Salvation? Conversion as Part of the Process of Colonization

Hannes Kalisch, *Nengvaanemkeskama Nempayvaam Enlhet*, translated by Nicholas Regan

Almost one hundred years ago, the colonization of Enlhet territory in the Paraguayan Chaco began with three traumatic events: preparations for the Chaco War (1932–1935) beginning in the mid 1920s, sudden mass immigration of Mennonite settlers beginning in 1927, and a smallpox epidemic in 1932–1933 that claimed the lives of more than half of the Enlhet people.

The Mennonite settlers arrived in three groups, each with its own history.[1] I will focus on the second group, the Fernheim colony, founded in 1930. This group, migrating from the Soviet Union, was influenced by ideas of development in the tradition of Johann Cornies and also by their interactions and experiences with native peoples in the Mennonite colonies of what is now Ukraine (Staples, 2000).

When the settlers arrived in the Paraguayan Chaco, they wanted to avoid once again being "overwhelmed by the hatred of the surrounding population" (Derksen, 1988, pp. 107ff).[2] This had been their experience in Stalin's Soviet Union. In response to this concern, they engaged in missionary work among the native inhabitants in the regions they took possession of. The report on the establishment of the first mission station at Ya'alve-Saanga highlights their unease.

> In Russia we lived for a hundred and fifty years without transferring to our Russian employees any of the living hope that dwells within us. For

> this we were filled with infinite guilt before God and man! It must not happen again! (Harder, 1937, p. 1)[3]

The evangelization of people they believed to be pagans also provided settlers with an answer to the question of why God "led our humble Mennonite people to the Gran Chaco, a place forgotten by the world" (Dürksen, 1990, p. 191).[4] That is, it gave meaning to the hardship of immigration (Klassen, 1991, pp. 130f).

In 1935, five years after their arrival, the Fernheim settlers founded the missionary organization Light to the Indians (Licht den Indianern). Its founding statute outlined the following aims:

> (a) To make the living Word known to the Indians and instruct them in Christian doctrine in accordance with Holy Scripture.
>
> (b) To elevate the mental and intellectual condition of the Indians through the education in school of their children and their instruction in morally virtuous and Christian family life.
>
> (c) To educate the Indians in matters of hygiene.
>
> (d) To instruct the Indians in economic and cultural matters; also to sedentarize them and educate them as loyal, useful and hard-working citizens of the Paraguayan state. (Wiens, 1989, pp. 40f)[5]

Although the missionary enterprise was dominated by civilizing and developmentalist ideas, in the eyes of the settlers the work of the mission represented primarily a spiritual enterprise. Conversion, through the Holy Spirit, was the central objective. According to Klassen (1991), it would manifest itself in a "radical break" with native cultural tradition (p. 151) and serve as the basis for all kinds of subsequent change:

> Among the missionaries, the comparison between the before and the now, that is, this radical cultural break, constituted an essential characteristic of the success of their work. . . . Every step away from Indigenous life was considered a step towards Christianity. (pp. 251f)[6]

In other words, every movement away from traditional life was considered an act of God. Observing those changes forty years later, the missionary G. B. Giesbrecht (1977) exclaimed:

> Looking back to 1935 [the year the missionary project was founded] we can say, "The Lord has done great things for us; whereof we are glad" [Psalm 126:3]. (p. 108)[7]

A tension is apparent here. On the one hand, the results of missionary work are understood as the work of God. On the other, this missionary work was motivated by fears and interests that emerged during the process of colonizing Enlhet territory. This raises questions regarding the extent to which the settlers were, and are, conscious of the tension.

The missionaries were certainly aware that the motives inducing the Enlhet to convert might be other than merely spiritual (Klassen, 1991; Wiens, 1989). For example, Dietrich Lepp (1984), a missionary working among the Enlhet for several decades, stated,

> The conversion of the Lengua [Enlhet] meant for them leaving pagan pleasures behind and turning towards the peaceful Mennonites. Was there a true change of mind? They placed their trust perhaps less in God than in the Mennonites. (p. 5)[8]

At the same time, the settlers did not reflect in depth on their own motivations for initiating their missionary work and took for granted that, essentially, "the mission among the Indigenous is a labour of faith and love" (Wiens, 1989, p. 91).[9] In keeping with this, G. B. Giesbrecht, the primary missionary of the first decades, notes that the message transmitted to the Enlhet was: "We want to help you because we love you" (G. B. Giesbrecht, 1977, p. 110).[10] This affirmation contradicts the express conviction that the settlers would have the power to impose themselves upon native society, a conviction stated by G. B. Giesbrecht (1977) himself:

> The Lord set down our churches in the Chaco among a people with this instruction: "to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, to build, and to plant." Jeremiah 1:10. (p. 108)[11]

The belief that Mennonites had divine instructions to destroy a people and their world in order to recreate them according to their own ideas affected all aspects of Enlhet life. This is made clear in the statute of Light to the Indians and the formulation of its stated aim to "sedentarize" the Enlhet within the framework of its missionary project (Klassen, 1991; Wiens, 1989). As described by Klassen (1991, pp. 251f), the instruction to destroy was realized through measures that would distance the people from their traditional way of life (Maangvayaam'ay' in Kalisch, 2021; forthcoming-b). At the same time, the settlers, though conscious that there was tension between the missionary project and the process of colonization (Klassen, 1991, pp. 151f), never seriously questioned the fact that evangelization supported their occupation of Enlhet territory. For example, Klassen (1991) calls the entanglement of missionary work with

the interests of the immigrants a "fateful interdependency between the settlers and the experiment to sedentarize the Indigenous"[12] with which the missionary project was charged in the first decades (p. 355). However, he does not specify that this "experiment" was (and remains) fateful only for the Enlhet. The settlers instrumentalized their missionary work to facilitate their project of colonizing the Enlhet territory (Kalisch & Unruh, 2014, p. 531; 2020, p. 537).

The discussion among the settlers as to where they would sedentarize the Enlhet provides an example. The mission of Ya'alve-Saanga was founded in August 1936 and inaugurated in October 1937 some thirty-five kilometres—one day's journey by cart—from Filadelfia, the centre of Fernheim colony (Wiens, 1989, p. 234). The inauguration was an important event, since the missionaries saw that

> the most likely way of doing so [evangelizing the Enlhet] was by removing them from their permanently nomadic life and settling them in a fixed home. (A. Ratzlaff in Ratzlaff, 2004, p. 107)[13]

At the time, the dominant idea was of a settlement separate from the Mennonite centres. In the first decades, it was natural to attempt sedentarization within the mission station (G. B. Giesbrecht, 1961, p. 1). It was not until the early 1960s that a debate emerged among the settlers of Fernheim about the most suitable distance between the settlers' villages and the Enlhet settlements, and the pros and cons of sedentarization of the native inhabitants in general. By that time, the lives of the settlers had acquired a certain stability and the colonies began to prosper economically. The Enlhet, for their part, could no longer move around their territory in their traditional way, but they were not yet confined to the missions. They lived in the areas surrounding the Mennonite villages, moved freely, and constantly changed their place of residence. At the same time, large groups of Nivaclé, traditionally living farther west, had arrived.

The unmanaged presence of Indigenous groups in the colony produced a feeling of "threat" among the settlers (Klassen, 1991, p. 303).[14] For example, Kroeker (1970) reported widespread fear among the settlers that the Indigenous population might grow too large to control (p. 147), and Klassen (1991) remarks that "after the harvest, and especially in the dry months of winter, unemployment increased rapidly, in such a way that the mass of Indigenous was considered a threat, at the least a latent one" (p. 303).[15] Coincidentally, the "Minutes of Meetings [of the leaders of the three colonies] regarding the settling of the Indigenous within the framework of the three colonies of the Chaco"[16] read,

> Within a few years the Indians could become a real problem for the colonies and for themselves. (Minutes of Meetings, 1961)[17]

As summarized by Klassen (1991), this perceived "threat was to become a strong motive for the sedentarization project" (p. 303).[18] Sedentarization seemed a means

> of preventing an explosion of forces which can only bring negative consequences for the development of the Indian. (G. B. Giesbrecht, 1961, p. 2)[19]

The result was an overall change in the logic of sedentarization. No longer motivated solely by the perceived need to evangelize the Enlhet, Mennonites now sought to contain and control them.

