Settler Colonial Studies

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rset20

Endless dispossession: the Charrua re-emergence in Uruguay in the light of settler colonialism

Gustavo Verdesio

To cite this article: Gustavo Verdesio (2020): Endless dispossession: the Charrua re-emergence in Uruguay in the light of settler colonialism, Settler Colonial Studies, DOI: 10.1080/2201473X.2020.1823752

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2020.1823752

Published online: 06 Oct 2020.

SETTLER COLONIAL STUDIES
https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2020.1823752

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Endless dispossession: the Charrua re-emergence in Uruguay in the light of settler colonialism

Gustavo Verdesio

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA

ABSTRACT

In a country like Uruguay, that imagines itself as a 'country without Indians', the emergence of groups of activists who claim to be of indigenous descent has provoked a series of reactions that cover a wide spectrum that goes from mockery to wrath. The State and some of the most revered anthropologists (like Daniel Vidart and Renzo Pi Hugarte), as well as the general public, are reluctant to recognize their legitimacy. This has serious legal consequences in that country, which does not count with a specific legal framework to deal with indigenous matters due to the fact that Uruguay has not ratified the ILO Convention number 169, which is the most important international piece of indigenous legislation that has binding power for the ratifying nations.

In this paper, I will discuss the pertinence of settler colonial studies for the understanding of some historical processes in the Southern Cone. I will also try to shed some light on the Uruguayan case through an analysis of the importance of the Marxian notion of primitive accumulation, which explains the process of dispossession suffered by the diverse indigenous groups that populated the land before the arrival of European settlers. Hopefully, this will shed some light on the sometimes angry and violent reactions of Uruguayan mainstream society to the reemergence of indigenous collectives in a country where they were thought to be extinct: their reappearance puts into question the legitimate possession of the land by the Uruguayan State and its inhabitants.

KEYWORDS

Uruguay; settler colonialism; primitive accumulation; Charrua Indians; ethnogenesis; ethnic re-emergence

In this article, I am going to discuss the re-emergence of indigenous identities in Uruguay with the help of some of the concepts developed in the framework of settler colonial studies. In it, I am going to review some of the tenets of the theoretical model elaborated by Patrick Wolfe and Lorenzo Veracini, in order to discuss not only the Uruguayan case but also some Latin Americanists' recent attempts at finding some use for said model in the analysis of colonialism in Latin America. Finally, I will focus on the problem of the land (central in any settler colonial regime) and extractivism in the Uruguayan case and, with the help of the Marxian concept of primitive accumulation, will try to shed some light on it.

In a country like Uruguay, whose national narratives represent it as a 'pais sin indios' ('country without Indians'), the appearance of several associations of descendants of

CONTACT Gustavo Verdesio verdesio@umich.edu

indigenous peoples in the last three decades has elicited a rather negative response from the State, some scholars, and the general public. The long list of people who deny the existence of indigenous peoples in Uruguay includes former presidents Julio María Sanguinetti (who approves the genocidal policies of the Uruguayan State in the first half of the nineteenth-century)[1] and José Mujica, as well as anthropologists Daniel Vidart and Renzo Pi Hugarte.[2] Mujica, however, acknowledges the existence of descendants from the Guarani people (in Cabrera), probably because Vidart (following the lead of the investigations conducted by Oscar Padrón Favre, Susana Rodríguez Varese and Luis Rodolfo González)[3] is persuaded that the members of that ethnic group were much more numerous than the Charrua during colonial times.

The members of the re-emergent collective are in a rather precarious situation because in Uruguay there is neither indigenous legislation, nor an acknowledgment, in its Constitutional law, of their pre-existence to the State. This is probably a consequence of the self-perception prevalent among most Uruguayans, who see themselves as citizens of a country where there are no indigenous peoples anymore, for they were exterminated, as we will see later, at the beginning of that State's independent life.[4] But even more probably, it is a consequence of the fact that Uruguay has not ratified ILO (International Labor Organization) Convention 169, which is, in the international arena, the legal corpus with the highest binding power. It is a dubious honor, for a country that views itself as one that passes progressive laws (such as legal abortion, same sex marriage, and the legalization of marihuana), to be part of an exclusive list of two with Surinam, the only other South American nation that has not ratified the aforementioned Convention. One of the consequences of Uruguay's position is that the struggles for recognition undertaken by the Charrua activists take place amidst a juridical vacuum that prevents them from being able to claim any kind of rights: without a ratification of Convention 169, they cannot obtain recognition of their existence as indigenous peoples, nor can they claim any lands – remaining, therefore, landless.[5]

Yet, it is not only because of the national narratives, the lack of indigenous legislation, predominantly hostile academic opinions,[6] and the anti-reemergence attitude of an important and influential segment of the political class, that the indigenous activists are in a dire situation: some government officials (like former Secretary of Labor José Bayardi) fear the possibility that, if Convention 169 gets ratified, the State might face a land claim by the Charrua. It must be said that this position is not exclusive of Bayardi's, for it is the same that has been held by all his predecessors in that job. Later, I will discuss the role played by indigenous territoriality, understood as an absence that must be viewed, paradoxically, as a constitutive element of the activists' collective identity.[7] But for now, suffice it to know that land claims are the *bête noire* of Uruguayan government officials. In the next section, I am going to consider the possibility that the reactions elicited by the indigenous activists' actions and claims might have something to do with the kind of colonialism that took place in Uruguay.

Settler colonialism

The kind of colonialism that developed in Uruguay was different, in several respects, from the one that predominated in most of Latin America. I am referring to settler colonialism. The dispossession that indigenous peoples suffered in that territory is confirmed and

legitimized daily by the vast majority of its citizens. One of the ways in which they do it is by ignoring their sheer existence as indigenous peoples. This denial is a consequence of the processes of colonization that characterized the trajectory of capitalism in Uruguayan territory, where indigenous peoples, like in other settler colonial States (USA, Canada, New Zealand, and Australia), were displaced, exterminated, and/or assimilated to mainstream society.[8] The logic behind these operations is that, in order to achieve their main objective (to have access to the land), the settlers mobilize a series of strategies that seek to eliminate indigenous peoples.[9]

Wolfe has proposed the expression 'logic of elimination' instead of the more controversial 'genocide' to refer to extermination practices, for in his opinion, the latter is semantically charged in such a way that the shadow of the War World II Holocaust ('the real thing' in the general public's opinion) falls over other kinds of genocide (which he calls 'hyphenated') in a way that detracts from their importance.[10] In any case, his rejection of the use of hyphenated genocides (for example, the cultural one) as opposed to the 'unqualified genocide', the Holocaust, does not stop him from proposing another term, 'structural genocide', which would be one that lasts over time in settler societies and, therefore, cannot be conceived as an event from the past (403).[11] Damien Short, for his part, has enthusiastically recommended to keep using the term genocide in an unqualified fashion to refer to the one that is perpetrated by settlers against the Natives.[12] It is his contention that in the original notion of genocide as conceived by its champion in the international law arena, Raphael Lemkin, mass killings were only one of the methods through which genocide could be perpetrated.[13] According to Short, a thorough analysis of Lemkiń s lifetime work on the subject reveals that he believed that the destruction of a people through pacific means, as, for example, actions aimed at reducing their ability to transmit their cultural traditions or the prohibition of their traditional subsistence practices (their mode of production, as we will see later), qualified as forms of genocide.[14] In this article, however, I will continue to adhere to Wolfe's choice, because, regardless of the original intention of the creator and promoter of the legal concept of genocide, the fact is that the term is loaded with legal and historical overtones that create more problems than solutions.

Another characteristic of settler colonialism is that, unlike the kind of colonialism predominant throughout the colonial period in Latin America (characterized by the exploitation of vast numbers of natives by a European minority intent on extracting a substantial surplus value from their work), that seeks to perpetuate itself as a system, it tries to disappear, 'supersede the conditions of its operation and eliminate the traces of its own trajectory'.[15] What settler colonialism wishes is that the situation in the territory does not look like a colonial one, where one group dominates another. The elimination of the natives and the denial of their existence are the most effective ways of perpetuating the settlers' main fiction, which says that there is no colonialism in the land.

There are differences, too, in the strategies of resistance undertaken by Natives in each type of colonial system. For example, in the most common form of colonialism, the colonizer's fundamental demand is for (cheap or forced) labor. Therefore, the anticolonial response is to sabotage it.[16] As is well known, this was a common strategy among indigenous peoples colonized by the Spaniards, who often tried to run away from the *Encomiendas* and *Repartimientos* to which they were confined.[17] In settler colonialism, because the main demand is the disappearance or the assimilation of the Native, the best form of

resistance for indigenous peoples is to persist and survive.[18] This is why Patrick Wolfe thinks that the best thing indigenous peoples can do to combat settler colonialism is to stay home.[19] This is precisely what the Charrua of Uruguay are doing: they are reaffirming their persistence. Maybe this is one of the reasons Uruguayans (who have forgotten about their status as citizens in a settler colonial regime) get so mad at them.

