degree [it] merely reflects an increased dissatisfaction with the political and cultural modernity on offer in Europe” (Stirrup 2013, 4).

These investigations invite to challenge the representations and ideas about the Mapuche that non-Mapuche actors mobilise in the context of transnational advocacy and international solidarity. These actors translate the Indigeneity of the Mapuche, a resource to claim their distinct nationality, into the European context. As argued in the previous chapter, such translations do not happen unhindered, but occur within an already existing conflictive field, where meanings and ideas are negotiated. Rather, they take part within what this chapter outlines as Maputhusiasm—a representational framework activated by non-Mapuche, particularly German, actors that racialises and stereotypes the Mapuche culture and society through mostly positively connoted, romanticised, and antimodern imaginaries.

Transnational advocacy and international solidarity with the Mapuche thus necessarily engage with the already existing framework of German Indianthusiasm and contribute to producing what this chapter defines as Maputhusiasm. This is because (in particular, non-Indigenous) advocacy NGOs tend to reproduce stereotypical and essentialised representations about Indigenous people as a consequence of their bureaucratisation, producing a “hyperreal Indian” (Ramos 1994) as a failed transcultural translation. So, what are the elements of Maputhusiasm and the hyperreal Mapuche that are articulated and mobilised by non-Mapuche actors and NGOs?

Isabell has been engaged in Indigenous rights advocacy in Germany since the 1970s. She notes that the first Indigenous delegations from Central and

South America had to fight against being subsumed under the dominant imaginaries about Indigenous people. As a consequence of Indianthusiasm, these imaginaries conceived Indigenous people from the Americas as exclusively North American. Delegations from South and Central America first had “to clarify that they actually existed” (Isabell, interview with the author, June 9, 2016). According to her, this has changed substantially today, but her narration sheds light on the imaginative force of Indianthusiasm within international solidarity in the German context.

Several statements from interviews with non-Mapuche actors engaged in solidarity and advocacy show how the gaze of Indianthusiasm still informs stereotypes about the Mapuche. To begin with, before travelling to Wallmapu the first time, Clarissa admits that her idea about the Mapuche before coming into contact with their culture and society was that “those are Indians just like in the US” (Clarissa, interview with the author, January 22, 2016). Other Indianthusiastic tropes were the Mapuche “sitting around a campfire” (Karin, interview with the author, January 22, 2016), wearing “colourful clothes,” and having “particular traditions and music” (Clarissa, interview with the author, January 22, 2016).

Though most of my non-Indigenous interview partners articulated imaginaries about the Mapuche informed by an Indianthusiastic gaze, they were aware of their stereotypical character. For example, they imagined them as technologically backward⁹ (Peter, interview with the author, December 1, 2015; Madelaine, interview with the author, December 6, 2015), as living cut off from Western society and remotely in the mountains (Eva, interview with the author, December 1, 2015a; Peter, interview with the author, December 1, 2015; Madelaine, interview with the author, December 6, 2015), having a close connection with nature and animals (Greta, interview with the author, December 12, 2015; Sybille, interview with the author, June 26, 2016; Verena, interview with the author, December 6, 2015), and that self-sufficiency and agriculture

9 The colonial and racial bias about the usage of information and communication technologies (ICTs) by Indigenous people is noteworthy: either it is impossible to even consider the very fact that Indigenous people also use ICTs and social media or the white gaze is astonished and disrupted when considering that these supposedly premodern people mimic ‘our’ modernity (Taussig 1993). The stereotyped Indian has either no mobile phone or he is an exception for having one. For example, Peter claims that using cell phones “was not really their thing” (interview with the author, December 1, 2015) instead of considering contextual factors like a bad Internet connection as reasons for his Mapuche interlocutors sometimes not being available.

were the basis of their livelihood (Verena, interview with the author, December 6, 2015).

After having spent some time in Wallmapu, several interviewees admitted that, as a consequence of such stereotypes, their own naivety led them to underestimate the highly conflictive and hazardous situation there (Clarissa, interview with the author, January 22, 2016; Rike, interview with the author, May 27, 2016; Sybille, interview with the author, June 26, 2016). Their experiences show that stereotypes like Maputhusiasm are far from innocent and can have harmful consequences. The imagined peacefulness and innocence surrounding Indigenous people made them careless and led them into dangerous situations during their stay in Wallmapu. In that way, stereotypes are not only harmful to the stereotyped group but also towards the people reproducing them. Furthermore, this carelessness does not only present a risk for the non-Mapuche visitors, but might even put their Mapuche hosts at risk by feeling responsible for their guests.