The locations for new Enlhet settlements generated further controversy among the Mennonite settlers. Given the fear of an imbalance of power between the two population groups, it seemed reasonable to locate the so-called Indian settlements[20] some distance from the Mennonite villages (Bartel, 1972, p. 143). However, there were also voices opposed to separate settlements on the periphery of the Mennonite colonies. On the one hand, "there was some concern that the Indians might get the best land" (Loewen, 1964, pp. 57, 65),[21] but, above all, there was strong competition for Indigenous labour among Mennonite farmers (Braun, 1972, p. 141; Redekop, 1980, p. 120). Settlements a long way from Mennonite centres threatened to aggravate the situation:

> The Mennonites also feared they might lose the Indians as workers. It was clear to them that the Indians had made a major contribution to the rapid success of the Mennonite colonies. . . . They were against the idea of the Indians becoming independent because they feared it might disadvantage them. (Loewen, 1964, p. 23)[22]

Thus, in establishing where the settlement of the Enlhet should be, one of the arguments employed was that "the [Mennonite] settlers living around the mission had an advantage over the others" (Hack, 1961, p. 204).[23] In sum,

> not all the Mennonites showed the same enthusiasm for settlement. Many farmers feared that settlement would result in a scarcity of labour. (Hack, 1978, p. 225)

The debate—more focused on the interests of the settlers than on the needs and interests of the Enlhet—ended between 1962 and 1964

with the foundation of several Indigenous settlements on what was at that time the periphery of the colonies. At the same time,

> each colony was anxious to reserve for itself the right to decide on its own Indian settlement and thus secure its own labour force. (Loewen, 1964, p. 35)[24]

* * *

The process of colonization meant enormous changes for the Enlhet. It significantly reduced their space as well as their possibilities for action, protagonism, and self-determination (Kalisch & Unruh, 2018, 2022). While distancing them from their traditional life, it forced the Enlhet to accept the new spaces offered by the settlers in the so-called "missions" (Kalisch & Unruh, 2014, 2020; Kalisch, 2021). This movement to the missions was interpreted by the settlers not as an effect of the process of colonization of the native territory, but as the work of God and the fruit of the missionaries' labour. In parallel, they ignored the tension between the perceived work of God and their own self-interest. Indeed, in the Mennonite colonies of the Chaco, it has become common practice to thank God for the results of one's own actions without having explored the consequences for those affected. It has become legitimate to speak of a love for Indigenous people that in no way translates into respect for their rights. A view has taken root in which the current colonies are the result of God's blessing summarized with the affirmation that "with hard work and 'manna' the wilderness became a garden. God meant it for good" (Stoesz & Stackley, 1999, p. 208; Stoesz & Stackley, 2000, p. 208). In this line of thinking, the native owners of the land would take part in that blessing, as "through the work of the Holy Spirit a living church of Jesus Christ has arisen [among the Enlhet]." (G. Giesbrecht, 2000, p. 9).[25] The marginalization experienced by the Enlhet since being dispossessed of their territory is left out of the picture.[26]

In the following section, I will show in detail that the Mennonite objective to convert the native owners of the region to Christianity obeyed much more than a spiritual logic, despite the fact the settlers continue to present it as such. I will go on to demonstrate that the Enlhet understood conversion primarily as a political act, which redefined their relations with the Mennonite settlers. This argument is based on two collections of Enlhet accounts of the process of colonization of their territory: *Wie schön ist deine Stimme*; *¡Qué hermosa es tu voz!* (How beautiful is your voice), edited by Kalisch and

Unruh (2014, 2020), and *¡No llores!*; *Don't Cry*, edited by Kalisch and Unruh (2018, 2022).

Images Created by the Settlers

The primary missionary among the Enlhet in the first decades, G. B. Giesbrecht, reports that during his first brief encounter with Indigenous people after arriving in the Chaco in early 1932, he wondered, "Where do they find what they need to live?" (G. B. Giesbrecht, 1977, p. 33).[27] Indeed, among the settlers the idea quickly became current that the Enlhet lived in "deep and appalling poverty" (G. B. Giesbrecht, 1956, p. 66).[28]

> When we arrived we were ourselves absolutely destitute, but we were rich in comparison with these brown people. In what did their poverty consist? Their clothing was poor; they barely covered their nakedness with a loincloth. They fed themselves with meagre fruits of the forest, snakes, lizards, and caterpillars. Their homes were miserable grass huts, and they often changed their place of residence. Worse still was their inner poverty: their darkened heart, their faces turned from God, their life in ignorance of salvation through Christ, the constant destruction of unborn life and the killing of many newborns. All this marked the Lengua [Enlhet] people with the stamp of deep and appalling poverty. (G. B. Giesbrecht, 1956, p. 66)[29]

On top of this "appalling poverty," the settlers ignored the violence the Enlhet suffered during foreign occupation of their territory (in particular, the Chaco War and the smallpox epidemic), insisting that the Enlhet "were almost extinct" when the Mennonites arrived (Redekop, 1973, p. 315; see also Kalisch & Unruh, 2014, p. 567; Kalisch & Unruh, 2020, pp. 578f):[30]

> *Missions have enabled tribes to develop autonomy for survival in a modern world culture.* When the Mennonites came, the Lengua Indians [Enlhet] were almost extinct. . . . [They] faced a dark future. But with the economic opportunities provided by the Mennonites in the Chaco, the future of these major groups . . . seems assured. Though the documentation cannot be provided here, it is fairly certain that these Indian tribes would have been subjugated to the more powerful Paraguayan society and become a proletariat. It now seems fairly certain that these Indian tribes will become autonomous societies and eventually Paraguayan citizens with a proud heritage to protect. (Redekop, 1973, pp. 315f)

Convinced that the Enlhet were on the road to extinction, the Mennonite settlers concluded that any interaction with them that did not

accelerate this fatal trajectory would be an act of salvation. Indeed, to this day, the conviction that they saved the Enlhet from extinction remains a central theme of their narrative.[31] For example, G. Giesbrecht (2000) maintains that

> in the Chaco it was the Mennonite immigrants who came to the aid of the Lengua [Enlhet] Indians. Numerically, the Lengua were reduced to a very small group as a consequence of diseases such as smallpox, attacks by other Indigenous groups and lack of water. In these circumstances, the advent of civilization meant a new possibility of life for the Lengua [Enlhet]. (p. 132)[32]

A corollary of the salvation narrative is that the Indigenous peoples of the Chaco, persuaded by the superiority of the Mennonite model, approached them after 1935 in a large-scale voluntary movement towards the Mennonite colonies:[33]

> The tribes of the central Chaco did not retreat fighting in defence of their lands; they came out of the forest curious, to taste bread, salt, and sugar. (Klassen, 1983, pp. 137f; Klassen, 1999, p. 138).[34]

To this day, settler discourse insists on the notion that this process of movement toward the Mennonite colonies was voluntary. It does not take into account that the beginning of this process coincided with the end of the violent Chaco War in 1935. Nor does it consider that successive reductions in native territories and the attendant violence, barely perceptible to the settlers, gradually made it impossible to live according to traditional patterns.[35] Complex pressures obliged Indigenous peoples to face their changed reality proactively and explore new spaces in which to live. As I have indicated, these processes of exploration met with the settlers' salvationist aspirations, which had a decisive influence on the direction they would subsequently take.

It is important to note how quickly the notion of Indigenous "indigence" became accepted among the settlers and coupled with the idea that they required help or even salvation. As early as July 9, 1932, two years after the arrival of the Fernheim group, Gerhard Isaak noted in minutes of the first of the meetings held to discuss a missionary station among the Indigenous of the Paraguayan Chaco,

> We have the right, nay, the obligation, to look around us and reflect that the indigence and misery of others makes us responsible before God.[36] (as cited in G. B. Giesbrecht, 1977, p. 82)

The image of the Enlhet the settlers formed so quickly —and this observation is fundamental—could not have been based on experiences of interaction that were anything more than superficial. It was an image constructed unilaterally, a supposed image of the Enlhet, which actually negated them and their reality.[37]

At the same time, it is important to note that the notion of the "indigence and misery" of the Enlhet which seemed to determine their need to be saved was not limited to the cultural and social spheres. It merged with religious categories. The settlers perceived the Enlhet as enormously different from themselves and, again, before having even taken the time to get to know them, translated this perception in precise terms by labelling them "a people seated in darkness" (G. B. Giesbrecht, 1977, p. 72).[38] They argued that "Satan has them in his claws" (G. B. Giesbrecht, 1939, p. 4),[39] and spoke of "our poor benighted Lenguas [Enlhet]" (Epp, 1939, p. 4).[40] So confused was the notion of "misery" that the settlers never differentiated clearly between religious, cultural, political, and economic actions to "save" the Enlhet. This is clearly reflected in the 1935 statute of the missionary enterprise Light to the Indians.[41]

* * *

The notion of the salvation of the Enlhet is fundamental to the Mennonite narrative for two reasons (Kalisch, 2018a, pp. 176–78; Kalisch, 2022a, pp. 140–41). On a very obvious level, as I have mentioned, the settlers used it to give meaning to the suffering they had themselves experienced under the Stalinist terror and to justify their presence in Enlhet territory, arguing that God had sent them to these lands for no less a purpose than to save its native inhabitants (Klassen, 1991, pp. 130f).