In this kind of society, the majority of the population has difficulty to perceive the colonial situation, for it is confusing, for the average citizen, to talk about colonialism in places that, like the US and the Latin American republics, consider themselves as independent nations since 1767 and the first half of the nineteenth century, respectively. This is so because, in those countries, there exist two types of independence: the settlers', that has taken place already, and the Natives', which has not happened yet.[20] We are talking about democracies that, in some cases, perceive themselves as progressive. This may be so because in those countries (like Canada or the US, for example), settlers, who identify themselves as locals, have renounced the violent procedures they used in the times when they took the land that belonged to the Natives.[21] Settlers do not feel responsible for the oppression suffered by indigenous peoples because, according to their narratives of legitimation, it was inflicted by others (the colonizers) in the past. In those narratives, settlers never appear exerting violence, for in the minds of the inhabitants of those States, even the pioneer, the original settler, is represented as innocent, because his or her activities are exerted, in this idyllic world, not on the Native but on the land.[22] This is possible because one of the characteristics of this kind of colonial project is that, despite its foundation on a violent and traumatic replacement of the Natives (like the extermination campaign in Uruguay, the pacification of the Araucania in Chile, and the Conquest of the desert in Argentina), the foundational violence, without which there would not be a settler State, is emphatically denied by the descendants of those who perpetrated it.[23] This leads one to consider the possibility of getting into the consciousness of the settlers, an endeavor that Veracini believes can be achieved through an analysis of the settlers' praxis – a praxis that suggests that settler societies are traumatized by the genocide suffered by indigenous peoples.[24] The perpetrator's (and its descendants', I add) trauma can be present or latent, and that's why the fantasy of a society without violence is so frequent in settler contexts. It can be said that we are before a society that embraces and rejects, at the same time, violence. This tension between contradictory drives produces, according to Veracini, psychological conflicts that generate, for settlers, an anxiety based on fear of a possible vengeance, which in turn promotes a paranoid dread of decolonization.[25]

In order to understand settler practice, then, one needs to understand their state of mind.[26] The primal scene, the painful encounter with the other, is what marks the beginning of settler memory, which often leads to a denial of said encounter. What Veracini calls mnemonic myopia (the denial of the history of their arrival to new lands) is an essential trait of the politics of memory in settler contexts.[27] These kinds of feelings and traumas predominant in societies of the type we are discussing translate, sometimes, into behaviors and outbursts of passion that surprise by their intensity, their violence, and their incredible irrationality.

In the case of Uruguay, every time the Charrua re-emergence is discussed in my presence, (I am among the few Uruguayans who have treated the topic respectfully), the gamut of my interlocutors' (friends, in their majority) emotions runs from an initial

disbelief, to move later to sheer surprise (caused by the fact that a researcher at a recognized American university pays attention to the matter), to become a wrath so violent that, sometimes, I fear for my friend's health. But it is not only the educated non-specialist who gets mad before this social phenomenon: academic specialists are also unusually bitter and aggressive against the Charrua re-emergence. The case of Daniel Vidart comes to mind, who never missed an opportunity to dismiss the groups of Charrua activists, or Renzo Pi Hugarte's, who accused the collectives of being part of a fashion he called 'Charruamanía' – a rather derogatory expression that was accompanied, sometimes, by accusations of racism directed against said activists.[28] This should not surprise anybody, for Uruguay is one of those countries where sovereignty is based on an original dispossession and on a clear, State-led, politics of extermination of indigenous peoples. In countries like that, it is very difficult to talk about indigenous issues in a rational manner, for it is a matter that puts into question the very foundations of the legitimacy of the Nation-State's sovereignty. This is why, as Veracini states, in settler societies one cannot combat paranoia and denial with a rational discourse: 'As denialists have not reasoned themselves into denial, they cannot be reasoned out of it. Something else is needed'.[29]

Another problem settlers have, according to Wolfe, is that it is difficult to acknowledge the existence or currency of a settler colonial system because the invasion is not an event, a unique episode, but a structure: in that kind of society, the elimination or assimilation of the Native is the organizing principle of the colonial system – that is to say, it is not a singular occurrence.[30] Although I must admit that I prefer (as the reader will see when I discuss the notion of primitive accumulation) to characterize settler colonialism as a process rather than a structure, let us keep Wolfe's idea in mind, so that we do not forget that the invasion suffered by indigenous peoples has not ended yet. One thing that remains to be said about this matter is that the continued task of trying to eliminate or assimilate the Natives has a revulsive side to settlers: a return of the Native (who, albeit repressed, continues to be a structuring factor of society) might occur.[31] In other words, it can be said that, in spite of the settlers' attempts to eliminate the Natives, the latter continue to structure settler society because they, and their demands, have never ceased to exist and are, therefore, deeply rooted in the foundations of that society. Hence the settler's fear of their return.

One of the ways in which the elimination of indigenous peoples was attempted was to replace their way of life by a Western one. In countries like the US, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Uruguay, and a good chunk of Argentina, settler colonialism imposed itself on lands occupied, in general (but not always), by high mobility peoples whose subsistence pattern was not an agricultural one but was based on hunting, fishing, and gathering. According to Wolfe, said mobility becomes, in settler discourse, something reproachable, which has the consequence of making indigenous peoples removable.[32] This is probably due, in part, to what Frederick Turner suggests: that Western culture shows a historical fear for life outside the city walls, that manifests itself, for example, as much in the semi-nomad Jewish authors of the Bible (who yearned for a life in the city and its sedentary life), as in the thoughts of the Christians who traveled to the New World, whose wilderness was perceived by them as a site of horror and death.[33] All of them favored agriculture as a mode of production – which in some texts by Marx appears, as Coulthard

points out, as a way of life – that brought out a new mental habit: the prevision of an economic future.[34]

It should also be taken into account that Patricia Seed states that the behavior of the indigenous peoples whose way of life was based on a high mobility did not conform to European expectations, in particular the English's, who privileged sedentism and land cultivation – which, added to the fact that, in English law, hunters were not in possession of the lands they used for hunting, left indigenous peoples in a dire situation.[35] It was common, as well, that English viewed Natives as lazy people, because they dedicated their time to an activity like hunting, which was viewed in England as mere recreation. As a matter of fact, it was frequent for English settlers to present indigenous male subjects as lazy people who had fun hunting (which, as we have seen, was not considered as work) while the women were actually working.[36] The agriculture (coupled with pastoralism) brought by European settlers is a sedentary mode of production that has the capability of guaranteeing its own reproduction, sustaining a more numerous population than the one allowed by non-sedentary modes of production, and endlessly expanding, thus affecting the territory and the previous mode of production of the Natives.[37] In the case of Uruguay, it was mostly the development and expansion of pastoralism, accompanied by agriculture, which displaced indigenous peoples until they were left with a very small segment of the territory.

Settler colonialism and Latin America

This is probably a good time to discuss whether the theoretical framework developed by scholars like Wolfe and Veracini has some utility for the study of Latin American societies. The discussion is pertinent, among other reasons, not only because the dossier of which this paper is part is dedicated to deal with that matter, but also because Veracini has stated with conviction that the settler colonialism paradigm is not applicable in Latin America.[38] Others, like Richard Gott, have stated the opposite: that all of Latin America suffered settler colonialism and, therefore, must be included in studies dedicated to the history of the global expansion of European White Settlers.[39] There is also a Forum published recently (December 2017) in *American Quarterly*, where authors who agree with Gott explore the potential of settler colonial theory for the study of Latin America. As Mari Yoshihara, editor of the volume, explains: 'The Forum calls our attention to both the utility and the limits of the settler colonial framework in the Latin American context'.[40] Let us see what they have to say about it.

In a 2007 article, Gott proposes a picture of the nineteenth century in Latin America in which certain social phenomena are interpreted as constitutive of a settler colonial regime. The first one is a series of extermination campaigns that lead him to say that '[t]he real Latin American holocaust occurred in the nineteenth century'.[41] Although it is true that said type of campaign certainly occurred in some countries like Argentina, Chile, and Uruguay, the author does not offer any data on other countries. However, that information can be found in a book by Argentinean scholar David Viñas, who dedicates a whole chapter to discuss violent extermination campaigns throughout Latin America in the second half of the nineteenth century.[42] Another social phenomenon Gott puts emphasis on is the massive immigration waves of Europeans that arrived in Latin America. Although this is a verifiable fact, Gott himself admits that 90% of the

immigrants that entered the continent between the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth, arrived in Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay and Cuba. He also admits that, in places like Paraguay, attempts to attract European immigrants were a failure, in particular those that failed to create German and Australian colonies, for which they barely found 'a handful of Germans and Anglo-Saxons'.[43]

Gott is right, however, when he points out that Latin American settlers of European descent are afraid of, and seem to hate, the expropriated, colonized indigenous peoples.[44] Nobody can deny the existence of settlers in that part of the world, and it would not be wise to deny the contempt and hatred they express when they talk about the Natives. What can be discussed, though, is Gott's belief that the model that explains the brand of colonialism that characterizes the USA, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand (a series to which I add Uruguay, big chunks of Argentina, and significant parts of Chile), can also explain what happened in the rest of Latin America, where through the *Encomienda*, the *Repartimiento*, and other institutions, the Spaniards extracted surplus value from the labor of high numbers of Natives. It should also be pointed out that, although bloody acts of violence were conducted by the colonizers at some point in the history of the conquest of Mesoamerica and the Andes, the truth is that its consequences for the demographics of the Natives were very different there from the ones for regions where settlers attempted to displace the original inhabitants so that they could establish themselves in the land. In the latter cases, the majority of the current population is of European descent, whereas in other parts (say, in the Andes or Mesoamerica), settlers are outnumbered by the descendants of the Amerindians. It should be added that, in the settler colonies that environmentalists like Alfred Crosby call the New Europes, there were very specific ecological outcomes that differ from what happened in the rest of the countries of Latin America: nature was dramatically modified and replaced, in good part, by species from the Old World, something that the invaders could not achieve in the rest of the regions.[45]

It is very likely that there is, behind Gott's misinterpretation of what settler colonialism is, an excessive emphasis on the word 'settler', which seems to structure his views of Latin American colonialism without paying attention to the other traits that characterize the colonial model described by Wolfe and Veracini. This kind of confusion elicits the question about the potential explanatory power of the model.[46] One who asks himself exactly that is Ran Greenstein, who seems to lean towards responding in the negative. His main reason for this is that the model has been applied (he does not say by whom, though) to too many cases that are very different from each other in their historical dynamics. Another reason he offers is that it does not exhibit, as a theoretical model, specific traits.[47] It goes without saying that if we stretch the concept to historical trajectories that transcend the few cases I have mentioned, (to which some people add the case of Israel), the defining traits multiply, but if we stick to the cases for which the model has been developed, the answer might be different. Yet, it is true that if one uses the expression 'settler colonialism' to account for colonial pasts like Guatemala's, the usefulness of the concept diminishes. Although there is a presence of settlers and examples of indigenous land dispossession in the article contributed by Juan Castro y Manuela Lavinas Picq to the *American Quarterly* forum (794, 796), the authors do not seem to take into account all the other factors that are at play in the model described by Wolfe and Veracini. Yes, there have been attempts to eliminate Maya subjects throughout recent history (799),[48] but it is also true

that the ethnic characteristics of the Guatemalan population, its institutional history, and the kind of economic exploitation that has taken place in that country, are very (and I mean very) different from the ones in Canada, Australia or, say, Uruguay.

