

FERNANDA PEÑALOZA

The Ethnographic Imagination and the Tehuelches

This paper is an exploration of the construction of an exotic other in the travel writing tradition of Patagonia.¹ Through a study of a travelogue entitled *At Home with the Patagonians* (1871), I would like to draw attention to how, curiously enough, a pre-professional ethnographic narrative has left its imprint in twentieth- and twenty-first-century anthropological studies. To this day, this text written by the English adventurer George Chaworth Musters is considered one of the most authoritative ethnographic documents on the Tehuelche people. Even more striking is that apart from some disagreement over the use of inaccurate ethnic classifications, which have been subsequently revised by contemporary anthropologists, there has been no significant critical assessment of this text.

THE ETHNOGRAPHIC IMAGINATION

The *objective* study of culture, which is central to modern anthropology, was the outgrowth of anthropologists' questioning of their once respected source of information. They came to feel that the travellers who in the nineteenth century functioned as data-bearers of their work were no longer reliable. For Malinowski the Victorian visitors of foreign cultures were 'full of the biased and pre-judged opinions inevitable in the average practical man'.² As a research method, ethnography gained popularity among Victorian anthropologists in the second half of the nineteenth century. However, it was not until the publication of Malinowski's *Argonauts of the Western Pacific* (1922) that the principles of ethnographic studies were formally theorised and formulated. Hence, non-professional data collectors were replaced by a new figure: the ethnographer.

Malinowski's textualisation of the Trobriand culture was a proclamation of ethnography as a method that set new quality standards for anthropology. Intensive fieldwork was the base of Malinowski's foundational methodology. Aided by developments in the concept of culture in the social sciences, ethnography became the anthropological research method *par excellence*, and armed with this codified system of enquiry ethnographers went into the *field* to study natives in their natural habitat. Needless to say, much like the nineteenth-century traveller, the early twentieth-century ethnographer was typically a highly educated Western male who travelled to foreign lands to record his experience. However, such experience was not to be documented according to the observer's own view but to an apparently rigorous method of observation.

Christopher Herbert has pointed out that in spite of Malinowski's attempts to draw a line of antagonism between ethnographic studies and Victorian anxieties, it is possible to trace the roots of the *objective* study of culture in nineteenth-century travel

writing. For instance, the need to speak *to* and *for* different cultures is as much bound up with the Victorian proclivity for exposing the exotic other in its colonial context as it is with the ethnographic practises of gathering information in scientific code. In *Culture and Anomie*, Herbert claims that some of the most characteristic principles of fieldwork can be traced back to nineteenth-century Evangelical ethnography in Polynesia. According to Herbert, this body of texts is so remarkably rigorous that it is no longer possible to accept that the methodical study of non-European societies began with the consolidation of modern ethnography.³ It seems the development of a meticulous method of scientific enquiry aimed at acting against the apparently superficial knowledge of travellers was more consonant with Victorian concern with locating, defining and classifying others than its founding fathers would have hoped.

In pursuit of its scientific ambitions, ethnographic imagination confined travel literature to the status of non-professional anthropology. Paradoxically, as shown by Herbert, such literature enables us to see that the emergence of fieldwork techniques into anthropological discourse belongs to a pre-professional stage of ethnography. Indeed travel writing prefigured not only the methodological framework later codified by modern anthropology, but also the ambiguities and contradictions ethnography later had to deal with. James Clifford claims the ethnographer belongs more to the realm of textuality than the actual method of fieldwork put into practise. In Clifford's own words, 'ethnographic texts are orchestrations of multivocal exchanges occurring in politically charged situations. The subjectivities produced in these often-unequal exchanges—whether of "natives" or of visiting participants-observers—are constructed domains of truth, serious fictions'.⁴ From Clifford's point of view, the authorial positioning in the text is also a representation.

