

Challenges to improve the Tensions and the Deterioration of the Relations between the State and the Mapuche People in Contemporary Chile

Ricardo Codoceo Tapia¹

¹(Universidad Católica de Temuco, Chile;)

ABSTRACT: *In the following work, he intends to develop a reflection on the current relationship between the Chilean State and the Mapuche Indigenous Movement. A relationship that has been stressed by the accentuation of indigenous demand focused on specific rights as a culturally differentiated people. This demand deepens at the beginning of the 21st century. This paper begins by developing an analysis of international factors and intranational factors that contributed to the development of an ethnic demand that challenges the State seeking greater degrees of autonomy within itself and the possibility of deciding as a people the fate of a series of subjects that directly affect them. It is proposed that what prevents a better process of dialogue and encounter between the different actors involved in the Mapuche question is a conception of cultural identities that conceives them as closed and essentialized entities. Rethinking this way of understanding ethnicity and nationality is a first achievement to move towards a higher quality dialogue. It is concluded that the rethinking of identities is essential for a rapprochement between the various actors, but it is also relevant that the national reality is not conceived from the State based on an egalitarian liberalism that ends up making ethnic diversity invisible within.*

KEYWORDS: *Collective Rights, Ethnic Identity, Nationality, Mapuche People, Cultural Rethinking.*

I. INTRODUCTION

What has become evident in the last decades of the 20th century and at the beginning of the 21st century, both in the world and in Latin America, is the fact that the Modern Nation-State has not been able to suppress the question of cultural diversity, specifically the one that says relation with the indigenous peoples or national minorities that live inside it. It has not been able to suppress the issue of indigenous peoples, despite the fact that in Latin America, with different nuances over almost 200 years, political elites tried to build nation models from a strong enlightened and liberal matrix.

From this matrix, in a deliberate and conscious way, an attempt was made to build a strongly homogeneous imaginary of a nation, having as a significant reference point the countries of Western Europe. The cultural diversity of indigenous peoples was excluded as a component, not only of the imaginary of the nation, but also as a significant component of the public and legal sphere of these States-Nations. In this construction of the Nation-State, citizenship was proposed in theory, as universal citizenship, egalitarian and with individual rights, regardless of ethnic, religious and geographical considerations.

Despite the foregoing, in recent decades the interpellation to the Nation-State has been intensified by social movements focused on ethnicity and the defense of indigenous-based cultural diversity. This allows us to verify

an undeniable reality: sociocultural or ethnic diversity cannot be suppressed; we must get used to living with it (Díaz-Polanco, 1998)[1].

Chile is no stranger to the reality outlined above, for which reason the interpellation to the State and to society in general by indigenous social movements that make requirements that go beyond an agrarian demand or search for resources has become visible specific materials. In Chile, the so-called "Mapuche conflict" has become evident at the national level, an issue that since the definitive forced incorporation of the indigenous population in the year 1883 into the Chilean State has not been resolved significantly (Bengoa, 2000^a [2]; Saavedra, 2002 [3]; Mallon, 2004 [4]; Pinto, 2003 [5] Pinto, 2012 [6]).

One of the interesting edges of the Mapuche question at present has to do with the complexization of the social demand posed to the State, which is expressed in general terms in transit, from a mainly peasant demand in much of the 20th century, towards a Wider demand, focused on the vindication of differentiated rights as an ethnic group (Lillo, 2003) [7]. This demand from the self-perception as a singular cultural group that seeks a genuine system of rights as a people, is not general in the Mapuche world and there is no single proposal in this regard, but it has been the most resisted contemporary Mapuche demand and at the same time the most overlooked for the Chilean National State and for its institutional political system. This lack of correspondence has contributed to the deterioration of relations between the different actors and mainly between the State and a large part of the Mapuche indigenous movement.

Considering the above and in the framework of reflections carried out in the compulsory course on Intercultural Relations of the Master's Program in Applied Social Sciences of the University of La Frontera, Temuco, Chile, in 2015 we asked ourselves the following questions that guided the development of This essay: 1) What factors would explain the strengthening of this demand focused mainly on ethnicity within the Mapuche social movement and what has been the degree of acceptance by the Chilean State? 2) What mechanisms are necessary to generate processes of rapprochement and inclusive dialogues between the Chilean State and the contemporary indigenous movement? The answers to these questions are not simple, nor are they limited to a single causal variable. Furthermore, responses must guard against ideological and / or fundamentalist judgments that demonize or, conversely, turn contemporary social processes into new panaceas.