Castro's and Lavinas Picq's bad aim when it comes to characterizing societies and histories is not that surprising once one takes a look at the article's bibliography: there is no reference to the fundamental works that gave shape to the settler colonial model. However, there are other contributions to the forum that show great familiarity with the works that constructed the model. One of them is the Introduction by M. Bianet Castellanos, where Wolfe's work is discussed. In it, the author criticizes Wolfe's distinction between two kinds of expropriation (land vs. labor) because she believes it reproduces binaries that 'mask articulations spanning imperial and colonial regimes'.[49] What is kind of surprising is that Castellanos does not discuss an article by Wolfe where he specifically vindicates the need to adopt a binary perspective in order to understand settler colonialism – a binarism that the settler tries to deny through a rhetoric of coexistence.[50] Yet, it is even more surprising to read that, according to Castellanos, an 'emphasis on binaries risks reproducing a monolithic, self-contained theory of settler colonialism lacking historical and relational specificity, the very project initially challenged by Patrick Wolfe',[51] especially taking into account that Wolfe has always been clear about the need to use his model to understand just a handful of very specific historical cases[52] – quite the opposite to what we see in the *American Quarterly* forum, where all societies where dispossession of indigenous lands by settlers has taken place seem to qualify as cases of settler colonialism.[53]

In other articles of the forum, like the one by Christopher A. Loperena on Honduras, one finds, again, a rather lax classification criterion, for the author considers the killing of indigenous leaders (a deplorable and lamentable phenomenon, but lacking the massive nature that characterizes a genocidal policy proper) and the laws that erode the indigenous peoples' collective rights to the land, as part of an elimination logic, typical of settler colonialism regimes.[54] The article by Shannon Speed also postulates the settler character of the colonization of Latin America, for in her opinion, the colonialism that took place there was characterized by not only the extraction of indigenous labor but also the dispossession of their lands. For this author, the fact that the settlers that established themselves in the parts of the Americas conquered by Spain never returned to the metropolis, is proof that the invasion was not, as Wolfe has shown, an event but a structure.[55] What is interesting about this is that Speed acknowledges that one of Wolfés accomplishments was to make a profound distinction: 'that the underlying logics structuring societies based on different types of colonialism give rise to distinct social relations, forms of oppression, and affective understandings and subjectivities'.[56] However, in spite of agreeing with Wolfe on the need to clearly distinguish between types of colonialism, Speed affirms that the dynamics and strategies used by all the Latin American States against indigenous peoples (for example, to represent Natives as uncivilized peoples who have a tendency to disappear) were similar to the ones that can be seen in settler States such as Canada or the US (788).[57] This is, to say the least, arguable, for the strategies developed by the settlers from the States studied by Wolfe and his followers are much more specific than those described by Speed, and took place in locations where a certain kind of indigenous societies (characterized, in general, by lower population densities and by a highly mobile way of life) predominated. But even if her views were correct,

it is evident that the results of those strategies did not have the same effect everywhere, because in each place, different indigenous peoples develop different strategies of resistance. Finally, there is also the issue of the results of settler colonial strategies: it is evident that, regardless of the strategies deployed, neither the Peruvian nor the Bolivian (or the Ecuadorian or the Mexican, for that matter) States have been able to accomplish what the US, Canada, or Uruguay have: to manage to reduce indigenous peoples to become a numerical minority of the population.

What these authors who affirm the settler character of the most prevalent kind of colonialism that took place in Latin America cannot see is that, beyond the words (for example, "settler," which as we have already seen, seems to lead to confusion) used to describe the phenomenon described as settler colonialism, the model describes a very specific type of colonial exploitation that is not applicable to societies where some of the traits that characterize said model are missing. Yes, there was land dispossession in Guatemala, but that does not make what happened in that country a case of settler colonialism. For that to be the case, the land should have been exploited by the settlers themselves, during colonial times, and by the *Criollo* after Independence. As we know, that has not occurred and it will never do (unless a catastrophe of planetary dimensions happens) while capitalism exists.

This is probably a good moment to ponder on the felicitousness of the choice of the word settler to describe the very specific form of colonialism that took and takes place in countries such as Australia, Canada, and Uruguay. From the examples discussed in the previous paragraphs, it is clear that many a scholar seems to believe that where there are settlers, there is settler colonialism. Perhaps a different name would prevent the model elaborated by Wolfe and Veracini from being taken for other forms of colonialism. Another name for the kind of colonial society described by the model known as settler colonialism has been proposed by J. Mowafad-Paul: sublimated colonialism. Although I believe it has its problems too, it has the advantage of not using the word 'settler' while referring to the kind of colonialism that predominates in a State that, after having achieved independence, has managed to retain the ideologies of colonialism in a sublimated form (196). According to Mowafad-Paul, Settler colonial States view themselves as part of the history of European hegemony in such a way that the ideology of the former Motherland survives in its citizens (197). This kind of colonialism has produced an ideology of settlement in which the settler is presented as not having a connection with the metropolis (197).[58] However, this denial of colonialism after independence can be found in most of the Latin American States today, where ideologies of colonialism are still firmly in place and contribute to the oppression of Afro-descendants and indigenous peoples. Perhaps we need to keep looking for more appropriate terms in order to avoid those that might lead (like 'settler') to confusion. For the time being, I will keep using it to refer to the kind of colonialism that predominates in Uruguay.

Uruguay: a country of settlers

Uruguay, unlike the other countries analyzed in the *American Quarterly* forum, is a clear case of settler colonialism as described by Wolfe and Veracini: its society imagines itself as a 'country without Indians' ('país sin indios') and, therefore, it also imagines itself as a society that has freed itself of the 'Indian question' ('problema del indio').[59] This is

fostered by a history of colonial practices that have operated rather effectively, organized by a strategy that combined an extermination logic with the successful action of dispositives of capture and assimilation to the capitalist system and the Nation.[60] The Charrua and other indigenous peoples (like the Guenoa or Minuanes), who organized themselves in small groups of high mobility, roamed freely before the arrival of the Conquistadors. Colonialism developed very slowly and in a relatively late date in that territory, consolidating itself only in the decade of the 1830s, during which the State inflicted serious military defeats on the Natives who still moved with a certain degree of freedom in the territory – defeats that had terrible demographic consequences for the latter. The strongest, but not the only, blow, the one that has become emblematic of the State's extermination policy and is considered, by many, as proof of the extinction of the Charrua, was an ambush that took place in a spot known as Salsipuedes, in 1831. In a recent book, Diego Bracco has discussed how the aforementioned military campaigns, that sought the elimination of the Natives, had started at least 30 years earlier. His investigation also suggests that the extermination strategy of the State included the summary execution of the adult male prisoners and the 'reparto' (distribution) of women and children among families of the Criollo elites.[61]

The effects of the policies that the very young Uruguayan State (that became independent in 1830) put into practice vis-à-vis the remaining indigenous population (the groups characterized by their high mobility) were, not surprisingly, terrible for the latter. But one thing is to acknowledge the undoubtedly dramatic decrease in the number of free (known as infidels or *infieles*) indigenous peoples in the territory and another is to affirm the absolute success of the extermination policy: it is well known that there were some survivors who fled to what is today Brazilian territory and it is also a fact that some, instead, stayed in Uruguay and slowly incorporated themselves to the job market as rural workers. Moreover, not only the Charrua, but also members of the other ethnic groups that populated the territory (Guenoa, Guarani, and others) joined the predominant economic system, the capitalist market, as *peones de estancia* or rural workers.

Another factor that may help explain the general public's incredulity regarding the legitimacy of the Charrua re-emergent collectives and why the idea of a 'country without Indians' is so pervasive in Uruguay, is their incapacity to distinguish between a Charrua activist and a Uruguayan citizen of unmarked identity. This lack of perception of difference might be caused by what Frederick E. Hoxie points out: in settler colonialism societies, settlers and Natives share, as time goes by, not only the same political system but also, in some cases, a common popular culture (1159).[62] Due to these factors, present-day Uruguayans have little trouble thinking of themselves as members of a rather homogeneous society in which 'el problema del indio' has disappeared.

In any case, and despite most Uruguayan citizens' homogeneity fantasy, the surviving indigenous subjects were forced to live their lives in a manner that was very different from their former way of life, because, with the passage of time, their groups started to disintegrate as such. To this we should add the constant work of the State's ideological apparatuses proposing the inferiority of the Natives, which must have induced the survivors to the practice of a self-censorship that, through the denial of their own indigenous identity, must have led, in turn, to a process of invisibilization. Enter the active campaign of disparagement undertaken by some of the main figures of the Uruguayan intellectual

establishment and one might get an idea of how unattractive a prospect must have been, in that country, to identify oneself as a Native.

Said invisibilization was achieved through different procedures, but one of the most popular ones was to state that history began with the arrival of the settlers.[63] This is the impression one gets when one reads the history textbooks from modern-day Uruguay. The earliest moment of Uruguayan history seems to be 1810, the year of the advent of the Revolución de Mayo; or even better, 1811, when the independence movement reached the shores of the Banda Oriental, the colonial name of the territory today occupied by the Uruguayan state. In this kind of representation of national history, indigenous peoples are seen as a mere preface to "real" history,[64] which is the one forged by modernity, brought to the land by settler society.[65] Yet, the invisibilization would not be complete without another, supplemental discursive strategy that Jean M. O'Brien calls lasting, which postulates that indigenous peoples have no future (106) while it creates a genre the aforementioned author calls "the last of," that predicates the extinction of a specific Native group (117).[66] In Uruguay, lasting took the form of the narrative about "the last of the Charrua," which tells the story of four members of that nation who were taken to France to be exhibited, in the tradition of the human zoos, as savages.[67] Last but not least, it should be pointed out that, in Uruguay, the strength of the extinction narrative is so strong that even some of the most serious scholars (like Bracco) affirm the disappearance of the Natives from its territory.[68]

Decimated and invisibilized, the survivors of the extermination campaign and their descendants have continued living their lives as Uruguayans for more than one hundred and eighty years.[69] Most of them have done it without alluding, in the public sphere, to their indigenous ancestry. It was only with the creation of ADENCH (Association of Descendants of the Charrua Nation), about a quarter of a century ago, that the descendants of the survivors of the extermination campaign started to organize themselves as such. This is what is known at the moment, but because there have not been any systematic investigations on the different trajectories that the descendants of Natives might have followed, both in the relative obscurity of their private lives and in the more public light of their relationship with the State, it is not impossible that some of those descendants, at some point in history, might have made demands to the State (although we have, hitherto, no knowledge of that), either as individuals or as a group. I am saying this because there are studies, in Argentina, on indigenous peoples like the Huarpe, who were considered as extinct as the Charrua, that have shown that they have, periodically, undertaken actions and rights claims before different State authorities.[70] Thus, it is not prudent to discard the possibility of the appearance, in the future, of documents that record the past agency of the descendants of the Charrua. Only exhaustive and sustained ethnographic and historical research could offer responses to the many uncertainties that plague the study of the indigenous past in Uruguay.