The professionalisation of fieldwork faced a critical contradiction. On the one hand its authority 'is anchored to a large extent in subjective, sensuous experience'; on the other hand, the product of such contact is a text that has 'to conform to the norms of scientific discourse whose authority resides in the absolute effacement of the speaking and experiencing subject'.⁵ It appears that the modern ethnographer 'is someone who seeks "to go native" with at least part of himself on methodological grounds'.⁶ Implicit in such theoretical and methodological difficulties is the discursive space created by ethnography in which culture is somehow a decipherable object of study. What lies behind such assumption is the illusion of capturing a fundamental nature that manages to delude historicity. As George Stocking has claimed, the temporality created by modern anthropology is linked with the process of expunging the colonial context in which the ethnographic work is being undertaken.⁷

Nineteenth-century travel writing and Malinowski's ethnographer seem to have intersected in the illusion of encountering the other in an unaltered state of *savagery*. Modern anthropology turned the lineal temporality of the evolutionary paradigm of ascendant cultural change into an atemporal structure: the ethnographer could capture a single moment outside temporality. Even though the discourses of Victorian anthropology and modern anthropology were organised around these two different conceptions of time, they both suffered equally from the difficulties of understanding culture as a decipherable structure. Although unnamed, the conception of culture as a legible object of knowledge was operant in travel writing and contributed to the rhetoric in which travellers authorise themselves.

THE TEHUELCHES

On 29 January 1834, the Beagle entered the Magellan Straits and anchored in Gregory Bay. Charles Darwin wrote in his diary about his impressions of ‘a large tribe of Patagonian Indians’:

They are half civilized.- they talk a good deal of Spanish and some English. Their appearance is however rather wild.- they are all clothed in large mantles of the Guanaco, & their long hair streams about their faces.- They resemble in the countenance the Indians with Rosas [...] At tea they behaved quite like gentlemen, used a knife & fork & helped themselves with a spoon.⁸

The ‘Patagonian Indians’ Darwin describes as ‘half civilized’ were the Southern Tehuelche or, more appropriately, Aónikénk. This ethnic group inhabited Southern continental Patagonia until the negative effects of sustained relationships with colonists and traders began to show. For the Aónikénk, as with so many indigenous groups of southern Patagonia, their encounter with Europeans proved devastating. A process of progressive reduction in their numbers led to their near extinction in the early 1900s.⁹ Jesuit missionaries were the first to introduce the term Tehuelche in the mid-eighteenth century.¹⁰ The missionaries also devised a form of classification that divided the Tehuelches into two large groups, the Northern and the Southern, according to their geographical location. Explorers like George Musters continued to use this divide in the mid- to late-nineteenth century, until twentieth-century anthropologists revised it and developed new forms of classification. Many anthropologists now agree that the so-called Southern Tehuelche should be called Aónikénk, a name that comes from their language—tsoneca—and is actually closer to their own naming, as it means ‘people of the south.’¹¹

As early as 1520, the Tehuelches entered the Western cultural imagination as gigantic creatures, as a result of Antonio Pigafetta’s account of the Magellan circumnavigation of the globe. Pigafetta’s widely quoted description emphasised the height of the first southern Indians to meet Europeans: ‘One day, without anyone expecting it, we saw a giant [...] He was so tall that the tallest of us only came up to his waist; however he was well built. He had a large face, painted on his cheeks: he had but little hair on his head, and it was painted white’.¹² This myth shaped the imaginative universe of the explorers willing to find such creatures in the South Seas.

Despite the powerful legend, Darwin did not devote many pages to the Tehuelches. In fact, he mentioned them as such in only one page of his journal. It appears that the ‘half civilized’ Tehuelches did not serve Darwin’s purpose of reflecting upon ‘how entire the difference between savage & and civilized man is’ (122). It seems that the *savage* state of the so-called Fuegians impressed him far more than the Spanish- and English-speaking Indians of Gregory Bay and Patagones. Notwithstanding Darwin’s scant attention to the Tehuelches, his observations on the territory then occupied by the ‘Patagonians’ fired the curiosity of a 28-year-old former officer of the English Royal Navy. George Chaworth Musters ‘read with delight Mr. Darwin’s work on South America [...] and had ever since entertained a strong desire to penetrate if possible the little-known interior of the country’.¹³ Between April 17,

1869 and May 26, 1870 Musters satisfied his 'desire' by exploring some 2,750 kilometres from Rio Santa Cruz to the Rio Negro in the company of the Tehuelches.