II. GENERAL FACTORS THAT COMPLEXED THE INDIGENOUS DEMAND IN CHILE.

One of the explanatory factors of the deepening of indigenous demand with an emphasis on ethnic specificity has to do with the accelerated processes of neoliberal modernization that occurred in Chile. These structural adjustments occur "from the second half of the eighties, especially from 1990 and have resulted in a lower presence of the State" (Bengoa, 2000b, p. 29) [8]. The retraction of the Welfare State and its supporting institutions is supplied and responded with the solidarity of the most primary groups, among them, the family and ethnicity. This neoliberal modernization of the State has implied in the rural areas of Chile with a strong indigenous presence, that the productive promotion action by the State agrarian development agencies towards the Mapuche economies has been restricted only to those economies with more capital endowment agrarian (Quiñones and Gálvez, 2014 [9]; Codoceo, 2019 [10]), so there is a significant marginalization of broad sectors of the rural population, "where perhaps the indigenous are the most excluded" (Bengoa, 2000b: 47) [8]. According to different studies, there would be a strong correlation in Latin America, between rural poverty and ethnicity. In this sense, in Latin America, "approximately 80%, that is to say between 26 and 32 million indigenous people, are poor, and of these more than half are extremely poor" (Subercaseaux, 2002, p. 47) [11].

The Mapuche population does not escape poverty. Already in the late 1990s, studies showed that 38.4% of the Mapuche population lived in poverty and 11.7% lived in poverty (Valenzuela, (1998), in Aylwin, 2000, p.285) [12]. Currently, the IX Region of Araucanía is the region with the highest poverty rates nationwide, with 22.9% and with the highest rates of extreme poverty nationwide, with 5.3%. Poverty in the region tends to be

concentrated mainly in rural areas, in a predominantly Mapuche population (CASEN Survey, 2011) [13]. The total Mapuche population of Araucanía represents 32.82% of the regional population according to the latest measurements¹.

What we propose is that neoliberal modernization, by excluding indigenous populations from development, has contributed to their responding with a restructuring of their ethnic or group solidarity as a mechanism for survival within the State. This brings with it the intensification of inter-ethnic conflicts within the Nation-State, since “there is a multitude of evidence around us that poverty and the growing competition for scarce resources increases solidarity within ethnic groups and stresses them between them”(Baumann, 2001, p. 50) [15]. The economic restructuring within the Nation-State in Chile generates a phenomenon of opposing identifications within it, since while “elites increasingly identify with their transnational peers, populations identify with subnational identities, including, sometimes, with xenophobic characters”(Assies, 2004, p. 230) [16].

Another factor that has contributed to the development of this demand focused increasingly on ethnicity by indigenous populations, is the end of what was called the "Cold War". In the confrontation between the Soviet Union and the United States, which adhered to political-ideological paradigms throughout much of the 20th century, "the emergence of independent indigenous identities from one of the world blocs was very difficult, if not impossible" (Bengoa, 2000b, p.41)[8]. By breaking the political and social guidelines of the interclass alliances that prevailed since the Second World War, the sociopolitical conflicts that emerge today are no longer read under the communism-capitalism axis. In this new context "the ethnic question could emerge independently" (Bengoa, 2000b, p.42) [8].

A third factor that contributed to this process is the advancement of indigenous rights in international law. In this sense, indigenous movements reinforce their collective actions, relying on legal instruments that have progressively given way to indigenous law in international law. Despite the fact that the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations, put “the emphasis on the individual rights of people and not on the collective rights of peoples” (Aylwin, 2003, p. 167) [17] progressively interstate international law has been changing, where the issue of indigenous rights “has gone from being a matter of protection of minorities, based on the individual rights that those minorities make up, to the approach towards forms of self-determination based on in the 'collective rights'”(Assies, 2004, p. 231) [16].

