University of Tartu

Department of Semiotics

Verónica Cuello Blanco

(DE)COLONIZING NARRATIVES IN ETHNOGRAPHIC FILM: FROM DISCOURSE TO REPRESENTATION

Master's Thesis

Supervisor: Prof. Peeter Torop

Tartu

2022

Table of contents

Introduction

Over the past decades, different indigenous groups in Latin America have been engaging in resistance movements against a so-called "cultural hegemony" by appropriating visual media as a way of self-representation to express their own values, and views, to make visible their cultural identities through their own voice[1]. Freya Schiwy (2016), who has worked alongside these movements, links the problematic to a struggle that began in the late 1960s in the region to creating an 'own filmic narrative': audiovisual texts that could locate these groups politically, denouncing the multiple injustices the have suffered since colonization. To do so, they have developed own ways of (self)representation, trying to escape from traditional western narratives that have described them. With the appropriation of the filmic media in the 1980s, the local communities have carried out projects to fight these imaginaries, whose representation has been usually stereotyped and exoticized.

Annotations, descriptions and ethnographic texts produced within the anthropological field have highly contributed to build these stereotypes. This has raised questions towards how indigenous communities have been represented and from whose point of view, or from which *locus of enunciation*. Although the anthropological research has focused overtime on developing mechanisms to achieve the most objective, truthful and ethic approach to describe cultures, the discomfort within the communities about the way they have been, and are still being portrayed, is latent. This is true not only for written ethnographic texts, but for ethnographic films and audiovisual texts, as Pablo Mora, Colombian anthropologist and filmmaker highlights:

> From the early etchings of the Spanish conquest in the 15th century to the electronic images that circulate today in video installations to portray the American Indian, artists have contributed to expose them in very different ways governed by cultural conventions, linked to historical hierarchies about the value of forms or their stereotyped modes of representation[2] .

---

[1] Ballesteros Caro, Nancy 2018. Review: Miradas Propias. Pueblos Indígenas, Comunicación Medios en la Sociedad Global. *Anuario Electrónico de Estudios en Comunicación Social "Disertaciones"* 11 (2). Retrieved from: https://revistas.urosario.edu.co/xml/5115/511555883010/html/index.html , 23.09.2021.

[2] Mentioned in the call for papers for the 16th volume of the *Journal of Music, Visual and Performing Arts*. Universidad Javeriana, Bogotá-Colombia. A*rte, Visualidad e Indigenidad en Clave Insumisa.*

At the emergence of the post-colonial studies, and with the appearance of the concept of 'colonial discourse', the problem of representation has been deeply discussed. The notions of civilization and development have enhanced imaginaries that locate indigenous communities as a colonized Other, usually related with the tropes of *savage*, *cannibal*, or *uncivilized*, among many others, as an outcome of colonization and the 'project of modernity'[3]. Despite this discussion, and the awareness that came with it, the problem of representation of indigenous communities tied to these tropes have been far to being resolved. In fact, and as Schiwy affirms,

> [for the] indigenous movements, Latin America is not post-colonial, despite most of the countries in the continent gaining independence early in the 19th century. The legacies and transformations of colonialism have exacerbated the colonization of the mind through the increased pressure to assimilate byways of migration, the promises of development, and the spread of literacy programs. (Schiwy 2003: 117)

My aim with this research is to study how the dominant discourses that have unfolded the construction of the anthropological Other, have been structured upon these specific tropes, and further reinforced with the consolidation of what I will refer as a narrative matrix, used to represent indigenous communities in ethnographic film. Later, I will address how this has been controverted with the emergence of indigenous video. *From discourse to representation*, as the title of this research signals, refers to how different discourses have set specific ways of representation in the audiovisual image, triggering a semiosis of (de)colonizing narratives to represent, and later, resignify and redignify the Other. Audiovisual media has been a powerful tool, not only to promote the stereotypes towards indigenous communities, but also as a mechanism of resistance to develop dynamics of self-representation rooted in the political image, worth to be analyzed under the framework of colonial discourse. The appropriation of new technologies by these groups has allowed them to elaborate their views upon audiovisual narrative forms configuring "their citizen narratives as a political force [expressing] how these narratives are discourses in which identity construction is evident"[4]. This exercise, nevertheless, compromises multiple aspects that will be discussed throughout all the chapters of this thesis. One of these, is the transversal role of the conceptions of time and

---

[3] 'Project of modernity', Habermas concept, explained by Castro-Gómez (2000: 88), looks forward to showing the genesis of two social phenomenon tightly related: the formation of the national states and the consolidation of colonialism.

[4] Ballesteros Caro, Nancy 2018. Review: Miradas Propias. Pueblos Indígenas, Comunicación Medios en la Sociedad Global. *Anuario Electrónico de Estudios en Comunicación Social "Disertaciones"* 11 (2). Retrieved from: https://revistas.urosario.edu.co/xml/5115/511555883010/html/index.html , 23.09.2021.

space, since they have framed and shaped the outcomes of ethnographic films, and later, of indigenous videos. The notions of both, time and space, are not exempt of multiple processes of semiosis that are relevant to understand how and why the Other has been built upon specific tropes and how, with decolonial theory, and by the appropriation of the new technologies, it has been possible to resignify them. The culmination of the study of colonial discourse will be the analysis of specific fragments of the videos produced by the Arhuaco filmmaker Amado Villafaña: *Nabusímake, Memorias de una Independencia* (2010), Resistencia *en la Línea Negra* (2011), and *Sey Arimaku o la Otra Oscuridad* (2012). In these videos, Villafaña reviews excerpts of ethnographic films, providing interesting material to study how semiosis takes place between both types of visual formats. His videos also provide a frame to analyze how the political dimension of the image has allowed indigenous communities to consolidate resistant movements towards ongoing dynamics of colonization.

To dwell in the analysis of these films and videos it is necessary, in the first place, to provide an overview of other aspects I have mentioned before. In chapter one, *Colonial and post-colonial discourse*, I will address the epistemological aspects on the construction of the anthropological Other in colonial discourse, and its critic by decolonial theory. As mentioned, the concepts of time and space have been elemental to frame the epistemological perspective that anthropology and, therefore, different kind of ethnographic production, as films, has used as starting point to define the Other. Here, time as constituting of anthropology, as the importance of the spatial positioning of the *locus of enunciation*, particularly addressed by the decolonial theory, become relevant for further analysis of the films and videos through a decolonial lens. Further, I will deepen in how these problems are reflected in the anthropological field through ethnography. In chapter two, *(De)colonizing Narratives*, I will briefly define how the epistemologies set by the (de)colonial discourse unfolds a semiosis into a narrative matrix that, throughout particular tropes, have framed the representation and experience of indigenous communities. This narrative matrix has relied in specific figures to reinforce colonial discourse upon the construction of the Other, being reviewed now by decolonial theory. In chapter three, *To representation: ethnographic film and indigenous video,* I will address how colonial discourse has been tied to ethnography, as a narrative matrix to define the Other. For the purpose of my research, it is quite relevant to review this aspect because it provides an overview on how the visual modes of ethnographic film, as indigenous videos, will be further analyzed in my case study giving a ground in my focus of analysis in representation: the political image. Finally, in chapter four, *Method of analysis*, I will present

a model to study colonial semiosis in audiovisual images, which will be used to carry out the analysis of Villafaña's videos in chapter five.

1. From discourse: epistemological aspects in the construction of Self and Oher

In this chapter, I will address the epistemological aspects that have provided the framework for the construction of the anthropological Other in colonial discourse. The concept, which appeared with the emergence of post-colonial studies and the postcolonial turn, has been highly debated for the implications it had over the description of colonized peoples and territories. Nevertheless, as a reproduction of colonial discourse, post-colonial discourse became also a subject of criticism under the premise that, despite the consolidation of national states that gave emergence to this period, the reinforcement of the imaginary of the Other was kept in essence. As we will see, the notions of time and space have been transversal and subtantial for production of knowledge in the social sciences, especially in anthropology. Therefore, I will parallelly address how these have shaped within the epistemological view applied to describe indigenous cultures. This review is relevant to understand, in the following chapter, how it has been manifested in the ethnography, and particularly, as I will address in chapter three, in ethnographic film and indigenous video as means, either to reproduce or fight dynamics of (self)representation of Self and Other. I will begin providing a brief overview of the main aspects that shaped the constitution of social sciences before to the emergence of the colonial discourse.

Prior to the 18th century, exoticism ruled as a primary aspect to project the image of indigenous communities as part of the imperialistic and colonial agenda. The anthropological field was not exempted from academic rules that, though ethnography, promoted these imaginaries, despite being conceived as an objective discipline. Consequent with Althusser's analysis of domination, anthropology has shown to been co-opted by discursive practices and theories of ideological apparatus. As part of the academia, on many occasions, anthropology became part of "the myth-making processes where factories called universities [use to] shape scientific explanations and descriptions in terms of dominant scientific 'paradigms'" (Tomaselli 1996: 94). Academia, then, has been suitable to construct and shape specific notions and representations carried out by historical paradigms – such as the one established by the Modernity, at the light of the scientific discourse. During the era of industrial positivism, the scientific discourse became dominant over "non-scientific discourses and their ways of organising production practices, social understandings and interpretations of 'reality'" (*Ibid*: 47). These interpretations of reality would rely on typologies and categorizations to position the production of western knowledge. As such, the ethnographic descriptions of colonized

cultures were also subjected to categorizations quite related to those employed by the natural sciences in order to establish the construction of the western Self. In other terms the "European discursive practices [were structured] in search of some cultural motives that will function as mediations against the colonized world" (Gómez 2015 :85). These motives were constructed as part of a conceptual apparatus of the XVII and XVIII social sciences that identified itself with a colonial imaginary of ideological character (Castro-Gómez (2000: 93). Authors such as Keyan Tomaselli (1996), Johaness Fabian (1983) and Santiago Castro-Gómez (2000), among many others, agree in the fact that these motives were built upon a series of concepts as evolution, development or civilization, and further on, in sets of binarisms as barbarism/civilization, myth/science or tradition/modernity, to mention a few. This was aligned with the project of modernization and was key to construct analytical models within the social sciences, which helped to build the anthropological Other as a result of an evolutionary perspective of Time. As Fabian highlights, this discourse was not only naturalized but thoroughly spatialized, constructing "relations with its Other by means of temporal devices [that] implied [the] affirmation of difference as *distance*". (Fabian 1983: 16) This exemplified a relation of domination and power that was subjected to, and constructed as the object of study, of anthropology: the Other. This, by using devices as ethnography, making anthropological knowledge political in nature (Fabian 1983:28). The emergence of these concepts, as Fabian highlights, corresponded to an epistemological dimension, reflected in a discourse that, by recurring to terms as primitive, savage, tribal or even Third World, "does not think, or observe, or critically study, the "primitive"; it thinks, observes, studies *in terms* of the primitive. *Primitive* being essentially a temporal concept, is a category, not an object, of Western thought" (1983:18).

With the publication of Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1977), the constant application of these tropes was acknowledged and discussed as part of what in post-colonial studies, the main paradigm of the 1980s to study the social and economic dynamics of formerly colonized countries that claimed independence upon that period, would be defined as the colonial discourse. In the following subchapters, I will define the core of the colonial discourse and the problems it faced being analyzed under the framework of post-colonial studies, which couldn't escape the Eurocentric bias. The construction of the Other upon a mechanism of distancing, but now under different terms, was still present. I'll begin reviewing the epistemological aspects that have shaped the construction of Self and Other, to trace how ethnographical knowledge has been produced within a same epistemology.

1.1 Colonial and post-colonial discourse

Despite the academic attempt to acknowledge and avoid the former tropes used to describe the Other, the sets of binarisms that constructed it couldn't help to be reproduced within colonial dynamics. This is consequent with the feeling of indigenous communities, raised at the introduction of this thesis, that claims that, despite post-colonialism, colonial dynamics are still latent.

Colonial discourse was a concept first used by Peter Hulme's to describe actions and discursive objects related to and produced in colonial situations. As Walter Mignolo points out, the concept became relevant to unify an interdisciplinary field among history, anthropology, and even literature scholars, that found the notion of "discourse" more appealing than "facts" or "information (1992:124). Despite the interest to clearing up how colonized communities had been studied, or represented during the colonial period, with the emergence of the postcolonial turn, the post-colonial discourse also fell under criticism considered to be produced under the same Eurocentric *locus of enunciation*. Said (1977) would recognize, that different types of genres or enunciates could constitute the same discursive formations, and this seemed to be the case of both, colonial and post-colonial discourse. It was considered that there was still an attempt of "fixating its object and constructing a group of topics and stereotypes towards the Other, which would end up being a discursive and conceptual straitjacket" (Gómez 2015:80). Patricia Seed would also affirm that ethnographies, as histories, were both imbued in the same rhetorical and literary devices (1991:181) that would produce these outcomes. Some of these conflicts were introduced by Ella Shohat in her article "Notes on the Post-Colonial" (1992). There, she highlights:

> Post-colonial [is] a new designation for critical discourses which thematize issues emerging from colonial relations and their aftermath, covering a long historical span (including the present). Dropping the suffix "ism" from "post-colonialism", the adjective "post-colonial" is frequently attached to the nouns, "theory", "space," "condition," "intellectual," while it often substitutes for the adjective "Third World" in relation to the noun "intellectual." The qualifier "Third World", by contrast, more frequently accompanies the nouns, "nations", "countries" and "peoples". […] [T]he "post-colonial" is largely visible in Anglo-American academic (cultural) studies in publications of discursive-cultural analyses inflected by post- structuralism (Shohat 1992: 101).

Here, the prefix 'post', as Shohat (1992: 102) explains, means 'after' the colonial period. Although the concept would refer to some 'third world' countries gaining their

independence after World War II, the concept embraces serious spatiotemporal problems, since not all nations ceased being colonies in the same period. These processes took place between the XVIIIth and XXth centuries, and the independences could have been achieved either by indigenous communities or white settlers (*Ibid*, 103). As the temporalities were different, the geographical frontiers were erased from the concept 'third world' creating multiple spatial ambiguities by referring now to diasporic circumstances lived by forced exiles or voluntary immigration This would suggest an interesting shift in the construction of the Other when understanding migration situations of the 'Third World' under a same frame, ignoring whether they were cases of violent displacement of native communities or political mobilizations of European citizens (*Ibid*, 102). This new conception of the Third World made indistinctive the centre of multiple countries, with quite different historical and socio-economic dynamics, by placing them in the same periphery (*Ibid*). The 'post', also, signals that colonialism is something from the past undermining the economic and political dynamics that still suppresses communities, groups and nations (*Ibid*). As Tomaselli (1996) addressed, the concept 'past' has been continuous when referring to the Other. The concept *post-colonial(ity)*, as Shohat (1992) sustains, then, wrongfully integrates in the same sphere ex-colonized with ex-colonizers and ex-colonial-settlers, implying a unification of the experiences of the previous colonized with colonizers, suggesting an integration and universalization of the First World European and the Third World colonized experience, neutralizing their geopolitical differences, both geographically and historically. This,

> masks the white settlers' colonialist-racist policies towards indigenous peoples not only before independence but also after the official break from the imperial center, while also de-emphasizing neo-colonial global positionings of First World settler-states […] As "post" signifies "after", it inhibits forceful articulations of what one might call "neo-coloniality" (Shohat 1992: 102–105).

This post-colonial discourse conceives an undermining dynamic on the construction of the Other by shifting the course of the discussion on how native communities were addressed in the colonial times, now by integrating the experience of both colonizers and colonized, placing them in the same space, presuming to transcend the old binarisms of the colonial period (Shohat 1992: 103). Nevertheless, old binarisms have been shown to remain while new ones have been set in neo-colonial dynamics for the construction of the Other.

