

Cultural configurations in indigenous communication. Resistance and autonomy among communicators from Wallmapu¹

Configuraciones culturales en la comunicación indígena. Resistencia y autonomía por comunicadores y comunicadoras de Wallmapu

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32870/cys.v2019i0.7209>

CLAUDIO MALDONADO RIVERA²

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3381-9963>

LUIS CRISTIAN PERALTA³

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6395-0044>

EVANDRO VIEIRA OURIQUES⁴

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1000-8447>

This work contributes to understand the communicative processes that take place in the intercultural and inter-ethnic Chilean-Mapuche conflict. We present an analysis of the results of ten interviews with Mapuche communicators. The discussion focuses on problematizing three topics: identity, technology and communication. The results establish that communication mediated by technology is a field of dispute that contributes to the struggle of the Mapuche people for the reconstruction of Wallmapu.

KEYWORDS: Identity, technologies, communication, intercultural conflict, Mapuche communicators.

El trabajo aporta a la comprensión de los procesos comunicativos que se desarrollan en el marco del conflicto intercultural e interétnico chileno-mapuche, presentando los resultados de un análisis aplicado a diez entrevistas efectuadas a comunicadoras y comunicadores mapuche. La discusión se centra en problematizar los tópicos referidos a identidad, tecnologías y comunicación. Se concluye que la comunicación mediada por tecnologías es asumida como un campo de lucha que tributa a los procesos de reivindicación política e identitaria que actualmente se efectúan para la reconstrucción del Wallmapu.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Identidad, tecnologías, comunicación, conflicto intercultural, comunicadores mapuche.

How to cite:

Maldonado Rivera, C., Peralta, L. C. & Vieira Ouriques, E. (2019). Cultural configurations in indigenous communication. Resistance and autonomy among communicators from Wallmapu. *Comunicación y Sociedad*, e7209. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32870/cys.v2019i0.7209>

¹ Work associated with the following research projects funded by CONICYT: FONDECYT 1190285; PLUS180002; SOC180045. The data presented here is part of the results obtained during the execution of a postdoctoral Project in Cultural Studies entitled *Identity, conflict and communication. Voices from Wallmapu*, carried out in the Advanced Contemporary Culture Programme of the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (2017-2018) under the supervision of Evandro Vieira Ouriques.

² Universidad Católica de Temuco, Chile.
cmaldonado@uct.cl

³ Universidad Austral de Chile, Chile.
cperaltacelis@gmail.com

⁴ Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.
evandro.vieira.ouriques@gmail.com

Submitted: 11/07/18. Accepted: 24/01/19. Published: 03/07/19.

INDIGENOUS COMMUNICATION: NOTES FOR ONGOING REFLECTION

Studies on culture must overcome essentialist readings about identity, denying the cultural dynamics that are experienced in contexts of intercultural relations. Grimson (2011), distancing himself from this foundational narrative of cultural studies, proposes the concept of “cultural configuration”, and thus “emphasises the notion of a framework shared by actors in confrontation, or who are merely different, by complex expressions of social heterogeneity” (p. 172), referring to the fact that in cultural relations, space ceases to be subject to its own limits and stands revealed as “a space of shared symbolic patterns, horizons of possibilities, power inequality and historicity” (p. 28).

Under this perspective, any cultural configuration presents at least four features that enable its realization:

1. It must be understood as a “field of possibilities” for the design or confrontation of “representations, practices and institutions”, as well as enabling them to assume identification logics from which to present their demands and projections in the symbolic spaces in which the groups are generated.
2. A cultural configuration requires an “inter-relational logic between the parties”, whose specificity will account for the degrees of involvement or negotiation and/or conflict between the groups, revealing the existence of “irreducible pluralities” that dispute the meaning and the structuring of social life.
3. There is a need for a “common symbolic fabric”, a code or language which allows comprehension and confrontation between the parties.
4. It requires “shared” cultural aspects, to explain the “sedimentation of the course of history” experienced by cultural heterogeneity in fields where the parties inter-relate (Grimson, 2011, pp. 172-177).

Cultural configurations involve a complex process of construction, negotiation, adaptation and/or innovation of the cultural elements which organize systems of belief, social practices and social organization in

populations in contexts of political, territorial and identity dispute. Let us not forget, returning to Grimson (2000), that “the production of difference is a constitutive factor of any relation of inequality. Thus there is no identity outside power relations” (p. 34). For this reason we stress the fact that any identity construction is positional and strategic in contexts in which the dignity of difference is in dispute (Spivak, 2003).

From this analytic-conceptual framework we conceive the current practices of indigenous communication carried on in contexts of intercultural relations marked by political and identity conflicts. To explain this reading, we will sketch out a few ideas on these communication practices and then go further into how they are interwoven with the notion of cultural configurations.