On a less visible level, the significance of the figure of Enlhet salvation is related to dispossession. The flight from the Stalinist terror constituted a crucial part of the narrative of the Mennonites of Fernheim. These experiences led them to understand themselves as dispossessed. A few short years after their escape they settled in the midst of Enlhet territory. The dispossessed Mennonites became the dispossessors. Though the settlers did perceive this paradox, they did not question it. Rather, they legitimized their dispossession of the Enlhet with the argument that, having been dispossessed themselves and finding themselves without a place in the world to live, they had no option but to carry it out.[42] In addition to transferring onto the Enlhet their own prior condition as dispossessed, the Mennonites, as protagonists, gave their dispossession of the Enlhet

a particular conceptual turn. They declared dispossession an act of salvation—from constant hunger, from illness, from death, and, more broadly, from extinction. They synthesized this reading of dispossession in a simple formula: the survival of the Enlhet, they said (speaking in place of the Enlhet themselves), was much more important than the loss of Enlhet independence and sovereignty. Stahl (1993) legitimizes this formula, maintaining that the missionary project

> awoke among the aboriginals of the Chaco a feeling of dependency which in their own cultural terms signified something very natural and positive. (p. 37)

With this line of reasoning, the settlers implicitly proposed the concept of the capitulation of the native people who lived in the lands they took from them and whom they displaced (although the word capitulation does not appear in the settlers' vocabulary). For capitulation is just that: the surrender of independence in exchange for survival. It is to acknowledge that life is so valuable that it is better to live subjugated than to die. Capitulation, the final defeat of the Enlhet, occurred towards the end of the 1950s when, through the symbol of mass baptisms, the people took the collective decision to renounce their own world and commit themselves to the will of the settlers (Kalisch, 2010, 2011, 2021, forthcoming-a; Kalisch & Unruh, 2014, 2018, 2020, 2022; Unruh & Kalisch, 2008). With this defeat, a process that the Mennonite settlers paradoxically refer to as peaceful was completed.[43]

The terms "capitulation" and "defeat" might seem exaggerations in the context of a missionary enterprise. However, for the settlers, the evangelization of the natives was a deliberate strategy to pacify them or, as the settlers would say, to ensure peace. According to Stahl (2009),

> to this day the Mennonites trust above all in evangelization and in neighbourly assistance to harmonize interethnic relations. (p. 255)[44]

The idea that evangelization would reduce conflict with the natives and make coexistence with them safer became explicit after the 1947 deadly attack by a group of Ayoreo (a neighboring Indigenous community to the Enlhet that lived to the north of Fernheim) on a family of settlers in Fernheim (Hein, 1990). As a result of the incident, it was decided to initiate contact with the Ayoreo. A 1948 report by Siemens implies that converting them would remove the danger they represented. Siemens ended his report: "To succeed in the conversion of this savage tribe to Christianity would constitute

a great victory" (p. 4).[45] Here, the settler voice speaks of a great victory which inevitably correlates with a fundamental defeat.

Defeat was followed by the reduction of the Enlhet people to the missions on terms set out by Harder in his 1937 report of the inauguration of the mission station at Ya'alve-Saanga. Specifically, he proposes the settlement of a free people—though one whose lands the settlers are usurping—in a space which, besides being clearly delimited, had also been defined by the settlers:

> The Lengua [Enlhet] Indians, who surround our colony, have become a problem for us. . . . A reservation must be created for the Indians, where they can be settled and taught through the Gospel of Jesus Christ!!! A start has been made. (Harder, 1937, p. 1).[46]

It is natural that the missionaries should see themselves as allies of God, but they also made God their ally.

The Enlhet Perspective

As I have mentioned, terms such as capitulation and defeat—the inevitable steps towards their later reduction—are not commonly employed in relation to the history of the Enlhet. However, the idea that the Enlhet should be subjugated and reduced existed from the very beginning of Mennonite settlement. The settlers referred to this reduction as sedentarization, as in the 1935 statute of Light to the Indians (Wiens, 1989, pp. 40f). It was understood this process would necessarily go hand in hand with educating and changing the native people (Kalisch & Unruh, 2014, 2020; Klassen, 1991; Wiens, 1989).

The Enlhet were aware of the settlers' aim to reduce them. In 1920, a New York financier who had been contacted by Canadian Mennonites wishing to leave their country employed land scout Fred Engen to explore the centre of the Paraguayan Chaco, an area the colonial frontier had not yet reached, for suitable farmland (Friesen, 1997). According to Metyeeyam', Engen announced to the Enlhet that the settlers would occupy the whole region, while the Enlhet would live in a future mission:[47]

> Right at the beginning an *Elle* came, an Englishman. I wasn't there; I didn't see him. But my father told me a lot about him. My father, who was his guide, was Apveske', an important person, a leader. . . . The Englishman, the *Elle*, was the first white man to see this land. Fred Engen was his name—"Meste Engke." It's because of him that the Mennonites and the Paraguayans came. . . .

> After he spoke to the Enlhet, Meste Engke left, but before he went he marked the place where the Mission was going to be. We call it Nevkev'a, Loma Belena. He walked over and put a mark on a big *maaset*, a quebracho tree. The quebracho is still there.
>
> "This is where the Enlhet will live. This will be the Mission," said Meste Engke, the *Nolte*. "The Mennonites will live all over this land. They will multiply and live everywhere. They will own everything. But the Enlhet will all live crammed together here. They will come here from all around." (Metyeeyam' [Jacobo Paredes], 2013, pp. 221–23; 2014, pp. 212–16; 2020, pp. 212–16).

In this account, Metyeeyam' reveals also that subjugation would go hand in hand with the displacement and dispossession described very clearly by witnesses to the process of colonization (for example, Maangvayaam'ay', in Kalisch, 2021; forthcoming-a).[48] In their accounts, these witnesses made reference to the end of a process of resistance[49] and the beginning of another one of renouncing their world and redefining their own position as projected onto the proposals of the new social actors in their territory and the civilizing project they imposed.

Kenteem describes the moment the Enlhet realized that "we have to give up our way of life" (Kenteem, 2014, p. 293; 2020, p. 293) and relates this surrender to the decision to convert:

> We used to have a lot of goats here in *Lhaapangkalvok*, in Filadelfia. Now we have none; all that is gone. We gradually ate all the goats and the sheep and we were left with no animals, although this wasn't just a recent thing. I don't know how many years the Mennonites had been getting angry about our goats and sheep. They said they didn't like our animals going into their fields.
>
> Around that time, we stopped holding *yaanmaan* initiation festivals too; the last one took place outside Filadelfia. That was the time the last of the goats and sheep were slaughtered. It was why the Enlhet, the men with authority, met to speak together. "We have to give up our way of life," said one of them. Soon afterwards they converted. (Kenteem [Enrique Malvine], 2014, p. 293; 2020, p. 293).

To say that the consequence of surrendering their "way of life" was that the Enlhet "converted" is another way of expressing the fact that they had to capitulate to the settlers and submit to their terms. Haatkok'ay' Sevhen adds that, as a consequence of this experience, Enlhet society was obliged to "re-evaluate" its life.

> We eventually reached [at the beginning of the 1950s] the place where the Enlhet lived, Ya'alve-Saanga. The missionary, Yooksee-Pketkok [G. B. Giesbrecht], spoke to us:

> "Stay here. You will be protected, just as the vaetka'hak says, the paper; just as it says in the Good News, the Bible."
>
> My mother and I accepted that.
>
> "*Heey*," yes, alright,' we said.
>
> I didn't want to convert because I didn't realize the evil in me. But Yooksee-Pketkok explained it to me. He said my sin was that I had taken part in the maaneng dance and the alaapenyavaam dance with the other women; that's how he explained it to me. I re-evaluated my life and understood that that was evil and I accepted it. Later I was baptized, there by the old pond. (Haatkok'ay' Sevhen [Lena de Unruh], 2014, pp. 265–266; 2020, p. 266).