1.1.1 A take on colonial and postcolonial discourse in ethnography

Regarding the anthropological field and the description of the Other, as Tomaselli points out, "[i]t would be very naïve to believe that ethnographic film making lies outside these ideological relations, though very few authors and film makers have acknowledged them" (1996: 46). Although, in order to avoid these tropes and binarisms there has been a conscious effort to 'grasp the native's point of view' (Geertz, 1974), the shift between the colonial to the postcolonial discourse couldn't fulfil completely this intention. In this case, and using Juri Lotman's (1990) terms, the boundary, or semiotic border of space that shapes the division from Self and Other is based on a self-model that allows the description of the Other as a product of the Self's cultural space, reproducing a binary semiotic structure. Within this semiosphere, and despite the discursive transitions, the West has kept constructing itself in terms of distance towards the Other, reinforcing old patterns that still shape the views towards the Other:

> Some anthropologists have attempted to redress the inappropriate 'namings' imposed by anthropologists on tribes and the Other. […] The success of the term 'tribe' in shaping foreign perceptions of pre-literate and even literate indigenous societies, is visible in the widespread use of the category. […] The term also defined the categories into which rural and urban societies were forcibly allocated during the colonial period to suit the economic imperatives of the metropolitan states. This led to the development of urban Westernalized elites who, in the neo-colonial era, dominate still partly traditional majorities. (Tomaselli 1996: 99–100)

The notion of tribal or tribalism, as the concept of savage, as Wiley (1982) highlights, has evolved in anthropology to refer to a multiplicity of dynamics that can go from common language to common culture or ancestral lineages. The problem relies on homogenization of those 'multiple others' in a single construct, constantly reinforced. Methods as ethnography, therefore, are articulated within these research paradigms that are not given but constructed (Held 2019:2), and discursively shaped. Ethnography, as method previously influenced by positive and postpositive orientations, although being seen now under the lens of new produced paradigms (Held 2019:3), may still be problematic for the studied subject.

Although these discussions were taking place even earlier, at the light of post-colonial discourse, the solutions provided to address 'indigenous problems' were being produced from the same place of the colonial discourse. As Mignolo highlights, "Western critiques of modernity inside Western cosmology did not originate as anticolonial or decolonial

critique but as postmodern" (2012: 36). From this perspective, the attempt to entirely grasp the point of view of the Other would still miss codes or elements that reinforced the distancing of Self (anthropologies and ethnographers), and the Other.

As Shohat affirms "the disorienting space of the post-colonial generates odd couplings of the "post" and particular geographies, blurring the assignment of perspectives" (1992: 103). The semiosis emerging from the transitions of the colonial to the post-colonial contained common elements that, by presence or absence, continued to recreate the identity of the Other under the same premises. Concepts like *past*, or the replacement of *civilization* by *development*, tied both discourses, becoming visible also in ethnographic texts. Spatiotemporal dynamics too, continued to play a substantial role on how the Other was constructed. It didn't only occur in post-coloniality with the tergiversation of the geographical frontiers, but with the continued perspective upon anthropological time and space:

> Neither political Space nor political Time are natural resources. They are ideologically construed instruments of power. Most critics of imperialism are prepared to admit this with regard to Space. It has long been recognized that imperialist claims to the right of occupying "empty," underused, undeveloped space for the common good of mankind should be taken for what they really are: a monstrous lie perpetuated for the benefit of one part of humanity, for a few societies of that part, and, in the end, for one part of these societies, its dominant classes. But by and large, we remain under the spell of an equally mendacious fiction: that interpersonal, intergroup, indeed, international Time is "public Time"-there to be occupied, measured, and allotted by the powers that be. (Fabian 1983:144).

Then, methods as ethnography as Fabian (1983) and Mignolo (2013) have highlighted, worked as devices of distancing, set on a linear or evolutionist perspective of Time to define the position of the Other as opposition. Therefore, terms as primitive, for example, are key features of a temporalizing discourse (Fabian 1983:82).

The discourses reviewed, on the other hand, sustain a multiplicity of overlaps: anachronic elements that leave their trace in the constitution of the current descriptions of the Other. In Tomaselli's words:

> If anthropologists use science to study what in not-science, and cultures of other peoples are supposed to be pre- or non-scientific, then how can a post-modernist critique apply in such pre-modern societies. This applies lo every modernising society which retains pre-modern residues and post-modern appropriations. Indigenous languages emanating from recently

still oral societies arise from ontologies based on interacting forces and not concrete objects. (Tomaselli, 1996: 18).

These interactive forces are fundamental to unveil the epistemological approach towards ethnography. Looking at this problem from another perspective, as Fabian mentions, then it wouldn't be a surprise to find "[…] examples of explorers recognizing the familiar in landscapes they had never seen before, or the ordinary in extraordinary practices they witnessed for the first time; even to African persons in whom they saw savages most of the time they would occasionally give recognition" (2004: 50). In the process of describing, the access given to the Other's culture via ethnography, reflected these epistemological views.

At an ideological level, and in relation to what constitutes the traditional configuration of ethnographic film, we can underline similar problematization in the field of translation. As Theo Hermans highlights:

translations construct or produce their originals. […] [It] is of interest because it offers first-hand evidence of the prejudice of perception. Cultures, communities and groups construe their sense of self in relation to others and by regulating the channels of contact with the outside world. In other words, the normative apparatus which governs the selection, production and reception of translation, together with the way translations conceptualized at certain moments, provides us with an index of cultural self-definition. It would be only a mild exaggeration to claim that translations tell us more about those who translate and more about those who translate and their clients than about the corresponding source texts. (Hermans 1999: 95)

When trying to unveil the nature of the translator, this 'mild exaggeration' is less overstated when the ethnographer as an interpreter or translator of a culture, constructs its object in an environment where it can be considered to be already translated; even before accessing the Other's culture. The ethnographic object, as an expression of translation, more than a target text developed by a translator, may say much more about that one who translates the source itself (culture as text). In this sense, the 'prejudice of perception' framed by the dominant discourse of a target culture in which the ethnographic text is created, and by which the other culture is translated (the one of the ethnographers/ researcher/ anthropologists), through the (visual) ethnographic text (developed by him/herself), defines beforehand a Source Culture/Text (that of the Other) that is interpreted and 'translated' back to the Target Culture/Text. In a much more complex process of translation, when viewing the interaction of

13

intersemiotic systems, from the discursive to the visual, even the boundaries of the source/target texts seem to be easy to transgress.

In relation to the postcolonial studies, Douglas Robinson (1997) explains how within the field, there are overlapping roles of 1) the channels of colonization, controlled by markets and institutions; 2) 'lightning-rods' for cultural inequalities that continued after the so-called – as already has been stablished – 'collapse' of colonialism; and 3) channels of decolonization: "the three roles mark separate stages in a utopian narrative that informs much of postcolonial studies: from a colonial past taken as harmful; through a complex and conflicted present in which nothing seems easy or clear cut; to a decolonized future taken as beneficial" (Robinson 1997: 31). Although the boundaries of these separate stages are much complex and hazy as they seemed to be, when taking into consideration de *locus of enunciation*, the transformation of specific concepts can subject to analysis in a richer way if they can be traced back to how the researcher as 'translator' has developed them in its discursive and ideological formation to begin with. There is a reason to it. As Elisenda Ardèvol affirms, anthropology, and therefore ethnography, relies in the search of similarities and differences, to explain regularities and discontinuities that allow to create generalizations towards the human behaviour (Ardèvol 1994:144). In this sense, there is a clear aim in the anthropological methods:

> In ethnography a constant threat is that of 'going native'. Institutional discipline keeps this threat at bay. In this case the "discipline" discredits the loss of objectivity or the loss of an appropriate methodology implicit in total absorption in another culture. Unauthorized narratives carried out by those who lack legitimacy often provoke retaliation symptomatic of this threat to discipline. (Nichols 1997 :286)

An intersemiotic dynamic from the source to the target culture, where both cultures can manifest themselves as source in the same visual text, converges the nature of the ethnographic text. The discursive text of the researcher's culture can be understood as a 'system' that superposes an imaginary captured from the images of reality that come from the Other's culture. The realia, or cultural keywords, end up being familiar to the target culture because it is produced by itself as source. The discourse is constructing the Other's cultural identity by positioning its culture and reinforcing it by means of its double signification as target and source in the same material text/object: "the ways in which that discourse constructs its identity, its position relative to other discourses, the various types of interference between them" (Robyns 1994: 425-426). In the case of the emergence of these paradigms of study, the

interferences and its positionings are produced by the continuous discourses that shape the form of the elements and concepts to give account of an alleged reinvention on how the Other's culture is described and perceived. We can apply Sütiste's and Torop's perspective to the ethnographical context where, "alongside textual identity, we speak of discursive or medial identity, but also of interdiscursive and inter- or multimedial identity. Translation is no longer simply translation of a text into another text; it is also a translation of a text into a medium or a discourse" (2007: 202), and viceversa.

Without aiming to affirm whether the described Other can or cannot describe themselves in a better way, the purpose of this research is to explore the ways in which representation can be embraced according to the positioning of discourses and *locus of enunciation*. This conveys in a gray zone: multiple anthropologists and ethnographers, as the case of Freya Schiwy or Pablo Mora, have added valuable approaches to the conversation enhancing dynamics of reflexivity while providing support to indigenous filmmakers to familiarize with the technical use of the audiovisual media in their local communities. Many projects have opened the scope to promote a collaborative network to help raising native communities' voices and points of view. In this context, then, it is worth to explore how the stereotypes that came along with dominant discourses can be made visible in the filmic narratives, focusing on what political power of the image. It is my aim to see if there's implicit bound that ties the visual with its discursive frame under the premise to convey objectivity or 'truthfulness' on the images shown. The discussion, further on, will focus on how this quality has been reviewed upon the positioning of the narrator, as the inherent features of the media.

The motives of the colonial discourse have been all studied in more detail by the decolonial theory: instead of denying them, the task has been to understand its origins and development to empower indigenous communities' political aim. Looking at how these motives or tropes shift, and how they are still latent in actual socio-political and economic dynamics and discourses e.g., from the notions of economic to epistemic extractivism, or reconfiguration of geopolitical space and territory, some of which have been one of the important tasks of decolonial theory hoping to distinguish, as Gómez mentions "among the "colonial discourse" and the practices of power and domination that it carries in itself" (2015:83). According to Castro (2000: 92), the attempt to gnore the link between modernity and colonialism in social sciences reflects a conceptual limitation, especially when they have been both originated in the Eurocentric imaginary. The historical idea of an aseptic and self-

regenerated Europe detached from the colonial interaction, and its influence in the consolidation of modernity upon interventionist dynamics towards the colonized, has been dominant in the colonial imaginary that has been reproduced by the social sciences and philosophy. In the next chapter, I will address how this have been approached by the decolonial thinking.

1.2 Decolonial discourse

Once we have accepted that there is no possibility of making testable claims about and observer-independent reality, the fundamental change in our epistemology has been completed. All forms of observation and explanation are now expressions of the system's operation with whose production we may now deal. A re-orientation has come about, a change from Being to Doing, a transformation of the classic philosophical questions.

(Mignolo 2012:19)

The basis of decolonial thinking was set during the Bandung Conference of 1955, where various countries of Africa and Asia gathered to find common grounds to build alternate models of thinking, delinked from the major Western discourses. As Mignolo (2012, 2013) affirms, it looks forward to separating itself from the chronologies of the epistemologies produced by the modern and postmodern paradigms, that speaks about the internal history of Europe which, despite becoming global designs, cannot be considered universal concepts:

"[M]odernity is not an ontological unfolding of history but the hegemonic narrative of Western civilization. […] If modernity is to be accepted as a narrative and not as ontology, one answer is to claim "our modernity,". It is imperative to eliminate the concept of the "pre-modern" that serves imperial modernity so well and that speaks with pride instead of the "nonmodern," which implies delinking and border thinking for the non-modern shall be argued in its legitimacy to think and build just and equitable futures beyond the logic of coloniality that is constitutive of the rhetoric of modernity. (Mignolo 2012: 141-143)

As diverse as the 'Third World' is in its experiences and times, the epistemic singularity of every decolonial project is border thinking, which positions a politics of knowledge ingrained in local histories, which produces a geo- and body-politically thinking (Mignolo 2013). This border, as a delimitation of the modern/colonial world, must embrace its own epistemic and ontological view.

Although both post-colonialism and decoloniality are historically tied to Western colonialism, decoloniality emerges as a space where the epistemic opens to the possibility of creating new intercultural communications and exchanges to delegitimate the colonial matrix of power and reclaim a legitimate universality an get free from the rationality/modernity/coloniality paradigm. Decolonizing epistemologies, then, means to decolonize naturalized principles on which knowledge is built, either in disciplinary formations or ideological discourses in the public sphere (Mignolo 2012, 2013). With a geopolitical thinking that tried to break the 'chronological' modernity, a new reconfiguration of space and time would take place. As exposed by Mignolo (2012), the borders more than geographically, are experienced in the thinking, and expressed in political bodies. The experience of modernity would then be held in plurilateral ways, both alternative and peripheral, opening itself to the constitution of multiple modernities[5] or transmodernity. Instead of ignoring the colonial background, which cannot be erased, the purpose is to embrace it while making evident its implications in current geo-political and cultural formation. This is the mindset that the subject who is willing to go through a decolonization of the mind, the historical imaginary, and memory (Maldonado 2008: 67), must acquire.

With the concept Epistemologies of the South, under the decoloniality project, Bonaventura do Santos speaks about the production of knowledge and discussions developed in the Global South, with the objective to rethink specific social and political local problems that have been framed by colonialism and capitalism. This calls for the emergence of a political or relational ontology and epistemologies. This is a theoretical-political movement supported by a network of interrelation to review and face the struggles of the pluriverse of the Global South. (Escobar 2016). These interrelations are structure as a rhizome, with a logic which is difficult to map, measure or trace in simple way, standing by the multiple possible ways of becoming and being in the territory and place (Escobar 2016: 18). Withing this perspective, as

---

[5] Carlos Jauregui makes reference to this multiple modernities as: "the labor force; the rebellious Indian; the reason for a debate among jurists on the Empire; it is a tool of the imagination of time of modernity; the epitome of terror and colonial desire; a cartographic mark of the New World; the name of some islands and a vast Atlantic region from Florida to Guyana including the Gulf of Mexico and parts of Central America; the expression of cultural terrors and a utopian artifact to imagine the happiness; an inhospitable aboriginal, a rebellious monster that curses I love her from him, a wild philosopher and a peripheral intellectual; the sinister crowd; it popular; the insurgent slaves; a model metaphor to think about the relationship of Latin America with cultural and economic centers such as Europe and the United and to imagine models of appropriation of the "foreign"; the epithet for US imperialism and the symbol of anti-imperialist thought; the devouring consumer and the devoured". (Jauregui 2005:17)

explained by Seed, a process of resignification would take place by the realization of the limitation of European political discourses and the linguistic framework elaborated by the politics of colonial rule, making possible to acknowledge a "way in which the polysemic character of language [would also allow] the natives of territories colonized appropriating and transforming the discourses of the colonizers" (Seed, 1991: 183). On the other hand, as Grosfoguel points out, it is important to recall that non-occidental cosmovisions of the Epistemologies of the South, don't participate in a dualist view of the world, but a notion of holistic diversity within a unicity. There are no binarisms as the opposition between man and nature, for example, but a notion of cosmos where we all belong in interdependence. (Grosfoguel 2016).

Within this rhizome, it would be possible to embrace and reclaim the knowledge produced from the Western place of enunciation, making possible to understand the dynamics that had led the region to face an infinity of colonial situations, even after colonization and that have remained despite of the transition to post-colonization. In this sense, and despite not making direct reference to political aspects, as I will address in following chapters, a political process took place in Latin America that called and dwelled in the decolonization of methods of knowledge, tools, and even artifacts. Standing in the border, or producing knowledge from this place of enunciation, stands by the understanding that former discourses and its derivates could be approached not as means of repression but as ways of liberation. Then, the appropriation would call for ways of representation aligned with a pluriverse of knowledge. With the revision of methods, as those that defined disciplines such as anthropology, it would be possible for non-Europeans to review their own history, beyond the discursive way their identity was build when speaking about how a certain group represents themselves or others, "we point towards the devices of knowledge / power based on the which representations are constructed". (Castro-Gómez 2000: 89)

To summarize the experience of decolonization, I would like to refer to the following example used by Mignolo:

> "[A] New Zealand anthropologist of Anglo descent has no right to guide the "locals" in what is bad for the Maori population. […] – there are so many modernities of our own, while there are just one, theirs. […] The remarkable novelty comes when a Maori becomes an anthropologist, and he/she practices anthropology as Maori rather that studying the Maori as anthropologist […] If you engage in the decolonial option and put anthropology "at your

service", […] then you engage identity in politics, unveiling and enacting geopolitics and body-politics of knowledge (Mignolo 2012: 34-53).