Extracts of Musters' manuscript recording his experiences in the Tehuelches' camps were originally published in fragments in Buenos Aires in August 1870 in 'The Standard'.¹⁴ One year later, a book with the curious title of *At Home with the Patagonians. A year's wanderings over untrodden ground from the Straits of Magellan to the Rio Negro* was published in London. The title of this travelogue is rather suggestive and makes us wonder: how could the 'untrodden' become a 'home' for an Englishman? What discursive operations are to be found in Musters' narrative that turned the unfamiliar into the familiar? What kind of interpersonal boundaries do his narrative set between him and the Tehuelches to make their home his own? We will now examine the complex and often-contradictory engagement Musters had with his hosts in the steppes of Patagonia.

REVEALING THE MYSTERY

Musters' intentions to satisfy his curiosity to experience life in the Indian camps is outlined right at the beginning of his book: 'the Tehuelches, had been often communicated with, their stature noted, and their friendly disposition commended; but their real manners of life [...] had remained almost as much a mystery as they were in the last century' (xix). Musters claims he is writing to reveal the mystery of a largely mentioned but paradoxically little known ethnic group. In fact, many writers before Musters had described the Tehuelches, but there were very few attempts to devote a single text to their lifestyle. One of Musters' main sources was a book also based on experiential contact with the Tehuelches, but which aimed to deliver a vocabulary and grammar of the language spoken by the Tehuelches. Theophilus Schmid was a missionary of the Patagonian Missionary Society¹⁵ who built up a vocabulary of the Tsoneca¹⁶ language of Southern Patagonians. It is of little surprise that his laborious enterprise was 'undertaken with a view to make known the Saviour's saving gospel on those shores'.¹⁷

In the opening of his first chapter and as a form of warning, Musters explains that 'some readers who desire exact and scientific descriptions of the geography and geology of Patagonia will be disappointed' (1). Thus, any expectation of scientific interest was dismissed by Musters, as his only intention appeared to be to deliver a 'faithful record of life with the Indians' (1). In spite of Musters' *non-scientific* ambitions, the Royal Geographic Society thought his 'faithful record' deserved attention. In December 1870 Musters amused the Society's members with his story and under the title of 'A Year in Patagonia' the Society's Journal published his speech. His book rapidly caught the attention of scientists in England and France, and in 1873 a second edition came out. In the same year a translation was published in Germany, and in 1911 the National University of La Plata in Argentina edited a Spanish translation. As late as the 1940s, Argentine anthropologist Federico Escalada reinvented the reputation of Musters as an ethnographer by describing Musters' work as 'an ethnographic monument'.¹⁸ Indeed, Musters' expressed desire to be submerged in the Tehuelche culture for eleven months, in order to record their way of living, as well as his determination to learn their language are indications that Musters' undertaking was ethnographic.

Furthermore, Musters' experiences with the Tehuelches, occasionally recorded with a joint 'we' and 'us', assert his intention of observing them while interacting with them. His narrative makes clear that he does not wish to be a mere spectator, and it is upon this particular narrative strategy that the ethnographic value of Musters' work hinges. This does not mean, however, that he consciously employed an ethnographic framework or methodology for his observations. Using his intuition as his interpretative principle, he writes about a wide variety of aspects of Tehuelche life, including rituals of initiation, hunting methods, marital relations, family organisation, the chiefs' hierarchy, language and so on.

In order to deliver an account of what he considers 'the actual life in the *todos*'¹⁹ (185) Musters dwells on three main themes: the Tehuelches' intelligence, their honesty and personal cleanliness. Certainly impressed by the intelligence of the chief Orkeke, he extended this favourable feature to the rest of the group when stating, for example, that 'it has always been a matter of surprise to me that the missionaries should have been so unsuccessful in their efforts to teach these children of nature to read and write, for they are naturally very intelligent' (187). He provides another illustration on the same page: 'Hinchel himself, wishing to explain a part of the course of the Rio Negro, drew out a rough chart on the board, showing the bends of the river, which I afterwards found to be perfectly correct'. Significantly, in his chronicle of cohabitation with the Tehuelches, Musters seems determined to highlight the mental capacities and intellectual potentiality of his hosts. In all his descriptions of the great chiefs he meets—three in total—and with whom he travels at different stages in his journey, the word intelligent is present. Thus, in addition to describing the chief Jackechan as the 'most intelligent Indian, speaking Spanish, Pampa, and Tehuelche fluently' (113), he has no reservations about using the same compliment for the chief Casimiro, who was 'quick and intelligent, and a shrewd politician' (47). However, Musters' praise for the Tehuelches' intelligence also reveals his infantilised view of the Indians, a reworking of the noble savage archetype. The trope of the noble savage is central to romantic constructions of the primal nature of human existence and the brotherhood of man, which is also at play here.