Haatkok'ay' Sevhen makes clear that re-evaluation, with baptism as a logical consequence, meant re-assessment of life on the missionaries' terms. Indeed, with this re-evaluation, Enlhet society abandoned its own historical project and relegated its own cultural characteristics to a level that was hidden—and rendered them invisible. The Enlhet began to align themselves with the missionaries' proposals and become gradually more dependent on their actions. This reordering of thought, based on defeat, consolidated the change from self-initiative to dependency on external protagonism. Yamasma'ay' sums up the change by presenting himself as an object of missionary instruction while highlighting his own incapacity for initiative:

> I moved to Belén too; in the end I was baptized. The missionary, Yooksee-Pketkok [G. B. Giesbrecht], and Seepe-Lhama instructed me in the Word of God; they taught me about many things. I didn't know how to pray, but they showed me how to; they instructed me in the Good News too. At that time I didn't understand those things and I didn't know how to apply them on my own. (Yamasma'ay' [Isbrand Dück], 2014, p. 316; 2020, p. 316)

Like the settlers, Enlhet testimonials do not use the terms capitulation and defeat. Nevertheless, they describe their experiences using terms such as renouncement, surrender, and dependence on external actors. In their statements they point to the process of subjugation and reduction in the missions as much more than a geographical issue. This process implies a significant reduction of the Enlhet's *possibilities for initiative* (Kalisch, 2021). Indeed, the symbols through which capitulation manifested itself—and which simultaneously marked the key moments of the process of subjugation—made clearly visible a reorientation towards external initiatives and protagonism (Kalisch & Unruh, 2014, pp. 534ff; 2020, pp. 540ff). Two of the most paradigmatic of these symbols were the conversion and mass baptism, within a few years, of almost all the

Enlhet (Regehr, 1979, p. 274; Wiens, 1989, pp. 96ff). These were accompanied by the desire to settle in the mission (Klassen, 1991, p. 161; Loewen, 1966, p. 38; Regehr, 1979, p. 286), and the sudden acceptance of schools which until that time the Enlhet had explicitly rejected (Kalisch, 2020; Kalisch, forthcoming-b).

* * *

Despite manifesting itself in apparently religious categories such as conversion, capitulation is always a political act and the Enlhet were very conscious of this. They had always shared their territory with societies of invisible beings. When the occupation of their territory began they used their alliance with those beings to defend themselves, through the power of their elders, against the Paraguayan and Mennonite colonizers. They understood that the function of Mennonite proselytizing was to break this alliance, to remove it as a possibility for defence, and, as Maangvayaam'ay' states, "to tame them" through Christianization.[50]

> The Mennonites will have said, "Let's make the Enlhet stop curing their sick through the power of their elders." They were afraid that this power could kill them. One of them said, "I'll work among them as a missionary." One of the Mennonites, who was wiser than the others, proposed a plan: "Let's tame the Enlhet."
>
> That's why at first it seemed they were treating us with respect, suggesting carefully that we stop curing the sick through the power of the elders, that we stop following our own traditions. Instead, they suggested we make use of a greater power. They were referring to the word of God. The Enlhet didn't understand those things. They thought things were as the Mennonites said they were. It was only later that they realized the Mennonites wanted them to give up their own traditions. (Maangvayam'ay' [Ricardo Cangrejo] in Kalisch, 2021, pp. 107–108; forthcoming-b)

As Maangvayam'ay' highlights, the plan to tame the native people worked. In the eyes of the Enlhet, baptism denied the legitimacy of the elders and took away their power for action. The missionaries, for their part, suppressed the elders where they could, set about the deliberate destruction of the symbolic system of the Enlhet, and taught the Enlhet pastors to do the same. Thus, it can be understood how conversion and baptism disarticulated an entire political-spiritual tradition and constituted a central link in the long chain of processes resulting in effective loss of possibilities for Enlhet protagonism. In crucial aspects of their life, it subjected them to the word

and the approval of the missionaries. By substituting the specialists, elders previously guiding native tradition, the Enlhet lost, in a relatively short space of time, the idea of being political actors. Savhongvay' describes how they became consumers of the initiatives of external agents, dependent on their supervision:

> We also learned to plant, plough, and live in the new way. They told us that everything would be much better if we adopted the new way of living, the right way of doing things; that work would be much easier. On the other hand, if we didn't obey the new way of living, we would get ill and become weak. That's what the missionary taught us; he instructed us in everything. We did all kinds of work; we ate, we travelled, we played, and we read the Word of God. That made the missionary happy, and the Mennonite in charge of supervising our work. (Savhongvay' [Abram Klassen], 2014, p. 335; 2020, p. 335)

The process toward this new self-perception coincided with a generalized loss of memory and, thus, of an important tool for working on their frustrations and fears from within their own tradition and also for reactivating and developing historical potential within native society (Kalisch, 2018b, 2022b, forthcoming-a). Therefore, the Enlhet now rely heavily on the idea that good living and tranquillity come from written documents such as the title deeds to community lands kept in a safe or the Bible held in the pastor's hand. However, Maangvayaam'ay' implies that these documents, while defining spaces, do not bestow protagonism:

> Insofar as the present is concerned, it's true that there is food in the garden plot. But the sweet potatoes take a long time to ripen, as do the watermelons and the squash. In order to get food, therefore, we need to work for the Mennonites. In the face of such difficulties, the Enlhet were happy when they received a *vaetka'hak* [document] called *tetolo* [community land title, from the Spanish term *título*]. We recovered our tranquility when we received that document. We live without worrisome news. God gave us a piece of land because we trusted the Mennonite leaders when they proposed that we accept the word of God. There's no doubt that with the word of God, one avoids problems. However, today's youth confront many problems, and I cannot help thinking that they won't live well. (Maangvayaam'ay' [Ricardo Cangrejo] in Kalisch, 2021, p. 112; forthcoming-b).

There can be no doubt that it will be difficult for the Enlhet to free themselves from dependency on the settlers. To this day, all the Enlhet communities founded by settlers as missions following the Mennonite model of internal organization are administrated by a so-called advisor (*asesor*). This advisor is a Mennonite who works as

the representative of the Association of Services for Indigenous-Mennonite Cooperation (Asociación de Servicios de Cooperación Indígena-Menonita), a body financed largely by the colonies. Although mechanisms for consultation with Indigenous leaders have been created, cooperation takes place through practices and forms of reasoning that are not grounded in the day-to-day experience of native society and its historical trajectory. Indeed, the colonizers labour under the belief that they must continue to teach the Indigenous people in order for them to be able to manage their communities appropriately—in terms that are alien to their tradition.[51]

An alternative to reliance on instruction, from without and from above, would be to view native life in terms of its current social practice and to trust in the protagonism of the Enlhet themselves. Having said that, Enlhet society will not easily overcome structures of dependency reinforced over more than half a century, not only in practice but also in their own ways of reasoning (Kalisch, forthcoming-a). However, despite having suffered defeat, the Enlhet do not perceive themselves as victims (Kalisch, 2018b, 2022b). By resisting the temptation to see themselves as victims they remain a community of actors—though they have lost sight of the fact. This condition constitutes one of the potentialities that are indispensable to becoming independent of the proposals of those who have interfered in their historical path and who have taken from them their territory along with many possibilities for protagonism.

The recovery of possibilities for protagonism is not easy. It requires that the Enlhet redefine what they are and what they want to be. At the same time, it requires a more equitable reconstruction of the processes of communication between the Enlhet and the Mennonite settlers. The Enlhet know this very well and invest much in communicating with the settlers. For the Enlhet, equitable communication and interaction are necessary for a dignified life (Kalisch, 2010, 2023). For the settlers holding power in the region and exercising hegemony over it, opening themselves to such communication would mean that they would cease to control native communities. Until a change of consciousness takes place among the Mennonites regarding the way in which they relate with their neighbours—which might be motivated, for example, by their own Mennonite ethics—the Enlhet struggle for greater possibilities for protagonism remains difficult. It is not independent of the Mennonite settlers' attitudes and their predisposition to promote or hinder it. It is impossible to reconstruct balance unilaterally.

Notes

My thanks to my two anonymous reviewers for their comments on this article, to Nicholas Regan for the translation from Spanish into English, and to Richard Ratzlaff for his editing of the manuscript.

1 With around 8,200 members, the Enlhet are the largest group in the Enlhet-Enenlhet linguistic family including the Énxet, Angaité, Snapaná, Guaná and Toba-Enenlhet (Dirección General de Estadística, Encuestas y Censos, 2014, 78; Fabre, 2005; Unruh & Kalisch, 2003). Their traditional territory corresponded approximately to the territory occupied by the Mennonite colonies, beginning in 1927, in the central Paraguayan Chaco. The Mennonite settlers, from Canada and Russia and speakers of a variety of German, arrived in three separate groups and founded the Menno colony (with its centre in Loma Plata), the Fernheim colony (with its centre in Filadelfia), and the Neuland colony (with its centre in Neu-Halbstadt) between 1927 and 1947. They quickly began intensive efforts to convert the Enlhet to their religion and assign them a place within the colonial project.