Paul Whitinui complements:

> From a Māori world view, the question of what "counts" as Māori knowledge often remains an abstract idea, where we apply a strategy or approach (e.g., kaupapa Māori) and then through our own association with mainstream academic institutions apply it naively to a western or colonial and postcolonial paradigm, such as sociology or anthropology. […] Research has been inextricably linked to European imperialism and colonialism because imperialism frames the indigenous experience. As a response, indigenous peoples must respond by reclaiming our own research agendas by repatriating our cultural thinking, knowledge, and knowing. From a western perspective, Guba and Lincoln (1994) presented the notion of "competing paradigms," where quantitative scientists were considered relatively "disinterested" in people's experiences […] At this level, an individual's "voice" becomes more like conventional benchmarks of positivistic "rigor" where the laws of science prevail and continue as the dominant discourse. (Whitinui 2013:472)

By reviewing the European experience towards colonized countries in research, the decolonizing project understands that it's virtually impossible to do be detached from it. The appropriation of methods and media developed in the West, as I will later review, have been suitable to create strategies for autorepresentation, beyond the identities frames by the colonial and postcolonial discourses. Decolonizing the ways of thinking, doesn't mean silencing but acknowledging the diverse experiences, from both 'sides of the frontier'. This implies, using Mignolo's (2013: 137) words, that "when we, the anthropoi, write in modern, Western imperial languages (Spanish, English, French, German, Portuguese or Italian), we write with our bodies on the border".

1.2.1 Border thinking and colonial semiosis

In this subchapter, I will deepen in the elements that constitute border thinking and colonial semiosis. I will start by reviewing the relation of decolonial thinking with the meaning of border. In summary with some of the point covered above, it is important to remember that:

> Decolonial thinking means to dwell in the border (the slash "/" that divides and unites modernity / coloniality); which means in exteriority. Exteriority is not the outside, but the outside built from the inside in the process of building itself as an inside. […] modernity is a discourse defining its interiority by creating the difference to be marginalized and eliminated. […] Dwelling in exteriority means dwelling in the borders traced by the colonial difference from where border […]

[is] already engaged in decolonizing epistemology and engaging decolonial epistemologies. Mignolo (2012: 26).

Cristina Alcalde (2020) explains that thinking from the border is a result of the configuration of societies which structures and practices have been organized as product of centuries of colonialism. These – unequal – structures, have valued some identities and experiences "over others internal Others' in places of origin" (Alcalde 2020:4). This also "puts individuals into zones of non-being in new spaces of settlement. In these zones of non-being, the systemic racial oppression intensifies intersecting gendered, class, and sexual identity oppressions" (Alcalde 2020:5). Historically speaking, postcolonial societies, not only constitute identities that are expressed as lives within the border, but as experiences of othering within that westernized Other as result of multiple configurations of rejection and exclusion. All these processes take place in the border, the line that divides two sides, the side of the Self, and the side of the Other. Mignolo claims:

> On one side dwell the humanitas and on the other side the anthropos. This line dividing the borderland between the humanitas and the anthropos was invented and traced by the humanitas in the process of constituting itself in their own territory. As a third world person, I belong to the anthropos and I began to assume it with pride. That was my decolonial moment[6].

These experiences have been well framed Andalzúa's borderlands and Mignolo's colonial semiosis. I will deepen in these to explain the border in association to space, which has been defined by the struggles withing centre and periphery, and the environment constituted in the border itself, which can convey different ontologies as experiences of the body. Later, I will explore colonial semiosis to see how it can be addressed in visual representations.

Anzaldúa (1987) presents the bordered subject, which is explained through the Chicana identity formation. As Maldonado (2012: 197) highlights, when located by 'official history' in time and history, its configuration as a product of multiple forms of violence cannot be obviated. The "source of the self" in time is defined by the experiences tied to both, the oppressor and the oppressed, either Mexicans or indigenous in specific places. The spatial location, then, is characterized by a movement, in a displacement of both time and space. That's

---

[6] Interview - Walter D. Mignolo. https://www.e-ir.info/2017/06/01/interview-walter-d-mignolo/
E-INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, 1 June 2017

how multiple cultures have come to be forged in self-affirmation and pride, but also with legitimations of machismo and imperialism. These are element from multiple spatial configuration that converge in the same subject that stands in the border (*Ibid*). To engage in decolonial he /she must be aware of it.

As Mignolo[7] has addressed these borderlands are a consequence of linear global thinking, they can be subjective as a product of racism or sexism and can be found at all levels: economic, personal, aesthetic, political. When a subject stand and questions these levels, the decolonization of the mind happens. Now, these borders, are different from the notion of frontier, which is articulated with the modern Western epistemology of territory:

> On the other side of the frontier exists the void, namely space to be conquered or civilized. Territorial epistemology (modern and postmodern) cannot be decolonial; it is an imperial epistemology. Modern epistemology was built precisely to make sense of, justify, and legitimize coloniality. Post-modern epistemology is an in-family critique of modern epistemology but remains within the rules of the game. Decolonial thinking is always-already border thinking, although not all border thinking is always already decolonial thinking[8].

Standing in the border, then, has other implications for the constitution of the Self. In this sense, Maldonado specifies referring to Andalzúa that, instead of an 'island', Self is a border: "a point of encounter, an intersection, or even an archipielago, understood as a point of relation with other selves" (2012: 198). This place of 'suspension', which by any means implies complete rejection, requires to view the identity and the Self in a way in which part of him or herself is an oppressor but also an oppressed:

> Decolonization, then, is an ethical-political product of the places where this experiences, histories of the colonized peoples have been produced. [...] This is how ethnic studies are born: as a denunciation of the established geography of reason and as a desire for an opening that would allow – the serious exploration of a larger cognitive map and a deeper knowledge of self and society. It is the place where the dislocations of the sea and the ruptures of the borderlands, among other spatial images, can be seriously investigated beyond the limit imposed by the "time" of the nation or the "space" of a continent. (Maldonado 2012: 201)

Now, with colonial semiosis, Mignolo, shifts the conversation of being placed in the border to the production of texts. These productions, he sustains, stand in the ruins, the fractured realities that emerged from the colonial experience (Verdesio 2013: 9). It is, by any means, trying to return to a Mesoamerican thought, but a way of situated in the border (Mignolo 2013: 128). Mignolo develops further the concept of colonial discourse proposed by Hulme, which comprehends and limits itself to the analysis of oral, verbal and alphabetic written texts, leaving behind semiotic interactions between other systems as picto-ideographic writing, the Andean Quipus, and Mesoamerican codices among other expressions and artefacts (Verdesio, Mignolo 2013). In this sense, standing in the fracture allows to explore different types of representations produced in colonial situations, revealing the hermeneutical problems of the subject of knowledge or understanding:

> Colonial semiosis, which is the terrain in which the drama to be studied by the researcher unfolds, is characterized by a double fracture: that of the subject and that of the object of understanding. That is, colonial societies are fractured by the clash between different ways of seeing the world and doing things, at the same time that the subject of knowledge is also, if he wants to understand the colonial situation, divided in two: with one foot in the culture to which he belongs, and with another in his role as a member of a discipline that aims to understand a fractured reality that includes traditions that are not his own. (Verdesio 2103: 16).

This is the context which stands for the analysis of visual representation, not only produced in a colonial situation, but also as a colonial semiosis, whose relation can't be viewed as a cause-effect result but as an interdependent dynamic, constituting a problem for the subject of knowledge/understanding (Mignolo 2013: 141). Considering, as Mignolo mentions (*Ibid*), that historically the colonial situations have been studied by the fields e.g., economy, sociology, anthropology, etc., that produced them, the main question to have in mind is where the *locus of enunciation* is situated, and from where the subject of understanding comprehends the colonial situation. Here is where the relevance of *locus of enunciation* and the tensions of the academic configuration are exposed. In other words: the enunciative locus it is part of knowledge and understanding as much as it is the construction of the image that results from a disciplinary discourse (Mignolo 2013:144) in, for example, the philological, sociological, or the anthropological. In this sense:

> the 'true' narration of a subject or description of an object or place that accounts for knowledge or understanding of them, is a matter that is negotiated in the respective interpretive communities both for the value of veracity that its members grant it, as by the authority of the enunciative locus built-in the mere act of narrating or describing, in the form of knowledge or understanding, the

subject, the object, or the place. Furthermore, the locus enunciative of discourse or the locus of understanding of a sign is not a closed space that can be understood in itself or in its own relation to the known or understood, but rather its configuration depends as much on what you want to understand or know as on previous enunciative loci from which similar images were constructed or different from the world. The construction of knowledge and understanding brings into play both the act of saying and doing and the recipients of the say and do, as said and done and the world to which presumably models preserve or transform the image of the 'real' constructed by previous saying acts and previous discursive or semiotic objects. (Mignolo 2013:144)

Here lies the double face of colonial semiosis: the fracture of the object or subject who is trying to understand, and the implicit fracture of discourse and the position of the subject of understanding (Mignolo 2013:146). Moving forward, Mignolo's colonial semiosis has been applied to analyze the visual but not yet in the system of moving images. When it comes to ethnographic film, two important elements can be considered: the access provided by anthropological and ethnographic exploration, and the moment when indigenous communities appropriate the media. It is within ethnographic film and indigenous media where lies my interest to explore the fractures to find expressions of colonial semiosis. Before doing so, it is relevant to look upon the ways discourse have been constituent of the narratives that have framed indigenous experiences as a fixed identity over time, which is fundamental to review how, in the audiovisual, they have engaged in the border to address ways of self-representation by the appropriation of these, positioning the production of the texts as its own source/target to resignify stereotypes and tropes given throughout colonization.

2. (De) colonizing narratives

In this chapter, I will establish the relationship between discourse and narrative in the construction of the anthropological object: the Other. The importance of acknowledging this relationship is to understand how discourse is driven by narrative means. To review this, I will analyze the constitution of some tropes that have helped to consolidate a dominant narrative in the representation of indigenous communities, that will be followed, in the next chapter by the methods use in anthropological film to frame these oppositions.

In order to call for a decolonization of the narrative, I will introduce in this chapter what the constitution of a of a narrative means for this thesis. To do so, I will briefly make a reference to Carlos Jauregui study *Cannibalia*. The exposition of this example, I believe, can help to visualize how the transition from discourse to narrative takes places, as how tropes end up being subjected to a semiosis when framed by different discourses and *locus of ennunciation*. I find this study relevant because it evidences, how tropes have been used to identify, represent and materialize in different dimensions the notion of the Other. Jauregui studies the *cannibal* trope from a discursive level, set in an opposition to distancing the Other, to its continuous appearance in a variety of texts as a narrative, showing how the tropes, far from being fixed, historically shifts redefining the notion of the Other, and even Self. I will deepen in the features of the tropes as they began to be referenced in a multiplicity of texts, constituting the fundaments for the description of the Other.

In the following subchapter, I will explain how the manifestation of tropes configures what I refer to as narrative matrix. I sustain that even though in every text the references may not describe exactly the Other is essence or try to follow ethical approaches to untie from these dominants on the other hand, it is the constellation of all these which reinforce the imaginary towards indigenous communities. Now, by exploring the transformations within the matrix of texts, we may preview how the ways of representation have been not only manifested, reinforced, but ultimately shifted to debunk former imaginaries while setting them as part of the different discourses. This possibility of debunking, while using the same tropes, is particularly possible by the positioning of the *locus on enunciation* and the embracement of the decolonial. For indigenous communities, this moment happens -or at least is made easily visible- when appropriating the filmic media. Keeping in mind the manifestation of the tropes in all these texts, I will explain how the semiosis from discourse to the narrative matrix takes

place, referring to Mignolo's Universe of Sense. The continuity of these tropes in a diversity of texts, also could be set as a transmedial narrative, reason why it is possible to trace its application not only in different disciplines, but in different types of texts, being able to establish comparative analysis from classical ethnographies to ethnographic film, for example.

2.1 Colonial tropes and the case of the cannibal

In the previous chapters, I have addressed the contexts in which the dominant discourse towards the Other have been set, along with the proposed alternative to 'decolonize' them, from the border thinking and the shift of the *locus of enunciation*. Multiple concepts have already been underlined as dominant established within both discourses. Colonial discourse constructs its western Self upon dichotomy and the differentiations towards the 'Other', standing over the premises of progress and development, and technology, leading to describing the Other as underdeveloped or uncivilized to create a distancing that would allow the constitution of Self. Mignolo has argued that modernity, has reinforced this view by coining - an abundant vocabulary to mark the difference, to create exteriority spatially and temporally: pagans, barbarians, primitives, women, gays, lesbians, Blacks, Indians, underdeveloped, emerging economies, communists, terrorists, yellows, etc. "All of this will be incorporated into modernity or left out when necessary" (Mignolo 2012: 26). On the other hand, the postcolonial discourse, paradoxically, strengthens the dichotomy by establishing a spatiotemporal framing set on the Western chronology marked by the countries gaining their independence after the colonial period, as a geographical distinction that based on territoriality that wouldn't differentiated between the experiences of colonizers and colonized. A discursive continuity in the postcolonial was set "not in terms of unbridgeable gaps or breaks, but in terms of continuum, dialogue, and solidarity between the 'here' and 'there', the same and the Other" (Achaeraïou 2011: 190), denying the Other's experience in the colonial period. In this sense, as Achaeraïou sustains, scrutiny over a postcolonial discourse that enhances: "hybridity, the third space, deterritorialization, migrancy, nomadology, fluidity, brisure, and indeterminacy" (2011: 185), its based on a hegemonic diaspora-centred narrative that has defined identity and global geopolitics (Achaeraïou 2001: 189), making invisible the way local identities see themselves. In this temporal historical linear continuum, the Otherness was still subjected to the opposition of past and present, but with a different discursive frame, responding still to the evolutionary notion of Time Fabian mentioned.

But what is relevant for this chapter is to address how these discourses were materialized in narratives, making use of a multiplicity of devices, practices and mechanism, that helped to reinforce the discourses of civilization, development, and progress. As mentioned above, Hulme defined *colonial discourse* as actions and discursive objects related and produced in colonial situation. Carlos Jauregui makes a more precise description by signalling that less than a system, *colonial discourse* is a "bunch of texts and signifiers relative to a world of which they keep an index – in fragments – of its significance" (2005:21). In Jauregui's study *Canibalia: Canibalismo, Calibanismo, Antropofagia Cultural y Consumo en América Latina* (Canibalia: Cannibalism, Calibanism, Cultural Anthropophagy and Consumption in Latin America, 2005), the trope of the cannibal is explored to explain how it became fundamental to inaugurate the figure of the Other and frame the colonial experience. As Jauregui clarifies, with the concept cannibal he is not only referring to practice the of eating human flesh, but to its symbolic dimensions: beyond the "historical truth", cannibalism is constituted as foundation for the study of colonialism and cultural semiotics (Jauregui 2005: 16). With the trope of the cannibal, it is possible to analyze the dissolution and constitution of identities, in the sense that it constantly destabilizes the antithesis in/out, especially because it slides through a non-linear time in the space of the colonial *différance* (*Ibid* 2005:11-12). Cannibal is one of the first neologisms of the conquest of America, a linguistic and ethnographic misunderstanding – as Jauregui mentions, referring to Dussel, about the columbine discourse: since the conquest, Europeans documented anthropophagites everywhere, even before arriving to the continent, establishing a semantical affinity between cannibalism and America. From cartographies to ethnographies, the trope was constituted as a reading of the 'savage body':

> the cannibal tells us about the Other and ourselves, of eating and being eaten, of the Empire and its fractures, of the savage and the cultural anxieties of civilization. And just like the cannibal trope has been a sign of the alterity of America and has served to sustain the discursive edifice of imperialism, can articulate – as, in fact, it has done - discourses against the invention of America and colonialism itself. (Jauregui 2005: 15)

A trope is a figure of speech – such as metaphor or metonymy, and it is necessary for the pragmatics of language. With Tropology, Haydn White introduced a method for historical cognition to understand historiographic discourse and its deployment as a narrative. Stories and rhetoric play a substantial role in the formation, construction and process of signification of historical narratives, as metahistory. Agreeing with Clifford Geertz perspective, Jauregui affirms that this is the case of anthropology, highlighting "the complex system of tropes and

discursive strategies by which the anthropological discourse is organized" (Jauregui 2005: 16). In this sense -and coinciding with Geertz-, Jauregui views culture as an "articulation of stories in a intricated narrative fabric […] a narrative that we constantly write and read but by which we are constantly written and read" (Jauregui 2005:24). With the concept heterotropy (a neologism of hetero: others and trope: figure language), then, it is proposed a theoretical category that "articulate identity discourses to the operations of the language that make their representation possible. The concept works fundamentally on allegories, metaphors and other tropes from which both identity and individual otherness or collective can be produced in different historical-cultural contexts" (Jauregui 2005:16).