As we have established in previous works (Maldonado, 2013; Maldonado, Reyes & Del Valle, 2015), indigenous communication is exercised from a mentality which is diametrically opposed to the regulatory discourse of the mercantile political administration that operates in the field of the communications industry. There is a clear contrast with the paradigm of “western communication”, understood from its instrumental execution founded on a techno-determinist and techno-centric narrative in which, moreover, a central role is given to the mercantilization of informational goods (Torrico, 2015).

The work coordinated by Magallanes and Ramos Rodríguez (2016) recognizes that indigenous communication presents some features of specificity which sustain its antagonistic position to “western communication”: contexts of cultural self-representation, visibilization and self-valuation; design of discursive platforms of political and cultural resistance to the webs of meaning imposed by the dominant culture; and furthermore it operates as a field involved in the struggles for decolonization and expressions of self-determination, updating media and digital scenarios in contexts of conflict.

At the same time, Salazar (2002) establishes that the practices of indigenous communication design an autonomous space which is not restricted to the reproduction of dominant cultural codes, and thus produce an alternative semiosis to the representation regimes which for centuries have configured the “other” as otherness. Salazar remarks that we are in the presence of a collective process of self-production

“through which we can mediate historical and cultural ruptures within their own communities, and an alternative means of imposing their presence in the political scenario in which they exist” (2002, p. 66).

The indigenous communicators themselves agree on the value acquired by the right to communication in the framework of their demands, as expounded in the declarations which have emerged from the Communication Summits of Abya Yala.

An extremely important development is that indigenous communication practices are forcing a reconsideration of communication theory and its methodologies, taking up the legacy of the Latin American School of Communication (ELACOM)⁵ to generate a new coordination between communication theory and practice. Indigenous communication is emerging as a central field in the definition of the shape which the theoretical-methodological matrix of Latin American communications studies must adopt (Herrera, Sierra & Del Valle, 2016; Ouriques, 2011).

To summarize, we have found a clear remodelling of communication practices from the indigenous world, shifting from the intracultural space to the intercultural boundary space, the “in betweenness” (Bhabha, 2013), and then advancing to the construction of a political imaginary which defends the existence of “other possible worlds”. In this way they have broken free of the colonial semiosis designed by the monotypical and epistemicidal relation imposed by the hegemonic West on all possible difference (De Sousa Santos, 2010; Said, 2013).

On this basis, we maintain that indigenous communication is constituted today as a “field for interlocution” in which “certain modes of identification are possible” (Grimson, 2011, p. 179); these make clear “the cultural limits at which the participants perceive differences in the regimes of signification” (p. 178). In other words, indigenous communication is the result of a “cultural configuration” which has made possible the emergence of a political-identity narrative that positions certain cultural matrices in contexts of conflict. Although they refer back to identifications that differ from the dominant culture, these matrices

⁵ Acronym in Spanish for “Escuela Latinoamericana de Comunicación”.

also expose the tactical dynamisms required in a global society, where remaining on the margin simply ensures exclusion (Bauman, 2009).

Indigenous communication shows that cultural configuration always results from political and identity tensions, negotiations and projections which cannot be reduced to univocal discourse. Cultural boundaries are possible meeting points for cultural heterogeneity. They do not necessarily subside into a hybridization in which differences are effaced as the result of a post-modern synthesis; quite the reverse, they should highlight differences, the fabrics of meaning which function as interrelation systems from “the local” towards the interior of indigenous communities, but also outwards, dinamizing intracultural, intercultural and transcultural processes.

The voices of otherness are not subsumed in the visualization and focusing regimes that modern-colonial “othering” technologies promote through multidimensional devices (Barriendos, 2011; León, 2012; Ossa, 2017), since they emerge to dispute the imaginaries that have become institucionalized in western-centric nations, promoting the circulation of heteronomous narratives which seek to tension and open out the social semiosis produced around their identities, territories, bodies, epistemes, etc. Yesterday from Huamán Poma to Pascual Coña, today from Chiapas to Cauca, and from CONAIE to the struggles of the Mapuche people in Wallmapu, these communication practices have succeeded in tensioning the semiotic closure which has predominated over their selfness.

ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

Since 2015 we have worked to create contact and intercultural dialogue with various Mapuche communicators in the Araucanía Region of southern Chile, who participate in different digital news media: Radio Werken Kvrvf, Radio Wallon, Radio Aukinko, the newspaper *Azkintuwe*, the *Werken.cl* and the *Mapuchetimes* newspaper. We have also interviewed independent communicators and Mapuche professionals responsible for organising the Wallmapu International Indigenous Cinema Festival (FICWALLMAPU).