As I previously suggested, Musters devotes several paragraphs in different parts of his book to highlighting the honesty of the Indians. He writes, 'in my dealings with them I was always treated with fairness and consideration, and my few belongings—although borrowed at times, according to their mutual way of acting towards one another—were taken the greatest care of' (185–86). In the same paragraph, Musters admits, 'in minor affairs they nearly always lie, and will invent stories for sheer amusement'. However, he quickly adds, 'in anything of importance [...] such as guaranteeing the safety of a person, they were very truthful'. It is interesting to note that Musters highlights the need for such trust to be built up between the newcomer and his hosts for such proof of honesty was only expressed 'as long as faith was kept with them'. For Musters, honesty from the Tehuelche towards him was a demonstration of trust that could only be achieved by the sort of mutual agreement that only time and empathy could build up. In his own words, 'after a time, when they ascertained that I invariably avoided deviating in any way from the truth, they left off lying to me even in minor matters' (186). His interpretation of the Tehuelches' mechanisms for building up trust towards foreigners certainly lacks the methodological framework of the modern ethnographer. However, he distances

himself from what he regards as preconceptions belonging to former travellers in order to discredit them. Consequently, the lack of truthfulness of the Tehuelches becomes somehow a misunderstanding on the behalf of those who did not comprehend how to gain their trust. Unlike his predecessors, Musters wants us to believe he managed to set new personal boundaries that enabled him to build up trust between him and the tribes he visited. The outcome of such experience is a *formula* for successful cohabitation that Musters delivers as advice to potential new travellers:

Never show distrust of the Indians; be as free with your goods and chattels as they are to each other. Don't ever want anything done for you; always catch and saddle your own horse. Don't give yourself airs of superiority, as they do not understand it –unless you can prove yourself better in some distinct way. Always be first, as you are not likely to be encumbered by a wife or gear in crossing rivers, or any other difficulties; they will learn by degrees to respect you; in a word, as you treat them so they will treat you. (188)

Musters organizes his narrative around his determination of delivering a positive, empathetic view of the Tehuelches and such strategy is again put into practise when referring to personal cleanliness. When staying in the settlement of Patagones, the same one Darwin visited in the 1830s, he decides to show his gratitude to the wife and daughter of Jakechan by taking them to a store and asking them to choose an item for him to buy them. Musters shows no surprise when narrating that 'without hesitation, [they] selected two small bottles of scent to put on their hair' (314). This description illustrates Musters' concern for portraying Jakechan's family 'as exceptionally clean in their habits and persons' (314). Musters extends such virtue to the Tehuelches in general when earlier in his book he assures that they

have a good deal of regard for personal cleanliness, and besides the morning ablutions enjoy bathing when encamped near a river, swimming and diving for hours together. They also are scrupulously careful as to the cleanliness of their toldos and utensils, and will, if they can obtain soap, wash up every thing they may be possessed of. (164)

To the Tehuelches' preference for scents and soaps, Musters adds the use of an herb that keeps their teeth white. In an amusing paragraph Musters narrates how Wáki and Cayuke, whom he calls his friends, keep their teeth 'white and clean by chewing "maki" a gum which exudes from the incense bush [...] It has a rather pleasant taste and is a most excellent dentifrice, worthy to rival Odonto or Floriline' (159). It is not just their natural form of dentifrice that rivals Musters' civilized world. Elsewhere in the text he picks up one of his favourite themes: masculine bravery. The highly skilled Tehuelche horsemen provoke in Musters amazement and admiration:

Since my return a hunting friend, hearing the chase described, eagerly inquired, 'But who held your horse?' The well-trained Tehuelche hunters hold themselves, and no boy or man is available to render this service to

anyone unlucky enough to be mounted on an uneducated steed. Our breakers might take a useful lesson from the ‘savages’. (169)