In relation to the above, it is worth noting Convention 169 of the International Labor Organization of 1989, as the first international legal instrument “that comes to recognize the existence of indigenous peoples, recognizing a set of individual rights and collective rights such as people”(Aylwin, 2003, p. 169) [17]. A corpus of indigenous rights has then been generated, mainly through "rapporteurs, recommendations, jurisdictional decisions and human rights instruments, which are the ways in which International Law is manifested" (Lillo, 2003, p.128) [7].

In the Chilean context where ethnic identity is intensified as a mechanism of claim against the Nation-State, indigenous groups use the international legal means and instruments to base their relationship with the State and with the larger society of which they are part. In this sense, "if we compare the evolution of the protection of indigenous rights in international bodies, with the discourse currently used by the Mapuches, a clear derivation of one from the other is seen" (Lillo, 2003, p. 129) [7]. In other words, the Mapuche support their current demands for the recognition of differentiated rights as a people, based on the advancement of indigenous rights at the international level, despite the fact that the Chilean nation-state has not reformed its institutional framework as prescribed by international law. in the matter.

¹ According to the results of the last national census of 2017, a total of 1,745,147 people were considered to belong to the Mapuche people at the country level. This figure represented 79.8% of the national indigenous population. In the Araucanía region, the number of people considered to be Mapuche is 314,174, making it the second region with the highest Mapuche population after the Santiago Metropolitan region (INE, 2018) [14].

III. INTRANATIONAL FACTORS THAT COMPLEXIZED THE INDIGENOUS DEMAND IN CHILE.

Among the internal factors at the national level we find the restrictions of the current Indigenous Law, Law No. 19,253. This Law, when enacted in 1993, restricted important issues discussed in the Preliminary Draft of the Indigenous Law. For example, it is restrictive in participatory rights, since “the provisions of the bill that created the figure of indigenous justices of the peace, in charge of administering minor justice to the interior of the community, were completely eliminated” (Aylwin, 2000, p.281) [12].

Participation within the National Council of CONADI² was also restricted, since according to the Draft Law, this institution would be made up of “eleven indigenous, socially, ethnically and territorially representative of the country's indigenous peoples and their autonomy would be protected” (Aylwin, 2000, p. 281) [12]. The Law established that said Council would be made up of eight members, appointed by the President of the Republic, at the proposal of the indigenous communities.

Where the Draft Law was also restricted, was in the fact that in the current Indigenous Law, “the rights of indigenous people over the natural resources found in their lands or neighboring sectors were not given protection” (Aylwin, 2000 , p. 283) [12]. These restricted aspects, like other provisions of the current Indigenous Law, have weakened the actions of the public institutions in charge of applying indigenous policy, increasing the distance and distrust of the indigenous world in State institutions as a means to overcome their conditions of marginality and exclusion and as a means to achieve a cultural identity strengthening.

Another factor that would explain the complexity of contemporary Mapuche demand, has to do with the contradiction that is generated, between the duties that the current Indigenous Law assigns to the State towards indigenous peoples, and support for a series of infrastructure projects and to non-indigenous economic-productive ventures in southern Chile that have negatively impacted in environmental terms on indigenous territories.

In this sense, the development model that the State of Chile prioritizes has contributed to the significant expansion of the forest industry in southern Chile, with a dangerous environmental deterioration for the Mapuche communities. The magnitude of the forest expansion is such that a single company, such as Forestal Mininco, who currently owns “350,000 hectares of land destined for afforestation, most of it in Mapuche territory, in contrast to the approximately 500,000 hectares recognized to the Mapuche by the State through the titles of mercy³”(Aylwin, 2000, p. 286) [12].

The advance of the forest industry in the south of Chile has generated the substitution of native forest for exotic forest plantations, has generated soil erosion due to the same secondary effects of plantations, the decrease in water sources, due to high consumption of the exotic plantation and the reduction of the flora and fauna with which the Mapuche people have been related since time immemorial.

In relation to the above, we have the case of mining and aquaculture concessions, which have been established on lands of Mapuche communities or adjacent to them. For example, a significant number of aquaculture

² CONADI is the National Corporation for Indigenous Development and was created in 1993 from the provisions of Indigenous Law 19,253 in the government of President Patricio Aylwin. Its purposes are to design and execute public policy towards people who belong to some of the 9 Indigenous Peoples recognized by the State of Chile.