The information collection technique used was the in-depth interview, applied to ten Mapuche communicators, both men and women, over 18 years old. The instrument was structured around the following categories: identity, culture, conflict, government policies, communication and technologies. In the first stage, data analysis was carried out using the ATLAS.ti software, in order to identify the central categories which structured the signification systems of their discourse. Subsequently the corpus was analyzed using the Argumental Analysis Model (Bonilla, 2012) in order to identify the arguments present in the discourse of the interviewees. The data obtained were subjected to analysis to link the discourses analysed with theoretical sources taken from the Social Sciences. Thus, the discourse of the communicators is conceived as a social praxis, i.e., a system of reflexiveness and action in which knowledge and practice are combined. It should be noted that this way of proceeding is justified by the need to advance in the establishment of a knowledge dialogue that overcomes the waste of experience generated by “Occidental Thought” (De Sousa Santos, 2010).

The reader must consider that the data socialized here contribute to a second reading of the field of study addressed, which seeks to take a broader and deeper approach to the findings obtained in Maldonado (2018). The focus of that work was a reflection on the “technological appropriation process” (TAP) carried out by Mapuche communicators, a category which opens the way to a series of other dimensions linked to Mapuche techno-communications. The findings showed that TAP was the central axis from which to problematize: a) the logics of identity and territorial self-identification; b) the configuration of hybrid spaces, understanding that digital communication promotes collective forms of action “offline” resulting from a “self-communication praxis” proper to interconnected social movements; c) the impact of these techno-communication processes in the framework of intercultural relations marked by political-territorial conflicts.

In the present article we generate a shift in an attempt to understand technology not as the nucleus from which themes of identity, collective action and interculturality are activated, but as part of a more complex mechanism; we understand that techno-communication is not superimposed on cultural configurations but is intimately incorporated with

them, with technology being intersected by identity-related, political, territorial and communication decisions which operate in conjunction in the framework of Mapuche resistance and autonomy. For this reason we decided in the present article to socialise a deeper reading of three dimensions which, although present in Maldonado (2018), are here analyzed and interpreted in greater depth. The categories treated here are: identity, technology and communication.

The justification for this field of study is divided into three ambits: a) the implications of communications and the technology which supports them for the structuring of the Network Society (Castells, 2009), in which self-communication processes have become platforms for identity resistance in the context of the communicational nature of financialization (Ouriques, 2017); b) the organization processes which allow communication inside current social movements (Zibechi, 2007a); c) the role of media communications in the politicization of the Mapuche movement during the 20th and 21st centuries (Gutiérrez, 2014).

Identity in Mapuche communicators

Culture theorists and analysts have been reconsidering the concept of identity, since it is difficult to establish operational definitions which serve to clarify its complexity. The perspective which is gaining the upper hand in the intellectual debate refers to the impossibility of reducing identity to a monolithic, static, essential phenomenon. Identity is constructed in a continuous process of adjustments and readjustments, responding to psychopolitical mediation between socio-historical subjectivities and grammars.

The epistemological and semantic charge of the concept “identity” has encouraged the search for other theoretical-conceptual categories which help to capture and understand the complexity of identity phenomena. This is why authors like Silva (2013) and Grimson (2011) opted to problematize these phenomena from the category “cultural identifications”, which breaks away from essentialist reports and investigates in detail the identity implications that collectivities generate in contexts of intercultural relations.

In the case of Mapuche communicators, identity definitions are organized along three axes of identification: territory, ethnic affiliation and otherness. We will focus only on the first axis, leaving the other two for future studies.

In terms of identification with territory, the communicators state that they take part of a political, cultural and geographical location which differs from the territorial administration and the imaginary imposed by the Chilean Nation-State. The policy of systematic despoilment exercised since the 19th century by the Nation-State against the Mapuche people (Nahuelpan, 2012) emerges as the central argument in the discourses analysed, positioning territorial adherence as an identification tactic through differentiation, resistance and the projection of autonomy. The communicators live in Mapuche –not Chilean– territory from a logic of territorial, mnemonic and political positioning with a marked stance of insistence on demands, coherent with the project to reconstruct the Mapuche Country that the movement for Mapuche autonomy seeks to materialize in order to recover the sovereignty suspended by colonizing actions (Caniuqueo, Mariman, Millalen & Levil, 2005; Tricot, 2013).

This identification axis is deployed in two interlinked signification systems: the first one in terms of geographical localization and position; the second in terms of subjectivity and political tactics. Some of the statements recorded demonstrate this proposal:

D.M.: I would like to note that we are in territory that was historically Mapuche: Wallmapu. And that is the basis for our view, which is associated with how we settled here, with a projection for the future, bringing together elements of the Mapuche culture; but also understanding the current contexts in which we exist, a context which the Chilean world, since it took over the territory, has transformed (in favour of) the hegemonic, dominant society.