2 ". . . ohne vom Haß der umliegenden Bevölkerung überrannt zu werden."

3 "In Rußland konnten wir 150 Jahre wohnen, ohne unseren russischen Arbeitern etwas von der in uns wohnenden lebendigen Hoffnung zu dolmetschen, womit wir uns vor Gott u. Menschen unendlich verschuldet haben! Das darf sich nicht wiederholen!"

4 ". . . unser kleines mennonitisches Völkchen ausgerechnet in den weltvergessenen Gran Chaco geführt hat."

5 "(a) Bekanntmachung der Indianer mit dem lebendigen Wort und Unterweisung in der christlichen Lehre nach der Heiligen Schrift. (b) Hebung des geistigen Niveaus der Indianer durch Schulbildung ihrer Kinder und Belehrung über ein sittenreines, christliches Familienleben. (c) Erziehung der Indianer in hygienischer Hinsicht. (d) Heranbildung der Indianer auf wirtschaftlich-kulturellem Gebiet sowie Seßhaftmachung und Erziehung derselben zu treuen, nützlichen und arbeitsamen Bürgern des paraguayischen Staates."

6 ". . . dass bei den Missionaren der Vergleich von einst und jetzt, also der radikale Kulturbruch, ein wesentliches Merkmal für den Erfolg ihrer Arbeit darstellte. . . . Jeder Schritt weg vom indianischen Leben musste als ein Schritt hin zum Christentum gesehen werden."

7 "Rueckblickend auf 1935 sagen wir: 'Der Herr hat Grosses an uns getan, des sind wir froehlich!' [Psalm 126:3]"

8 "Die Bekehrung des Lengua [Enlhet] war eine Abkehr vom heidnischen Vergnuegen, eine Hinkehr zu den friedlichen Mennoniten. War es eine eigentliche Sinnesaenderung? Das Vertrauen galt vielleicht weniger Gott als den Mennoniten."

9 "Die Mission unter den Indianern ist ein Glaubens- und Liebeswerk."

10 "Wir wollen euch helfen, weil wir euch lieben."

11 "Der Herr setzte unsere Chacogemeinden unter ein Volk mit dem Auftrag: 'dass du ausreissen, zerbrechen, verstoeren und verderben sollst und bauen und pflanzen.' Jer. 1, 10."

12 ". . . schicksalhafte Verflechtung der mennonitischen Siedlungsgemeinschaft mit dem Siedlungsexperiment für die Indianer"

[13] "Die beste Möglichkeit, dies zu tun sahen wir darin, sie aus ihrem stetigen Wanderleben zu einem festen Wohnsitz zu führen."

[14] "Bedrohung"

[15] "Nach der Ernte und vor allem in den trockenen Wintermonaten stellte sich rasch Arbeitslosigkeit ein, so dass man die Masse der Indianer, wenigstens unterschwellig, als Bedrohung empfand. "

[16] "Protokoll einer Sitzung [von leitenden Vertretern der Siedlergemeinschaften] in Angelegenheit der Ansiedlung von Indianern im Rahmen der drei Chacokolonien"

[17] "In einigen Jahren könnten die Indianer wirklich ein Problem für die Kolonien und für sich selber werden."

[18] "Diese Bedrohung wurde dann mit ein starkes Motiv für das Siedlungsprojekt."

[19] ". . . einer Kraftexplosion Halt geboten würde, die sich auf jeden Fall nur negativ auf die Entwicklung des Indianers auswirken kann."

[20] "Indianersiedlungen"

[21] ". . . hegte man gewisse Befürchtungen, daß die Indianer vielleicht das beste Land bekommen würden."

[22] "Die Mennoniten befürchten auch, daß sie die Indianer als Arbeiter verlieren könnten. Sie waren sich klar, daß die Indianer einen großen Beitrag zum rapiden Erfolg in den mennonitischen Kolonien geleistet haben. . . . Man war gegen das Unabhängigwerden der Indianer, weil man daraus Nachteile für sich selbst befürchtete."

[23] ". . . die Kolonisten, die in der Umgebung von Missionsposten wohnen, einen Vorsprung vor den anderen" haben.

[24] "Jede Kolonie war darauf bedacht, sich das Alleinbestimmungsrecht über ihre Indianersiedlung, und damit ihren eigenen Arbeiterbedarf zu sichern."

[25] "Durch das Wirken des Heiligen Geistes entstand eine lebendige Gemeinde Jesu Christi."

[26] The first years were not easy for the settlers. For example, the group that came from Canada and founded Colonia Menno suffered a typhus epidemic that claimed many lives (Friesen, 1997). The Neuland group was composed chiefly of widows who had lost their husbands in the Second World War (Regehr, 1972). The immigrants settled in a region of unknown dangers and potential, and had to re-establish their existence on a standard of living they considered to be beneath what was appropriate for them. The descendants of the settlers state frequently that with hard work and external financial aid they slowly achieved a level of some prosperity (Klassen, 2001), to the point where the colonies are today one of the country's most productive regions. What they often and increasingly forget is that, from the very beginning, the project of colonization was aided considerably by the work of the native inhabitants. As Derksen (1988) states, "especially in the early years, the help of the Indigenous people was vital in building the colonies" (p. 98) (Es waren "gerade die Indianer, die in den ersten Jahren entscheidend geholfen haben, die Kolonien aufzubauen"). Similarly, Loewen (1994, pp. 26, 32) notes that the presence of groups of Indigenous people in a particular place was an important factor in deciding whether to establish a Mennonite village there.

It is very natural that the settlers thank God for the prosperity they attained. What is striking is the lack of awareness of the price of that prosperity—paid largely by the native population—at both the social and environmental levels. At the social level, for example, alienation and internal

violence within marginalized groups, the Enlhet among them, are increasing rapidly. At the environmental level, the central Chaco has been entirely deforested, and the settlers' recent interest in soya, with all of the toxic agrochemicals it involves, is very distressing for the non-Mennonite population. No one calls the Chaco an impenetrable region or a wilderness anymore, but for the native inhabitants it is far from being a garden.

27 "Woher nehmen sie das Allernotwendigste zum Leben?"

28 It is worth noting that the assumptions in this quotation, and in the text as a whole, are still current in settler society. Attempts to question them are typically refuted by the claim that the person questioning them lacks knowledge of the context (G. Giesbrecht, 2000; Funk, 2008).

29 "Wir waren bei unserer Ankunft selbst bitterarm, aber doch reich im Vergleich zu diesen Braunen. Worin bestand denn ihre Armut? Sie waren arm an Kleidern, denn nur Lendenschürzen bedeckten ihre Blöße. Sie ernährten sich von dürftigen Buschfrüchten, Schlangen, Eidechsen, Raupen. Ihre Wohnung bestand aus einer elenden Grashütte, und den Wohnort wechselten sie häufig.—Aber schlimmer noch war die innere Armut: ihr verfinstertes Herz, ihr von Gott abgewandtes Angesicht, ihr Leben, das von keiner Erlösung durch Christus wusste, das ständige Vernichten werdenden Lebens und das Töten vieler Neugeborener. Das drückte dem Lenguavolk [den Enlhet] das Gepräge tiefer und schreckenerregender Armut auf."

30 On the question of the extinction of the Enlhet, see also G. Giesbrecht (2000, pp. 150–153), Loewen (1964, p. 3; 1966, p. 31), Redekop (1980, p. 163), Siemens (n.d., p. 5), Stoesz & Stackley (1999, p. 2), Stoesz & Stackley (2000, p.2), Wiens (1989, pp. 32, 114), and others.

31 It is not possible to go into detail here, but salvationist discourse linked to the demonization of the Indigenous world is typical of the various missionary contexts of the Chaco. See, for example, Fritz (1997) on the Nivaclé context and Bartolomé (2000) on the Ayoreo context.

32 "Im Chaco waren es die mennonitischen Einwanderer, die dem Lengua-Indianer [Enlhet] zur Hilfe kamen. Zahlenmäßig waren die Lenguas durch Krankheiten wie Pocken und Überfälle von anderen Indianergruppen und Wassermangel zu einer ganz kleinen Menschengruppe zusammengeschmolzen. In diesem Fall bedeutete das Vorrücken der Zivilisation eine neue Lebensmöglichkeit für die Lenguas."

33 Klassen (1991) writes of "einer großen Sternwanderung der Chacoindianer nach 1935" (pp. 60, 74).

34 "Die Stämme des zentralen Chaco zogen sich nicht kämpfend und verteidigend zurück, sie kamen aus dem Busch, neugierig, um Brot, Salz und Zucker zu schmecken."

35 See, however, note 41.

36 "Wir haben ein Recht, nein die Aufgabe, um uns zu sehen und daran zu denken, dass die Not und das Elend anderer uns verantwortlich macht vor Gott."