³The “Titles of Mercy” corresponded to the documents delivered by the State of Chile to the Mapuche population once what historiography called the “Pacification of Araucanía” (1861-1883) had ended. The title of mercy “began to be extended in 1884, in accordance with the provisions of the law of August 4, 1866, completed with the law of January 1885 and by Supreme Decree No. 733 of March 31, 1907 and other later laws” (Saavedra, 2002, p.58) [3]. In a period of 45 years (1884-1929), the State granted “3,078 grant titles, on an area of 475,422 hectares” (Saavedra, 2002, p.58) [3]. In this way, the settlement of the Mapuche population begins in the current provinces of Bio Bio, Arauco, Malleco, Cautín, Valdivia and Osorno in small territorial extensions known as reductions where land ownership in legal terms was regulated in an undivided and community. Despite the legal figure of “reduction”, within these institutions the economic exploitation in fact and the real form of land tenure was familiar and not collective (Saavedra, 1971) [18].

concessions have been established in the main lakes of the IX, XV and X region, in waters adjacent to Mapuche communities. To these same concessions from non-indigenous individuals, “approximately 75% of the surface water use rights available in the same territorial space were granted. Of the latter, only 2% were in Mapuche hands”(Aylwin, 2000, p. 286) [12]. On the one hand, indigenous legislation seems to protect indigenous communities and gives the State a leading role as a mediating agent between the Mapuche people and society in general, but on the other hand, “legislation on private property and State support for business activities go in another direction”(Mallon, 2004, p. 218) [4].

The set of previous factors, some with more importance than others, and operating simultaneously constitute the antecedents that help to explain in large part the discontent that the Mapuche people have been manifesting socially since the last decades of the 20th century and which have intensified in the first two decades of the 21st century. These restrictive factors have led him to become an important social and political subject. It is these factors that have influenced a distancing of a good part of the indigenous world from the State and its public institutions in charge of applying indigenous policy, increasing uncertainty in the capacity of the Nation-State to solve the real problems of the communities.

The above contributes to promoting demands and discourses that emphasize ethnicity as a form of relationship with the State, which translates into proposals of a territorial nature by the indigenous social movement with a sense of economic, political and cultural autonomy in the territories rural with a strong indigenous presence, planning to assume from the Mapuche organizations themselves control of their ways of life in the spaces in which they live or claim as their own.

Thus, since the late 1980s, demands slowly began to emerge aimed at recognizing the autonomy and collective rights of the Mapuche people. Organizations such as the Council of All Lands and the Mapuche Liwen Center for Studies and Documentation are pioneers in this new autonomist discourse. Over time, other organizations will be added, mainly in the 1990s, such as the Coordinator of Conflicts Arauco Malleco and the Poyenhue Association of Villarica.

The same Mapuche National Congress held in 97, developed approaches that put the emphasis on Mapuche development from its own sociocultural, historical and territorial references. The state and the larger society begin to be questioned, through different collective actions, but where the focus is on the search for a new relationship with the State and Chilean society based on the development of a genuine ethnic consciousness in much of the Mapuche social movement. We call “ethnic consciousness” the process of “self-perception of a human group of possessing deep cultural differences with the rest of the population (history, language, religion, traditions, and even race) and collectively postulating their right to maintain those differences, that is , not to assimilate culturally”(Bengoa, 2000^a, p. 22) [2].

They cannot fail to name the Lafquenche Territorial Identity of the Province of Arauco and the Ñankuecho Association of Lumaco. All these organizations in general terms, with greater or lesser emphasis, share a new Mapuche discourse and demand, which places the emphasis on Mapuche development with autonomy within the State, and on the reform of the latter, with a view to a Plurinational State, where the different indigenous peoples overcome their situation of exclusion and can develop in a state of justice, beyond the mere equality of individuals, as proposed by the liberal budget that supports the existence of the modern nation-state.