J.C.: I like this idea of Mapuche territory, the idea of Wallmapu; I subscribe to the idea of Wallmapu. In fact, considering how Chile is organized, it is tremendously necessary for the distribution of economic resources to recognize the different local autonomies that exist, not just the autonomy of Wallmapu, not just the Mapuche people.

The statements reported here reflect the value of adherence to a territory as a central matrix of the system of identification and identity differentiation. It is interesting to note that the overlap between place and political subjectivity goes beyond the monotopical design imposed by modernity through its “discontinuity” (Giddens, 2011); as Zibechi (2007b) and Escobar (2005) say, one of the central features of current social movements in Latin America, and particularly the indigenous movement, is the growth of identification with, and demands to recover, territory, as a central component of an agenda which revitalizes the local as a political and identity-related space from which to project models of social organization “from the bottom up”.

The logics of territorial identification associated with identity construction demonstrate the permanence of externalities which cannot be subjected to the hegemony of institutions imposed by modernity (Escobar, 2005). Territory as such emerges as a category associated with the need to subscribe to a place from which to exercise the right to be different, and therefore to communicate from that difference; a locus for proclamation from which to resist colonial actions, and to exercise autonomy as a right to difference and political-territorial sovereignty. In other words, from a mental territory in the process of psychopolitical emancipation (Ouriques, 2009).⁶

Indigenous territoriality, as Escobar (2005) says, incorporates “a community life project” (p. 183), becoming a category alluding to the process of material and symbolic appropriation of space from which to exercise practices of difference, and thus from which it is possible to communicate in/from difference.

⁶ We may further note that “ethnic territory thus possesses a mythical geography by which it is defined and signified, appearing as the sacrificial sphere of a culture” (Bartolomé, 2010, p. 18), associated with cosmogonic or origin myths that “tradition claims for its own” (p. 18). Thus we must understand that issues of belief also intersect, strengthening a reading that positions the cultural component as a dimension coordinated with the political component.

Technological identifications

There can be no doubt that the proliferation of studies in communications devoted to digital culture, cyberdemocracy, net-activism, etc., reflect the central position of digital technologies in the configuration of social life today, showing the structural mutation experienced by hypermodern societies at the material and symbolic level (Cuadra, 2008).

Despite the findings that critical investigation has started to identify in this field, the hegemonic narrative which orbits around technology, founded on an instrumental and neodifusionist rationale, appears to obviate the intersections presented by the latter with the socio-historical contexts of the agents who make particular social use of technologies (Sierra Caballero, 2013). The superposition of the reigning techno-determinist discourse invisibilizes the external factors and technological appropriations which mediate in the construction of the social (Marí, 2011).

On this basis, we have opted for a social focus on technologies, through which mediation is positioned from the point of view of the subjects and their relations with the socio-cultural contexts in which they live, since the reality observed in this study shows us that technologies are “appropriate” cultural elements for the sovereign exercise of “Mapuche technopolitics”.

We use the concept of technopolitics because “it assumes the reappropriation of technological tools and devices to impact the social sphere, creating multiple connections that make possible other types of organization and action to coordinate digital networks and mobilization in urban spaces” (Burgos, 2015, p. 433). The technopolitics refers to human mediations and connections, rather than hardware and software, since the issue here is the capacity for action that social movements can deploy through the appropriation and use of technologies, in order to “connect, group and synchronise, through technological and communications devices and around objectives, the brains and bodies of a large number of subjects in sequences of time, space, emotions, behaviour and languages” (Toret, 2013, p. 20). In these terms, it is not the technologies that determine the action of the subjects, far less ensure per se the development of groupings; it is the senses attributed to communications praxis that configure the relations between subjects, environment and technologies (Zallo, 2011).

It is this premise that justifies the generation of “a shift that leads us from technologies as such to their modes of access, acquisition and use” (Martín-Barbero, 2004, p. 177), and so verify the processes of “resistance, re-semanticization and re-design” (p. 177) which emerge from the agency of multitudes of Mapuche who are connected in the age of digital interaction.

This concept is significantly expressed in the following fragment:

P.C.: I give great value to technology, and I believe that it allowed movements like the Zapatistas in Chiapas and the Landless Workers Movement in Brazil to publicise their position and achieve the impact that they had. ... I do not reject this component of globalization, I could not be anti-globalization, because globalization has many positive aspects ...; technology is being globalized, justice is being globalized, human rights are being globalized ... Technology is not a negative phenomenon, and for indigenous peoples it has been a tremendous communication tool.