It is also important to note that historic languages, instead of being regulated by the events of the world, are articulated by tropologic mechanisms, aligned with the infrastructure or deep structure of the historical discourse. Discourse, as a model for the assimilation of the process of consciousness, is articulated by tropes that also become a model that is constantly repeated upon transformational patterns, as the theory of discourse, and can say a lot about representation. (Lavagnino 2011: 91-92). Under this perspective, the homologization of historiography with anthropology is also aligned with literature and Seed's approached, mentioned in the previous chapter. Trope and tropology, then, are constituted, as a mechanism that establishes the connection between discourse and narrative devices. Although these don't deny, literally, the presence of the practice of cannibalism or exposes the colonial discourse as a compilation of lies, the predilection for specific topics and tropes like this in ethnographies, and its ideological isolation, not only strengthen the myth but the disciplinary knowledge of construction of Otherness (Jauregui 2005: 19).

With a thorough analysis, Jauregui exemplifies how cannibalism as trope, with its transformational pattern quality, has shifted over the centuries reinforcing the development discourse, and constructing the identity of Self: the colonial Eurocentric modern that observes form the 'here' and 'now' the cannibal civilization over 'there' and 'one of the savage' (Jauregui 2005: 28). While bolstering this view, the cannibal has suffered multiple symbolic transformations over time. Being first a deformation of the word Caribe, – which for the native Caribes meant 'bold', and 'enemy' for the Arawak, for the Europeans that first arrived at the Caribbean meant 'eater of human flesh'. This defined the 'bodies', of the 'savages' first encountered after the conquest, that began to be portrayed in the ethnographies, chronicles or cartographies of the 'New World', organizing America as a in a system of representation rooted

in the desire, human sacrifice and cannibalism. The trope was later used to refer to natives, that resisted domination, and would then be used in a bricolage with other tropes, as 'savage' (natives), 'good savages' (those that surrendered to domination) or 'indian' (those who required to be evangelized to enter modernity). Later, there were Spanish or White cannibals (colonizers that suffer of hunger, which was later justified by the presence of the devil), which also worked as an "otrifier device by excellence" (Jauregui 2005:29). Then, along with the evangelization, the Eucharistic ritual where the 'blood and body' of Christ was consumed, was resembled to cannibalism, to finally view the extractive dynamics of the conquest as such: "eat and being eated, the Empire, its fractures, the savage, and the cultural anxieties of civilization. […] As the cannibal trope has been a sign of the American alterity and has served to sustain the discursive building of imperialism, it can articulate -as indeed it has- discourses against the invention of America and colonialism itself". (Jauregui 2005:15). It has been clarified in further research, as exposed by Michael Taussing's: *Shamanism, colonialism and the Wild Man* (1987), that although the cannibalism was considered an inexistant practice, it was used to refer natives who resisted the slavist system for the exploitation of rubber. Alternatively, the trope has been also appropriated to develop 'counter-discursive' texts being resemantized by the *locus on enunciation* of the Other and used against the hegemonic semiotic of (neo)colonialism, but despite its anticolonial intention and appropriation, it has left, in multiple occasions, the colonial structures intact (Jauregui 2005:43). Geographically, in has been used to the justify the trade of slaves in Africa, then to justify the economic exploitation in the Caribbean.

The use of the trope cannibal reflects spatiotemporal displacement, the colonial *différance* that configurated of the Eurocentric Self and the Other for economical purpose but was still well documented in an infinity of devices. These tropes, and their semantic multiplicity, show that it is "always […] about something else, sometimes even, about an encounter with oneself" (Jauregui 2005:24). With this example, I frame the constant shifting of colonial concepts as a process of semiosis in time and space that has framed the colonial experience for both, the Self and the Other. Despite the various semantic attribution of the tropes, these have been constantly used in a multiplicity of text reinforcing the way the colonized have been thought. These different texts constitute a narrative fabric that feeds the discourse of 'Other'. Although these tropes are still used to refer to or represent indigenous communities, they have been ultimately used as resistance by their appropriation and resignification.

2.2. Narrative matrix: from discourse to narrative

Within the concept of narration, we can recognize tales, stories or "part of a discourse where the facts are narrated". The configuration of texts that rely on tropes produced in colonial situations, at any level, can constitute the colonial discourse. Mignolo (2013) recognizes three levels of the linguistic competence: a.) the structure of the phrase; b.) the structure of discourse, that contemplates more complex verbal structures as description, narrative or argumentation; c.) and the 'figurative' use of language. The studies that are part of historiography and anthropology, for example, use verbal structures that can embody different narratives are embedded in a same discursive frames or universe of meaning. In that sense, it is important to understand the verbal structures with its components, as the Universe of Meaning where these embedded:

> A narrative grammar takes us to the doors of the universes of meaning in which stories are produced and understood. In these, we are not only interested in the structure of the story but also in its correlation with the universes of meaning in which it is narrated. […] We need to know, in short, the 'discursive frames' that the participants establish to identify and act in a universe of meaning" (Mignolo 2013: 32).

The discursive frames, therefore, influence the different way by which a language is used. The structure of any given text, then, is as relevant as the universe of meaning that frames it. Therefore, we must determine the relevant criteria through which participants operate the verbal structures, as narratives, and within which Universes of Meaning. I have identified the three different Universes of Meaning through three discursive frames: the colonial, post-colonial and decolonial. Colonial discourse, nevertheless, can be produced or understood within within these three different discursive frames. The *locus of enunciation* can provide an analysis either from an occidental view or standing in the fracture. It is relevant to point out that a natural discourse is not universal, but also refers to a determined Universe of Meaning.

Mignolo makes a distinction between Natural Universes of Meaning or Disciplinary Universes of Meaning. Discursive Frames (DF) and Discursive Concepts (DC) are both part of them in different levels. As member of a determinate community, certain DF and DC are embraced with the understanding and use of notions, social norms and rules, but as a part also of a disciplinary community, in addition, there is an acknowledgement of complementary DF

and DC that are specifically used as part of the discipline. An anthropologist, for example, not only employs the DF and DC of the society he belongs to, but also uses the DF and DC of the disciplines he studies: anthropology. The DF and DC of his society and discipline towards the description of the Other, are both materialized in ethnographies. Natural Universes of Meaning and Disciplinary Universes of Meaning are not opposed: they complement each other and run parallelly in the linguistic general grammar. This is a direct relation to Lotman's primary and secondary modelling systems, so it is possible to speak about Primary Universes of Meaning (PUM) and Secondary Universes of Meaning (SUM) consequently.

PUM conveys basic general concepts related to 'know what' use of grammatic rules. They are not necessarily reflexive. SUM use of specific rules from the discipline employs a 'know how' that is always reflexive. The 'know what', always sets the conditions of the 'Know how'. To make this clearer, Mignolo recurs to Focault's (1966) example: it's not just about Linneo 'knowing how' to describe plants, but to 'know what' should they be described.

What must be described through ethnographies, is set by the PUM and positioned by the SUM that produces it: "while every essential definition postulates the universal of the defined, it is also true that it postulates it from a certain position" (Mignolo 2013: 40). The 'know what' PUM is set in a discursive frame, which is formed also within rules of cognoscitive character. Mignolo establishes the specific semiotic activities that take place in the SUM. Here, the semiosis of expression and content (Hemslev; Greimas) and the relation of representamen, object and interpretant (Peirce; Morris), as the cognoscitive aspect, that allows a discourse to be inscribed in a PUM.

> So if, on the one hand, we can accept that 'One aspect' of semiosis is the meeting of the plane of expression with the content plane; and 'another aspect' of semiosis is the relationship of the sign with the object and with the interpretant; a third aspect would correspond to the inscription of the sign in a universe of meaning established by own users (2013: 95).

Every semic or enunciative act is part of a 'intercomprehensive system' which involves the knowledge of a language (structural aspect), the context of the situation (pragmatic aspect) and the Universe of Meaning where the discourse is subscribed to (cognoscitive aspect).

With the concept 'blurred domain' Mignolo refers to words or concepts of the cognoscitive aspect and regular use that, when appropriated by disciplines become part of a 'theoretical domain'. In this sense, narrative, is part of a blurred domain, which becomes part of a theorical domain when understood as literary or historiographic 'stories of a certain type'. Now, when referring to historiography the word 'history' appoints its blurred domain, which responds to the events of the past, and its narration or description. 'Literature' of 'fiction' are concepts of the blurred domain, but it is required a theory to place them within disciplinary interactions. Hayden White uses the concepts of 'literature' and 'fiction' to locate 'historiography', opposing to its belonging to a theoretical domain that inscribes it as discipline, under his project *Metahistory* (1973). By questioning the structures of the historical conscience, the epistemological by which events are given account of, ways of representation and the authority that calms the historiographical story, he acknowledges historiography as a verbal fiction, with invented content, and with close relationship to literature instead of the sciences locating it in terms of the blurred domain: "How a given historical situation is to be configured depends on the historians' subtlety in matching up a specific plot structure with the set of historical events that he wishes to endow with a meaning of a particular kind. This is essentially a literary, that is to say fiction-making operation" (White, 1978:85). Here, Mignolo summarizes:

> "Narration, and not as a discursive structure similar to the discourse of the natural sciences, opposes the assumption that history reproduces the nature and truth of the event. For Ricoeur, the nature of historiography is storytelling, and as it is, it becomes almost indistinguishable from fictional storytelling. But history and fiction not only resemble each other on the level of meaning but also on the level of reference. The premise that sustains this argument is that (expanded in our time) that every 'symbolic system' does not re-present a 'reality' ('diffuse domain' of a particular type, designated by certain words of our daily life), rather, it 're-produces it creatively' […]. Thus, to the extent that the historiographic story resembles the fictional story, it can be considered, analogically, as "a literary artifact." (Mignolo 2011:77)

Historiography, despite being considered as a verbal artifact that tries to be a structural model to describe processes that occurred in the past, employs elements of the blurred domain. The same case could be applied to anthropology. Not referring to processes that took place in the past, it locates it descriptions in the present using ethnography, which belongs to a theoretical domain. According to Fabian, "[t]he ethnographic present may be declared a mere literary device, used to avoid the awkwardness of the past tense and of constant doubling up in the form of numeric or temporal qualifiers; that sort of problem can be dealt ·with once and for

all in a methodological appendix" (1983: 81). The element that constitutes ethnographic form, does not review its presence as part of a blurred domain.

Then, a narrative is a set of linguistic unities, from phrases to figures. All of them can be identified in the structure of discourse. Notions of truth, or objectivity, are found in the conventions used by language. Anthropology, in this case is produced under the rules that structure discursive production within the disciplinary community. Colonial tropes in this case, are conventions accepted as elements of 'truth'. Although as part of a discursive structure, they are not modified, but work as a convention by being approved by both the discipline and community, becoming effective when the members of all the community mutually agrees on using them. Therefore, ethnography as a description that constitutive of a discursive structure, also embrace tropes as figurative structures that have been set as conventions (Fabian 1983:78).

With the concept narrativism, White (1978;1992) refers to a group of narratives articulated by a concrete use of language. He sustains that the trope is the basic feature of historic cognition, whose verbal structures refer to the past. The ethnographical text also conveys the figure of the trope, but as we'll see with Fabian's approach, constructs the other through verbal structures that rely in the present. White recognizes in the trope the necessary figure for a pragmatic of language. For historiography, the tropological basis of its discourse "is shown as well as a device that explains the specific configuration of diverse historiographic texts and that allows to understand the endemic state of interpretive divergence" (Lavagnino 2011:90). The distinction between anthropology and history, when analyzed through the tropological view reveals what differences embody its object of study with a determinate the trope, while its place in time is defined by the verbal structure. If we study ethnographic texts through the figure of the trope, it will allow us to see what is fixed of transformed in the representation of the Other. Tropes, instead of the events of the world, are the mechanism that organize the experience and regulate language: in narrativism a trope is a model that repeats itself persistently through different texts becoming transformational patterns. Each narrative suggests the use of a plot (model of articulation and anticipation of a sequence of events) and is this constellation of models of plot used which highlights the patterns (Lavagnino 2011:105). To this I will call a narrative matrix: a group of, in this case, ethnographic texts by which these patterns and tropes are made visible scaping from structures of the theoretical domain, being used in the regular basis of the blurred domain.

The constitution of this narrative matrix might be seen or can somehow be related to Jenkins' concept of transmedia storytelling. How transmedial the matrix can be, depends on the elements chosen for analysis as part of this universe. If in any kind of text of the colonial discourse, we can identify figurative patters and relate them to the Universe of Meaning that produces it, then we can define its discursive frames. The sum partial narratives represented in media such as maps, cartographies, iconographies, ethnographies, ethnographic films and videos, can constitute a narrative matrix by with we can abstract which are the tropes that modify the discursive structures and have built the large narrative of the anthropological Other. Now, as Elleström (2019) suggest, each text that cross the multiple media, while being actualized, transformed, contributes to the whole, the great narrative. Nevertheless, the review upon the grand narratives can also be suitable to rethink the Other's identity, and review other narratives as those indigenous communities have, as "conceiving of life as a narrative unity gives us a narrative identity which provides the response to the all-important question" (Withinui 2013: 475). This coincides with Bruner's (1991) understanding of the importance of narrative which, as a conventional form culturally transmitted, conveys a conglomerate of devices and individuals and it is organized in myths, stories and so on (Bruner 1991:4). Nevertheless, and as Mignolo mentions, "anthropology have taught us that the configuration of universes of meaning responds to certain conditions (if not universal, at least general) of symbolic production" (2013: 43). This symbolic production is modified in a multiplicity of ways, throughout tropes and other elements. But when it comes to the understanding of indigenous sign systems, they may not all be understood under the same universe of meaning.

3.   To representation: ethnographic film and indigenous video

In this chapter, I will specifically address how ethnography has been built over time as a process to describe and translate the Other's culture as the shift between ethnographic film and indigenous video. This is substantial to understand how, upon the attempt of 'grasping the native's point of view' and acquiring certain objectivity to describe the studied objectivity, the field of ethnographic film has endlessly reviewed its methods without taking into consideration the main element behind the films: the constitution of the political image. I will review transition of ethnographic film to indigenous video, and how they convey the political image which, not only show political contents, but convey the political as mechanism of resistance.

3.1 Ethnography and the translation of culture.

Ethnography is the anthropological method for the description of cultures. Throughout time, it has been subject of multiple criticisms by the way it constructs the 'Other' in the inherent dominance of a colonial discourse. Despite the consolidation of the post-colonial studies, which made visible the discursive influence of its *locus of enunciation*, it also possible to broaden, through it, the spectrum for border thinking. In this chapter, I will address the problem of translatability of the culture in visual ethnography arguing that these texts are constructs that, through an intersemiotic dynamic defined by its nature, positions the dominant culture (embedded in the role of the researchers) both as source and target of its own production.

To begin with, I'd like to give an overview of the understanding of culture as text, followed by a description of its theoretical ground, and the critique that surrounds the notion of the colonial and post -colonial discourse, from where it emerges. In *Deep Play Notes on the Balinese Cockfight* (2005 [1972]), Clifford Geertz established how culture could be understood as texts.

> […] so far as anthropology is concerned, that cultural forms can be treated as texts, as imaginative works built out of social materials, has yet to be systematically exploited. […] The culture of a people is an ensemble of texts, themselves ensembles, which the anthropologist strains to read over the shoulders of those to whom they properly belong. (Geertz 2005: 83 - 86).

Ethnographic texts have been seen as a substantial method to provide a detailed description of the Other's view of the world, practices and habits. At the eyes of the 'reader', these texts are constituent of culture itself, structured in principle through the perspective of the anthropologist or the ethnographer, now positioned as 'mediators' or as translators themselves: they get immerse on the other's culture as a source text and create an ethnographic account that not only describes but interprets 'other's' behaviours, societal configurations, etc. He/she translates all the material and immaterial expressions – such as dances, rituals, etc. – into compact written texts, or in what could be seen as an intersemiotic translation, synthetizing multiple modes in a unique system addressed to a target culture.