Significantly, the word savages is in inverted commas. Musters’ contact with the Tehuelches documents the ambivalence and contradictions between the concepts of civilization and savagery and his ambition of capturing the way of living of the Tehuelches for posterity. Although he does not use the term ‘half civilized’ as Darwin did when referring to the Tehuelches, such a label enters Musters’ narrative implicitly. His journey starts with the objective of meeting the legendary giants and cohabiting with them so he can see and therefore tell how they are. The highly idealised portrayal of the Tehuelches that Musters delivers tells us more about what was already gone than what it was there. In spite of Musters’ attempts to discredit his predecessors, the space of contact he constructs is one in which the Tehuelches are as absent as they were before. The mystery of the Tehuelches that Musters wants to reveal, a supposed pristine state of savagery, is only a fantasy that Musters re-creates in his expectations of comprehending the mental world of the Tehuelches. The ‘half civilized’ Indians of Darwin have completed their civilization cycle: they speak Spanish and English, use soap, ride horses, fire guns, drink liquor, among other civilized customs. In other words, the presence of the Tehuelches melts into the fictionalised and textualised map of Patagonia.

ANACHRONISMS AND A CULTURAL DILEMMA

‘Interested observers, such as natural scientists, missionaries, and colonists’, says Gillian Beer, ‘offered first-person accounts that were too often granted the special status of objectivity when quoted in anthropological articles’.²⁰ That is precisely the case with Musters’ narrative. Although he apparently distanced himself from the scientific gaze, his travelogue promised precision and accuracy. After all, as I quoted earlier in this paper, he hoped his narrative would be a ‘faithful record of life with the Indians’ (1). Musters’ travelogue is framed by an assemblage of conventionally masculinised tales of heroism and adventure with the illusion of entering the Tehuelches’ *real world*. At the time Musters was writing, the armchair anthropologist strongly criticised by Malinowski and his followers would have read avidly a travelogue like his and consider it of scientific value.

However, what is extraordinary is that the recognition Musters’ travelogue achieved at his time has lasted almost unaltered for over a hundred years. A reading of twentieth-century anthropologists’ work on the Tehuelches is all it takes to realise that strikingly enough, Musters’ narrative remains an ethnographic document of scientific value. Argentine anthropologist Alejandra Pero provides us with a recent example. In her essay on the way the nineteenth-century travellers chronicled the Tehuelche, Pero thoroughly explains the negative effects of Western intervention in the way of living of the Indians:

The travellers of the nineteenth century were among the last to experience life among the Tehuelche as mobile hunters [...] By the late nineteenth century their existence was increasingly precarious. Not only had they been engaged in a process of acculturation that had altered most aspects of their

livelihood, but alcoholism and disease were already devastating their small population.²¹

Although Pero is fully aware of the effects of transcultural contact, and the title of her essay—‘The Tehuelche of Patagonia as Chronicled by Travelers and Explorers in the Nineteenth Century’—does suggest a critical perspective, she seems to recreate a quite impossible scenario: a traditional community acting as if it were unaffected by and unaware of the sharp-eyed gaze of Musters. Supporting her argument about the travellers of the nineteenth century being among the last to see the Tehuelches as hunters, Pero organises her text covering all aspects of their culture by quoting Musters. *At Home with the Patagonians* is the key source of Pero’s essay, as it is in the work of other anthropologists such as Federico Escalada, Mateo Martinic, and Carlos Martínez Sarasola,²² among others. Indeed, Musters is responsible for a substantial part of what now is considered knowledge by anthropologists about the Tehuelches. Validating Musters’ travelogue as an ethnographically accurate text without critically assessing the positioning of its author is privileging the writer’s personal experience over the specific historical location of his ethnographic enterprise. The physical proximity between Musters and the Tehuelches was possible because the power relationship between him and them was balanced in his favour. This power structure is what it makes Musters’ narrative one-sided. It partakes of a tradition of accumulating, documenting and classifying information as objectified description of the many non-European others who were subjected to scrutiny in colonial or neo-colonial settings. Curiously enough, as much as the myth of the giants belongs to the travel tradition of Patagonia, so do the attempts to demythologise such tale.