As Maldonado (2018) emphasized, it is important to address the technology in the context of Mapuche communication as appropriation. In order to explore this notion more deeply, we extrapolate the category of “appropriation of media products” (Thompson, 2010) to our study, understanding that the technological appropriation which supports Mapuche technopolitics operates in a very similar way to the principles that Thompson recognizes when considering the dynamics of the construction of meanings that audiences attribute to the symbolic materials which circulate in the context of the globalization of communications.

For Thompson, and in agreement with the opinion expressed in the interview cited above, the globalization of communications has not effaced the local dimension of appropriation. From the fragment cited we see that technology is valued as a function of the uses that the various collectives mentioned have developed in support of their particular political struggles, demands and projections. Because, as Thompson himself says, appropriation, as a localized phenomenon, implies that specific subjects, situated in particular contexts, use the resources at their disposal in order to incorporate them into their practices, insofar

as the meanings attributed to them are coherent with the requirements of the context in which this process occurs.

The technological appropriation carried out by Mapuche communicators reflects the new types of manoeuvre available in a time of networks and virtualization. In this sense, technopolitics has become one of the fields of strategic action which social movements assume in the framework of territorial recovery processes, strengthening their projects for autonomy, affirmation of identity and demands for local forms of knowledge. Communication mediated by technology has become a space for the politicization of social movements (Gravante, 2016), as well as situating technology as a cultural enclave in the production of information (Marí, 2011):

J.P.: For me, technology is a possibility. If you are conscious of this and you can use it, that's great. For us, technology has allowed us to palliate the lack of means available to indigenous people; it has allowed us to generate interactions with communicators from other latitudes, to exchange, support and reinforce experiences. But I also understand completely that it reaches other (non-indigenous) places where this reading (our reading) does not exist.

Of course, following the proposals of Martín-Barbero (2004), we must not fall into a fascination with technology based on the "voluntarist certainty that good will finally triumph" (p. 189), because, paraphrasing Winner (2008), specific power models are projected in every technology. Nevertheless, redesigning the use of technology is possible, insofar as agents are conscious that they are entering the territory of the dominators, mutating the cultural potential of technological devices (Candón, 2013; Martín-Barbero, 2004). This is what occurs with the meanings and uses that Mapuche communicators generate in the framework of the technopolitical struggle, a new space for political, identity and territorial resistance and autonomy.

Communication from Mapuche praxis

The discourses of the Mapuche individuals interviewed transcend the instrumental reductionisms which subsume communications in a technocentric approach, shifting to a conception which appeals to communication as a basic right, and through which the regimes of signification imposed by the racializing discourse which many modern institutions (media, justice, education, government) have installed around the “other” as truth-power can be reversed. This is expressed both at the material level, through the concentration of business ownership which rules the media in Chile, and through the uniformity apparent in symbolic production about the Mapuche (Del Valle, 2005).

The possibility of creating autonomous communication through the appropriation and use of digital tecnomediation networks is part of a historical process which started with the publication of the bulletin *El Araucano* in 1926. To date, these communication experiments have functioned as complementary platforms to the political struggle of the Mapuche people (Gutiérrez, 2014), as well as making possible the recovery of traditional communications practices, using new technological codes and formats (Cárcamo & Paillan, 2012).

Thus, the interviewees assume communication as a space for struggle in which the ethnocentric social semiosis produced by the hegemonic-colonial discourse can be tensioned, offering an alternative narrative starting from interdiscursive tension by establishing a relation of opposition with the dominant media discourses:

W.P.: The media in Chile have held a particular view of the Mapuche, (which) has disqualified cultural difference. So the responsibility of making a stand against this constructed image filled you with enthusiasm; and it placed you in a very special disjunctive within the framework that at that time was already called the Mapuche conflict. You have to change this negative image that has been constructed. It's a huge task.

However, Mapuche communication mediated by technologies cannot be reduced to simple cause and effect, in the sense that it does not depend exclusively on the agenda of the traditional media. It installs in the public space forms of knowledge, identity appreciation, definitions

of justice, self-recognition, lexical-semantic repertoires in Mapuzungun (the Mapuche language), etc., which together take part of a system for the psychopolitical validation of the Mapuche people's own epistemic, identity, linguistic, world-view and historical matrices, contributing to the construction of intercultural relations based on recognition, respect and appreciation of difference:

R.C.: We believe that communication is a right; and because it is a right we turn it into a tool to tell the world, and Chilean and Mapuche society, what our claims, our real demands are; and I believe that communication has been a basic tool in that respect. And for us as Mapuche I believe that this was what led us ... to communicate. Although I didn't have much knowledge; the little I had, I learnt during the process and from what I learnt about the everyday lives of our people ...; I was able to document, teach, rescue our culture, our language, our religion, how our ancestors lived, how politics worked in the old days. So I believe that communication has been fundamental, and I believe that I am, in a way, the fruit of all that; because thanks to communication I can recognise myself as Mapuche and participate in this struggle through communication.