The stereotypes about the Mapuche are generally very positive. Some described their interest in Indigenous cultures as a result of their conscious “idealisation of Indigenous people” (Verena, interview with the author, December 6, 2015) and of a positive (Greta, interview with the author, December 12, 2015) and “idyllic” (Clarissa, interview with the author, January 22, 2016) image of their culture. Especially the imaginations about the Mapuche as living in close touch with nature were presented in a very positive, affectionate, and even admiring way. Such positive references towards an assumed ecological consciousness of the Mapuche are part of a larger set of colonial stereotypes about Indigenous societies and cultures as the keepers and preservers of the environment (LaFramboise 2017, 15).

It struck me that non-Mapuche actors reproduce stereotypes whilst being aware of them. If there is an explicit awareness about their Maputhusiasm, what consequence do they experience as a result? Do they critically engage with their Maputhusiasm, aim to challenge it, or is their awareness essentially “non-performative” (Ahmed 2004)? For some, being confronted with their stereotypes “sparks the interest in visiting these countries, to see how it really is” (Karin, interview with the author, January 22, 2016). Similarly, during her trip to Europe, the Mapuche weaver María Teresa Loncón felt that non-Indigenous people were “on the quest for the most genuine” (interview with the author, March 3, 2016). Also, the event in Bad Ems and particularly the reaction of the audience to the intervention of Alina Rodenkirchen expresses a similar fascination about the opportunity to talk to a ‘real’ Mapuche woman.

Such statements and reactions can be described as a “quest for the authentic Indian” (Penny 2006)—in this case, for something that would count as real and authentic Mapuche people, culture, and society. Their awareness about their own Maputhusiasm and their reproduction of a hyperreal Mapuche leaves the non-Mapuche actors with a troubled feeling about not knowing what actually is authentic and real. In short, the hyperreality needs to be substituted by something real.

This quest for a real encounter with the Mapuche translates itself into attempts to make transnational advocacy or international solidarity projects as authentic as possible. For example, in his documentary, for Peter it was “important [...] to portray above all ‘the life’. People, how they live, as authentic and real and as interesting as possible” (interview with the author, December 1, 2015). In her photography project portraying different aspects of life in Wallmapu, Sybille’s idea was

[...] actually to see how these people live, what problems they have, what are all the circumstances, and in the end not to show these are their traditions and those are their costumes, as all the photos normally show, but to show—starting from their everyday life—that this is their situation. (Sybille, interview with the author, June 26, 2016)

Such attempts seek to authenticate solidarity efforts. Thus, they not only try to portray something in the most authentic way but seek to make the solidarity efforts more credible and trustworthy.

For some, the most authentic experience of solidarity and advocacy could be achieved by the very presence of Mapuche people. As shown in chapter four, Mapuche actors manage to maintain a high level of agency and autonomy within solidarity efforts. For many non-Mapuche activists, this authenticates their solidarity activism. For example, their presence is considered to be “important, because it is more authentic [...] when someone [...] comes from this culture” (Clarissa, interview with the author, January 22, 2016) and because “what comes from these people themselves is what represents them much more” (Greta, interview with the author, December 12, 2015). As a non-Indigenous supporter of the Mapuche foundation *FOLIL* in the Netherlands, Amanda wishes “that there were more opportunities for those affected themselves to set out those organisations” because “they lived it, they see it, they are in touch with it constantly. That makes it really raw, to be honest—when you hear the stories, when you see the emotions, you’re in the middle of it” (interview with the author, July 1, 2016).

Whilst the presence and agency of Mapuche actors in solidarity efforts is an important achievement, the quest to authenticate solidarity might in the end only benefit non-Mapuche actors and organisations, making them more credible to outsiders. The attempts to make experiences of solidarity more authentic also puts a lot of pressure on Mapuche activists during rallies, in which they are approached by the audience or the media as supposedly authentic voices. Llanquiray Painemal feels that her presence as a Mapuche woman is made into a burden, and that she is pressured to deliver an authentic and legitimised account. For her, the “distinct legitimacy” of Mapuche people talking for themselves and the pressure to authenticate solidarity remains an unresolved dilemma (Llanquiray Painemal, interview with the author, June 16, 2017).