Under the premise of Bronislaw Malinowski "the goal of the anthropologist, or ethnographer, is "to grasp the native's point of view, his relation to life, to realize his vision of his world" (Malinowski 1961: 25), Malinowski is considered the father of modern anthropology, and one of the strongest advocates of the fieldwork methodology of 'participant observation', that have set the basis to provide the most accurate and objective description of a culture and translation of its features/element. His statement defined how the 'new' ethnographic practice should been carried out: immersing deep into the source culture and studying it through a long-term fieldwork exercise – that, if possible, should exceeded a year to get to learn the local language and collecting every detail of the experience – to provide data that would, basically, being produced by the native itself (Malinowski 1961). After the scandal that followed the publication of his fieldwork experience in the publication *A Diary in the Strict Sense of the Term* (1967)*,* where the real feeling of Malinowski towards the communities he worked with and his frustration during his experience on the field surfaced to the light, many ethical problems within the practice were unveiled: "the myth of the chameleon field-worker, perfectly self-tuned to his exotic surroundings – a walking miracle of empathy, tact, patience, and cosmo-politanism – was demolished by the man who had perhaps done the most to create it" (Geertz 1974:27). But the question has been substantial for modern and anthropology:

> [H]ow is anthropological knowledge of the way natives think, feel, and perceive possible? The issue the *Diary* presents, with a force perhaps only a working ethnographer can fully appreciate, is not moral; it is epistemological. If we are going to cling to the injunction to see things from the native's point of view, what is our position when we can no longer aim some unique form of psychological closeness, a sort of transcultural identification, with our subjects? What happens to *verstehen* when *einfuhlen* disappears? (Geertz 1974: 28).

As one of the biggest methodological discussions of anthropology, as Geertz argues (1974: 28), the problem of 'grasping the point view of the native' goes beyond a moral or an ethic commitment to become an epistemological problem. What this discussion brings to the table is the fact that texts, and particularly ethnographical ones, are not only dependant of the 'natives' context, but on the way the anthropologist/ethnographer approaches their practice. The concepts *verstehen*, which means "understanding the meaning of action from the actor's point of view'[9] and *einfühlen*, translated as 'to empathize with'[10], embrace not only an underlying problem of the anthropological field and its productions of tangible production of culture as texts-, but other aspects that may influence how the process of translation in these texts is defined. All these enlightening questions, propelled by the Malinowski 'scandal', pushed the discipline to face a 'postmodern turn'[11]; a change that enhanced the reflexivity on the field, the scope of its practices (ethnography), and the positioning of the subject/object of study by *locus of enunciation* here.

To move forward, comprehending what the practice of ethnography embodies is substantial. Ethnography, then, can be considered as a practice of cultural mediation. The anthropologist personifies the individual whose "capacity to interpret the reality", transforms other's culture in a "first-hand experience with mediation into ordinary language and into various languages of culture and types of media" (Torop 2019: 64): languages and media that can be set in the production of visual topological text through film and video. Here, the concepts of *verstehen* and *einfühlen* cannot be set aside. On the contrary, they provide a ground to understand how culture can be (re)produced even before the creation of the ethnographic text, being constructed from what is understood as a 'source culture', that has previously determined what defines a 'target culture' under translation studies (these concepts will be address later in the chapter 3.3). In this case, the *verstehen* should be extrapolated to understand how the ethnographer develops its texts, since what he/she is implicitly composing through visual anthropology, using Geertz terms, is part "of one's own biography [the anthropologists/ethnographer], not of theirs" (Geertz 1974: 45). Ethnography, of furthermore, ethnographic objects – as Fabian defines it are, in this sense:

---

[9] *In:* Online Dictionary of the Social Sciences. Retrieved from: http://bitbucket.icaap.org/dict.pl?term=VERSTEHEN , 23.09.2021.
[10] *In:* Collins German-English Dictionary. Retrieved from: https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/german-english/einfuhlen , 23.09.2021.
[11] Young, Michael 2014. Writing his Life through the Other: The Anthropology of Malinowski. *The Public Domain*. Retrieved from: https://publicdomainreview.org/essay/writing-his-life-through-the-other-the-anthropology-of-malinowski, 23.09.2021.

[A]rtefacts by their nature – were, within the paradigms of emerging anthropology (evolutionism and diffusionism, the warring twins), treated as objects of the kind science needs in order to operate its methods. They were studied by a discipline, ethnology, that may have thought of itself as a Kulturwissenschaft, but adopted methodologies that had their origins in positivist «natural history». Spatial distribution and taxonomic classification dominated the agendas of research and theorizing about culture" (Fabian 2004: 49).

These paradigms can be easily traced. Before the 'postmodern' turn and the modern era of anthropology – which took place in 1950s and 1970s according to Fabian (2004, 47), exoticism ruled as a primary aspect to project the image of the 'primitive' peoples in terms of the "(imperialistic) colonial academic agenda" (Tomaselli 1996: 92). Later, with the emergence of the post-colonial studies in 1980, the influences of the colonial discourses that shaped the knowledge through the ethnographic texts, enhancing the conception of the 'Other' culture as 'primitive', where reviewed. Nevertheless, the arise of the post-colonial studies also made evident that these paradigms worked as an academical construct, but in multiple cases failed to understand the Other's culture outside of the bias of the colonial discourse. Now, specifically regarding to the construction of the ethnographic text, Tomaselli explains:

Visual anthropology depends for its authority on the way its constituent discourses – the relation between knowledge and vision, on the one hand, and knowledge about other peoples, on the other – impact on the everyday life of people depicted in the 'text' of the discipline. […] Valentin Yves Mudimbe (1.988) traces the origins, history and discourse of the ways in which the existence of Africa has been made intelligible to the mind of the West. He stresses the special relationship assigned by the West to the African person's world as a form of Other. In terms of the way this relationship has progressed-through missionary contact, colonial occupation, and the economics of development in the post-colonial era- there has been a tradition of deploying the example of being-African as a negative case upon which the positive identification of the West can be elaborated (Tomaselli 1996:123).

What's interesting of Mudimbe's example, is that it makes explicit how the discourses that precede the production of the ethnographic texts, are the same that have established what Other's culture should be defined as, even before accessing to their culture and 'interpreting' it. This puts over the table a major problem regarding the social sciences. Throughout the development of anthropology, the discourses conveyed from different and chronologically well-defined paradigms have influenced how the discipline and its methods had been carried out. If, as Sütiste and Torop highlight, "the development of sciences — regarded as scientific disciplines mapping cultural terrain — is dependent on the dynamics of culture and does not take place as a linear movement" (2007: 187), then this affirmation calls

into question how post-postcolonial studies were presented as a rupture of the colonial paradigm in a linear sequence that closes the chapter, for western studies, of colonial exchanges. As Mendieta highlights:

> Modernity is the product of the globality or 'mundialidad' of humanity, and it would be hubristic to negate most or any contributions to such a project. The political consequences of this form of theories are evident. They are a critique of all forms of Eurocentrism, Americanism and Ethnocentrism. The subject is at the same time an object of study, and its locus of enunciation is the locus of enactment and actualization. Here the other speaks about itself from its own place: from its quotidianity. The question "can the subaltern speak?" is provisionally answered with: no, so long as the same onto-epistemological-historical categories of the Euro-North American project of modernity and globalization continue to be used (Mendieta 2005:194).

To review this discussion, I will provide an overview of the development of the ethnographic film towards the post-colonial studies and the appropriation of the media by indigenous filmmakers.

3.2 From film ethnography to indigenous video

Ethnographic film has been defined by Karl Heider (1976) as ethnographic description which basic characteristics are set in the non-fictional genre with anthropological intention, defined by the scientific canons of anthropology as a tool of knowledge for the analysis of culture based of the images recorded on film (Ardèvol, 1994). Nevertheless, its boundaries have not been yet completely defined. Heider, for example, acknowledges every video as ethnographic, and video as part of anthropology and ethnographic research, while Ruby attributed the specifity of ethnographic film as footage produced by or in association with anthropologists. For Sol Worth, video cannot be considered as ethnographic because it depends on the usage of footage and the intention of the filmmaker or producer[12].

Despite the conceptualization or typology in which images produced within the anthropological research is made, the discussion on how 'to grasp the natives view' has unraveled an exploration towards objectivity, subjectivity and how this can fit within the

---

[12] Duarte, Carlos; Cárdenas, Carlos 2008. ¿Antropología visual? Retrieved from: https://docplayer.es/112632159-Antropologia-visual-por-carlos-duarte-y-carlos-cardenas-carlos-duarte.html 15 August 2021

ethnographic method of description. In this path, different orientations in ethnographic film have emerged. Peter Crawford (1992) has defined an ethnographic film classification that can subscribe to Bill Nichols's (1997) modes of representation of documentary film, as Ardèvol (1994) explains. Nichols's modes are the *Expositional*, *Observational*, *Interactive* and *Reflexive*. The *Expositional* follows the guidelines of classical documentary which exposes verbal argument supported by images, while The *Observational* mode intents to record the 'reality as it is'. The *Interactive* mode looks forward to leaving evidence of the relationship between the filmmaker and the subject recorded, while the *Reflexive* gives awareness of the process and mechanisms of representation. Crawford, on the other hand, defines three types of ethnographic film modes of representation: the *Perspicuous* ("fly on the wall) which supposes a distancing from the subject, *Experiential* (fly in the soup) that suggests an active participation of the subject and *Evocative* (fly in the me) as a reflection over the camera and subjects filmed. The history of ethnographic film can be adjusted and seen under the spectrum of these documentary modes were the latter three can be related to Nichols' expositional or observational, interactive, and reflexive documentary modes respectively. In *Table 1*, I provide a general upon the characteristics of these ways of representation based on Ardèvol's (1994) descriptions.

| | *Expositional Mode* | *Observational – Direct Mode (Perspicuous)* | *Interactive Mode* | | *Reflexive and auto-reflexive mode* |
			Cinema Verité (Experiential)	*Participatory cinema (Evocative)*	
Influence	L. Kuleshov; Z. Vertov, J. Grierson	C. Young; T. Asch	Z. Vertov. R. Flaherty	J. Rouch	
Some Representatives	F.L. Regnault; F. Boas; M. Mead & G. Bateson	R. Leacock	J. Rouch; E. Morin	D. MacDougall	J. Ruby; B. Myerhoff.
Characteristics	· Scientific thought, intent of representing of social reality: "Reality as it is, I show I tell". · Analysis of human behaviour, and physiologic expression.	· Maintain naturality by not influencing in subjects' behaviour. · Limited mediation between researcher and subject. · Invisible ways of production.	· Acknowledge of position of researcher and his influence. · Evidence production mechanisms. · Collaborative dynamics with subjects. · Acknowledge of his role as interpretant.	· Subject becomes active part of production process. · Evidence of some political, social or economic topics.	· Reflects about the mechanisms of production. · The border between objectivity/subjectivity is blurred. · Constructed non-stable identities. · Epistemological review.
Methodology	Verbal commentary supported by sequence of images that support the argument.	·Continuous sequences with little manipulation ·Avoidance of jump cuts. · Limited verbal commentary. · Use of close ups, mobility of camera for spontaneity. · No previous script to 'Obtain richness of data'	· Camara is a catalyst of events: action-reaction, description-interpretation observation-participation. · Montage in field, spatio-temporal cuts. · 'Organic production' Importance of subjects' voice, ethnographer as translator, guide.	· Reveal technical resources and use of filmic media.	· Evidence the producer, process and film as a whole. · Empiricist use of the camara.
Narrative Style	· Appropriation of traditional storytelling (exposition, conflict, resolution). · Narration of events as absolute.	Avoidance of traditional storytelling, still lead by narration.	·'Mettre en scène de la realité'. · Narration of events as interpretant. · Camara as observant, participant give just one view.	·Exposition of dialogues between researcher and subject.	·Anthropologists expose their experience and reflection. ·Autobiographical aspects.
Critique	· Dominance of the researcher commentary. · Spatio-temporal linearity rupture by montage.	· Invisibility of the researcher. · Political, ethical or ideological issues addressed by the voice of the researcher.	· Voice of filmmaker vs. voice of subjects. · Close interpretation of the events. Subject not in control of production of film. · Events segmented to follow narrative intentions.	Film escapes control of subjects. Rights of representation, production and ownership not acknowledged.	· Requirement to break narrative codes. · Locus of enunciation based on the anthropologist position.

Table 1. Ethnographic film modes and characteristics

Despite the orientation, Fabian has criticized the models by signaling:

[W]hen it comes to producing anthropological discourse in the forms of description, analysis, and theoretical conclusions, the same ethnographers will often forget or disavow their experience of coevalness with the people they studied. Worse, they will talk their experience away with ritualistic invocations of participant observation and the "ethnographic present." In the end, they will organize their writing in terms of the categories of Physical or Typological Time, if only for fear that their reports might be otherwise disqualified as poetry, fiction, or political propaganda. (Fabian 1983: 33)

In the journey of representation, the reflexive mode has gone close to review the underlying epistemological premises of research questions, search of a specific sense and how the results are exposed and under which strategy (Ardevol 1994:118) evidencing as Myerhoff and Ruby (1982) explain, a constant conflict between the previous ethnographic film and documentary conventions in relation to the scientific need of methodological exposition. Acknowledging science as a dynamic rooted in a linear historical development and tied to the specific culture of the society that produces it, Ruby criticizes the scientific position of anthropology and its interest of reclaiming a conscious of the impossibility to provide an epistemological neutrality of the events that it studies. This has led to the examination of anthropology itself were "Science [becomes] reflective from the moment its results return to the system in which they have been explained, showing clearly the methods by which, they have been achieved and related […] Examining the way ethnographic data is presented is also a reflexive act" (Ruby 1982: 17-20). A common ground is agreed on. As Ardèvol exposes, (1994: 120), there is no isomorphism between reality, the image perceived by the observer and the event formerly recorded and manipulated. Basically, distortion is an imperative feature of the whole process. This matches Fabian's view towards coevalness.

Authors as Joaquín Barriendos (2011), and Gliozzi (1978), pointed out that the disciplinary limitation of auto-reflexive ethnography, was related to the imperial luminic paradigm:

To be able to postulate a true decolonial strategies, cross-cultural visual studies need then to go beyond the simple statement that both the heterogeneous historical-structural development of visuality colonial and imperial ethnographies, such as the process of disciplinary legitimation of self-reflective ethnography are strongly related to [this] paradigms" (Barriendos 2011: 25).

Ardèvol suggests a fifth mode, the *evocative or deconstructionist cinema*, which emerges after the decade of 1980s, and introduces images produced even outside fieldwork as an intention to evidence dynamics of power and political relationships. It exposes the codes of documentary film and questions its ability to produce objective, veridic and truthful images, making evident the objective / subjective, reality / fiction, truth / falsehood dichotomies to "realize that both are fictions: social constructions" (Ardevol 1994:128). The *evocative mode* also puts into questions the discursive frames, embedded in the consolidation of a post-modern anthropological thinking.

As Ilbeykyna highlights, in the task of describing unknown cultures, the production of visual production became "uninpretable in the process of fixation" (2014: 1473). The attempt to achieve the premise of objectivity in the practice was focused on a discussion unliked from the problem of representation that were being held in other in other fields, as the filmic. Despite the interdisciplinary elements subjected to film ethnography: "[t]he narratives provided by many of its authors on their work indicate an ill-advised detachment from the international theoretical debates which questioned issues of realism, representation, and science" (Tomaselli 1996: 5). This also may have implied the need of rethinking of the relevance ethnography as tool. MacDougall points out, at this point that "the inclusion of indigenous narratives always raises the question of whether the film is presenting indigenous claims or merely absorbing one more mechanism into its own narrative strategies" (1994: 29) But this may be the anchor point where we can find a common ground with border thinking.