37 Profoundly contemptuous views of and attitudes toward Indigenous people were not exclusive to the Mennonites. They were dominant at the time and for a long time afterwards. As late as 1969, Barreto writes of "tribes of an inferior condition which inhabited the region" (p. 37) and of people lacking "creative civilization" (p. 38).

38 ". . . ein Volk, das im Finstern sass."

39 "Satan hält es in seinen Krallen."

40 ". . . unserer armen, umnachteten Lenguas [Enlhet]."

[41] Again, this confusion was not exclusive to the Mennonite mission. In the various missionary contexts of the Chaco, the establishment of proselytizing efforts, on an axis that was both religious and civilizing, was a constant. The work of Ceriani Cernadas (2017) gives an overview of the Argentinian context. Even though the work of evangelization in Argentina and Paraguay was internally heterogeneous, in both the Paraguayan Chaco and in Argentina "the various Catholic and Protestant missions aim[ed] at the moral and corporal reform of the indigenous" (Wright, 2017, p. 15) and sought to push the "Indian to take his place as a citizen" (Ceriani Cernadas & López, 2017, p. 27), undertakings in which schooling plays a central role. As Ceriani Cernadas (2021) points out, moral discourse, schooling, economic enterprise, and medical care—in short, so-called "help" for the Indigenous people—besides encouraging their conversion had the specific function of incorporating them into national society (p. 75).

Despite similarities, the practices of evangelization in the two countries—carried out in Argentina in particular by a considerable number of distinct denominations and organizations—display differences which it is not possible to detail here. However, it is interesting to briefly compare the Mennonite missions in the two contexts which began and developed independently and in different ways. In Paraguay, the mission among the Enlhet beginning in 1935—and later among other Indigenous groups—was carried out by missionaries belonging to the group of Mennonite settlers which occupied the territory of those being evangelized, whereas the mission in Argentina was begun in 1911 by the Mennonite Church of the United States, which in 1943 began its work among the Toba-Qom with missionaries sent from the US (Altman, 2017). It is important to highlight that the groups to which these missionaries belonged respectively had been through totally different historical experiences (it should be remembered that the Mennonites in Paraguay were also internally heterogenous).

At first, like the Mennonite mission in Paraguay, the Argentinian mission revolved paternalistically "around the civilizing ideal" and the "moral redemption" of the natives (Altman, 2017, p. 124), with the objective of "using daily practices more consistent with the evangelical message" (p. 125). However, according to Altman, in the 1950s a new dynamic led to the "dismantling of the colonial structures of the mission and . . . the creation of local churches run by local workers" (p. 127), since "the importance of accepting Toba Christianity and of working as brothers" had started to be recognized (p. 142). In the Paraguayan Chaco, the process of granting independence to the church and handing its administration to the Enlhet themselves did not begin until the 1980s (Wiens, 1989). Today, the Enlhet run their churches for themselves, though under the guidance of missionaries of Light to the Indians (Licht den Indianern). The effects of this accompaniment by missionaries are complex and cannot be dealt with here (Kalisch, forthcoming-a). In any case, it must be pointed out that "decolonization of the mission" (Altman, 2017) limits itself to giving more protagonism to the Christianized Indigenous people—and therefore to the colonized—and does not work on the layers of native history and memory that precede conversion, that is, before the time in which the Indigenous people—for example, the Enlhet—capitulated. Indeed, among the Mennonites of the Paraguayan Chaco, the Enlhet past continues to be described in terms of negativity (Kalisch, 2014, 2020).

Decolonization implies not only that the missionaries must begin work on the colonial structures of their thinking, but also that Indigenous people themselves must do so. One reason why it is difficult for them to begin a process of decolonization that reaches before the time of conversion is that, historically, the Argentine missionaries or Mennonite settlers appeared to become their allies in a situation of severe crisis. This created bonds of loyalty that persist to this day (Kalisch & Unruh, 2018, 2022). The words of native pastor Marcos, of Embarcación (Salta), make the difficulty clear: "The missions were the first to defend Indigenous rights, although they have been criticized for killing aboriginal culture and many other things, but the missionaries helped a lot" (in Ceriani Cernadas, 2021, p. 79). These words contain a note of criticism in the sense that they contrast two opposing elements in the people's past. Among Enlhet pastors there is no such perspective. Typically, they maintain the view that, with the arrival of the Mennonites, their people were saved from a life with no meaning—one which, moreover, was under the power of Satan. These ideas are similar to the discourse of the Mennonite settlers concerning the Enlhet past.

[42] The settlers did not question the fact of dispossession. While conscious of it, they understood their missionary project as a way of compensating for it. For discussion of this, see Kalisch & Unruh (2014, pp. 529ff; 2020, pp. 535ff). Also, in this regard, refer to the minutes of meetings of Filadelfia educators (1933–1935):

> The life of the Indigenous people around our homes, and constant contact with them, gave rise to the idea among some of the brothers in our colony that the moment had arrived to consider compensation for the hunting grounds of which we had robbed them. This would not be in the form of money, as the settlers did not have money. They believed that they should take the gospel to them, the Good News of our Saviour. (Protokollheft für Lehrerkonferenzen, 1933–1935).
>
> (Das Wohnen der Indianer um unsere Hütten u. das beständige Zusammensein mit ihnen führte einige Brüder in der Colonie auf den Gedanken, ob es nicht an der Zeit sei daran zu denken einen Gegenwert für die geraubten Jagdgründe zu geben. Nicht sollte er in Geld bestehen, denn dieses hatten die Ansiedler nicht, sondern, daß man ihnen das Evangelium, die 'Frohe Botschaft' vom Sünderheiland bringen sollte.)

[43] It is a constant theme of the Mennonite narrative that the encounter was peaceful. For further discussion of this, see Kalisch & Unruh (2014, pp. 519ff; 2020, pp. 523ff).

[44] "Für die Harmonisierung der interethnischen Beziehungen vertrauten die Deutschmennoniten bislang wohl am meisten auf die Evangelisation und die Nachbarschaftshilfe."

[45] "Es müsste aber einen ganz großen Sieg bedeuten, diesen wilden Stamm für das Christentum zu gewinnen."

[46] "Die Lengua-Indianer [Enlhet], die unsere Kolonie umgeben, sind für uns ein Problem geworden. . . . Es müsste ein Schutzgebiet für die Indianer eingerichtet werden, wo sie angesiedelt und durch das Evangelium von Jesu beeinflusst werden könnten!!! Der Anfang ist gemacht."

[47] See the video-recorded account by Metyeeyam' in Metyeeyam' et al. (2011).

[48] The process of those decades is well documented by many Enlhet elders, both men and women (Kalisch, 2021; Kalisch & Unruh, 2014, 2018, 2020, 2022; Nengvaanemkeskama Nempayvaam Enlhet, 2021).

[49] There can be no capitulation without resistance. Only by ignoring Enlhet acts of resistance against the colonial enterprise can the settlers claim that, with the establishment of the missions, they saved them. On Enlhet resistance, see Kalisch & Unruh (2014, pp. 220, 225–27, 552; 2020, pp. 220, 225–27, 560).

[50] See video-recorded account by Maangvayaama'ay' (2021).

[51] The affirmation of a supposed need for schooling, enshrined in the 1935 statute of the missionary project Light to the Indians is repeated regularly to this day in ways similar to that expressed by Lepp (1984):

> I ask, "Is there an alternative for the Lengua [Enlhet] to come to experience God?" The answer: "Yes, there is, through the bible schools, with the intercession of all the believers of the Chaco." I ask, "Is there a path to education for the young people?" The answer: "Yes, there is. It is to be found in agricultural school for the boys and domestic training for the girls, with the intercession of the congregations." (p. 5)
>
> (Ich frage: "Gibt es eine Alternative fuer die Lengua [Enlhet], Gott zu erleben?" Antwort: "Ja, es ist der Weg ueber Bibelschulen, getragen von der Fuerbitte aller Glaeubigen im Chaco." Ich frage: "Gibt es einen Weg zur Erziehung der Jugend?" Antwort: "Ja, in der Landwirtschaftsschule fuer die Jungen und in der Haushaltsschule fuer Maedchen mit Fuerbitte der Gemeinden.")

References

Altman, A. (2017). La disolución de Nam Cum en perspectiva: Contextos globales de la misión menonita en el Chaco argentino. In C. Ceriani Cernadas (Ed.), *Los evangelios chaqueños: Misiones y estrategias indígenas en el Siglo XX* (pp. 117–43). Asociacion Civil Rumbo Sur.