Postcolonial and decolonial perspectives do not resolve this dilemma, since their critiques do not seek to substitute a stereotype with something real or authentic.¹⁰ Instead, such critiques complicate the very possibility of a proper representation of cultural Otherness. Similarly, a critique of German Indianthusiasm considers it “irrelevant whether German authors knew what the reality of Native American life actually was” (Usbeck 2015, 8). Rather, there is a “critical consensus” that Indigenous people “have gained the ultimate authority to mediate representations of Indianness” (Penny 2006, 814). Most importantly though, “the debate over ‘realism’ will always be framed in terms of White values and needs, White ideologies and creative uses.” (Berkhofer 1979, 111)

The quest for authenticity and the authentication of solidarity is hence not about what replaces the hyperreal with a real Mapuche, but rather needs to be understood as another contested arena, wherein different actors—Indigenous and non-Indigenous—struggle over authority, access, and content. At the same time, the quest for authenticity paves the way for (dis)encounters of solidarity between Mapuche and non-Mapuche, yet never towards the ultimately real Mapuche. This is because a singular encounter with a Mapuche person could never claim authority over each possible encounter with Mapuche people. Nadia Paineñil from the community of Llaguepulli, for example, rejects this representational authority because representing her culture

10 For example, in his work about Orientalism, Edward Said (2003) highlights that he is not interested in criticising an apparently false representation of the Orient through Western eyes—this has to be straightened out through better and more objective accounts.

“is not [portraying] a different image, but how we really are” (interview with the author, March 10, 2016).

A final significant element of Maputhusiasm is that it stands in sharp opposition to the negative stereotypes of the Mapuche in Chilean media and mainstream society. One major challenge of transnational advocacy and international solidarity with the Mapuche is how to transform the racialised frame that not only represents them as violent terrorists, but ultimately legitimises them being treated as such. In contrast, transnational advocacy and international solidarity by non-Mapuche suddenly introduces a representational framework in which the Mapuche appear in an essentially positive light. At the same time, Maputhusiasm helps to explain why non-Mapuche people from Europe seem to be much more welcome in Mapuche circles than non-Mapuche Chileans, thus contributing to their privileged access.

Several conversations, especially with Mapuche activists and representatives, critically address the representational politics by non-Mapuche in the context of transnational advocacy and international solidarity. To start with, Llanquira Painemal critiques the ways in which Mapuche people, society, and culture are essentialised. Particularly, she challenges how Mapuche people are identified as such exclusively in biological terms and blood ties. In contrast, she argues that being Mapuche has much more to do with a political anticolonial and decolonial positionality, which can be assumed or rejected independently from ancestry (interview with the author, June 16, 2017). This provides a much more integrative and dynamic perspective on Indigenous belonging.

In addition, non-Mapuche activists articulated a prominent critique about essentialising the Mapuche through romanticised imaginaries. This “romanticising Indian-lens” (Isabell, interview with the author, June 9, 2016) contributes to the fact that people in the West misunderstand the often precarious realities of Indigenous or Native American lives (Maike, interview with the author, June 9, 2016). Simultaneously, this opens the way for non-Indigenous people to “sell an imaginary Indian” and to “commercialise and corrupt” (Isabell, interview with the author, June 9, 2016) Indigenous cultures according to their own interests (Llanquira Painemal, interview with the author, June 16, 2017).

A very strong critique is directed against attitudes and discourses of non-Mapuche that subsume the Mapuche under a national (Chilean or Argentinian) belonging. Such practices are expressions of a paternalism by non-

Mapuche Chileans or Europeans that have their origin in the racist social structures in Chile and which are reproduced within solidarity work. Particularly on a discursive level, white Chileans talk in a possessive way about Indigenous people and develop “a language that is hard for me. For example, they say ‘ah, our Mapuche” (Llanquiraý Painemal, interview with the author, June 16, 2017). This critique also concerns the fact that non-Mapuche Chileans appear in solidarity events in Europe with a Chilean national flag without being aware that “the Chilean flag has a colonial history” (Ibid.). In contrast, the Mapuche flag holds the “meaning of an antiracist, an anticolonial struggle” (Ibid.). This nationalist and paternalist annexation is also expressed in experiences in which “they [the Chileans] want to talk for you, but don’t want you to talk” or claim to be the “representatives of the Mapuche in Europe” (Ibid.).