Taken as a whole, the discourses expressed by the Mapuche interviewees refer to the need to situate the voices of the subordinates as a source of conflagration, not necessarily to perpetuate a conflict but to dynamize a social semiosis which will help to break down the colonial-racial matrix which underlies the experience of being or not being indigenous in the imaginary instituted by the Chilean nation.

Communication, therefore, is a field in which the voice of the Mapuche emerges under a modality of the desire and the duty of one who has suffered at first hand the shut-in experience of being other. Mapuche communication mediated by technology is, today, a source for re-thinking the tensions, representations of otherness and functional intercultural models which still continue to reproduce the segregation and domination of racial and identity differences:

D.M.: People who have taken up a microphone, or a video or still camera, have played important roles in the visibilization of the conflicts that exist in the territories, the visibilization of the voices and the demands originating

in the territorial or other organizations that are raising issues like the defence of territories, recovery of the land, etc. ... The alternative media have offered this possibility, providing a view from the perspective that the mass media do not provide. The mass media have transformed the national demand of the Mapuche people into a gutter press demand, where the conflict is not portrayed as political but as a judicial or even criminal issue. So this is a fundamental role that these media have played, giving a voice to these people, these groups, who sometimes seem to lack a voice.

CONCLUSIONS

We studied the results of the interpretive analysis of the discourses obtained in interviews with Mapuche people who have helped to generate knowledge in this investigation. We found that communication is assumed as a psychopolitical, ethnopolitical and technopolitical space which responds to “a will to establish own aesthetic and political communications practices”, and at the same time a “political and symbolic desire to interrupt ... the homogenizing narrative of the communications practiced by agents of the Chilean State and big business” (Cárcamo & Paillan, 2012, p. 34).

The Mapuche communicators stress these new forms of social and political use of the media as a:

Political and cultural practice based on a dialogic, community and self-determinative sense proper to the Mapuche; a practice which, in this way, offers resistance to the logics of colonialism and domination which today characterize the space ... of communications in the Gvlumapu” (Cárcamo & Paillan, 2012, p. 345).

The reports of these communicators speak to us also of a new militancy. Stavenhagen says that:

The use of these new media is directly linked to the new militancy of indigenous people, which in turn is based on resistance and the struggle for human rights, autonomy, political participation and strengthening of the cultural identities which have been denied for so long (2016, p. 9).

Thus, the Mapuche communicators can be considered as “agents of cultural production, and therefore of potentially counter-hegemonic knowledge and power” (Álvarez, 2009, p. 29). For Escobar, the very process of ethnic and identity self-affirmation and the maintenance of these practices of difference “become political acts” (1999, p. 27).

Likewise, through the reports of the interviewees we see that the appropriation and re-codification of technologies brings with it the possibility of innovation by the communities, broadening their horizons into “diverse uses and other new uses not proposed initially”. This explains how “the concept of appropriation is transformed into a category in movement, (which) overflows the limits of reproductivity and heteronomy” (Gravante, 2016, p. 109). One possibility for this process, according to the author, and which is relevant to our work, is that through these praxis individuals or collectives can “reflect themselves and others, and on the world to which they belong” (p. 109). In other words, the practices of these Mapuche communicators may be classified as technopolitical action with a definite emancipatory horizon: resistance, self-affirmation and the struggle for the political, cultural and territorial autonomy of the indigenous peoples of Abya Yala.

Finally, the reports analyzed reflect practices of technological appropriation linked to processes of ethno-political and technopolitical resistance, in a scenario in which the emergence of indigenous movements, in both Chile and Latin America, can be seen as a social, political and identity-related fact (Assies & Gundermann, 2011).

Bibliographic references

- Álvarez, S. (2009). Repensando la dimensión política y cultural desde los movimientos sociales: algunas aproximaciones teóricas. In R. Hoetme (Coord.), *Repensar la política desde América Latina. Cultura, Estado y Movimientos Sociales*. (pp. 27-36). Lima: Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos.
- Assies, W. & Gundermann, H. (2011). *Movimientos indígenas y Gobiernos Locales en América Latina*. Santiago: Ocho Libros Editores.
- Barriandos, J. (2011). La colonialidad del ver. Hacia un nuevo diálogo visual interepistémico. *Nómadas*, 35, 13-29. Retrieved from <http://>