Uruguay is characterized by a historiographic production that has always narrated history from the point of view of Western cultures – that is to say, from the settlers' point of view. It is only in the last few years that a new kind of academic production, inspired by the work by Argentinean, Brazilian, and American scholars who have put emphasis on the concept of the frontier, has started to attempt to offer a more complex, less biased view of Uruguayan history.[71] The work by the aforementioned Adriana Dávila and Andrés Aspiroz proposes to stop viewing the historical process in

Uruguay as the narration of the difficulties faced by the *Criollo* (that is, settler) society in its endeavor to occupy a territory that was conceptualized as empty. The idea is to start to view it as the history of the relations between antagonistic groups in a frontier society in which they dispute but also share the territory and its resources.[72] Unfortunately, this kind of scholarly work is still very infrequent and the great majority of the local historiographical production still reproduces settler narratives.

Carole Pateman says that States can have one of two kinds of settler contracts: one she calls strict, where the State does not have any legislation, and it does not even acknowledge, the existence of indigenous peoples in its territory. The other kind she calls tempered, for it allows the existence of, albeit limited, some indigenous jurisdiction (61).[73] Canada and the United States belong in the second kind but, unfortunately, Uruguay is a clear case of a State with a strict settler contract.

Having reached this point, it is perhaps opportune to acknowledge the existence of a corpus of scholarship produced about the settlement of Pampa and Patagonia in Argentina that, although it does not explicitly speak of settler colonialism, is lucidly aware of its operations and procedures. The pioneer in that kind of study was the aforementioned David Viñas, who in his book *Indios, ejército y fronteras* talks about some of the most characteristic traits of settler colonialism, such as its tendency to remain silent about the foundational violence against indigenous peoples (17), and the existence of military campaigns to force the displacement (25) or the extermination (if necessary, 34, 59) of indigenous peoples as a strategy for the appropriation of their lands. There is also a growing production in the fields of social anthropology and ethnohistory by authors like Walter Delrio, Mariela Eva Rodríguez, and Pilar Pérez, among others, who, inspired in Claudia Briones's work and ideas, have analyzed the consequences of the "Conquista del Desierto" from a theoretical perspective that has points of contact with the studies on Aboriginality in Australia.[74] Like Viñas, these scholars study the consolidation of the Argentinean State in the second half of the nineteenth century, producing research that is every bit as enlightening as the works by the main authors of the settler colonialism paradigm. One of the reasons I focus, in this paper, mostly on the work produced by the main English-speaking authors of said paradigm, is that I believe it is important to establish that, in spite of Veracini's belief, there actually are cases of settler colonialism in Latin America. Another reason is that I am persuaded that the degree of development the settler colonialism corpus has achieved is of great help for the study of the Latin American cases, adding to, but not replacing, the aforementioned corpus produced by Argentinean scholars on the "Conquista del Desierto."

The problem of the land in Uruguay

As we have already seen, Uruguay has not ratified ILO Convention 169. One of the consequences of this is that the Charrua's struggles for recognition are taking place in a legal vacuum that prevents them from reclaiming any kind of rights, from the recognition of their existence as Natives to land claims. One natural and obvious consequence of all this is that they remain, to this date, landless. It is no news that in Latin America, as José Carlos Mariátegui persuasively demonstrated, 'el problema del indio es el problema de la tierra' (the problem of the Indian is the problem of the land.[75] For this reason, it should not surprise anyone that, as we have seen, former Secretary of Labor Bayardi, whose opinion is

shared by ample sectors of the Uruguayan population, declared his adamant opposition to the cession of lands to the Charrua collectives. His argument is that, first of all, there are no Natives in Uruguay and, second, the country cannot ratify Conventions that could create situations in the context of which it could be observed by international organisms like the UN for not complying with the mandate of the Convention.[76] His words present us with a country that foresees a non-compliance with Convention 169, which allows us to suspect that it is very unlikely that said country is planning to willingly give lands to the Charrua or any other indigenous group.

At this point, it might be convenient to ask what the Uruguayan State needs the land for. It is well known that it is a country that, throughout its history, has based its economy on both agricultural industry and cattle exploitation. The reason I think it is opportune to ask about this is that, during the three Frente Amplio (the political party that inherits the traditions of both the national and the international left) administrations, the government has shown a sustained interest in the possibility of both exploiting non-renewable energy resources (like oil) and developing mega-mining projects in the national territory. This should not come as a surprise, for it is rare today that a Latin American State does not favor that kind of possibility. On the contrary, the economic model founded on a pronounced extractive drive (known, in Spanish, as *extractivismo*) has extended throughout the region. In order to justify that drive, governments invoke the need to have access to their own energy resources in the name of an independence based on nationalist discourses and values and, more importantly, in the name of that objective that everybody seems to seek in the contemporary world: development, both economic and human.

Uruguay, a country its citizens like to imagine as special or different, is, in this particular department, an actual exception: there are neither projects of exploitation of the subsoil nor those of the kind that seriously affect the environment that are so common throughout the continent. The State has built dams, but that kind of infrastructure project does not create disturbances to the environment comparable to those caused by mega-mining or fracking projects. Although former President Mujica, with the support of all four of the political parties of the Uruguayan political system, vehemently tried to introduce mega-mining in the country through negotiations with the mining company Aratiri, the opposition that this generated in several segments of civil society was such that the project became less and less viable. In the end, the mobilization of significant numbers of citizens put an end (at least for the time being) to the mining aspirations of the former President, and it looks like current President Luis Lacalle Pou is not going to continue to attempt to impose this project in particular – which does not mean he will not try to propose a similar one in the future.

Uruguayan political leaders have yet another hope: to be able to find oil in their territory. This is why the State signed a contract with an Australian oil company (Schuepbach Energy) so that it can search for it in the Uruguayan subsoil – more concretely, in the Departments of Salto and Tacuarembó. The problem, according to Leticia Sánchez, is that the State organism that is in charge of regulating the use and production of combustibles in Uruguay, the Administración Nacional de Combustibles, Alcohol y Portland (ANCAP), has not informed the population about the fact that this oil company is not only looking for conventionally exploitable resources but is also searching for those that are obtained through hydraulic fracture or fracking, whose effects on the environment are really destructive. For the time being, there is no official news about any

findings in the prospected zones – which does not mean this will not happen in the future, because ANCAP has signed an agreement with another company (Petrina S. A.) that will be in charge of prospecting the territory for oil.[77] Even if this company fails (as the Argentine YPF failed in the past) in its endeavors, the fact is that, given the political and economic climates in the country and the region, it is very likely that the Uruguayan Nation-State (as persuaded as its neighbors by developmental narratives) will continue to look for riches in its subsoil.

Primitive accumulation

When one discusses the exploitation of land resources in settler countries like Uruguay, it is convenient to revisit the colonial roots of the situations of injustice of the present, in which indigenous peoples are often the most oppressed subjects. The arrival of the Spaniards to the continent entailed the appropriation and the exploitation of the lands that had offered, until then, the basic elements for indigenous peoples' subsistence. This dispossession had consequences: the spatial displacement and the economic impoverishment of the Natives, producing what Karl Marx called primitive accumulation (which is the operation that precedes the emergence of capitalism, what makes it possible), which is the separation of the worker from the means of production that made his or her subsistence possible.[78]

It could be argued that Marx's conception of primitive accumulation gives the impression that one is before a specific event fixed in time: a dispossession occurred and, from then on, certain history began. However, there are other parts of his work where he seems to suggest that said dispossession should not be characterized as an event,[79] but as a continued series of actions throughout time. I would like to seriously consider this interpretation in order to discuss, under its light, a few ideas expressed by Manu Vimalassery. This author does not make any allusion to the notion of primitive accumulation, but when he analyzes some aspects of Adam Smith's work, he states that the global accumulation of capital remains tied to the dispossession suffered by the Natives in colonial times (296). In his opinion, the resolution of the crises suffered by Capital always takes the shape of a repetition, a re-consolidation of the foundational dispossession: it is the renovation of the assault over indigenous lands and lives what guarantees the survival of Capital (296, 305).[80] In other, Marxist words (like the ones used by Wolfe in 'Recuperating Binarism')[81]: in order to exist and to be effective, primitive accumulation requires a constant repetition so that the legitimate owners of the land continue to be unable to recover the privileged tie with the land they had before the arrival of the invaders.[82] In Hannah Arendt's words, who did characterize, a long time ago, the aforementioned dispossession in Marxist terms, the bourgeoisie became aware that 'the original sin of simple robbery, which centuries ago had made possible the 'primitive accumulation of capital' (Marx) and that had started all further accumulation, had eventually to be repeated, less the motor of accumulation suddenly die down'.[83] To refer to the continued nature of the process, David Harvey coined the concept 'accumulation by dispossession', which describes a continuation of Marx's primitive accumulation, through the appropriation of assets and natural resources, in times of neo-liberalism. Harvey proposes this expression because it seems counterintuitive, in his opinion, to use the adjective 'primitive' to refer to something that persists in time.[84] However, if

one believes, as we saw Hannah Arendt did, that accumulation is a process that needs to be renovated all the time, it seems unnecessary to give it another name in the present.