Barreto, S. (1969). Por qué no pasaron: Revelaciones diplomáticas y militares. Talleres Gráficos de la Escuela Técnica Salesiana.

Bartel, A. (1972). Wie ich den Weg zu den Indianern fand. In W. Regehr (Ed.), *25 Jahre Kolonie Neuland, Chaco, Paraguay (1947–1972): Eine Gedenkschrift zum fünfundzwanzigjährigen Jubiläum* (pp. 142–145). Schneider.

Bartolomé, M. A. (2000). *El encuentro de la gente y los insensatos: La sedentarización de los cazadores ayoreo en el Paraguay*. CEADUC, Instituto Indigenista Interamericano.

Braun, H. (1972). Vom Indianerholen. In W. Regehr (Ed.), *25 Jahre Kolonie Neuland, Chaco, Paraguay (1947–1972): Eine Gedenkschrift zum fünfundzwanzigjährigen Jubiläum* (pp. 141–142). Schneider.

Ceriani Cernadas, C. (Ed.). (2017). *Los evangelios chaqueños: Misiones y estrategias indígenas en el Siglo XX*. Asociacion Civil Rumbo Sur.

Ceriani Cernadas, C. (2021). Cosmology of development: Humanitarian narratives and missionary work in the Argentine Gran Chaco. In S. Hirsch, P. Canova, & M. Mercedes Biocca (Eds.), *Reimagining the Gran Chaco: Identities, politics, and the environment in South America* (pp. 73–92). Gainesville: University Press of Florida.

Ceriani Cernadas, C., & López, A. (2017). Una antropología comparativa sobre las misionalizaciones chaqueñas. In C. Ceriani Cernadas, (Ed.), *Los evangelios chaqueños: Misiones y estrategias indígenas en el Siglo XX* (pp. 117–143). Asociacion Civil Rumbo Sur.

Derksen, H. (1988). *Vom "Paradies" in die grüne Hölle Paraguays* (2nd ed.). ASCIM.

Dirección General de Estadística, Encuestas y Censos. (2014). *III Censo Nacional de Población y Viviendas para Pueblos Indígenas, Censo 2012: Pueblos indígenas en el Paraguay, resultados finales*.

Dürksen, H. (1990). *Dass du nicht vergessest der Geschichten: Lebenserinnerungen von Heinrich Dürksen*. ASCIM.

Epp, B. (1939). Indianermission. *Mennoblatt*, *10*(6), 4–5.

Fabre, A. (2005). Los pueblos del Gran Chaco y sus lenguas, primera parte: Los enlhet-enenlhet del Chaco Paraguayo. *Suplemento Antropológico*, *40*(1), 503–69.

Friesen, M. W. (1997). *Neue Heimat in der Chacowildnis* (2nd ed). Sociedad Cooperativa Colonizadora Chortitzer Komitee.

Fritz, M. (1997). *"Nos han salvado": Misión: ¿Destrucción o salvación? Comienzo de una misión entre etnocentrismo e inculturación*. Abya-Yala.

Funk, B. (2008). *Wer konnte das bewirken? Die Sesshaftmachung der Indianer im zentralen paraguayischen Chaco und ihre Missionierung*. Druckerei Friesen.

Giesbrecht, G. (2000). *Ich sah der Lengua Hütten: Erfahrungen und Beobachtungen in der Missionsarbeit. Anregungen zu einem besseren Verständnis im Zusammenleben der Indianer und Deutsch-Mennoniten im Chaco von Paraguay*.

Giesbrecht, G. B. (1939). Einen Schreckensabend. *Mennoblatt*, *10*(2), 3–4.

Giesbrecht, G. B. (1956). Die Mission unter den Indianern. In P. Wiens & P. P. Klassen (Eds.), *Jubiläumsschrift zum 25jährigen Bestehen der Kolonie Fernheim, Chaco Paraguay* (pp. 66–68). Echo-Verlag.

Giesbrecht, G. B. (1961). Neue Wege in der Missionsarbeit im Chaco (Schluss). *Mennoblatt*, *32*(16), 1–2.

Giesbrecht, G. B. (1977). *Missionsgeschichte* [Unpublished manuscript]. Colonia Fernheim Archive.

Haatkok'ay' Sevhen. (2014). "Ja gut," sagten wir. In H. Kalisch & E. Unruh (Eds.), *Wie schön ist deine Stimme. Berichte der Enlhet in Paraguay zu ihrer Geschichte* (pp. 265–266). Centro de Artes Visuales/Museo del Barro.

Haatkok'ay' Sevhen. (2020). "Sí, de acuerdo, dijimos." In H. Kalisch & E. Unruh (Eds.), *¡Qué hermosa es tu voz! Relatos de los enlhet sobre la historia de su pueblo* (pp. 256–266). Centro de Artes Visuales/Museo del Barro; Nengvaanemkeskama Nempayvaam Enlhet; Servilibro.

Hack, H. (1961). *Die Kolonisation der Mennoniten im paraguayischen Chaco*. Instituto Real de los Trópicos.

Hack, H. (1978) Indios y menonitas en el Chaco Paraguayo (1). *Suplemento Antropológico*, *13*(1–2), 205–60.

Harder, A. (1937). Einweihung auf Missionsstation Thamokthapopyit. *Mennoblatt*, *8*(10), 1–2.

Hein, D. (1990). *Die Ayoreos—unsere Nachbarn: Anfaenge der Mission im noerdlichen Chaco*.

Kalisch, H. (2010). Nengelaasekhammalhkoo: La "paz enlhet" y su transfiguración reciente. *Suplemento Antropológico*, *45*(1–2), 343–92.

Kalisch, H. (2011). Nengelaasekhammalhkoo: An Enlhet perspective. In W. Dietrich, J. Echavarria Álvarez, G. Esteva, D. Ingruber, & N. Koppensteiner (Eds.), *The Palgrave international handbook of peace studies: A cultural perspective* (pp. 387–414). Palgrave McMillan.

Kalisch, H. (2018a). Observaciones. In H. Kalisch & E. Unruh (Eds.), *¡No llores! La historia enlhet de la guerra del Chaco* (pp.141–193). Centro de Artes

Visuales/Museo del Barro; Nengvaanemkeskama Nempayvaam Enlhet; Servilibro.

Kalisch, H.. (2018b). Los relatos enlhet y el Paraguay. In H. Kalisch & E. Unruh (Eds.), *¡No llores! La historia enlhet de la guerra del Chaco* (pp. 195–282). Centro de Artes Visuales/Museo del Barro; Nengvaanemkeskama Nempayvaam Enlhet; Servilibro.

Kalisch, H. (2020). ¡El papel los enflaquece! La historia de la escuela entre los enlhet. *Acción: Revista paraguaya de reflexión y diálogo*, (402), 28–33.

Kalisch, H. (2021). "They only know the public roads": Enlhet territoriality during the colonization of their territory. In S. Hirsch, P. Canova, & M. Mercedes Biocca (Eds.), *Reimagining the Gran Chaco: Identities, politics, and the environment in South America* (pp. 93–117). University Press of Florida.

Kalisch, H. (2022a). In dialogue with the Enlhet accounts. In H. Kalisch & E. Unruh (Eds*.), Don't cry: The Enlhet history of the Chaco War* (pp. 113–152). McGill-Queens University Press.

Kalisch, H. (2022b). A further reflection: The Enlhet accounts and Paraguay. In H. Kalisch & E. Unruh (Eds*.), Don't cry: The Enlhet history of the Chaco War*. (pp. 153–226). McGill-Queens University Press.

Kalisch, H. (2023). Learning from within: A proposal for a new approach to education in native society. *FIRE: Forum for International Research in Education*, 7(3), 68–86.

Kalisch, H. (forthcoming-a). *¿Quieren acaso volver al pasado? Un viaje por el espinoso paisaje de una sociedad colonizada*. Tren en movimiento.

Kalisch, H. (forthcoming-b). "Me llevaron a sus lugares": La territorialidad de los enlhet durante la colonización de sus tierras. *Suplemento Antropológico*, *57*(1–2).

Kalisch, H., & Unruh, E. (Eds.). (2014). *Wie schön ist deine Stimme: Berichte der Enlhet in Paraguay zu ihrer Geschichte*. Centro de Artes Visuales/Museo del Barro.

Kalisch, H., & Unruh, E. (Eds.). (2018). *¡No llores! La historia enlhet de la guerra del Chaco.* Centro de Artes Visuales/Museo del Barro; Nengvaanemkeskama Nempayvaam Enlhet; Servilibro.

Kalisch, H., & Unruh, E. (Eds.). (2020). *¡Qué hermosa es tu voz! Relatos de los enlhet sobre la historia de su pueblo*. Centro de Artes Visuales/Museo del Barro; Nengvaanemkeskama Nempayvaam Enlhet; Servilibro.