The critique of such paternalism is also directed against non-Indigenous people or Indigenous rights advocacy organisations, who “make themselves the owners [...], the representatives of all the Indigenous topics in the world [...]” (Llanquiraý Painemal, interview with the author, June 16, 2017). In that way, their paternalism leads to a cultural appropriation of Indigenous issues within advocacy and solidarity. These acts of appropriation do not remain on a symbolic level, but have very concrete material consequences. For example, non-Mapuche actors and organisations can benefit from this appropriation by receiving donations and funding, or solidarity activists might get access to interesting jobs or internships in transnational organisations because of their experience in advocacy action.

Mapuche communities and organisations in Wallmapu seem to be aware of such acts of symbolic or material appropriation within solidarity and advocacy action. Andrea Cotrena, for example, explains that “the people there [in Wallmapu] think we [the Mapuche diaspora] are making money on top [...]. Taking advantage of the name of Mapuche and things like that” (interview with the author, June 6, 2017).

The fact that “the Mapuche issue as a cultural thing [...] sells” is exemplified by Llanquiraý Painemal (interview with the author, June 16, 2017) with a particular experience: There is an organisation with a Mapuche name in Berlin that in the past ten years has claimed to collect money for a school in Wallmapu and organises numerous solidarity events. One activist of that organisation even gave himself a Mapuche name. Llanquiraý Painemal reveals that there is no information about the school project the organisation claims to fund. She puts that experience in the more general context in which non-Mapuche people and organisations benefit from selling Mapuche culture in

the form of food or political symbols or from organising workshops about Mapuche culture.

Another critique addresses the depoliticisation of solidarity. For example, Isabel Cañet demands more political content within solidarity action and criticises those who repeat Mapuche slogans without embracing the political message behind them (interview with the author, February 24, 2016). In addition, Llanquiray Painemal gives an example wherein she was invited to lead workshops about Mapuche ceremonies in schools in Berlin. She expresses that she would love to work with children, but not teaching them “only” about Mapuche ceremonies (interview with the author, June 16, 2017).

This is connected to experiences in which the demands of particular Mapuche organisations or communities are made invisible in advocacy or solidarity action if they are not compatible with the political positions of the non-Mapuche organisation or group (Isabel Cañet, interview with the author, February 24, 2016). Party members of *Wallmapuwen* had one such experience: One of their members travelled to Canada and got in contact with a local magazine advocating for the cause of the Mapuche. One edition had an interview with the leader of the CAM, Héctor Llaitul, in which he was asked about his opinion of *Wallmapuwen*. Although he might not agree with their policy, in the original statement Llaitul answered in a very diplomatic way. Nevertheless, in the English translation of the interview that was finally published, Llaitul apparently harshly disagreed with and opposed the approach of *Wallmapuwen*. Isabel Cañet explains to me that it was the magazine's editor who distorted his answer on purpose because of their disagreement with *Wallmapuwen's* policy; they willingly damaged and sabotaged their political project on a transnationally visible scale (interview with the author, February 24, 2016).

A final objection to the damaging representational practices by non-Mapuche concerns the portrayal of Mapuche people as victims. Isabel Cañet addresses this issue as part of “a self-critique [...] that several Mapuche, when they go abroad, also sometimes present themselves as victimised and that is also annoying” (interview with the author, February 24, 2016). This critique is foremost directed towards their own political community and its representational practices towards the non-Mapuche world. Her critique also resonates with other contexts of solidarity between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people, where the “continual production and amplification of victim narratives to feed white appetite for trauma porn” (Simpson, Walcott, and Coulthard 2018, 81) is problematised.

However, critiquing its negative effects is not the only way of engaging with representational politics within transnational advocacy and international solidarity. Other statements, especially of Mapuche interview partners, show a more positive reaction to Maputhusiasm. Such reactions are positive in two senses: On the one side, they utilise Maputhusiasm in a productive way instead of rejecting it. On the other, they highlight and engage with positive ideas about Mapuche culture, society, and cosmology. Producing positive representations as a stereotyped group of people means challenging modern/colonial racism and its underlying “Manicheism delirium” (Fanon 2008, 141), where Blackness—and I would add Indigeneity—is referred to with foremost negative connotations in comparison to whiteness (Sardar quoted in Fanon 2008, xiii).