It is important to say that the proposals for autonomy within the State and the recognition of different forms of law depending on Indigenous Peoples, through the recognition of collective rights, mainly at the political, territorial and legal level, are the indigenous demands that have had less reception by the State in Chile. In this sense, the different initiatives, mainly from Mapuche organizations, proposed to the State regarding the recognition of collective rights, mainly in relation to quotas of political autonomy within the State, territorial rights and the right to indigenous Mapuche jurisprudence, "have provoked a transversal opposition in society, mainly in political actors”(Lillo, 2003, p. 114) [7].

Among the main tensions in the contemporary Chilean State caused by the proposal of differentiated rights based on indigenous peoples, are the following:

I). The proposal of the collective rights of indigenous peoples when establishing a subject of public law, in this case the figure of the Indigenous People, which stands between the State and the indigenous, comes to configure the establishment of a State within another State. This argument, with more or less emphasis, has been supported by the different political trends within the State, and dates mainly from the beginning of the 1990s, when the Preliminary Draft of the current Indigenous Law was being discussed in Chile.

II). The proposal for the collective rights of indigenous peoples jeopardizes the individual rights of its members, since the universality of these rights within these peoples would be restricted based on tradition or culture. From the State it is feared that the civil⁴ and political rights of its members, which correspond to the indigenous people due to the fact of national citizens, may be suppressed or violated.

There is no doubt that civil and political rights, together with social rights, are the basis of the idea of modern citizenship. In modernity and in western culture, civil rights have contributed to a significant humanization of social relations. In this sense, civil and political rights constitute a first floor for the protection of cultural diversity, but "in many countries it is increasingly accepted that some forms of cultural difference can only be accommodated through special legal or constitutional measures, above --and beyond — the common rights of citizenship"(Kymlicka, 1996, p. 46-47) [19]. These differentiated rights imply special rights by cultural group.

It is necessary to pause for a moment in the previous arguments of the State regarding the proposals for differentiated rights for indigenous peoples. We consider that in the analysis by the Chilean State, there is an excess of centralist tradition that is fearful of cultural diversity on an ethnic and territorial basis. This same condition of the Nation-State leads him to conceive in a wrong way the concept of autonomy outlined by indigenous peoples, mainly by the Mapuche People, since autonomy is not independence or secession from the State, but "the ability to decide matters fundamental according to their culture and under rules agreed with the State"(Gómez, 2000, p. 1036) [20]. Indigenous autonomy has been understood in this way by most of the Latin American States that have reformed their institutions, as well as by the indigenous movements that have demanded such State reform.

The different political and ideological forces that have assumed control of the State, since the democratic restoration at the beginning of the 90's of the 20th century, have been characterized, despite their differences, for not including the collective rights of indigenous peoples in Chile. This negativity of the State actors, would have to do more than anything with "an ideological position regarding rights and diversity" (Lillo, 2001, p.1) [7]. This same ideological position tends to implicitly conceive a contradiction between the recognition of the collective rights of Indigenous Peoples, and the macroeconomic stability of the outward economic development model, which requires the empowerment of local communities for the free development of capital in national territories. It is here where we find a new risk for the cultural diversity of our time, since in many territories with an indigenous presence we find a hegemony almost without counterweight on the part of market forces (Subercaseaux, 2002) [11].

In Latin America there are significant advances in the recognition of collective rights of indigenous peoples, mainly in matters of self-government and administration of justice and resolution of disputes within indigenous communities. Most of the Latin American States reformed a large part of their institutions in the 1990s of the

⁴ Civil and political rights are those fundamental freedoms recognized for individual citizens who are members of a given Nation-State. These rights are also known as "negative rights", since by definition the State should not intervene in them, but only limit itself to guaranteeing their free enjoyment. Among the main civil and political rights are: freedom of association, of conscience, of worship, of expression, of free movement, of political organization. The right to be elected to positions of popular representation and the right to be able to elect political representatives. The right to a nationality, the right not to be arbitrarily disturbed in his private life, or suffer attacks on his honor and reputation, the right not to be subjected to slavery or servitude, among others.

20th century, to incorporate the demand of indigenous movements and adapt to the recommendations of international law on indigenous peoples. Among them are Panama (1971), Nicaragua (1986), Brazil (1988), Colombia (1991), El Salvador (1992), Guatemala (1992), Mexico (1992-2001), Paraguay (1992), Peru (1993), Argentina (1994), Bolivia (1994) and Ecuador (1994-1998). These reforms have mainly included the rights of Indigenous Peoples to significant quotas of self-government and mainly to the development of Indigenous Law within their territories. (Aylwin, 2003 [17]; Assies, 2003 [16]; Lillo, 2003 [7]; Bengoa 2000b [8]).