This is the point where we need to stand to study the threshold for semiotic analysis for anthropological film. The 'double ethnographic disappearance' is a concept addressed by Barrientos to describe some element of the 'Coloniality of the View' which is tied to the notion of cultural cannibalism (Barriendos 2011:24). As the author mentions, despite not being engaged within the decolonial thought, these perspectives meet in the invisibility of the observer who searches among the Other, the 'savage', and the invisibility of the cannibal dehumanized by radical ethnography as a denial of its existence in the observer by placing it in the other: "Faced with this double regime of the unnoticed, it can be said, consequently, that both the "discovery" of the "New World" and the "invention" of its inherent monstrosity correspond symmetrically with the birth of a new transatlantic visual economy, on one hand the, and with a properly capitalist and properly anthropophagous ethnocentric visual culture, on the other" (*Ibidem* 22). Therefore, when it comes to the precepts of the visual ethnography

41

defined by Malinowski, which relies in a mise en scène that 1.) disarticulate de discourse of objectivity by Eurocentric ethnography; 2) that distance itself from the transparency or anthropological acculturation; and 3) puts into question the epistemological approach of the 'participant observation' and interactions based in the coloniality of the view. (Marcus 2002: 191-199). This is embedded in the 'poscolonial crisis of the ethnographic authority' (Clifford 1995:23). Nichols highligts:

> The status of the Other as projection or fabrication, however, means that classical fiction has enormous difficulty in representing other cultures outside of their function within a system of opposition and identity. The Other (woman, native, minority) rarely functions as participant and creator of a system of meanings, including a narrative structure of her own creation. The creation of the Other, audiovisually, is a fictional medium: Monsters, aliens, Indians and assassins: the wide range of Others, at best, conveys a certain recognition of a common link between the protagonist and themselves, but almost he never carries this process forward to the point where it becomes clear that the monster is wholly and utterly a creature of the system that represents it. This means that popular fiction films can support readings that make it more evident that the Other is a projection and fabrication. (Nichols 1997: 261-262)

Moving forward analysing how description, or self-description, can be addressed beyond the dominance of the anthropological discursive frame, it's important to see how the position of the native is different from that one of the researchers. For Paul Whitinui (2013), only the native can speak about the cultural underlays and overlays that are associated with elements of place, space, time and identity: "Autoethnography, as the dominant discourse, has become a widely accepted method of inquiry that is grounded in an interpretive paradigm and designed to construct wider cultural, political, and social meanings and understandings (Whitinui 2013: 462). Despite the discussions regarding the cultural, political, discursive and technological events that took place in the decade of the 1960s and the 1970s as part of the relativist turn in anthropology, the political dimension of the image outside of the colonialist discourse could only take place in 1980s by the appropriation of the camera by the native communities. With the democratization of the media, meaning the possibility to access technologies, the view of the ethnographic film shifts to the emergence of indigenous media.

Indigenous Video

Indigenous video, was first coined in Mexico in 1983, has become an assemblage of discourses and practices that document and disseminate local struggles, covering political

conflicts of cultural identity (Salazar; Córdova 2019). It has been used to refer to indigenous production, although in many cases, indigenous filmmakers refer to frame their productions just as 'communication material' or simply videos (Mora 2015: 35). Nevertheless, native filmmakers claim that the appropriation of the media shouldn't reduce their practice to that of merely video makers. They claimed to be acknowledged as directors and documentalists themselves. These productions are expected to be understood detached from the traditional filmic categories, not associated merely to a king of artisanal production and looking forward to being structured within an own language and narratives that are continuously being explored (*Íbidem*). Another term suggested by Faye Gisbourg (1994), has been *embedded aesthetics,* (traslated by Córdova (2011) as *estéticas enraizadas* or rooted aesthetics) has been also suggested, to refer to the cultural and social systems where these are produced, circulated, and used (Salazar; Córdova 2019).

Either as a process of hybridation, by the inclusion of occidental elements in indigenous cultures (García 2001), or as phenomena of 'domestication' or 'indigenization' of the camera which allows indigenous cultures to integrate European elements to their own symbolic and social order (Schiwy 2009), "The use of the camera and editing tools allows indigenous producers to create an audiovisual aesthetic based on orality and their particular conceptions of time and space to […] evidence the physical displacements and symbolic mobility of various indigenous groups". (Muñoz 2018, 123).

Indigenous video looks forward to unlinking these productions from traditional styles and as "a critique of the political effects of multicultural tropes of indigeneity" (Anthias 2017, 270). Iván Sanjinés, Bolivian filmmaker highlights:

> We wanted to break away from the anthropological gaze in which researchers arrive and encounter a reality, and in some cases bring cameras, and pay attention to how an individual or a group sees the world, or how people use the camera, etc., but ultimately people were treated as objects, not subjects, and often there was no thought about how to respond to specific requirements from a process-driven perspective. (Sanjinés 2013:36)

Ethnographic film, and in some cases even documentary, have been seen as categories that not illustrate their vision, which has ended in avoiding attempts to produce film ethnographies as such, in order to avoid the claims for a search of a so-called sense of reality

and naturality. Following this understanding, autho-etnography is supported on an epistemological perspective that, "which maintains that an individual life can account for the contexts in which the person in question lives, as well as the historical periods that he / she goes through throughout its existence". (Blanco 2012:170). Somehow, these perspectives may be aligned to Kuehnhast notion of visual imperialism:

[it] is the subliminal message of cultural hierarchy where the condition of one culture over another culture is communicated by presenting what is natural, normal, and desired in culture through the dominant culture's set of racial or gender stereotypes, and what is unnatural, abnormal and undesired through the subordinate culture's set. (Kuehnhast 1992: 185)

With the appropriation of the video by native communities in the early 1980s, the problem towards the right of self-representation and self-determination became fundamental to address the plurality in the ways of belonging and being (Salazar; Córdova 2019:128). These productions have been created under the concept of *Abya Ayala*, originated by the Kuna, that means "land in plain maturity" in reference to the Americas. It represents a feel that, even though, "dispersed throughout the national geography [in the case of Colombia, shows], the connections between their authors are evident since they coincide in the same arenas of political and social assemblage: that of regional and national indigenous movements," (Mora 2015:24) As part of a self-description, it is relevant to address the political agendas of indigenous mobilizations that highlights complex realities in expressions that involve elements of fictional film, audiovisual essay, and hybrid forms, manifesting the latent dynamics of colonization of the body, the territory and the mind they are still subjected to. Here, the use of visual mechanism as flashbacks, flashforwards, cuts and fictionalizations, in narrative conventions as 'docufictions' are used as liberation of historical continuity of the time of anthropology.

With the form of the 'intercultural documentary' an alternative visual dynamic that, unlike ethnography and other filmic styles, works as a strategy for the analysis of socio-cultural change (Restrepo *et al.* 2016:144). Beyond focusing on how to represent the Other -or Self, it uses the media as a political mean to change social injustice. Based on their research, two aspects are relevant in this new *locus of enunciation*: 1.) the place and the political position claimed as 2.) the geopolitical and geohistorical environment where these productions emerge. Without attempting to frame indigenous productions under the umbrella of intercultural documentary suggested by the authors, or a specific style, what is relevant from the view the convey is addressing the place and political as core of these films, constituted by the

repositioning of the *locus of enunciation*. By reviewing the impact of the video and focusing less on the form or trying to define how the structure of the film fits within a specific style, the focus is set on how it can work as a piece to transform existing social institutions, structures and relationships. It works as a mechanism of resistance. This interculturality, nevertheless, is manifested in these films by evidencing precisely the lack of cultural and epistemological, interculturality of the products that have represented indigenous communities since de XVI century, which has been set as a basis to review former representations of reality because, as Restrepo et al., highlight, the bet with collaborative or reflexive ethnography has relied on multiculturalism instead of the dialogue suggested by interculturalism. (2016:128).

Indigenous video, as self-representation works as a medium that allows to review the current realities by inscribing other epistemologies in the process of production, which enter in dialogue with former ethnographical views, from the making to the display. These processes, suggests also the revision or resignification of the aim to study the Other, their practices and behaviours, as core of ethnography. As such, the political power of these projects is born from the resignification of the role of the media and the appropriation of devices that have marked dynamics of power. Therefore, as part of the current intercultural dialogue, "the Other doesn't allow themselves to be ethnographied, because they know the epistemo-politic roots of this practice" (Restrepo 2016: 154). Instead, the search of fair economic, politic and epistemologically dynamics, as Restrepo highlights, is what becomes valuable in collaborative cinema, where the elimination of ethnographic distance is achieved by turning the subjects into researchers, while the anthropologist becomes an adviser or companion of the local filmmakers and productions (Mora 2015).

3.3 The political dimension of the image in space and time

If indigenous video has presented itself as a way of resistance, it is important to address what constitute the image as political for the ratification of own epistemologies, ontologies and ways of representation, as the political agency of ethnographic film. This can mark an anchor point to set a borderland for cultural representation. To define what makes an image political, or what can we consider as the politics of the image, we can review Juan Carlos Arias' *La vida que resiste en la imagen* (2010). The reflection upon what constitute the political image, analyses the thought of Epstein and Vertov in the aesthetical political value, Gilles Deleuze's (2000) concept of inorganic life and Rancière's (2005) fable that run contrary to

itself. The first two authors are of relevance for their high influence in ethnographic film. Now, Deleuze and Rancière's view can help to frame why indigenous voice becomes political, even within ethnographic film since film is always political, but "life resist in the image, not as a content of it, but as the possibility to make visible a singularity" (Arias 2010: 36). I will briefly review the three perspectives to tie the notion of political image to both ethnographic film and indigenous video.

As Juan Diego Caicedo highlights (2010), filmic texts may say more than their authors may attempts to reveal. It is an aspect that cannot be completely dominated by reason. This happens when the knowledge of the filmmaker, altogether conjoint with the 'knowledge' attributed to the dispositive -the camera-, mixes fragments of social, academic and aesthetic knowledge. Arias affirms that if there is a relation between the filmic image and the political, cinema works as a vehicle for the political as a separate object from cinema itself and becomes possible by the mediation of a specific subject: either the filmmaker or the viewer (Caicedo 2010:23). In its inherent political capabilities, the filmic media becomes a resistance mechanism, despite of what is visually represented. By entailing cinema to life, and life to the politic, the spectrum that configures different ways of life are created. The political in cinema refers to the "constitution of ways of thinking and ways of living […] wondering about the political dimension of cinema implies thinking about the way in which cinema is defined as the opening of possibilities of life" (Arias 2010:31), meaning that film is always political, but "life resist in the image, not as a content of it, but as the possibility to make visible a singularity" (Arias 2010: 36).

When trying to find how the political can be displayed in ethnographic film or indigenous video, we may see that cultural description tied to representation in ethnographic film, differs from the intention of indigenous video which premise is not cultural description but the constitution of political mobilization. Nevertheless, the aim of objectivity in ethnographic film cannot be entirely achieved due to the existence of a political life which mediates representation, even scaping the historical premises by which these ethnographies are produced: "The power of cinema lies in the possibility of opening the 'occurrence' of a life in the image. This is what Deleuze will call "inorganic life" opposing to the reduction of life to the organization of the biological" (Arias 2010:33). But before dressing Deleuze's thought, I will briefly trace Vertov and Epstein's influence in ethnographic film and its political dimension.

Both Vertov and Epstein view cinema as a non-essential narrative art that could reveal what it is hidden for the human eye, an immaterial life that could be captured as movement. The attempt of entailing the social reality, as Vertov and Epstein suggested was adopted as a premise by expositional mode, and later extended to the observational mode by the attempt to avoid any kind of visible mediation of the operator of the camera and anthropologist. Nevertheless, here we can find a fundamental contradiction: the ethnographic method cannot be addressed without the commentary of the anthropologist. Also, these ethnographic modes were based on a chronology or evolutionary time, which contradicted Vertov and Epstein's intention. Biological life, tied to a modernist project in which ethnography is inaugurated, could not subscribe fully to the principles of Vertov and Epstein, could deploy the political dimension under Deleuze, and even more, upon Ranciere's perspective.

With Deleuze's (1985a) concept of *inmanence plane*, we can speak about a filmic space where movement flows without a centre of reference. Here, objects as such, perception or clear perspective towards them doesn't exist yet: we can find here a series of images crashing between them, actions and reactions. Now, the *centre of indeterminancy* are the subjects capable of perception. The 'inorganic life' is produced with the possibility to present time purely, as occurs in modern cinema in Deleuze's (1985b) *image-time*, supposing that the structural centre that organizes events in chronological order disappears. This point, as mentioned above, was still not possible to be achieved by the nature of ethnography. Deleuze proposed the paralysis of narration for a non-representational essence to happened: in order to convey the political power of the image, we require the presence of the inorganic life. This required a denial of the existence of the narrative. If this happened in fragments of expositional and observational ethnographic films, it was never detached from the whole description that was being addressed. Now, according to Rancière, Deleuze's perspective to address the political image is problematic. The point is not to achieve the inorganicity potence of the image by denying the narrative feature of films, but to understand the existence of a space of struggle where both dynamics coexists for the political to occur, "The denial of the narrative character of cinematographic art is nothing more than an allegory that always supposes what it tries to deny: the existence of a fable" (Arias 2010: 131). Instead, it is in the concept of the *fable as contrary to itself* where we can find the political embracing all the filmic features. Two things are relevant here. Documentary, for Rancière, is not a genre that record reality without fictionalizing it: it is a property of cinema that configures a "new history" through images.

In the struggles of ethnographic film, we would be able to see new written histories, despite the narrative need to address cultural description. Film, then, frames both the narration and pure 'asignificant' situations (Arias 2010:110). It creates a history composed not only by memorable facts, but by texts built in order to officialise a memory within the narrative matrix. It this case, images oppose texts in its character as monument: "The monument is what speaks without words, what instructs us without the intention of instructing us, what carries memory for the very fact of having cared only for its present." (Arias 2010: 126). A monument would thus be any object in which a way of being of the everyday is revealed, a particular practice that has been inscribed in it without a "historical intention" (Arias 2010:113). Ethnographic film, then, turns political when making visible and, paradoxically, giving voice to those who doesn't have one without words, as a monument. This consolidate the political power of the Other even behind their description, which is the one that has been appropriated and serves now as political mobilization. In our case study, and following Rancières perspective, we will see how these ethnographic images have been appropriated for this purpose.

To deepen on how this works, Rancière uses as example the appropriation of the film *Mother Dao* (1995) by Vincent Monnikedam. I will actualize this example with the case of Villafaña's film *Sey Arimaku y la Otra Oscuridad* (2012). The film analyses previous ethnographical films and dramatizations recovered from the audio-visual archive made in the Arhuaco territory (Santa Marta, Colombia) during the period of evangelization of the community by the Capuchin, that spans between 1914 and 1982. The purpose of these former films was to show the processes of acculturation as 'benevolent' towards the community, necessary to carry on a project towards of civilization. The narrative used in each film is clear: throughout the use of tropes that described indigenous peoples as alcoholics and witches, a voice over explaining the importance for these communities to embrace evangelization, while using support images to sustain the premise. By using and reorganizing these images, as occurs with Rancière's case, Villafaña resignifies the images supporting now the actual political mobilization and dynamics of resistance of the current Arhuaco peoples. As Arias exposes it, if this is possible is because the filmic image cannot just be reduced to the intention of the one using the camera and filming. What escapes this intention reproduces a contrariety between the "voluntary intention of showing and involuntary presence of that filmed" (Arias 2010: 115) It is standing in this border where it is possible to reorganize the space-time frame where the original images where produced. Every ethnographic film carries the possibility of being resignified as part of political mobilization by making visible the invisible. This is the core for

dynamics of self-representation with political intent. Later, the appropriation of the filmic media and intercultural dialogue would enhance the knowledge produced in the border as a new *locus of enunciation*. In this game, the recorded events and ethnographic descriptions made defy the history they have produced. The latency of the fable contrary to itself lies in the border where narratives and images struggle, as in the new configuration of the now and then in the same spatial frame that now actualizes itself. Here, as Arias highlights, is where the power of cinema to 'speak up' lies:

> It is not a question of allowing those who could not speak to speak, […] in which, through camera registration, ordinary people are given "the opportunity" to freely express their concerns and opinions. Nor is it an ethnographic work in which unknown cultural customs and actions are filmed. The first thing that can be said of this "giving word" is that it designates, for Rancière, a particular relationship between the visible and the invisible, between what is said and what is not said. […] The power of the cinema by which it "gives the word" to what was not destined to have it consists, in this way, in separating the words from what they themselves say and separating the images from what they themselves show. Thus, the cinema builds a "moment of dialogue" between the visible and the invisible. At this moment the voice of those who have no voice arises; it is the moment when the image builds a new history, making life a monument" (Arias 2010:117- 119)

Agreeing with Arias, the political surpasses the representational sphere that defines it. Accordingly, scholars as Priya Dixit, refers to the importance of "encouraging the focus not only on what is seen, but also on what is hidden, thus shifting analyses from the politics in representation to the conditions that enable representability" (2014: 207). In this sense, the analysis of rhetorical strategies, limited to the formal and narrative aspects that constitute films themselves, fall short to address the political and epistemological perspectives in which they are framed. What I am eager to explore next is how the possibilities of life can be understood in indigenous media under an understanding of the political, that ends up unlinking from representation and the descriptive parameter set by ethnographic film.