For example, several Mapuche interview partners seek to (re)produce positive images about Mapuche culture, society, and cosmology in their work as artists or educators (Alex Mora, interview with the author, November 28, 2015; Victor Carilaf, interview with the author, February 23, 2016). They hereby challenge the largely negative ideas about the Mapuche in Chilean civil society and domestic media. At the same time, they provide multiple stories (rather than just a single story) about the ways of being Mapuche in the world. For example, in the work of *Kimeltuwe*, the Mapuche figures are portrayed through “very friendly, [...] very close, and even funny animations” (Victor Carilaf, interview with the author, February 23, 2016). These efforts must be understood as an integral part of the struggle for decolonisation, as they “express an Indigenous spirit, experience or world view [by] countering the dominant society’s image of Indigenous peoples, their lifestyles and belief systems” (Smith 2008, 151). To provide one’s own society with a positive identity has been part of several struggles of minorities and colonised collectives.¹¹

However, providing a positive image of Indigenous people within transnational advocacy and international solidarity is complicated by the framework of Indianthusiasm and is described as, for instance, a “tightrope walk” by Maike (interview with the author, June 9, 2016). On the one hand, non-Indigenous NGOs popularise images and stories about Indigenous livelihoods that feed into satisfying the Indianthusiastic gaze. On the other

11 For example, the decolonial movements like the Black Power (Ongiri 2009) and Red Power movements (Nagel 1997) in North America, the Zapatistas (Hayden 2002), the Maori movement in New Zealand (Smith 2008), as well as in the German migrant experience (Steyerl and Gutiérrez Rodríguez 2012).

hand, international solidarity seeks to deliver critical information about the political and historical background of their struggle and respects the heterogenous expressions of Mapuche people.

Appropriating a (negative) stereotype and turning it into something positive and dignified has been described as “strategic essentialism” (Spivak 1990, 11). However, whilst it contributes to essentialising an identity, in its strategic appropriation “one can self-consciously use this irreducible moment of essentialism as part of one’s strategy” (Ibid., 109). What is interesting here is that the Mapuche are making a strategic use of the essentialism and Maputhusiasm of non-Mapuche actors and organisations. The essentialisation of their identity through Maputhusiasm is thus less weighty than its possible strategic political usage.

Vicente Painel offers an example of this in the story of a Mexican shaman woman who was overrun by a mass of white North Americans because of her access to a very particular mushroom. Although this had emotionally and economically negative consequences for her, Vicente Painel emphasises its positive side effects, because “if the New Age [movement] did not exist, maybe many things would be already destroyed” (interview with the author, March 3, 2016). In that way, the essentialist treatment of Indigenous culture—in that case, the quest for a particular magic mushroom—could be strategically used to rescue the material or immaterial cultural products of Indigenous societies. Vicente Painel also claims to be fine with Maputhusiasm as long as it helps to stop the repression of the Mapuche people (Ibid.). Here, the political goal is clearly prioritised over the possible negative outcomes of Maputhusiasm.

Furthermore, the Mapuche diaspora publicly introduces elements of Mapuche culture in Europe, for example by wearing traditional clothes, as essentially positive features. They hereby gain extra attention by interrupting the public space with an Indigenous performance. At the same time, they benefit from a generally positive attitude, especially in Germany, from non-Indigenous spectators of Indigenous culture due to Indianthusiasm. Alex Mora (interview with the author, November 28, 2015) explains that diasporic Mapuche groups in Europe strategically perform their Indigenous identity collectively in public rallies but notes that it is not performed in everyday life.

Another example of the strategic usage of Maputhusiasm is given by Andrea Cotrena (interview with the author, June 6, 2017). Amongst other things, she supports her father’s community in Wallmapu by supporting its efforts in implementing ecologically and culturally sensitive tourism. In her perspective, the contact between the community and non-Mapuche visitors can have

a positive impact on the community in the following way: her idea is that non-Indigenous visitors, influenced by Indianthusiasm stereotypes, would ask the community members questions about their culture. As a consequence, the community members would need to start to “check their identity” and “look more for their roots and also recover the language.” They would also remember, for example, some traditions of their ancestors. For her, “when Europeans go to see Indigenous people, they expect them to live like a tribe” (Ibid.). In turn, this Indianthusiasm makes them aware that they have lost their cultural identity and became *wigkanised*.¹² Therefore, the strategic engagement with Maputhusiasm would unleash a process of consciousness-building about the fact that the community has been assimilated by Chilean culture.