Chile is the exception in Latin America, since it has remained "on the fringes of the processes of recognition of Indigenous Law, which, as it has been realized here, has been verified at the regional level and in international forums in recent decades" (Aylwin, 2003, p. 172) [17]. This slow walk in Chile would not be due to the absence of ethnic social movements that challenge the State from its sociocultural condition, but rather to structural factors characteristic of the political and economic project adopted by Chile to adapt to the international "rules" of competition of the world market.

IV. TOWARDS A REVIEW OF CULTURAL IDENTITIES IN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE STATE AND MAPUCHE PEOPLE RELATION.

The demand for the rights of indigenous peoples in Chile, specifically the demand for the recognition of differentiated rights and the search for greater spaces of autonomy for the Mapuche people within the contemporary Chilean State, imply a series of challenges for the different actors, both for the State, as for indigenous movements. These challenges have to do with rethinking that needs to go beyond what is immediately legal. Challenges that imply a high degree of flexibility in the proposals of the actors and in their ways of understanding their respective cultural systems and those of the other.

It is important to emphasize that the exercise of rethinking cultural identities is not only a necessary mechanism to advance in matters of recognition of group rights, such as autonomy or legal pluralism, significant edges of the contemporary Mapuche question, but in broader terms, constitutes a resource that could enable a better daily dialogue between the different cultures that intersect at the national level.

In the first place, citizens who defend an integrated and unified national culture should rethink what has historically been understood as Chilean and as a Nation-State. Rethinking means ceasing to see the Nation-State as ethnically neutral, since this enlightened and liberal budget has indirectly contributed, to the assimilation in the dominant cultural conformity within the State, of wealth based on ethnic and territorial diversity, closing the possibility of enriching the imaginary of the nation.

The formation of modern states, and consequently the construction of a national identity mainly in Europe (such as Germany, Italy, France), and in the countries of Latin America "implied that for rather random reasons, overnight, people who had nothing in common were under the same state power" (Lillo, 2003, p. 134) [7]. Then came one of the first problems of the modern state. This had to do with overcoming the limits of the ethnicity of its citizens. For this the Creole elites built an imagined cultural community, called "nation", which overlapped, not without drawbacks, over the differences, not only ethnic, but also geographic, class, gender, religious, etc. of its members.

Rethinking nationality, and being able to understand it as a community built socially and politically by certain sectors of the population, generates the possibility of developing new national imagery, now from the diversity of cultural references that inhabit the territory of the Chilean State. To stop conceiving the construction of the nation from a single monocultural reference, is one of the first challenges. Accommodating cultural diversity within national states requires the imagination and subsequent construction of the nation from a cultural and symbolic proposal beyond the elites. Our age, characterized by the social emergence of cultural diversity, not only of indigenous peoples, constitutes a new stage and collective time, conducive to rethinking our idea of nation, of State, of citizenship (Subercaseaux, 2002) [11].

At this point it is important to bear in mind that this rethinking of the idea of the nation and of the State should not lead us to the extreme point of promoting an absolute sociocultural fragmentation, disengaged from a referent that identifies us beyond particularisms, a matrix necessary to understand ourselves. It is about accommodating diversity and difference in the context of modern culture, and not in the context of postmodern culture, a culture that paradoxically coincides with neoliberalism (Subercaseaux, 2002) [11].

Secondly, members who claim ethnic identities should rethink the idea of ethnicity as something absolute and instead it is preferable to speak of "contextual ethnicity". Stop seeing ethnicity as an absolute substance, it should allow us to conceive it as something that can be attenuated, depending on the social context and power relations in certain historical contexts (Bauman, 2001 [15]; Díaz Polanco, 2005 [21]) . If ethnic identity is not an immutable essence, then the possibility of cultivating and refining our identity opens up, to continue incorporating new repertoires or cultural loans, in this sense it is not risky to dialogue with other cultural groups.