4.   Method of analysis: Colonial Semiosis, the Space of Theory criteria and Ideological Chronotope.

As I have highlighted in previous chapters, if colonial discourse refers to framed in colonial situations from the XVI to XXth centuries, and designates oral and written productions in alphabetic writing, with colonial semiosis Mignolo extends the analysis to a domain the involves interactions of different systems of sign, beyond the verbal e.g. semiotic productions based in orality, picto-ideographic, textile, as alphabetic ones, in reflexion fields as the Andean and Mesoamerican which surpasses the domain of the word and literature. It, beyond describing ways or representation, signals the fractures, frontiers and interactions that characterize representations in colonial situations. (Mignolo 2013:132-134). Even though it is not provided a clear typology in which a method for colonial semiosis can be applied, Mignolo provides relevant elements for its analysis. My aim is to actualize the concept of colonial semiosis with Eduardo Mendieta's *Space of Theory* criteria and Ideological Chronotope. The later, first introduced by Mikhail Bakhtin, provides an understanding of time and space in text for intersemiotic analysis. I will use Perteer Torop's (2013) conceptualization, and briefly review Michael Chanan's (2000) perspective for the analysis of documentary films. Through these inputs, I will develop a scheme to analyze a few excerpts the narrative matrix of Amado Villafaña films, *Nebusímake: Memorias de una independencia* (2010), *Resistencia en la Línea Negra* (2011), and *Sey Arimaku o la Otra Oscuridad* (2012).

Colonial Semiosis

As a network of processes that looks forward to understanding the *locus of enunciation*, colonial semiosis is as the net of spaces where this comprehension takes place, it requires a pluritopic perspective to reveal the tensions, on one side academic and disciplinary and, on the other, the social, ethnic, and sexual position of the subject of comprehension (Mignolo 2013: 146). The first element, also to tie to the anthropological field, is which is the *locus of enunciation* where the subject of comprehension understands colonial situations. To review it, it is important to refer to the *decires fuera de lugar* (sayings out of place). This is the most relevant characteristic of the colonial semiosis: "semiotic interactions of control, adaptation, opposition, resistance, etc. in which it is a question of finding a new place, a new *locus of enunciation* in the terrain of a constant war of sayings" (Mignolo 2013: 120). It

comprehends, not only a geographical space, physically, but the territory as a memory of the space. When providing a broad view towards this point, Mignolo highlights that, in general, colonial discourse is technological (referring to a symbolic horizon of the technique related to cultural notions of 'progress' and 'development') when it enunciates is out of place and rootless from the soil, this meaning that, in general, the conqueror e.g. the Spanish chronist stands in the 'say' of the technique, while the indigenous or mestizo stand in the 'say' of metaphysics: this assuming and ontological and epistemological view towards geography and territory of each. In the period of the American, for example, two saying out of place can be acknowledged: 1.) the accommodation to a symbolic horizon that is not the own, between colonized and colonizers, e.g., at a technological level with the use of alphabet 2.) and that of the territory where the habits and memory of the colonized is accommodated to own experiences of the colonizer[13]. To position these saying out of place, we can signal three main aspects: 1.) the saying subject; 2.) the social roles; and the 3.) inscription forms.

Space of Theory

In other perspective, Eduardo Mendieta's (2015) *Space of Theory*, provides 5 criteria for the development of a typology of theories, to "differenciate between theories and their effects" (Mendieta 2015: 185). Here, the sayings out of place mentioned by Mignolo can be framed in current colonial situations and analyzed in a plural way since, as Mendieta affirms, "[w]e observe ourselves in the act of observing. If we cannot see the place from which we observe, we could at least observe what it is that we observe and how it is that we observe it" (*Ibidem* 184). As the author manifests, the juxtaposing of observer and observed in Niklas Luhmann cybernetics, falls short to address the multiple ways how this relation can take place: is not either a participant of a community gives account of its experience in it by hermeneutical immersion, or there is an objectivating manner of an observer as non-participant of a community:

---

[13] To understand this point, the following example provided by Mignolo may be useful:

> So, if the saying of the Castilians is 'out of place' because it is uttered in a space alien to the habit and customs of the saying subject, it is not 'out of place' regarding the writing itself, since the chronicler Castilian could articulate an oral discourse with alphabetic writing, which for them was a being 'in the place'. On the other hand, for Andean speakers (and also Mesoamericans, in Anahuac or Yucatán), one of the manifestations of their being 'out of place' was the incorporation of alphabetic writing and the creation of an unknown mediation (without habit and without custom) between speaking and writing or other forms of graphic inscriptions or visible signs (kipus, fabrics, stones, paintings, etc.). (120-121)

We are observed observers, and observers who observe themselves. The gaze is not monological, but always mediated by a third. In the language of semiology, we could say that observation is always a triadic relation: there is always a gazing of an observer who is in turn observed in its very act of gazing. The one observed can always return the gaze: the observed can gaze back, can look back. Using Mignolo's language, I would put it now in the following way: we always speak about something, or someone, from a given perspective, and when we do so, we are enacting, performing, deploying certain forms of knowledge-power. Now, what this type of analysis allows us is to make explicit the power dimensions, or the dimensions of coercion and epistemological violence that every knowledge pronouncement entails. At the same time, this type of analysis also allows us to unmask the form in which allegedly universal propositions and formulations, pronouncements that are putatively not contaminated and damaged by the subjective or local, are in fact made possible by an epistemological machine that has specific goals and functions. (Mendieta 2005:188).

In this sense, Medieta's criteria provides a framework for comparative analysis of theories as follows:

1.) *Epistemograph or ontograph:* inscribed by a group of theories or theory: this relates to the spatial imaginary that conveys geo-political locus determined by its place of enunciation as the image it projects to the planet.

2.) *Locus of instatiation of the social*: This refers to how certain groups of social structures or processes are materialized. It can be manifested in social differentiations e.g., modernity as rationality constitutes a certain form of society by which other societies are primitive, or pre-modern.

3.) *Normative criteria:* This criteria evaluates how a certain society achieves or actualize its reason the social world, or to what is normative for a theory or group of theories e.g., for some theories of modernity, the criteria to determine whether certain societies are or not modern based of levels of institutionalization or self-reflexivity, for example.

4.) *Political Consequence*: of an epistemological project: Meaning in "in what ways does a certain ontograph or epistemograph turn into an actual political project?" (Mendieta 2005:185), reviewing political impact. This is the political impact of a theory. The main question, for Mendieta is "which political projects are sanctioned when certain processes, loci of materialization of reason, epistemograph or ontographs are theoretically defended and articulated?" (*Ibidem*)

5.) *Articulation:* this criteria asks about how a theory is produced, and the position of the theoretical agents that produce he theories. This locates the positioning of the subjects that are authorized to speak, occupying a privileged epistemological place, while

locating its own object of knowledge. A different way of saying this would be: "who speaks for whom and who speaks over or about whom?" (Mendieta 2005:1986). This refers to Mignolo's *locus of enunciation* and practice of *enactment* (Mignolo 1994:2000).

Theories are a configuration of both social and imaginary space; therefore, it is important to think "our locus of epistemological privilege, or to think the place of our epistemological scorn and segregation, this is what Raymond Pannikar has called a plurotopic hermeneutics" (Mendieta 2005: 187). As Medieta suggests, there are required many chronotopographs, different historical and geographical maps, to evidence multiple ways of being historical and contemporary, as multiple ways of being modern (Mendieta 2005:194); it requires to think the timing of space and the spacing of time beyond the "mapping of world historical time, and the temporalizing of geo-localities, which become the chronotope against which, or onto which, then narratives may be thought as logos, and logos as space, i.e. the time of the modern and the space of civilization" (*Ibidem* 198). This chronotope, therefore, can be reviewed producing another one that can give account of the multiple modernities.

Ideological chronotope

For the analysis of the films, the chronotope model or chronotopical analysis, can be suitable for a comparative analysis of texts in intersemiotic space, reviewing the main ontological characteristics of texts and its plurality (Torop 2013). Being first introduced by Mihkail Bakhtin, it allows to review the connection of time and space, in this case, in film texts. As Peeter Torop highligts: "while any particular text in a culture can exist simultaneously in the form of multiple transformations, […] the sum of the source text and its transformations constitutes an integral imaginary cultural text that exists differently in the collective and individual cultural memories" (2013:242). Although set to provide a comparative analysis of a text and its multiple translations, it become relevant for my research when reviewing the dominant narratives towards indigenous communities, presenting itself as a tool that can allow also to signal the fractures between ethnographic films and indigenous video compiled in a single text, in their multiplicity of ways to describe a culture. In this sense, with the crisis of gran narratives, what comes to be important, as Torop affirms, in providing a ground on "[w]hat makes the agreement of the real and the imaginary, the identification of the real in the imagined, [as] difficult is the congruence between seeing something in a certain manner (seeing as) and

what is actually seen" (2013: 242-243), in the concrete material and abstract imaginary at the level of the text itself and its intersemiotic space upon different sign systems (*Ibidem*). In the films to review, the notions upon what is real or imaginary, in put into question when the formerly observe is the one placed now in the position of the observer. In other words, review of the former description towards the Other is question by from the *locus of enunciation* of the Other themselves. The film in its multimodal capacity will allow us to review not only the film structure, but element as tropes used continuously in a narrative matrix. Chronotopical analysis, then, facilitates the analysis of film texts in its elemental features, as provides a differentiation of the social worlds or discursive frames where it is inscribed. Here, can be set "three roles mark [that] separate stages in a utopian narrative that informs much of postcolonial studies: from a colonial past taken as harmful; through a complex and conflicted present in which nothing seems easy or clearcut; to a decolonized future taken as beneficial" (Robinson 1997: 31). Nevertheless, it is important to remember, as we have seen in the previous chapters, that colonial discourses can be produced within all these frames, producing the first breakage of chronological time imposed by anthropological time as a mechanism of distancing towards the Other. As such, the hybridity of the indigenous media, also escapes the timeline of ethnographic film and its debates towards the dynamics of recording in field and postproduction (filmic montage), allowing indigenous filmmakers to review relationships between the anthropologists and their subjects of study, by finding their voice in the political image of the ethnographic film and producing now their own media: "the source text as an ideologically conformist text has become, as a translation made in another time and space, an instance of ideological resistance" (Torop 2013:249); it is an ideological resistance that also alters the dynamic of source and target texts. In the following example we may see, as Michael Chanan highlights that:

> although documentary may borrow the garb of narrative continuity, documentary space has a
> different syntax. In documentary, two different pieces of space may be joined in a continuous
> argument that links together quite disparate elements of the historical world in a kind of
> analogical affinity that generates signification. […] In the documentary mode, the visual and
> geographical leap is bridged by a logic of implication, where the organizing principle does
> not rely on plot and story but rhetoric, argument, or poetry. This is a very important insight:
> In documentary, narrative does not provide the only possible form of representational space
> on the screen. (Chanan 2000: 8-9).

Taking this into consideration, it is important to note that the chronotope model for the case study analysis, has been modified to review the most important aspects of this films to

find the fractures that will allow understand dynamics of colonial semiosis in the sayings out of place and the Space of Theory criteria. The Parametrical Text analysis frames the internal parameters of the chronotope. With these internal parameters, I will introduce the description and inscription forms of the text to study. The chronotope analysis, which conveys the external parameters, will be carried out using a modified version of chronotopical structure presented in Torop (2913). The method of analysis for the films, then, we will take place as follows:

Parametrical Text analysis for intersemiotic Space

Internal parameters (Texts materials and composition): Description of the inscription form of the films and connection between elementary units of the film.

External parameters

Chronotope: Description of phenomena in the sphere of spatio-temporal for comparative analysis. The model I will use (Table 2) integrates Torop's (2013) chronotopical structure, the elements of Space of Theory and aspects reviewed in Mignolo's colonial semiosis as follows:

Sphere of semiotization of the filmic fragments to analyze			
Topographical Chronotope	*Story*	*Intertextuality, Model of reality*	*Event*
Psychological Chronotope	*Narration*	*Self and Other – Sayings out of Place*	*Showing on screen*
		Epistemograph or ontograph	
		Locus of instatiation of the social and Normative criteria	
Metaphysical Chronotope	*Verbal description*	*Political Consequence*	*Pictorial description*
		Articulation	

Table 2. Chronotopical structure

5.   Case study: *Nebusímake: Memorias de una Independencia* **(2010),** *Resistencia en la Línea Negra* **(2011), and** *Sey Arimaku o la Otra Oscuridad* **(2012), by Amado Villafaña.**

The prolific experience of Amado Villafaña as Arhuaco photographer and filmmaker, evidences the discussions related to the representation of the Other in ethnographic films and the description made by anthropologist towards Other's culture, framed in previous chapters. With his production, he highlights not only the political struggles indigenous communities in Colombia -in this case of those located at the North of Colombia in the Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta (Arhuacos, Wiwas, Kogis and Kankuamos), as result of constant dynamics of colonial situations that still takes place in the zone. Authors as Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui, Leanne Betasamosake or Ramón Grosfoguel have referred to those as dynamics of economical, epistemic and ontological extractivism that have produced extreme waves of violence and ethnocide since colonization. In the chosen films, Villafaña addresses not only the political struggles these communities have and still face in multiple spheres, but presents insights towards ways of representation, cosmological views of the communities and the relevance of the appropriation of the media to raise their voice against injustice, and as mechanism to consolidate their cultural memory. These films convey and interesting dialogues not only between each other, but at an intercultural level, working as a narrative matrix set to review the imaginaries set towards their representation. I will analyze the specific excerpt of the film that deal with their representation in ethnographic films, sometimes extended as docudramas, and how they are using the audio-visual media to confront these imaginaries at a political level.

Nebusímake: Memorias de una independencia (2010)

Parametrical Text

With *Nebusímake*, Villafaña explores the impact of the presence of the Capuchin missions that took place in the territory between 1914 until their expulsion, in 1982. The film illustrates the processes of resistance of Arhuaco peoples to liberate themselves from the processes of evangelization and acculturation they were subjected to with their presence. In this film, Villafaña recurs to photographic and filmic archive material, oral testimonies, interviews, written texts, fictionalized historical events made by the own community to review,

in a hybrid documentary style, to explore this history and debunk the views constructed towards them during this period. As it is displayed in the film by the testimony of Antolino Torres, member of the community, their ceremonial temples were considered diabolical, they were thought to be alcoholics and lazy, and those who had their teeth stained for chewing coca were considered cannibals. As stated by Torres, the purpose of the Capuchin was to make them appropriate their thinking, creating multiple misunderstandings along a violent process of evangelization, which the Capuchins saw as education. The film is constructed in a non-linear way constantly reviewing commentaries, and the cosmological views of the Arhuaco peoples. Villafañas reviews Vidal Antonio Rozo's fiction film *El Valle de los Arhuacos* (1960) to explain the real events that inspired the film, whose verbal commentary recurs to the use of tropes that view indigenous as alcoholic and devil indian witches. Villafaña also uses fragments of Hector Acebes' *La gente de Aluaka*[14], that reviewed the geographical and 'aboriginal' aspects of the zone. I will describe how the latter is used in Villafañas film.

External parameters: Sphere of semiotization of the filmic segment: 00:11:58 – 00:16:38 (Annex 1).

Topographical Chronotope

Story: Villafaña's production team mobilizes to the Serankwa people's territory to speak with the Mamos (spiritual leaders) about the Capuchin experience in the 1980s.

Intertextuality – Model of reality: We are presencing the time and space of the Serankwa peoples and Villafaña's team. In this sequence, a dialogue with the Acebes' film is presented to reference the time of the arrival of the Capuchins to the Serankwa territory, in an observational style. The model of reality is that provided by the Mamos' testimony which, in contraposition to the Acebes' film, show the dissatisfaction of the community with their presence, despite the welcoming images depicted in *La gente de Aluaka*.

Event: General shoots of the team arriving to Serankwa. At arrival, Mamo Bernardo Suárez and José Romero give their testimony. Shots of the community, the production team while recording, and the community, are interspersed with frames of *La gente de Aluaka* film.