Kalisch, H., & Unruh E. (Eds.). (2022). *Don't cry: The Enlhet history of the Chaco War*. McGill-Queen's University Press.

Kenteem. (2014). Wir müssen unsere Art aufgeben. In H. Kalisch & E. Unruh (Eds.), *Wie schön ist deine Stimme: Berichte der Enlhet in Paraguay zu ihrer Geschichte* (pp. 293–294). Centro de Artes Visuales/Museo del Barro.

Kenteem. (2020). Tenemos que renunciar a nuestra manera de vivir. In H. Kalisch & E. Unruh (Eds.), *¡Qué hermosa es tu voz! Relatos de los enlhet sobre la historia de su pueblo* (pp. 293–294). Centro de Artes Visuales/Museo del Barro; Nengvaanemkeskama Nempayvaam Enlhet; Servilibro.

Klassen, P. P. (1983). *Immer kreisen die Geier: Ein Buch vom Chaco Boreal in Paraguay*. ASCIM.

Klassen, P. P. (1991). *Die Mennoniten in Paraguay: Band 2. Begegnung mit Indianern und Paraguayern*. Mennonitischer Geschichtsverein.

Klassen, P. P. (1999). *Tierra de sol, sangre y sudor: Un libro sobre el Chaco Paraguayo*. ASCIM.

Klassen, P. P. (2001). *Die Mennoniten in Paraguay: Band 1. Reich Gottes und Reich dieser Welt* (2nd ed.). Mennonitischer Geschichtsverein.

Kroeker, P. J. (1970). *Lenguas and Mennonites: A study of cultural change in the Paraguayan Chaco, 1928–1970* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Wichita State University.

Lepp, D. (1984). Hat die Mission den Lengua-Indianern Glueck gebracht? *Mennoblatt*, *55*(11), 4–5.

Loewen, J. A. (1964). *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchung über die Frage der Ansiedlung der Lengua- und Chulupí-Indianer im Chaco von Paraguay*. Mennonite Central Committee.

Loewen, J. A. (1966). From nomadism to sedentary agriculture. *América Indígena*, *26*, 27–42.

Maangvayaam'ay'. (2021). *Sentemeskeskama manso lengko* [Video]. Apkelenyemay'aklha' enlhet [Spoken memory library], 58. Produced by H. Kalisch & L. Unruh. 6:30 mins., Enlhet. Nengvaanemkeskama Nempayvaam Enlhet. https://enlhet.org/memoria_hablada.html

Metyeeyam'. (2013). Who showed him our land? In P. Lambert & A. Nickson (Eds.), *The Paraguay Reader* (pp. 220–223). Duke University Press.

Metyeeyam'. (2014). Wer hat ihm dieses Land gezeigt? In H. Kalisch & E. Unruh (Eds.), *Wie schön ist deine Stimme: Berichte der Enlhet in Paraguay zu ihrer Geschichte* (pp. 212–216). Centro de Artes Visuales/Museo del Barro.

Metyeeyam'. (2020). "¿Quién le mostró estas tierras?" In H. Kalisch & E. Unruh (Eds.), *¡Qué hermosa es tu voz! Relatos de los enlhet sobre la historia de su pueblo* (pp. 212–216). Centro de Artes Visuales/Museo del Barro; Nengvaanemkeskama Nempayvaam Enlhet; Servilibro.

Metyeeyam', Sa'kok-Nay', Seepe-Pta'heem-Pelhkapok & Kenteem (2011). *Éramos nosotros, los que vivieron aquí* [Video]. Produced by H. Kalisch & L. Unruh. 56:04 mins., Enlhet with Spanish subtitles. Nengvaanemkeskama Nempayvaam Enlhet. https://enlhet.org/audiovisual.html

Minutes of Meetings. (1961). Ansiedlung der Lenguas und Chulupíes. *Mennoblatt*, *32*(14), 3.

Nengvaanemkeskama Nempayvaam Enlhet. (2021). *Biblioteca de la memoria hablada*. https://enlhet.org/memoria_hablada.html

Protokollheft für Lehrerkonferenzen. (1933–1935). Colonia Fernheim Archive.

Ratzlaff, G. (2004). *Vater Abram: Von der Ukraine über Sibirien und China nach Paraguay und Kanada*.

Redekop, C. (1973). Mennonite mission in the Paraguayan Chaco. *International Review of Mission*, *62*(247), 302–17.

Redekop, C. (1980). *Strangers become neighbours. Mennonite and Indigenous relations in the Paraguayan Chaco*. Herald Press.

Regehr, W. (Ed.). (1972). *25 Jahre Kolonie Neuland, Chaco, Paraguay (1947–1972): Eine Gedenkschrift zum fünfundzwanzigjährigen Jubiläum*. Schneider.

Regehr, W. (1979). *Die lebensräumliche Situation der Indianer im paraguayischen Chaco: Humangeographisch-ethnologische Studie zu Subsistenzgrundlage und Siedlungsform akkulturierter Chacovölker*. Wepf.

Savhongvay'. (2014). Der Anfang auf Ya'alve-Saanga. In H. Kalisch & E. Unruh (Eds.), *Wie schön ist deine Stimme: Berichte der Enlhet in Paraguay zu ihrer Geschichte* (pp. 334–336). Centro de Artes Visuales/Museo del Barro.

Savhongvay'. (2020). Los comienzos en Ya'alve-Saanga. In H. Kalisch & E. Unruh (Eds.), *¡Qué hermosa es tu voz! Relatos de los enlhet sobre la historia de su pueblo* (pp. 334–336). Centro de Artes Visuales/Museo del Barro; Nengvaanemkeskama Nempayvaam Enlhet; Servilibro.

Siemens, N. (n.d.). *Indianermission im Chaco von Paraguay, 1930–1947* [Unpublished manuscript]. Colonia Fernheim Archive.

Siemens, N. (1948). Im Chamacocogebiet. *Mennoblatt*, *19*(1), 3–4.

Stahl, W. (1993). Antropología de acción entre indígenas chaqueños: Una evaluación. *Suplemento Antropológico*, *28*(1–2), 25–42.

Stahl, W. (2009). Interethnisches Zusammenleben. In *Lexikon der Mennoniten in Paraguay* (pp. 223–26). Verein für Geschichte und Kultur der Mennoniten in Paraguay.

Staples, J. R. (2000). "On civilizing the Nogais": Mennonite-Nogai economic relations, 1825–1860. *The Mennonite Quarterly Review*, *74*(2), 229–56.

Stoesz, E., & Stackley, M. T. (1999). *Garden in the wilderness: Mennonite communities in the Paraguayan Chaco, 1927–1997*. Canadian Mennonite Bible College.

Stoesz, E., & Stackley, M. T. (2000). *El Chaco Paraguayo, tierra de refugio, patria adquirida: Un libro sobre los mennonitas en el Chaco Central Paraguayo, 1927–1997*. Asociación Evangélica Mennonita del Paraguay.

Unruh, E., & Kalisch, H. (2003). Enlhet-Enenlhet: Una familia lingüística chaqueña. *Thule: Rivista italiana di studi americanistici* (14–15), 207–31.

Unruh, E., & Kalisch, H. (2008). Salvación—¿rendición? Los enlhet y la Guerra del Chaco. In N. Richard (Ed.), *Mala guerra: Los indígenas en la Guerra del Chaco (1932–35)* (pp. 99–123). Museo del Barro; ServiLibro; CoLibris.

Wiens, H. J. (1989). "*... Daß die Heiden Miterben seien*"*: Die Geschichte der Indianermission im paraguayischen Chaco*. Konferenz der Mennoniten Brüdergemeinden in Paraguay.

Wright, P. (2017). De las misiones a las mediaciones culturales. In C. Ceriani Cernadas (Ed.). *Los evangelios chaqueños: Misiones y estrategias indígenas en el Siglo XX*. (pp. 13–17). Asociacion Civil Rumbo Sur.

Yamasma'ay'. (2014). Bevor die Mission kam. In H. Kalisch & E. Unruh (Eds.), *Wie schön ist deine Stimme: Berichte der Enlhet in Paraguay zu ihrer Geschichte* (pp. 313–316). Centro de Artes Visuales/Museo del Barro.

Yamasma'ay'. (2020). Antes de que llegara la misión. In H. Kalisch & E. Unruh (Eds.), *¡Qué hermosa es tu voz! Relatos de los enlhet sobre la historia de su pueblo* (pp. 313–316). Centro de Artes Visuales/Museo del Barro; Nengvaanemkeskama Nempayvaam Enlhet; Servilibro.