Contemporary Mapuche society not only has a contextual ethnic identity, but also multiple identities, for example class identities, professional identities, religious identities, gender identities, a national identity, etc. In this sense, "three of these identities - ethnic identity, national identity, and class identity - are strategic to understand the Mapuche question in our days" (Saavedra, 2002, p.232) [3]. Reducing the identities of the contemporary Mapuche population, only to ethnic identity, simplifies the problem and contributes to making the sociocultural wealth that has historically existed within Mapuche society invisible. The historical facts in the 20th century show us the important degree of flexibility that the Mapuche ethnic identity has had and in this sense "we cannot see it as a one-dimensional thing, nor as a relationship that exists independently of the State or the relations of power in society as a whole "(Mallon, 2004, p.225) [4].

These acts of rethinking are not easy, they imply in the first place going beyond an essentialist and romantic idea of cultural identities as complete entities. Rethinking the ethnic and national identity within Chilean society and specifically within the framework of the relationship between the State and the Mapuche people could give viability to the project of the differentiated cultural and political rights of indigenous peoples, especially the proposal of the Mapuche People and In this sense, contribute to partially overcome what has been called the "Mapuche conflict".

Citizens who believe in a closed unified national culture, by restating their enlightened idea of nationality and the Nation-State, and beginning to conceive of these entities as historical and cultural constructs that could always be otherwise by the very contingent and political nature of Its construction, could conceive as an act of historical justice that enlarges our imaginary of nation in the cultural plane, the proposal of the differentiated rights that part of the indigenous movement raises.

On the other hand, members of ethnic groups who defend a closed ethnic culture, by rethinking their idea of ethnicity beyond the absolute essentialist, but as a perfectible entity, which can be enriched with the contribution of other cultures, could contribute to make interesting an idea of ethnicity that does not promote cultural isolation and intolerance processes, since a conception of absolute and closed identity "instead of promoting pluralism ends up stimulating the landscape of multiple homogeneity constituted by separate conglomerates and in permanent tension" (Díaz Polanco, 2005, p.53) [21]. In general, indigenous groups do not constitute closed cultural references, as many times they want us to believe a certain absolute conception of cultural diversity, a conception that uncompromisingly politicizes the question of indigenous identity, but that ethnic identity, like all identities, is not determined by absolute or ahistorical factors, and does not constitute "the product of the work of nature by itself" (Baumann, 2001, p. 84) [15].

V. CONCLUSIONS

Indigenous peoples or national minorities have historically had demands against the State of which they became part, most of the time involuntarily. However, these demands were not always characterized by the search for

recognition of their cultural uniqueness and by the search for a set of rights differentiated by group, which would ensure their reproduction as a differentiated cultural community. Most of the time, mainly in the 20th century, these were demands with an emphasis on the distribution of material resources, mainly a fight for land, which had historically been stripped. What is relevant about the indigenous question in the last decades of the 20th century and at the beginning of the 21st century, is that the social demand has become more complex. The material economic demand focused on the recovery of their territorial heritage is no longer exclusive, but indigenous groups currently include the previous demand, in a broader demand for singular cultural development with a sense of autonomy within the National-States of those who are part.