But also, and perhaps more importantly, what emerges from Musters’ text as well as from recent readings of his work is a reworking of the trope of the *vanishing Indian*. The attempt to retrieve a world perceived as gone bespeaks a sense of loss. Writing about a *vanishing* reality on which Musters had a privileged last gaze before it disappeared suggests nostalgia for a lost past. Persuasively, Renato Rosaldo links nostalgia with the imperialist expression of domination. The concept of ‘imperialist nostalgia’ operates by turning the killer into the mourner: ‘Imperialist nostalgia revolves around a paradox: a person kills somebody, and then mourns the victim’.²³ ‘In more attenuated form’, continues Rosaldo, ‘somebody deliberately alters a form of life, and then regrets that things have not remained as they were prior to the intervention [...] Imperialist nostalgia uses a pose of “innocent yearning” both to capture people’s imagination and to conceal its complicity with often brutal domination’ (70). This discursive investment in the nostalgic obliterates collective and individual responsibility for the aftermaths of colonial encounters. The trope of the *vanishing Indian* is present in Musters’ text, and, to certain extent, in contemporary attempts to reconstruct the world of the Tehuelches as portrayed in the nineteenth century. The illusion of making intelligible for *us* the world of the Tehuelches as an homogeneous totality is a fantasy that still has its implications today.²⁴ Musters’ pre-professional ethnographic experience reflects the theoretical difficulties of attempting to comprehend culture as a self-sustained system which, in turn, is susceptible to corruption by an external force or presence.

A critical reading of a text like Musters' reveals how evasive and oblique is a world that has been imaginarily and nostalgically recovered, and how strong are the myths that created it. Because the consequences of this encounter can only be analysed from Musters' view, the uncritical use twentieth-century anthropologists have made of this nineteenth-century text on the Tehuelches is highly contestable. However the question remains: Would it be better to ignore completely Musters' ventriloquism and confine the elusive world of the Tehuelches to absolute oblivion?

University of Exeter

NOTES

1. Though Musters visited southern Chile as well, I am focusing on Argentina because his experience with the Tehuelches took place in Argentine Patagonia. When Musters was in the area, political borders were still contentious, but an Argentine military presence was in the region to safeguard the National Government's interests.
2. Bronislaw Malinowski, *Argonauts of the Western Pacific* (London: Routledge, 1964), 5.
3. Christopher Herbert, *Culture and Anomie: Ethnographic Imagination in the Nineteenth Century* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991), 155.
4. James Clifford, *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth Century Ethnography, Literature and Art* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1988), 10.
5. Mary Louise Pratt, 'Fieldwork in Common Places', in *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*, ed. James Clifford and George E. Marcus (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986), 29.
6. Dennis Porter, *Hunted Journeys. Desire and Transgression in European Travel Writing* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1991), 249.
7. George W. Stocking, ed., *Observers Observed: Essays on Ethnographic Fieldwork. History of Anthropology, Vol. 1* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1983), 274.
8. Charles Darwin, *Charles Darwin's Beagle Diary*, ed. Richard Darwin Keynes (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 125.
9. The indigenous peoples of Patagonia who survived the wars of extermination, the appropriation of their natural resources, the expulsion from their territories, the contagious diseases, and the forced labour, had to develop complex strategies of resistance. Although the Tehuelches have ceased to exist as a differentiated ethnic group endowed with traditions of its own, the descendants of these native inhabitants of Patagonia, who are now mixed with other indigenous groups and white Argentines, claimed their cultural legacy, based their territorial demands on the recognition of their identity and are still struggling to reconstruct a collective memory which was almost wiped out. For a recent analysis of these communities see Luisa Virginia Pinotti, ed., *Sin Embargo Existimos: Reproducción Biológica y Cultural de la Comunidad Tehuelche* (Buenos Aires: Eudeba, 2001).
10. Apparently the word is a derivative of a compound form from the language spoken by another ethnic group called the Mapuche; *che* meaning people and *Tehuel* meaning south. There are many conflicting interpretations of the ethnic classification of these indigenes. This brief introductory description of the classification of the main native group which Musters joined is a simplified sketch. For a recent anthropological and archaeological study on the subject see Claudia Briones and José Luis Lanata, eds, *Archaeological and Anthropological Perspectives on the Native Peoples of Pampa, Patagonia, and Tierra del Fuego* (Westport: Bergin & Garvey, 2002).
11. Although I am fully aware of the distinction between both terms, I apply the word Tehuelche throughout this paper as it is the most commonly used, even for the indigenous groups such as the Organización de Comunidades Mapuche-Tehuelche (Organization of Mapuche-Tehuelche Communities) who are based in Argentina and claim to be the Tehuelches' successors.