Although it is true that, as Glen Coulthard states, Marx put the emphasis on just one of the two elements that comprise primitive accumulation (the historical formation of the proletariat as a 'free' worker) at the expense of the other (the dispossession of the land suffered by American Natives),[85] it is possible to revert that tendency, as he himself proposes, through the intellectual operation of placing the position of the colonized, in relation to the dispossession they have suffered, at the center of the analysis.[86] The main reason that leads him to take that turn is that, in his analysis of Canadian social reality, the dispossession suffered by indigenous peoples is the most important factor in the history of the development of the relationship between them and the State, and it continues informing their resistance strategies: the theory and practice of indigenous anti-colonialism is less understood if they are viewed as proletarians than if their actions are understood as struggles for their land.[87] In this way, what Coulthard is telling us is that it is convenient to redirect our attention from the study of a relation (Capital) to a different kind of relation: the colonial one.[88] It is in this way that one can give a different direction to Marx's move, who, according to Wolfe, excluded land from capitalist dialectics, relegating it to a status of pre-condition to capitalist production. This kind of conceptual operation allows one to see the importance of the land in settler colonialism more clearly, for when the Natives suffer dispossession, several negative consequences to their collective life-world ensue, because it is replaced by a social system based on a conception of the land as alienable property – one that is very different from the indigenous conception that imagines its possession and usufruct as collective.[89]

It is for all these reasons that States in the Americas so adamantly oppose indigenous land claims. And even in those cases in which there is an indigenous legislation that contemplates the right of the Natives to the land, its property remains in the hands of the State. This is the case of Brazil, where the Constitution of 1988 acknowledges the rights of indigenous peoples to the lands they occupy, but said rights are limited to its usufruct.[90] The dispossession, from the perspective of the State, needs to be secured at every moment, so that the process of primitive accumulation remains alive.

Indigenous claims and settler's fear

This article intended to be, among other things, a theoretical reflection on settler colonialism in Uruguay and its relation to the problem of the land, but real life, always intent on changing our plans, leads me to discuss all this in a more specific, concrete framework: the and claim made, in May 2013, by Martín Delgado Cultelli, then an official representative of CONACHA, the organization that today coordinates eight re-emergent collectives who identify themselves as Charrua." with "The relationship between settler colonialism, indigenous peoples, and the problem of the land in Uruguay can be illustrated by a claim made, in May 2013, by Martín Delgado Cultelli, a member of CONACHA, the organization that today coordinates eight re-emergent collectives who identify themselves as Charrua.

From Delgado Cultelli's, and by his predecessor in that position, Mónica Michelena's, statements to the press, one can deduce the reasons and foundations for their land claims. One of them, at least for some of the members of the different collectives that

comprise CONACHA (we will see that not all members think along the same lines), is the need to have control over the cemeteries of their ancestors, in the understanding that, in the spiritual world of the ancestral Charrua, their relationship with their dead was of the utmost importance. According to Delgado Cultelli, the terrains that surround the ancestral cemeteries could serve as an abode for present-day Charrua families that could dedicate themselves to the preservation of an ancestral space.[91] For Michelena, the lands to which they could eventually lay claim are necessary to reconstruct themselves as a people and as a nation; the idea is not, as some may surmise, to live in the *tolderías* (tent camps) of their ancestors, but to search for their own forms of production in order to create labor opportunities that would allow the members of the collectives to develop a way of life that could have more points of contact with the *buen vivir* (good living) postulated by other ethnic groups in the Americas, than with the one they practice now (Michelena in Delgado). In Michelena's own words:

> 'To develop our culture implies a territoriality, which is independent from whether we are the owners of the territory or not. In order to recover and practice our identity as ours or, for example, to exercise the right to have our own medicine, an intercultural health, we must have an environment from where to get our medicinal plants, because we have not kept much of an oral memory. We need a communal space where to collectively develop [as a group].
>
> desarrollar nuestra cultura implica una territorialidad, más allá de que seamos dueños o no de ese territorio. Para poder recuperar y ejercer nuestra identidad como propia, por ejemplo el derecho a tener una medicina propia, una salud intercultural, debemos tener un monte de donde sacar las plantas medicinales, seguir nuestra investigación de estas plantas, porque mucho no hemos recibido de memoria oral. Necesitamos un espacio comunitario donde desarrollarnos colectivamente.[92]

For these CONACHA leaders, the reaffirmation of an indigenous way of life depends on two things: the strengthening of the spirituality of the collectives and the development of a subsistence pattern based on an economy that would allow them to live more in tune with the values of other indigenous communities. In conversations with both activists I had the opportunity to confirm that they are aware of the possibility that their fellow Uruguayan citizens who find out about their land claims may not be very supportive of their cause, because the colonial sources that talk about the Charrua of the period that goes from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century do not mention, among the ones practiced by their ancestors, some of the activities (namely, agriculture) they plan to develop in the lands claimed. They are perfectly aware of that, but they believe that to be an Indian today is, by necessity, something very different from what it was in the past – in the pre-Columbian, the colonial, or the early nineteenth century republic, periods. Like many other indigenous groups of the Americas, the re-emergent Charrua adhere to concepts, ideas, and practices that have become pervasive among the indigenous groups with higher visibility and political strength in the present. This is why concepts and beliefs like the Pachamama and the *buen vivir* (good living) have become part of the worldview of indigenous groups that did not include them in their past cultural repertoires. It is because of this kind of cultural decision that the Charrua of the present, unlike their ancestors, are willing to cultivate the land in the future.

To give some perspective about their economic and cultural choices, let us see what another indigenous group declared extinct, in neighboring Argentina, has done in those departments. Also a re-emergent group, the Tehuelche of Comunidad Copolque, from the Province of Santa Cruz, have made a decision that differs from the Charrua's: they have decided to continue with the subsistence practices of their ancestors. In their own words: 'In the present, like our ancestors, we raise mainly ovine and equine cattle' ('En la actualidad y al igual que nuestros ancestros, nos dedicamos principalmente a la ganadería ovina y la cría de caballos').[93] But the reader may have already noticed that this decision also appeals to a subsistence pattern that could not be practiced by the Tehuelche that inhabited the territory before its European colonization: neither sheep nor horses existed in the Americas before the arrival of the invaders. After that, their way of being in the world was based on a mobility that was much higher than the one allowed them by the sedentary life they were forced to adopt in the twentieth and twenty first centuries. Like the Charrua, the Tehuelche of the present are aware that things change and that there are many ways of being indigenous in the present and, therefore, have a flexible attitude vis-à-vis the adoption of economic, social, and cultural practices that give shape to their identity in the present. As Andrea Smith reminds us, traditions are not static and, despite settler colonialism's attempts at interrupting the continuity of indigenous memories, it is possible for them to reestablish, at some point in the future, their communication with the land.[94] In the case of the Charrua and the Tehuelche, said communication takes, or is going to take, a shape that will probably be different from the one privileged by their ancestors.

The difference between the Copolque community and the Charrua from Uruguay is that, although both believe in the need to have a territory for the reaffirmation of their identity, the former have, today, a 9500 hectares of land they can inhabit and practice as their own. This idea of living in contact with a land that allow them to develop a way of life of their own that differs from the West's, comes from the belief that all human beings have a very special relationship with the land they inhabit.[95] It could be said that the way in which we think and live is, in part, a consequence of the way in which we conceive and practice the territory. Dwelling, in the sense given to the term by Martin Heidegger (who believed that to be human was to dwell),[96] in one place and not in another, must have significant consequences for human beings. It is understandable, then, that the Charrua believe that, in order to live as they wish, in order to be what they aspire to be (and all identity is, as is well known, a building process), they need their own territory.

As we have seen, officials of the Mujica administration, like Secretary of Labor Bayardi, were afraid that the Charrua movement crystalized in a land claim – a claim to which the State, as we saw, is not willing to respond affirmatively. Those fears were confirmed in May, 2013, in the TV show *Esta boca es mía*, hosted by journalist Victoria Rodríguez, by Delgado Cultelli, who threw, like a grenade, his belief that the Uruguayan State has the obligation of granting lands to the indigenous collectives.[97] In that occasion, Delgado Cultelli was not yet a representative of CONACHA and, therefore, his words did not have major consequences. It was not until the declarations he made to the Uruguayan newspaper *El país*, on the edition of October 27, 2015, that the general public got more details about his proposal. He said that 'with 2000 hectares of land and the control of all the indigenous cemeteries, "all the problems between the Uruguayan State and the descendants

of the Charrua would end"' ('con 2000 hectáreas de campo y el control de todos los cementerios indígenas, "se terminan todos los problemas entre el Estado uruguayo y los descendientes de los charrúas"').[98] As can be imagined, the repercussions of his words were significant and the responses to them came almost immediately. Daniel Vidart and Hoenir Sarthou (a well-known journalist) were quick to identify the land claim as just another manifestation of the traditional (although not necessarily Charrua) 'viveza criolla' – a popular form of wit that, supposedly, allows Uruguayans (and Argentinians) to take a doubtfully licit advantage in soccer games or any other complex situations.[99]

In this way, what until recently was a mere possibility, was expressed as an actual land claim with very specific numbers (2000 hectares) and a concrete geographic location (lots in the Departments of Salto and Tacuarembó). Delgado Cultelli's actions also elicited reactions from within the re-emergence movement: ADENCH, the oldest of the organizations that vindicate Charrua ancestry, produced a statement complaining about Delgado Cultelli's failure to consult with their organization on such an important topic before making his declarations to the press. They also stated that that particular claim had never been part of their collective's list of demands.[100] Truth be told, it looks like in the context of a country where most people do not even believe in the legitimacy of the identity claims of the members of the Charrua associations, with a Nation-State that continues to refuse to ratify ILO Convention 169, Delgado Cultelli did what in popular parlance is known as 'poner la carreta delante de los bueyes' (to put the cart before the horse).