This strategic appropriation of the essentialised identity is a remarkable way in which Mapuche actors deal with Maputhusiasm. Such stereotypes are not uncontested, but are put into service for the particular purposes of the Mapuche people. Thus, within Indianthusiasm “Native Americans can and will continue to harness – albeit sometimes in rather ironic ways – these ‘White ideologies’ within that ‘White frame’ to support their own ‘values and needs’ [...]” (Penny 2006, 815).

Furthermore, beyond their strategic appropriation, these experiences produce a “mimetic excess” (Taussig 1993, 254–55) between Mapuche and non-Mapuche.¹³ Indigenous people, and in the present case Mapuche, participate actively in the process of cultural transformation through mutual imitation. In Andrea Cotrena’s example, the Mapuche community imitates the non-Mapuche visitors’ imitation of a supposedly authentic Mapuche culture. This exchange thus contributes to a cultural revitalisation of the Mapuche community and ultimately has the potential to transform the non-Mapuche’s essentialism through the mimetic excess between both groups (since the latter would imitate the former’s imitation of the imitation and so on). In a similar way, the public performance of Mapuche culture in demonstrations in Europe feeds into the European appetite for Maputhusiasm but at the same time becomes an expression of the revitalisation of cultural symbols

12 The Mapuzugun word *wigka* (sometimes *huinca*) generally denominates a non-Mapuche person or an outsider to the Mapuche society in a rather derogatory way.

13 The idea of a mimetic excess highlights the creative transformation of cultures through imitation within cross-cultural and interethnic contact between Western and Indigenous cultures.

and language within the Mapuche diaspora and contributes to reconstruct a positive Mapuche identity.

Based on ongoing debates in critical race, decolonial, and feminist studies, the previous chapter critically examined how whiteness, conceived as a privileged and invisibilised social positionality, and colonial stereotypes, outlined as Maputhusiasm, are at work in the interethnic and interracial relations of solidarity between Mapuche and non-Mapuche actors.

First, the chapter described the different forms in which non-Mapuche actors enter spaces and relations of transnational advocacy and solidarity with the Mapuche. That led me to identify three forms of white privilege within solidarity action: 1) Compared to Mapuche actors, who describe their engagement as an inherited burden, white non-Mapuche have the privilege of freely choosing to enter solidarity and advocacy activism; 2) Due to the colonial relations of power within Chilean society, non-Chilean solidarity actors are considered to be more trustworthy and reliable than their white Chilean counterparts. This was defined as the privilege of trust; 3) Finally, whiteness includes the privilege of being able to abandon their engagements of solidarity, which is met with critical attention by Mapuche actors.

The second part presented the personal, political, and ideological motivations of non-Mapuche actors engaging in TMA and solidarity activism. I explained the limited references to leftist ideas by the non-Mapuche supporters through the historically complicated relationship between the Mapuche and non-Indigenous left-wing parties and movements in Chile. Through a decolonial left-wing melancholia an ideological void between Mapuche and non-Mapuche actors becomes visible, which presents a danger of depoliticising solidarity. However, it also uncovers the possibility of an ecological cosmopolitanism from below, creating commonalities between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people.

The last section proposed the notion of Maputhusiasm as a representational framework activated and (re)produced by non-Mapuche, particularly German, actors which racialises and stereotypes the Mapuche culture and society through mostly positively connoted, romanticised, and antimodern imaginaries. Interestingly, most of my interview partners presented themselves as being aware of these stereotypes whilst also reproducing them. As an effect of this awareness, they seek to encounter and show the most authentic expressions of Mapuche culture and society within solidarity and advocacy action. In conversation with Mapuche interlocutors, expressions

of Maputhusiasm that essentialise, romanticise, paternalise, appropriate, depoliticise, render invisible, silence, and victimise the Mapuche and their cause, voices, and struggle were criticised. But the Maputhusiasm of non-Indigenous people is also strategically appropriated by Mapuche actors as long as it serves their particular goals. The strategic essentialism and appropriation create a mimetic excess between Mapuche and non-Mapuche that holds the potential of reconstructing and revitalising Mapuche culture.

Whilst this chapter primarily looked at the motivations, representations, and ideologies that are mobilised within solidarity and advocacy action, the next chapter turns the focus to the concrete practices and the social and interpersonal outcomes of these encounters.