- nomadas. ucentral.edu.co/index.php/en/inicio/14-regimenes-de-visualidad-emancipacion-y-otredad-desde-america-latina-nomadas-35/135-la-colonialidad-del-ver-hacia-un-nuevo-dialogo-visual-interepistemico
- Bartolomé, M. (2010). Interculturalidad y territorialidades confrontadas en América Latina. *Runa*, XXXI(1), 9-29. Retrieved from <http://revistascientificas.filo.uba.ar/index.php/runa/article/view/755>
- Bauman, Z. (2009). *La globalización. Consecuencias humanas*. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Bhabha, H. (2013). *El lugar de la cultura*. Buenos Aires: Manantial.
- Bonilla, E. (2012). El grupo de discusión como generador de discurso social en la mercadotecnia en salud. *Universita*, 1, 13-23.
- Burgos, E. (2015). La tecnopolítica la acción colectiva en la sociedad red. *Razón y Palabra*, 89, 427-442. Retrieved from <http://www.revistarazonypalabra.org/index.php/ryp/article/view/260>
- Candón, J. (2013). Movimientos sociales y procesos de innovación, Una mirada crítica de las redes sociales y tecnológicas. In F. Sierra Caballero (Coord.), *Ciudadanía, tecnologías y cultura. Nodos conceptuales para pensar la nueva mediación digital* (pp. 233-256). Barcelona: Gedisa.
- Caniuqueo, S., Mariman, P., Millalen, R. & Levil, R. (2005). *¡Escucha, Winka! Cuatro ensayos de Historia Nacional Mapuche y un epílogo sobre el futuro*. Santiago: LOM.
- Cárcamo, L. & Paillan, E. (2012). Taiñ pu amulzague egvn: Sonidos y voces del Wajmapu en el aire. In Comunidad de Historia Mapuche, *Taiñ fi jke xipa rakizuameluwün: Historia, colonialismo y resistencia desde el país Mapuche* (pp. 341-358). Santiago: Ediciones Comunidad de Historia Mapuche.
- Castells, M. (2009). *Comunicación y poder*. Madrid: Alianza.
- Cuadra, A. (2008). *Hiperindustria cultural*. Santiago: ARCIS.
- De Sousa Santos, B. (2010). *Para descolonizar Occidente. Más allá del pensamiento postbismal*. Buenos Aires: Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales.
- Del Valle, C. (2005). Interculturalidad e intraculturalidad en el discurso de la prensa: cobertura y tratamiento del discurso de las fuentes en el “conflicto indígena mapuche”, desde el discurso político. *Redes*.

- com*, 2, 83-111. Retrieved from <http://revista-redes.hospedagemdesites.ws/index.php/revista-redes/article/view/44>
- Escobar, A. (1999). *El final del Salvaje. Naturaleza, cultura y política en la antropología contemporánea*. Bogotá: Instituto Colombiano de Antropología/Cerec.
- Escobar, A. (2005). *Más allá del tercer mundo. Globalización y diferencia*. Bogotá: ICANH.
- Giddens, A. (2011). *Consecuencias de la modernidad*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial.
- Gravante, T. (2016). *Cuando la gente toma la palabra. Medios digitales y cambio social en la insurgencia de Oaxaca*. Quito: CIESPAL.
- Grimson, A. (2000). *Interculturalidad y comunicación*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Norma.
- Grimson, A. (2011). *Los límites de la cultura. Críticas de la teoría de la identidad*. Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI.
- Gutiérrez, F. (2014). *We aukiñ zugu. Historia de los medios de comunicación mapuche*. Santiago: Quimantú.
- Herrera, E., Sierra, F. & Del Valle, C. (2016). Hacia una Epistemología del Sur. Decolonialidad del saber-poder informativo y nueva Comunicología Latinoamericana. Una lectura crítica de la mediación desde las culturas indígenas. *Chasqui*, 131, 77-105. Retrieved from <https://revistachasqui.org/index.php/chasqui/article/view/2694>
- León, C. (2012). Imagen, medios y telecolonialidad: hacia una crítica decolonial de los estudios visuales. *Aisthesis*, 51, 109-123. Retrieved from <http://revistaaiesthesis.uc.cl/index.php/rait/article/view/274>
- Magallanes, C. & Ramos Rodríguez, J. M. (Coords.). (2016). *Miradas propias. Pueblos indígenas, comunicación y medios en la sociedad global*. Quito: CIESPAL.
- Maldonado, C. (2013). Prácticas comunicativas decoloniales en la red. *Redes.com*, 8, 131-151. Retrieved from <http://revista-redes.hospedagemdesites.ws/index.php/revista-redes/article/viewFile/262/259>
- Maldonado, C. (2018). Apropiación tecnológica por comunicadores mapuche. Reflexiones desde la praxis comunicacional. *Chasqui*, 138, 233-252. Retrieved from <https://revistachasqui.org/index.php/chasqui/article/view/3368>
- Maldonado, C., Reyes, C. & Del Valle, C. (2015). Emergencia Indígena, Comunicación-otra y Buen Vivir: pensar la socio-praxis