In this situation, everything seems to point towards the conclusion that the land claims by the Charrua will continue to be more a long term goal than a concrete reality. But it is not just a goal like the others: it is one of the most important demands of the indigenous peoples of the Americas – the one that is a necessary condition for them to be able to be in the world in their own way, a way that does not coincide with the Western, capitalist way of life. In the case of those groups who lack lands, that absence may become a part not only of their agenda but also of their identity building process: that lack is something that gives shape not only to their way of imagining themselves but also to their actions, their strategies, and the forms their identities take. If Frantz Fanon was right when he said that the culture and identity of an oppressed people are forged through struggle, the absence of territory and the struggle for it may become constitutive elements of present-day Charrua identity. It is on the idiosyncrasies of that struggle that the collective form with which they will emerge depends.

Coda

In Uruguay, the struggle of the re-emergent Charrua continues to face great obstacles that prevent them from getting recognition as indigenous peoples – which is, by the way, the first step in the struggles of indigenous groups that have been declared extinct by the powers that be, the academia, and common sense. The invisibilization they have been suffering since the nineteenth century extermination campaign, added to the one that is promoted by an important sector of the authors (who are not always professional, academic scholars) that occupy themselves with indigenous topics, make it very easy for the Uruguayan Nation-Sate to continue to deny the dispossession that made the appropriation of lands under its control possible. It is only through the

questioning of the national narratives that postulate a Uruguayan exceptionalism that presents it as a 'country without Indians', that will one be able to unmask the mechanisms through which that State continues to perpetrate the act of foundational violence that made the dispossession that constituted primitive accumulation possible. The Charrua re-emergent collectives pose, through their mere existence, a serious, deconstructive risk to those narratives, for as we have seen, Veracini affirms that, in settler colonialism countries, the colonizer's demand is that the Native leave, disappear or assimilate and, for that very reason, the best form of resistance for indigenous peoples is to continue to exist. Maybe that is why in Uruguay the Charrua of the present have been received with so much hostility and so much passionate ire. Maybe this occurs because the beneficiaries of that colonial regime intuit or know that the only thing that can destroy settler colonialism is the persistence of the indigenous presence. This come back, this return of the Native, is the worst news the beneficiaries of said colonial system (that is to say, the majority of the Uruguayan population) could get. If the re-emergent collectives survive the busloads of incomprehension, contempt, and mockery they have been getting from mainstream society, we are about to witness a radical revision of the fictions that serve as foundations for the ways in which Uruguayans view themselves.

Notes

1. Julio María Sanguinetti, 'El charruismo', *El País* (April 19, 2009).
2. Renzo Pi Hugarte, 'Sobre el charruismo. La antropología en el sarao de de las seudo ciencias.' *Anuario de Antropología Social y Cultural en Uruguay* (2002–2003): 103–21; Daniel Vidart, 'No hay indios en el Uruguay contemporáneo' en *Anuario de Antropología Social y Cultural en Uruguay* (2012): 251–7; Sebastián José Cabrera, 'La garra minuana', *Qué pasa* Abril 6 (2013), http://www.elpais.com.uy/que-pasa/los-abuelos-indios.html (accessed July, 2013).
3. Oscar Padrón Favre, *Ocaso de un pueblo indio. Historia del éxodo guaraní-misionero al Uruguay* (Montevideo: Fin de Siglo, 1996); Luis Rodolfo González and Susana Rodríguez Varese, *Guaraníes y paisanos. Nuestras raíces 3* (Montevideo: Nuestra Tierra, 1990); Luis Rodolfo González and Susana Rodríguez Varese, *En busca de los orígenes perdidos: Los guaraníes en la construcción del ser uruguayo* (Montevideo: Planeta, 2010); Vidart, 'No Hay Indios'.
4. The exclusion of indigenous people in the Uruguayan social imaginary has not taken place, like in other Latin American societies, as a consequence of the affirmation of a process of *mestizaje* or miscigenation that would have produced a new, hybrid, national subject. On the contrary, in Uruguay, the majority of its citizens consider themselves as descendants of Europeans; see: Gustavo Verdesio, "Colonialismo acá y allá: Reflexiones sobre la teoría y la práctica de los estudios coloniales a través de fronteras culturales" *Cuadernos del CILHA* 13, no. 17 (2012): 175–191, and Mariela Eva Rodríguez and Mónica Michelena, "Memorias charrúas en Uruguay: Reflexiones sobre reemergencia indígena desde una investigación colaborativa" *Abya Yala* 2, no. 2 (2018): 183–184. This does not mean that a biological mestizaje did not take place in those spaces called "frontera" (see endnotes 65 and 66 for a bibliography on this notion), as Diego Bracco suggests in *Charrúas, Guenoas y Guaraníes. Interacción y Destrucción: Indígenas en el Río de la Plata*. (Montevideo: Linardi & Risso, 2004), 37–38; for reflections about an earlier kind of biological mestizaje in the region, see Antonio Lezama. *La historia que nos parió. Ensayo sobre el origen de la idiosincrasia rioplatense*. (Montevideo: Linardi & Risso, 2008). It is interesting to note that *mestizaje* has not played a very important role in the history of southern Brazil, either, for its inhabitants assign great importance to their European descent and neglect the contributions of "both indigenous and black people to the formation of the population of Rio Grande do Sul" (113–114): Michael Kent and Ricardo Ventura Santos, "'The Charrua Are Alive'. The Genetic Resurrection of an Extinct Indigenous Population in

Southern Brazil" in *Mestizo Genomics: Race Mixture, Nation, and Science in Latin America* (Durham: Duke UP, 2014), 109–133.

5. The work by Sherene H. Razack, that shows how spaces are, in settler societies, organized by the law to promote unequal social relations (1), can shed some light on the Uruguayan case, where the law, or lack thereof, determines that there is no space for indigenous peoples. Sherene H. Razack, 'Introduction. When Place Becomes Race', in *Race, Space, and the Law. Unmapping a White Settler Society*, ed. Sherene H. Razack (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2002): 1–20.
6. It should be pointed out that the situation is slowly changing, for in the last few years, some academics from Uruguay and other countries have expressed opinions that differ from Vidart's and Pi Hugarte's. The list is not long, but there have been articles by biological anthropologist Mónica Sans, "Identidad perdida: discordancias entre la 'identidad genética' y la autoadscripción indígena en el Uruguay." *Conversaciones del Cono Sur,* 3, no. 1 *Dossier Reemergencia indígena en los países del Plata: Los casos de Uruguay y de Argentina*. Mariela Eva Rodríguez, Ed., 2017, available at: <https://conosurconversaciones.files.wordpress.com/2017/09/conversaciones-del-conosur-3-1-sans.pdf>; "Indios en un país sin indios," *La diaria* November 10, 2015, available at https://ladiaria.com.uy/articulo/2015/11/indios-en-un-pais-sin-indios/), archaeologist José López Mazz, "Sangre indígena en Uruguay. Memoria y ciudadanía post nacionales" *Athenea Digital* 18, no. 1 (2018): 181-201. https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/athenea.2235), sociologist Felipe Arocena, "¿Quién es descendiente indígena en el siglo XXI?" *La diaria* October 31, 2015, available at: https://ladiaria.com.uy/articulo/2015/10/quien-es-descendiente-indigena-en-el-siglo-xxi/), a book by social anthropologist Andrea Olivera, *Devenir charrúa en el Uruguay: una etnografía junto con colectivos urbanos*. (Montevideo: Lucida editores & Fondation pour l'Université de Laussane, 2016), and articles and a dossier edited by Argentinian social anthropologist Mariela Eva Rodríguez, "Reemergencia indígena en los países del Plata: Los casos de Uruguay y de Argentina." *Conversaciones del Cono Sur,* 3, no. 1 *Dossier Reemergencia indígena en los países del Plata: Los casos de Uruguay y de Argentina*. Mariela Eva Rodríguez, Ed., 2017, available at: <https://conosurconversaciones.wordpress.com/>; Mariela Eva Rodriguez and Mónica Michelena, "Memorias charrúas en Uruguay", 180–210, that take the Charrua collectives seriously.
7. Eduardo Delgado, 'Lo indígena divide al gobierno', *El País* 26 de enero (2015), http://www.elpais.com.uy/informacion/indigena-divide-gobierno.html (accessed October 11, 2015).
8. Lorenzo Veracini, 'Introducing Settler Colonial Studies', *Settler Colonial Studies* 1 (2011): 2–3. Extermination must be seen, as Scott Lauria Morgensen has pointed out, as a form of biopolitics: Scott Lauria Morgensen, 'The Biopolitics of Settler Colonialism: Right Here, Right Now', *Settler Colonial Studies* 1 (2011): 52–76.
9. Patrick Wolfe, 'Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native', *Journal of Genocide Research* 8, no. 4 (2006): 388, 393.
10. Wolfe, 'Settler Colonialism', 402.
11. Wolfe, 'Settler Colonialism', 403.
12. Damien Short, *Redefining Genocide. Settler Colonialism, Social Death, and Ecocide* (London: Zed Books, 2016), 1–37.
13. Short, *Redefining Genocide*, 36.
14. Short, *Redefining Genocide*, 28.
15. Veracini, 'Introducing Settler', 3.
16. Ibid.
17. The *Encomienda* system was a widespread way of exploiting the land and the labor of the Natives throughout Spanish possessions. It was defined by law in 1503 and it consisted of a grant to a Conquistador of a number of Natives from whom the *Encomendero* (the grantee) could extract tribute. In exchange, he was required to offer protection and religious education to the Natives. Although they were technically free subjects, the status of indigenous peoples under this regime resembled that of slaves. Because the *Econmienda* did not include a grant of land, Latin American scholars and intellectuals have dedicated a significant number of investigations to define that legal figure. For a thorough discussion of the subject,