12. Antonio Pigafetta, 'Navigation et Descouvement de la Indie Superieure Faicte par Moy Anthoyne Pigapheta, Vincentin, Chevallier de Rodees' in *The First Voyage Round the World, by Magellan, translated from the Accounts of Pigafetta, and other Contemporary Writers*, ed. and tr. Lord Stanley of Alderley (London: Hakluyt Society, 1874), 50.
13. George Chaworth. Musters, *At Home with the Patagonians. A year's wanderings over untrodden ground from the Straits of Magellan to the Rio Negro* (London: John Murray, 1871), 1.
14. 'The Standard' was a weekly magazine founded by the Irish-Argentine sheep-farming community and circulated widely among the English-speakers of Buenos Aires. For a brief history of 'The Standard' see Andrew Graham-Yooll, *La Colonia Olvidada. Tres siglos de Presencia Británica en la Argentina* (Buenos Aires: Emecé, 2000), 164–67.
15. The Patagonian Missionary Society was founded in 1841 and changed its name to South American Missionary Society in 1868. It still actively supports and funds missionary work in the South American continent from its headquarters in Birmingham.
16. The Anglican missionary Schmid was the first to use the term Tsoneca for the language spoken by the Tehuelches.
17. I am quoting from an Appendix published in English in the '*Actas XVII Congreso Internacional de Americanistas*' (Buenos Aires: Universidad de la Plata, 1910), 20. Robert Lehmann-Nitsche was an anthropologist from the University of La Plata who included the complete work of Schmid in this Congress' publication from which I quote. Curiously, the book that Musters used to study the Tehuelches' language could not be found by Lehman-Nitsche. In the introduction to the Appendix (also written in English), the Argentine scholar explains the trouble he went through in order to publish Schmid's vocabulary: 'After the most diligent search I am obliged to confess that I have not been able to discover a single copy of this publication, and I very much doubt if any reader of mine has ever been fortunate enough to meet with it' (13).
18. Federico Escalada, *El Complejo Tehuelche: Estudios de Etnografía Patagónica* (Buenos Aires: Instituto Superior de Estudios Patagónicos, 1949), 253. The translation is mine.
19. 'Toldos' is the plural for 'toldo', a Spanish word which in Argentina is used as the equivalent for 'Indian tent'.
20. Gillian Beer, *Open Fields: Science in Cultural Encounter* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 79.
21. Alejandra Pero, 'The Tehuelche of Patagonia as Chronicled by Travelers and Explorers in the Nineteenth Century', in *Archaeological and Anthropological Perspectives on the Native Peoples of Pampa, Patagonia, and Tierra del Fuego*, ed. Claudia Briones and José Luis Lanata (Westport: Bergin & Garvey, 2002), 118.
22. See Mateo Martinic, *Los Aónikenk. Historia y Cultura* (Punta Arenas: Ediciones Universidad de Chile), 1995 and Carlos Martínez Sarasola, *Nuestros Paisanos los Indios: Vida, Historia y Destino de las Comunidades Indígenas en la Argentina* (Buenos Aires: Emecé, 1993).
23. Renato Rosaldo, *Culture and Truth: The Remaking of Social Analysis*. (London: Routledge, 1993), 69
24. The persistence of such fantasy comes as a surprise considering the impact of the criticism developed by scholars such as Johannes Fabian, James Clifford, and Renato Rosaldo, among others, who successfully challenged the anthropological canon. See Johannes Fabian, *Time and the Other: How Anthropology makes its object* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1983); James Clifford and George E. Marcus, eds, *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986); Renato Rosaldo, *Culture and Truth: The Remaking of Social Analysis* (London: Routledge, 1993).