The foregoing is not without differences between the State and indigenous movements, for the same reason in recent decades the deterioration of relations between the State and the Mapuche indigenous movement in Chile has increased. Our analysis suggested that an important question that partially hinders a better understanding between the State, the Mapuche movement and citizens in general is how to understand the different cultural identities embedded in the current Mapuche question. When one begins by dialoguing from a closed national, ethnic, religious, etc. identity, meaningful understanding with the culturally diverse other becomes difficult. I also argue that when the national reality is conceived from the State based on an egalitarian liberalism that makes ethnic diversity invisible within, the possibility of dialogue is also closed. In this sense, contemporary social movements have stressed that the supposed cultural neutrality of civil and political rights is not absolute. These legal mechanisms bequeathed to us by western culture have been insufficient in a world where cultural diversity transcends private spaces and demands different types of recognition of its sociocultural systems. The rethinking of cultural identities within a framework of contextual and perfectible identities that need the culturally diverse other for their realization is a necessary condition for intercultural dialogue in contemporary Chilean society.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Díaz-Polanco, Self-determination, Autonomy and Liberalism, *Magazine América Latina en Movimiento*, (1998). Document available at: <https://www.flacsoandes.edu.ec/agora/autodeterminacion-autonomia-y-liberalismo>
- [2] J. Bengoa, *History of the Mapuche people: XIX and XX centuries* (Santiago de Chile: Lom Ediciones, 2000a).
- [3] A. Saavedra, *The Mapuches in the Present Chilean Society* (Santiago de Chile: Lom Ediciones, 2002).
- [4] F. Mallon, *The Blood of the Copihue. The Mapuche Community of Nicolás Ailío and the Chilean State (1906-2001)* (Santiago de Chile: Lom Ediciones, 2004).
- [5] J. Pinto, *The Formation of the State and the Nation and the Mapuche People: from Inclusion to Exclusion* (Santiago de Chile: Editions of the Directorate of Libraries, Archives and Museums, 2003).
- [6] J. Pinto, *The Mapuche People-State Conflict*, *Universum Magazine*. Universidad de Talca, 27 (1), 2012, 167-189.
- [7] R. Lillo, Mapuche Discourse and Human Rights, *Law Review, Universidad Católica de Temuco*, (4), 2003, 113-145.
- [8] J. Bengoa, *The Indigenous Emergency in Latin America* (Santiago de Chile: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2000b).

- [9] X. Quiñones, and J., Gálvez, *Past and Present of the Rural Mapuche Economy in Chile: Elements of Analysis for the Understanding of a Current Conflict* (Talca: Editions of the Catholic University of Maule, 2014).
- [10] R. Codoceo, The Importance of Medieria as a Mechanism for Cooperation within the Rural Mapuche Economy in the Context of the Valentín Marín de Nueva Imperial Community, IX Region, Chile, *CUHSO magazine*, 29 (1), 2019,131 -161.
- [11] B. Subercaseaux, *Nation and Culture in Latin America. Cultural diversity and Globalization* (Santiago de Chile: Lom Ediciones, 2002).
- [12] J. Aylwin, The Conflicts in the Mapuche Territory: Background and Perspectives, *Perspectiva Magazine*, 3 (2), 2000, 277-300.
- [13] CASEM, *Survey*(Santiago de Chile: Ministry of Social Development, 2011) In: www.observatorio.Ministry of Social Development. Gob.cl /.
- [14] National Statistics Institute, *Gender Radiography: Original Peoples in Chile, 2017* (Santiago de Chile: INE, 2018) Available At: <https://historico-amu.ine.cl/genero/files/estadisticas/pdf/documents/radiography-of-gender-indigenous-peoples-chile2017.pdf>
- [15] G. Baumann, *The Multicultural Enigma. A Rethinking of National, Ethnic and Religious Identities* (Barcelona: Editorial Paidós Estudio, 2001).
- [16] W. Assies, Diversity, State and Democracy: a few notes, In UNDP (Ed.) *Democracy in Latin America: Towards a Democracy of Citizens: Contributions to the Debate*, 2 (Buenos Aires: Aguilar, Altea, Alfaguara, 2004) 228-243.
- [17] J. Aylwin, Indigenous Law and State Law in Latin America, In R. Lillo (coordinator) *Conflict Resolution in Mapuche Law, A Study from the Perspective of Pluralism* (Temuco: Edited by Universidad Católica de Temuco. Escuela, 2003)135-183.
- [18] A. Saavedra, *The Mapuche Question*(Santiago de Chile: Ediciones ICIRA, 1971).
- [19] W. Kymlicka, *Multicultural Citizenship. A liberal theory of minority law* (Barcelona: Editor Paidós Estado y Sociedad, 1996).
- [20] M. Gómez, Indigenous Law and Constitutionality, In: Milka Castro (ed.) *Proceedings of the XII International Congress. Customary Law and Legal Pluralism: Challenges of the Third Millennium* (Arica: International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences. Commission on Customary Law and Legal Pluralism, 2000) 1029-1050.
- [21] H. Díaz-Polanco, Indigenous Peoples, State and Democracy, In Clasco (Ed.) *The Dilemmas of Pluralism* (Buenos Aires: CLACSO Editorial, Latin American Council of Social Sciences, 2005) 43-66.