Miguel Angel García, *El nacimiento de América. La acumulación del capital como fundamento del orden colonial y de su crisis revolucionaria* (México, D. F.: Editorial Extemporáneos, 1984).
18. Veracini, 'Introducing Settler', 3.
19. Wolfe, 'Settler Colonialism', 388.
20. Lorenzo Veracini, 'Settler Colonialism and Decolonisation', *Borderlands* 6, no. 2 (2007): 5.
21. Those countries, unlike Uruguay, have tried to incorporate indigenous peoples to mainstream society through recognition: Veracini, 'Introducing Settler', 7.
22. Lorenzo Veracini, *Settler Colonialism. A Theoretical Overview* (Londres: Palgrave, 2010), 14.
23. Veracini, *Settler Colonialism*, 75.
24. Veracini, *Settler Colonialism*, 76.
25. Veracini, *Settler Colonialism*, 77, 81.
26. Veracini, *Settler Colonialism*, 86.
27. Veracini, *Settler Colonialism*, 87, 90.
28. 'Tabaré that's Right! Renzo Pi Hugarte y los charrúas'. *Montevideo Portal*. February 26, 2010. Accessed September 3, 2018.
29. Veracini, *Settler Colonialism*, 93.
30. Wolfe, 'Settler Colonialism', 388.
31. Wolfe, 'Settler Colonialism', 390.
32. Wolfe, 'Settler Colonialism', 396.
33. Frederick Turner, *Beyond Geography. The Western Spirit Against the Wilderness* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers UP, 1994 [1983]), 21, 23, 30, 146.
34. Glen Coulthard, 'From Wards of the State to Subjects of Recognition? Marx, Indigenous Peoples, and the Politics of Dispossession in Denendeh', in *Theorizing Native Studies*, eds. Audra Simpson and Andrea Smith (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2014): 93; Turner, *Beyond Geography*, 23.
35. Patricia Seed, *American Pentimento. The Invention of Indians and the Pursuit of Riches* (Minneapolis & London: U of Minnesota P, 2001), 5, 47.
36. Seed, *American Pentimento,* 55.
37. Wolfe, 'Settler Colonialism', 395.
38. Veracini, *Settler Colonialism*, 30.
39. Richard Gott, 'Latin America as a White Settler Society', *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 26, no. 2 (2007): 270.
40. Mari Yoshihara, 'Editor's Note', *American Quarterly* 69, no. 4 (2017): v.
41. Gott, 'Latin America', 286.
42. David Viñas, *Indios, ejército y frontera*. (Buenos Aires, Santiago Arcos Editor, 2003) [1982]. 29–52.
43. Gott, 'Latin America', 286, 287.
44. Gott, 'Latin America', 273.
45. Alfred W. Crosby, *Ecological Imperialism. The Biological Expansion of Europe, 900–1900* (New York: Cambridge UP, 1996 [1986]), 102.
46. Other authors, like Ricardo Salvatore, seem to be confused in a different way: he seems to believe that whether Argentina belongs in the category of settler colonial States or not, depends on the number of British immigrants in the country: Ricardo D. Salvatore, 'The Unsettling Location of a Settler Nation: Argentina, from Settler Economy to Failed Developing Nation', *South Atlantic Quarterly* 107, no. 4 (2008): 780. Come to think about it, his confusion may owe something to the provenance of the theoretical model under discussion.
47. Ran Greenstein, 'Settler Colonialism: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis?' *Jadaliyya* (2016, June 6): 1, 4, http://www.jadaliyya.com/Details/33333/Settler-Colonialism-A-Useful-Category-of-Historical-Analysis (accessed September 3, 2018).
48. Juan Castro and Manuela Lavinas Picq, 'Statenes as Landgrab: A Political History of Maya', *American Quarterly* 69, no. 4 (2017): 794, 796, 799.
49. M. Bianet Castellanos, 'Introduction: Settler Colonialism in Latin America', *American Quarterly* 69, no. 4 (2017): 778.

50. Wolfe's idea is that the binarism that emerges from frontier relationships generated by settler invasion is undeniable. The rhetoric of coexistence between the parties in conflict is a denial of the initial binarism that was so visible in frontier times. Patrick Wolfe, 'Recuperating Binarism: A Heretical Introduction', *Settler Colonial Studies* 3, no. 3–4 (2013): 257, 258.
51. Castellanos, 'Introduction', 778.
52. Another contributor to the forum, Shannon Speed, also critiques Wolfe for not paying sufficient attention to the specificity of each case, which is rather puzzling. Shannon Speed, 'Structures of Settler Capitalism in Abya Yala', *American Quarterly* 69, no. 4 (2017): 783.
53. What Castellanos does acknowledge is that the model is capable of accounting for the structures of elimination and dispossession occurred during colonial times in Latin America, while she criticizes the theoretical framework known as decoloniality or decolonial option, which she calls coloniality of power (*colonialidad del poder*), for not being able to do so: Castellanos, 'Introduction', 778.
54. Christopher A. Loperena, 'Settler Violence?: Race and Emergent Frontiers of Progress in Honduras', *American Quarterly* 69, no. 4 (2017): 801, 802.
55. Speed, 'Structures', 784, 785.
56. Speed, 'Structures', 786.
57. Speed, 'Structures', 788.
58. J. Mowafad-Paul, 'Sublimated Colonialism: The Persistence of Actually Existing Settler-Colonialism', *Philosophy Study* 3, no. 3 (2013): 196, 197.
59. Gustavo Verdesio, 'Un fantasma recorre el Uruguay: La reemergencia charrúa en un "país sin indios"', *Cuadernos de Literatura* 18, no. 36 (2014): 86–107.
60. Gustavo Verdesio, 'La mudable suerte del amerindio en el imaginario uruguayo: su lugar en las narrativas de la nación de los siglos XIX y XX y su relación con los saberes expertos', in *Hacia una arqueología de las arqueologías sudamericanas*, ed. Alejandro Haber (Bogotá: Ediciones Uniandes, 2005), 115–50.
61. Diego Bracco, *Con las armas en la mano: charrúas, guenoas, minuanes y guaraníes* (Montevideo: Planeta, 2013).
62. Frederick E. Hoxie, 'Retrieving the Red Continent: Settler Colonialism and the History of American Indians in the US', *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 31, no. 6 (2008): 1159.
63. For a thorough description of this procedure see Jean M. O'Brien, *Firsting and Lasting. Writing Indians out of Existence in New England* Minneapolis & London, U of Minnesota P, 2010, especially 1–53.
64. O'Brien, *Firsting and Lasting*, 2.
65. O'Brien, *Firsting and Lasting*, 6.
66. This is a kind of narrative that can still be seen in recent scholarly works from Argentina. A good example is a book by Karina Bidaseca and Marta Sierra, *Postales femeninas desde el fin del mundo. El Sur y las políticas de la memoria*. (Buenos Aires: Ediciones Godot, 2013), where the authors repeatedly talk about "the last Selk'nam" (10, 19, 22, 24, and many other pages) and the extinction of her ethnic group (22, 25, 33, etc.).
67. See, among many references, Darío Arce Asenjo, "Nuevos datos sobre el destino de Tacuavé y la hija de Guyunusa" *Anuario de Antropología Social y Cultural en Uruguay* (2007): 51–71, and Annie Houot, *El trágico fin de los indios charrúas*. Montevideo: (Linardi & Risso, Cruz del Sur, 2013).
68. Bracco, *Con las armas en la mano,* 164; *Charrúas, Guenoas, y Guaraníes,* 18. It never occurs to the supporters of the thesis of the extinction to wonder why there are still Charrua Indians in Brazil (Rio Grande do Sul) and Argentina (Province of Entre Rios), recognized as such by those states. As Mariela Eva Rodriguez has ironized: "How do you explain that there are Charrua in Brazil and Argentina but not in Uruguay? Is the symbolic power of state borders so great as to limit the movements of indigenous peoples?" (my translation): "Excepcionalidad uruguaya y reemergencia charrúa" *Conversaciones del Cono Sur,* 3, no. 1 *Dossier Reemergencia indígena en los países del Plata: Los casos de Uruguay y de Argentina.* Mariela Eva Rodríguez, Ed., 2017, 30. For studies about the Charrua of Porto Alegre, Rio Grande do Sul, see: Vivianne M. Pouey

Vidal, "Ethnoarqueologia dos charrúa do Rio Grande do Sul: Historia, construçao, e ressignificaçao étnica" *Estudios Históricos SDHRP y B* 7, no. 15 (2015): 1–30; and Viviane Pouey Vidal, Ronaldo Bernardino Colvero, and Jeremyas Machado Silva, "Etnografias das etnias charrua e minuano: O olhar dos cronistas e viajantes dos séculos XVI, XVII e XVIII" *Revista Memorare* 3, no. 2 (May/August 2016): 22-43. For the Entre Ríos Charrua there are no academic studies thus far.