- comunicativa de los pueblos indígenas. *Chasqui*, 128, 166-183. Retrieved from <https://revistachasqui.org/index.php/chasqui/article/view/1609>
- Marí, V. (2011). *Comunicar para transformar, transformar para comunicar. Tecnologías de la información desde una perspectiva del cambio social*. Madrid: Popular.
- Martín-Barbero, J. (2004). *Oficio de cartógrafo. Travesías latinoamericanas de la comunicación en la cultura*. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Nahuelpan, H. (2012). Formación colonial del Estado y desposesión en Ngulumapu. In Comunidad de Historia Mapuche, *Ta iñ fjike xipa rakizuameluwün. Historia, colonialismo y resistencia desde el país Mapuche* (pp. 123-160). Temuco: Ediciones Comunidad de Historia Mapuche.
- Ossa, C. (2017). La metamorfosis del príncipe. *Chasqui*, 136, 215-229. Retrieved from <https://revistachasqui.org/index.php/chasqui/article/view/3083/2985>
- Ouriques, E. (2009). Território mental: o nó górdio da democracia. *Revista Democracia Viva*, 42, 76-81.
- Ouriques, E. V. (2011). Epistemologías prehispánicas de América Latina y cambio psicosocial: el caso de los conceptos Derecho a la Comunicación y Desarrollo Mediático. *Revista Folios*, 24, 121-140.
- Ouriques, E. V. (2017). *Teoria Psicopolítica: a emancipação dos Aparelhos Psicopolíticos da Cultura* [Collection Teoría Psicopolítica, Volume I]. Temuco: Universidad de La Frontera, Universidade General do Rio de Janeiro, Universidad de La Plata, Universidades do Porto, Universidad de Groningen.
- Said, E. (2013). *Orientalismo*. Barcelona: Debolsillo.
- Salazar, J. (2002). Activismo indígena en América Latina: estrategias para una construcción cultural de las tecnologías de información y comunicación. *Journal of Iberian and Latin American Research*, 8(2), 61-80. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13260219.2002.10431783>
- Sierra Caballero, F. (2013). Ciudadanía, comunicación y ciberdemocracia. Un enfoque sociocrítico del Capitalismo Cognitivo. In Sierra Caballero, F. (Coord.), *Ciudadanía, tecnologías y cultura. Nodos conceptuales para pensar la nueva mediación digital* (pp. 17-56). Barcelona: Gedisa.

- Silva, V. (2013). *El conflicto de las identidades: comunicación e imágenes de la interculturalidad*. Bellaterra: Institut de la Comunicació.
- Spivak, G. (2003). ¿Puede hablar el subalterno? *Revista Colombiana de Antropología*, 39, 297-364.
- Stavenhagen, R. (2016). Presentación. In C. Magallanes Blanco & J. M. Ramos Rodríguez (Coord.), *Miradas propias. Pueblos indígenas, comunicación y medios en la sociedad global* (pp. 9-10). Quito: CIESPAL.
- Thompson, J. (2010). *Los media y la modernidad. Una teoría de los medios de comunicación*. Barcelona: Paidós.
- Toret, J. (2013). Tecnopolítica: la potencia de las multitudes conectadas: El sistema red 15M, un nuevo paradigma de la política distribuida. *IN3 Working Paper Series*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7238/in3wps.v0i0.1878>
- Torrico, E. (2015). La comunicación “occidental”. *Oficios Terrestres*, 1(32), 3-23. Retrieved from <https://perio.unlp.edu.ar/ojs/index.php/oficiosterrestres/article/view/2381>
- Tricot, L. (2013). *Autonomía. El Movimiento mapuche de Resistencia*. Santiago: CEIBO.
- Winner, L. (2008). *La ballena y el reactor: Una búsqueda de los límites en la era de la alta tecnología*. Mexico: Gedisa.
- Zallo, R. (2011). *Estructuras de la comunicación y la cultura. Políticas para la era digital*. Barcelona: Gedisa.
- Zibechi, R. (2007a). Los movimientos sociales como sujetos de la comunicación. *América Latina en Movimiento*, 426, 16-23. Retrieved from <https://www.alainet.org/es/active/23062>
- Zibechi, R. (2007b). *Autonomías y emancipaciones. América Latina en movimiento*. Lima: Programa Democracia y Transformación Global y UNMSM.