69. The invisibilization of indigenous people in Uruguay is a constant throughout its history as an independent nation. Even during those moments when other Latin American countries were celebrating the image of the Indian, Uruguay was a little more reluctant to include indigenous imagery in its national narratives. Although Viñas (*Indios, ejército y frontera*, 69–70) demonstrated (much earlier than Rebecca Earle, "Sobre Héroes y Tumbas: National Symbols in Nineteenth-Century Spanish America." *Hispanic American Historical Review* 85, no. 3 (2005): 375–416; *The Return of the Native. Indians and Myth-Making in Latin America, 1810–1930* Durham: Duke U P, 2007) that in most Latin American countries, between 1810 and 1830 there was a vindication, in neoclassical rhetoric, of the figure of the Native, it should be pointed out that, in the Banda Oriental (which was not, of course, the same entity as the independent nation known as República Oriental del Uruguay, born in 1830), the use of indigenous imagery during those decades, although far from non-existent, was not as conspicuous as in, say, neighboring Argentina (see Gustavo Verdesio, "El día de la independencia o Doscientos años de incertidumbre: La indecidibilidad de una fecha en el Uruguay post-independencia" *Revista de Crítica Literaria Latinoamericana* 36, no. 71 (2010): 75:98). Maybe one of the reasons for that reluctance to celebrate the image of the Native is that the European enclave of Montevideo was waging an intermittent war against the "indios infieles" (Charrua, Guenoa, Minuanes) since, as we have seen (Bracco, *Con las armas en la mano)*, at least the year 1800. See also: Adriana Dávila and Andrés Aspiroz. *Indios, cautivos y renegados en la frontera. Los blandengues y la fundación de Belén, 1800–1801*. (Montevideo: Ediciones Cruz del Sur, 2015). 89–90.
70. For the case of the Huarpe, see: Diego Escolar, *Los dones étnicos de la nación. Identidades huarpe y modos de producción de soberanía en Argentina* (Buenos Aires: Prometeo, 2007).
71. The corpus that inspires this new take on indigenous agency during colonial and early republican times includes, but is not limited to, the following authors and works: Frühauf Garcia, Elisa, "Quando os índios escolhem os seus aliados: As relações de 'amizade' entre os minuanos e os lusitanos no sul da América portuguesa (c. 1750–1800)." *Historia* 24, no. 40 (July/December 2008): 613–32; "'Ser índio' na fronteira: limites e Possibilidades. Rio da Prata, c. 1750–1800" *Nuevo Mundo Mundos Nuevos* (Debates 2011): 1–12; Norberto Levinton, "Guaraníes y charrúas: una frontera exclusivista- inclusivista" *Revista de História Regional* 14, no. 1 (Summer 2009): 49–75; Wilde, Guillermo. "Guaraníes, 'gauchos' e 'indios infieles' en el proceso de disgregación de las antiguas doctrinas jesuíticas del Paraguay." *Revista del Centro de Estudios Anthropológicos* 38, no. 2 (December 2003): 73–128; "Territorio y etnogénesis missional en el Paraguay del siglo XVIII" *Fronteiras* (Dourados, MS) 11, no. 19 (jan./jun. 2009): 83–106; Carina P. Lucaioli and Sergio Latini, "Fronteras permeables: circulación de cautivos en el espacio santafesino" *Runa* 35, no. 1 (2014): 113–132; Jeffrey A. Erbig, Jr. "Borderline Offerings: Tolderías and Mapmakers in the Eighteenth-Century Río de la Plata." *Hispanic American Historical Review* 96, no. 3 (2016): 445–80; *Where Caciques and Mapmakers Met. Border Making in Eighteenth-Century South America* (Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 2020); Diego Bracco, *Charrúas, Guenoas y Guaraníes*; Raúl J. Mandrini,"Indios y fronteras en el área de las pampas (siglo XVI-XIX). Balance y perspectivas" Anuario del IEHS, VII (1992): 59–92; "Hacer historia indígena: El desafío a los historiadores". In: Raúl J. Mandrini and C.D. Paz, Eds., *Las fronteras hispanocriollas del mundo indígena latinoamericano en los siglos XVIII-XIX: Un estudio comparativo CEHIR/IEHS/UNS* (2003): 18–19; and the work by one of the pioneers in the study of interethnic relations in the Pampa and Patagonia regions, Lidia R. Nacuzzi: *Identidades impuestas: Tehuelches, aucas y pampas en el norte de la Patagonia*. 2nd ed. (Buenos Aires: Sociedad Argentina de Antropología, 2005); "Repensando y revisando el

concepto de cacicazgo en las fronteras del sur de América (Pampa y Patagonia)." *Revista Española de Antropología Americana* 38, no. 2 (2008): 75–95.

72. Adriana Dávila and Andrés Aspiroz, *Indios, cautivos y renegados en la frontera,* 20.
73. Carole Pateman, 'The Settler Contract', in *Contract and Domination*, eds. Carole Pateman and Charles W. Mills (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2007), 61.
74. Mariela Eva Rodríguez, "De la 'extinción' a la autoafirmación: procesos de visibilización de la comunidad tehuelche Camusu Aike (provincia de Santa Cruz, Argentina)". Doctoral Dissertation, Georgetown University, Washington DC, EEUU, 2010; Walter Delrio. *Memorias de expropiación. Sometimiento e incorporación indígena en la Patagonia. 1872–1943*. (Bernal: Universidad Nacional de Quilmes Editorial, 2010); Pilar Pérez, Archivos del silencio. Estado, indígenas y violencia en Patagonia central, 1878-1941. (Buenos Aires: Prometeo, 2016); Briones, Claudia. La alteridad del "cuarto mundo." Una deconstrucción antropológica de la diferencia. (Buenos Aires: Ediciones del Sol, 1998).
75. José Carlos Mariátegui, *Siete ensayos de interpretación de la realidad peruana* (México: Serie popular Era, 1978 [1928]), 35, 40.
76. Delgado, 'Lo indígena'.
77. Leticia Sánchez, 'Petróleo y transparencia. El abajo que se mueve', *Observatorio Minero del Uruguay*, http://www.observatorio-minero-del-uruguay.com/2015/01/petroleo-y-transparencia/ (accessed November 6, 2015).
78. Karl Marx, *Capital. Volume I* (London: Penguin, 1992), 873–5, 915.
79. Karl Marx, *Capital. Volume III* (London: Penguin, 1992), 233.
80. Manu Vimalassery, 'The Wealth of the Natives: Toward a Critique of Settler Colonial Political Economy', *Settler Colonial Studies* 3, no. 3–4 (2013): 296, 305.
81. Wolfe, 'Recuperating Binarism', 268.
82. Due to this kind of capitalist conception of the land it is necessary, as Andrea Smith suggests, to continue to attempt to re-conceptualize the relationship between the land and the people who inhabit it, paying special attention to the way in which many indigenous groups forge their relationship to it: through the practice of rituals and their lived experience in that territory: Andrea Smith, 'Indigeneity, Settler Colonialism, White Supremacy', in *Racial Formation in the Twenty-First Century*, eds. Daniel Martínez HoSang, Oneka LaBennett, and Laura Pulido (Berkeley: U of California P, 2012), 83, 84.
83. Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (Cleveland and New York: The World Publishing Company, 1962 [1951]), 148.
84. David Harvey, *The New Imperialism* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2003), 143–5.
85. According to Patrick Wolfe, the emphasis Marx placed on labor at the expense of dispossession was due to the fact that he viewed the latter as 'merely ancillary' to what for him was the main event: the historical emergence of the 'free' proletariat – a being without precedents that could only emerge without ties to the land. In Wolfe's opinion, Marx's characterization of the proletariat as free was based on the fact that they were not part of the means of production (like the slaves were) but they were not owners of said means either: Wolfe, 'Recuperating Binarism', 268.
86. Coulthard, 'From Wards of the State', 60.
87. Coulthard, 'From Wards of the State', 62.
88. Coulthard, 'From Wards of the State', 60. In this respect, although for different reasons, Coulthard proposal resonates with Sarita Echavez See's, who reminds us of Rosa Luxemburg's ideas, namely, that capitalism was (and is) always colonial, because it depends on something that exists beyond itself: it needs to invade primitive economies: Sarita Echavez See, 'Accumulating the Primitive', *Settler Colonial Studies* April (2015): 1–2, http://dx.doi/full/10.1080/2201473X.2015.1024382 (accesssed May 31, 2015). Morgensen proposes a similar turn in the domain of biopolitics: after pointing at the limitations of their main theoreticians (Michel Foucault and Giorgio Agamben), who were incapable of seeing colonialism as a context within which the biopower of both past and present takes place, affirms the need to understand it, as Ann Laura Stoller has suggested, as a colonial product: Morgensen, 'The Biopolitics', 55.

89. Wolfe, 'Recuperating Binarism', 268–9.
90. Fabiola Andréa Silva, 'Contract Archaeology and Indigenous Peoples: Reflections on the Brazilian Context', *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 19, no. 4 (2015): 834. Exception made of the resources located underground, on which they do not even have the usufruct. This is a consequence of the colonial legacies of Brazil. As Patricia Seed reminds us in her rigorous and fundamental study on the forms in which colonizers of different European countries appropriated indigenous riches, Iberian kingdoms (Spain and Portugal), unlike England, distinguished between the right to the surface of the land and the right to the riches of the subsoil: Seed, *American Pentimento*, 58.
91. Pablo Melgar, 'Piden cementerios indígenas y tierras al norte del Río Negro', *El País* (October 27, 2015), http://www.elpais.com.uy/informacion/charruas-reclaman-hectareas.html (accessed September 3, 2018).
92. Delgado, 'Lo indígena'.
93. Gobierno de Santa Cruz, Consejo Provincial de Educación. 'Comunidad Copolque', http://educacionsantacruz.gov.ar/index.php/comunidad-copolque
94. Smith, 'Indigeneity', 84.
95. Frederick Turner, according to T.H. Watkins, 'The Travels of Turner', in *Beyond Geography. The Western Spirit Against the Wilderness*, ed. Frederick Turner (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers UP, 1994[1983]), xxi.
96. Martin Heidegger, 'Building Dwelling Thinking', in *Poetry, Language, Thought*, ed. Martin Heidegger, Trans. Albert Hofstader (New York, NY: Harper and Row, 1971), 147.
97. *Esta boca es mía*. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WFjKMUEW4SY May, 2013. Accessed May, 2015.
98. Melgar, 'Piden cementerios'.
99. Vidart in Melgar, 'Piden cementerios'; Hoenir Sarthou, '¿Hubo alguna vez 2.000 hectáreas charrúas?', *Semanario Voces* (4 de noviembre, 2015), http://www.voces.com.uy/articulos-1/indisciplinapartidarialacolumnadehoenirsarthouteoriassobrelajusticia
100. 'Se generó dura polémica entre organizaciones "Indígenas". ADENCH y CONACHA se enfrentan por reclamo de tierras', *La República* (November 5, 2015), http://www.republica.com.uy/se-genero-dura-polemica/545525/ (accessed November, 2015).

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Notes on contributor

Gustavo Verdesio, Associate Professor in the Departments of Romance Languages and in the Program of Native American Studies at University of Michigan. He teaches courses on colonial Latin America, indigenous societies, and popular culture. A revised English version of his book *La invención del Uruguay* (1996) has been published as *Forgotten Conquests* (Temple UP, 2001). He is the co-editor (with Alvaro F. Bolaños) of the collection *Colonialism Past and Present* (SUNY P, 2002). He has also edited an issue of the journal *Dispositio/n* (#52, 2005) dedicated to the assessment of the legacy or the Latin American Subaltern Studies group. His articles have appeared in *Trabajos de Arqueologia del Paisaje, Arqueologia Suramericana*, *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, *Revista de Estudios Hispanicos*, and *Revista Iberoamericana*, among other journals.

ORCID

Gustavo Verdesio http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2644-290X