---

[14] The date of this production is not registered. Accepted in the Filmic Patrimony of Colombia in 1982.

Psychological Chronotope

Narration: The Mamo Bernardo Suarez recalls from their oral tradition that, what happened at the arrival of the Capuchins. Another member of Serankwa peoples explains how the place was constituted as a sacred and the impact of the Capuchin presence. Mamo José Romero recalls the experience.

Self and Other – Sayings out of Place: Here, the Other takes the place of the Self. The Other is no longer the community depicted by Acebes' film, but the one who is allowed to speak of its behalf. The oral testimony of the Mamos reinforces the sovereignty of the community when their shots are displayed, and opposes the narrative displayed by the Acebes' film. From the perspective of the Capuchins that arrive to the territory, shown in Acebes' film, they represent a saying out of place from the territory and probably the language used (we cannot hear it in the fragments), but in not 'out of place' by the mechanisms they use in the montage of the film. Now, embedded in Villafaña's film, where they are in their own territory, Villafaña on purpose depicts how the appropriation of the media is a saying out of place satisfactorily used to review the Capuchin experience, making use of own orality and traditions.

Epistemograph or ontograph: It is inscribed in Serankwa peoples, where they explain the presence of the Capuchinos from the constitution of their own spatial imaginary and *locus of enunciation.*

Locus of instatiation of the social and normative criteria: According to their spatial imaginary, Villafaña manages to actualize the value of the community orality according to their own values, holding to traditions that were tried to be presented by the Capuchin as primitive, pre-modern or part of the past in their attempt of evangelization.

Showing on screen: While the Mamos give their testimony, we can see close ups of member of the community following by frames of *La gente de Aluaka*. Close ups of the production teams recording the testimonies are introduced and interspersed with general shots of the community, following more fragment of the Acebes film. The sequence closes with fragments of traditional practices of the community.

Metaphysical Chronotope

Verbal description: The Mamos explain how they were forbidden to use their sacred artefacts, practice their rituals, and eat their traditional food, being just obliged to read and write. This was the reason why many of their ancestors tried to escape to different places of the Sierra, constituting Serankwa in a sacred place away from the pressure Capuchin to preserve their roots. Some Mamos were murdered, and people threatened to have their hand cut if they practiced their rituals. By a dialogue with the government, they were able to preserve their new traditions in this new place.

Political Consequence: After the Capuchin experience and the resistance of the native community, it was possible to preserve within the epistemic and ontological perspective.

Articulation: In Villafaña's film, the subjects authorized to speak are the members of the Serankwa community, recovering their orality over the Capuchin process of acculturation. The Capuchin, now as the Other, is allowed a secondary place in the historical retelling of the experience.

Pictorial description: All the shots take place in la Sierra, where the presence of the Capuchin took place in the 1980s, and now where the settlement of Serankwa is. Their traditional practices are displayed along the sequence.

Resistencia en la Línea Negra (2011)

Parametrical Text

The title of this film refers to la Línea Negra (black line), which delimits the sacred territory of the four indigenous communities of la Sierra de Santa Marta. Here, Villafaña exposes the political struggles for the protection of the territory, the extractivist projects that have settled there, and the violent episodes of displacement and genocide experienced by armed groups and military members. At the introduction of the film, Villafaña makes a powerful statement: he realized that the best way to engage into political resistance is using the image. Following the advice of one the Mamo José de Jesús Izquierdo, as he explains, he understands

that by principle they cannot answer to these events with violence but sharing their message and their thinking to the youngest brother (meaning the Other, as outsiders of the community) for them to understand the values hold in the territory. Villafaña thought then, that the strongest way to communicate this message is through the audio-visual media. At the birth of the river Guatapurí, as he explains, is where the idea of producing this film happens. He recalls his experience, mentioning that learning to use the tools and the language was not easy and took them over five years. At the end of this process, they engage in the most important part: the spiritual baptism of the filmic equipment which doesn't belong to the culture. This establishes a turning point in the saying out of space. By this ritual, led by Arhuaco, Wiwa and Kogui mamos -which is displayed in the film, they now don't just not use a sign system that used to be located outside of their saying, they appropriate it as part of their culture, locating it now as part of their own space. Film, now, is no longer a saying out of space for the community and they can share a *locus of enunciation* with those who, formerly, spoke for them. The baptized tools, now, become part of their oral tradition. Mamo José Shibulata, proceeds to narrates:

> *In the old times they told that Mukueke,*
> *Had similar tools than those that you have now.*
> *That's what the ancestors said.*
> *So, every time you start a 'work' think like Mukueke.*
> *They say that the Sun was taken a picture,*
> *And that that image is a mask*
> *That works to communicate with Jate Sé, the father of Darkness*
> *That is why it's stablished*
> *For you not to do anything without the Mamos guidance.*

Within this ritual, the filmic language was appropriated now as part of their epistemology and ontology.

As the previous film, Villafaña also recurs to a multiplicity of systems that end up embedded in the multimodality of film: photographs, picto-graphic elements, archive material of different types, oral testimonies, interviews, written texts, fictionalized historical events, and documentary style to reach the purpose commanded for this film by the Mamos: to protect the territories located around the Sierra. In this task, Villafaña recovers footage from his previous film and speaks about the Capuchin experience, among other struggles. This film explores a

multiplicity of subjects in an intercultural dialogue with corporate agents and even the heads of museums in Colombia that display sacred artifacts appropriated from their territory, as discussion with members of the Colombian Institute of Anthropology and History. In this film, tropes as 'Indians', 'belonging to the past' or 'outsiders of the civilization', are currently used by local agents and tourist to diminish their process of resistance. Although Villafaña engages the viewer in very rich interactions, I will rely for this analysis in the fragment related to our topic.

External parameters: Sphere of semiotization of the filmic segment: 00:52:57 – 00:59:43 (Annex 2).

Topographical Chronotope

Story: Villafaña visits Nabusímake to remember the episode of the arrival of the episode of Capuchin mission in 1914.

Intertextuality – Model of reality: The documentary images interact with fragments of Vidal Antonio Rozo's film El Valle de los Arhuacos (1964) in a dialogue that allows the viewer to question how these images were produced, showed in the acceptance of the Capuchinos by the community. In contraposition, photographies and the fictionalization of the events show the punishments the community was subjected to in order to accept the process of evangelization. In this dynamic, the reality of the mission of the Capuchins as the events shown are questioned, in the attempt to understand what really happened there.

Events*:* Arrival to Nebusímake, follow by the visit of the places that used to occupy the Capuchins. Following, they visit the Manuel Chaparro, former councilman of Nebusímake, to hear his testimony and review pictures and documents that relate the events. Later, they proceed to make a *mise en scène* of the event recreated in the picture, which took place back then.

Psychological Chronotope

Narration*:* Villafaña narrates how the places were used back the by the Capuchins. He explains the ontology and views towards their knowledge, and how they have been imposed to think as

the Capuchin, being forced to leave their beliefs aside, leading to the events of extermination of the community. Villafaña conducts a visual analysis of Gustav Bolinder's photographs took in 1915, and proceeds to explain to the participants involved in the production of the film how to recreate the events shown in the pictures. The instructions for the filming are made, and then the viewer in immerse in the fictional sequence. Leonor Zabaleta, Arhuaco leader, explains how they first engaged in the process of resistance against the Capuchins.

Self and Other - Sayings out of Place: the photographs, as a sign system brought in this case by Bolinder, as Rozo's media, are exposed as a saying out of place. But, as mentioned above, with the aim of the documentary and the ritual of baptism of the tools, the filmic system is no longer a saying out of place for the Arhuaco: it is now a part of their space. With cuts, the events depicted in Villafaña's film build a complex temporal dynamic were, even participant of Rozo's film are brought to the present to question the events that formerly took place. With the fictionalization of the same event by Villafaña, he also makes a commentary towards events that, despite happening decades ago, are still quite present in their collective memory and still shape current events.

Epistemograph or ontograph: The narration part from the *locus of enunciation* of the previous Other, and the events that took place with the Capuchins are explained and critized from their own epistemological and ontological perspective. Of course, Rozo's film introduces the Other in their path to 'civilization'.

Locus of instatiation of the social and normative criteria: Following their spatial imaginary, Villafaña recreates a non-linear dynamic that actualizes the events that took place in the past in the present, making constant commentaries in different temporalities.

Showing on screen: The images of Villafaña in the territory, are interspersed with fragments of the Rozo's film. These fragments are used as a meta-commentary: Villafaña takes frames of the members of the community formerly recorded to show their alleged acceptance of the Capuchin religion and makes them interact with images of the ruins of the monument of saint the brought to the place, questioning now the veracity of the event shown in Rozo's own film. Later, as we see Bolinder's pitures, Villafaña explains what we are looking at. Finally, after the explanation about the process upon how to fictionalize the events, Villafaña puts into

dialogue the finalized images, which are part of the films *Nabusímake* and *La Otra Oscuridad* with Bolinder's photographs and fragment of Rozo's film.

Metaphysical Chronotope

Verbal description: In the dialogue with Manuel Chaparro, it is explained that their houses where use to baptized and convert the community into Catholicism. He mentions where the priest stood and shows the icons brought by the Capuchins. Villafaña explains that the Mamos taught the community them that everyone has norms and ways to understand the creation of the world. He says that they don't believe that the youngest brother shouldn't follow their rules, because those are their views and the youngest brother, on the other side, have theirs. The bad thing occurs when the youngest brother thinks that Arhuaco believes are not the reality and what they bring is what should be, which has been reflected in the ethnocide of their culture. Following, Villafaña explains how Bolinder's pictures represent the punishment they were subjected to be converted and exhibit a lesson to the rest of the Arhuaco community. Later, after the production of the recreation of the events, Leonor Zabaleta explains how deliming their territory and the expulsion of the Capuchin was a symbol of resistance that has allow them to 'be and continue being'.

Political Consequence: The review of the documents and visual elements is a remembrance of the resistance movements, which are taking place till the day.

Articulation: Here, the subjects authorized to speak are the members of the Arhuaco community who experienced the event and those who are looking forward to keeping them alive as in collective memory as an act of resistance.

Pictorial description: Overall, we see the traditional costumes and musical instruments used by the Arhuacos. Gradually, the footage and pictures, as the fictionalization of the events illustrate how the communities were dispossessed of their traditional costume in the process of evangelization.

Sey Arimaku o la Otra Oscuridad (2012)

Parametrical Text

Sey Arimaku is presented as a dialogue between Amado Villafaña and Colombian anthropologist and filmmaker, Pablo Mora, who has collaborated in the production of Villafaña's films. The discussion begins at the screening of the film Nebusímake in Bogotá. Here, both review their experiences in the production of the previous films and explore the meaning of the image in their cosmology, dynamics of representation, and the process of the appropriation of the media as a recognition of a mechanism to show their experiences to the world, now in with the audio-visual as an inscription form of their own. This film is full of anecdotes, including the experience Villafaña had with the production of Alan Ereira's, a British filmmaker, film *The Heart of The World: Elder Brother's Warning* (1990) for the BBC. This will be the fragment I will review next.

External parameters: Sphere of semiotization of the filmic segment: 00:32:56 – 00:38:08 (Annex 3).

Topographical Chronotope

Story: Villafaña reviews his experience with film produced by Alan Ereira.

Intertextuality – Model of reality: Ereira's film is screened while Villafaña and Mora discussed its production. It interacts with footage of Villafaña in the Sierra and with footage of a meeting that Villafaña and Mora had later with Ereira to produce a new film, probably Aluna (2012).

Events: Villafaña explains the experience while the film is screened at his back. Frames of the film are exposed later in the whole screen of Villafaña and Mora's film.

Psychological Chronotope

Narration: Villafaña and Mora discuss about the right of representation of the Arhuaco community. They speak about the lack of display of the current political and resistance processes of of the community. Villafaña explains what occurs in the film. Later, both Villafaña

and Mora, give commentary in relation to these fragments, and discuss how the Arhuaco would develop the film. Later, footage of the meeting the held with Ereira for his new film are presented.

Self and Other – Sayings out of Place: Here, the content of the reflexion locates both Mora and Villafaña in place. Ereira, both in his film and in the discussion held with Villafaña and Mora is standing in a saying out of place. Regarding the use of the audio-visual tools, and given the former appropriation of the media by Villafaña and their acceptance by the Arhuaco community, they are all speaking on place.

Epistemograph or ontograph: Here, the discussion held by Villafaña, and Mora refers to the position of the communities of the Sierra. Although Mora may stand on a saying out of place, his experience with Villafaña, and the producers of the Sierra, gives him background to carry the conversation. On the other hand, Ereira also stands in saying out of place when arriving to the Sierra, but he carries the tool which and acknowledges the media which, back then, positioned him in space.

Locus of instatiation of the social and normative criteria: Here, in the meeting, we see a struggle between normative criteria carried by the filmmakers of the Sierra and Ereira, as part of the BBC. They can't agree on a common to ground to allow the film to be shot conjointly, imposing Ereira's criteria.

Showing on screen: Shoots of Villafaña with the screening on a tv at his back, footage of Ereira's film and the meeting the held afterwards.

Metaphysical Chronotope

Verbal description: We listen to a voice off of Ereira's film introducing the territory: la Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta. Then, the voice mentions that the 'people hidden' there calls it the heart of the world and they call themselves the eldest brothers. Mora mentions, the importance of thinking about the rights of whom represents whom, and what right have other to arrive and film. He says that it has to do with the films made in la Sierra, among them, Ereira's film. Villafaña expresses that when the film was shot, the community allowed it. He says that, later, he spoke to Ereira and said that the film didn't express the thought of the

indigenous peoples of the Sierra because he 'erased' other communities that live there. He also addressed that he (Ereira) didn't expose the struggles of indigenous communities to preserve the territory. Villafaña says that his film will be different (*La Línea Negra*), because the white men cannot tell exactly how they feel since the Mamos will not express to a person, who is not indigenous, everything they want to say.

The voice off from the film comes to first place. Ereira addresses that he was told to take everything he needed. Then, he mentions "that's me, Alan Ereira. Naturally, the Kogui called me the BBC. It didn't matter what I was. I was there as a messenger for the youngest brother". Mora mentions that the way Ereira builds the film in terms of 'I come to this world, which is closed'. This premise is followed by a commentary made by one of the Mamos in the film saying they want to prevent for the producer team to get in. Mora continues saying, that 'then they allowed the produces to get in, the filmmaker, Alan'. He asks Villafaña how his film would be, to which Villafaña replies that it would carry feeling of sadness, maybe anger, but also laugh. Then, Villafaña continues questioning why a person should go there, take a picture, make a documentary, and then go around the world speaking about them as if they belonged to the past. He says they, the indigenous communities, must self-represent and speak by themselves.

Then, both Mora and Villafaña recall when, twenty years later, Ereira went back to make a new film to ask for permission to make it. Villafaña says that everything was set, despite trying to make an the agreement for Ereira to film. Ereira mentions that they don't have the power to do that, and if they don't start with logistic, the film won't happen. Mora, then makes a commentary saying that, what Villafaña was suggesting is that them, in the community, are also filmmakers. At the end, Villafaña recall, that Ereira accepted the terms but then didn´t fulfil his promise. Villafaña mentions it was a 'soccer goal'. Mora closes mentioning it was a lost battle, but it is important to insist that neither filmmakers of producers speak on behalf on the indigenous. Villafaña agrees mentioning that Ereira should have allowed for them to jointly make and strengthen the film.

Political Consequence: The right for production is still being fought by the members of the Sierra. Nevertheless, they are aware now of the logic by which many of foreign filmmaker arrive to their territory, and they have been strongly appropriating the media to avoid this from happening.

Articulation: the member allowed to speak from the Sierra, as local and foreign filmmakers and anthropologists. The struggle of power towards the means of production and rights of representation is clearly displayed.

Pictorial description: The discussion is introduced over general shots of the landscapes and indigenous communities Ereira's film. Then, a sequence of close ups of Villafaña interacts with excerpts of Ereira's film, closing with the footage of the meeting held with Ereira. All are closed shots, for the exception of Ereira's film, which showed the 'grandiosity' of the landscape, enhanced by the soundtrack, and images of himself and the Mamos while arriving to the Sierra.

As we have seen, the chosen films not only display political struggles, as new constitution of the narrative matrix, but becomes political in their image when Arhuacos are allowed to find their voice not only by appropriating the media, but by using archive texts, photographs and films, that allows them to review their history. Is quite interesting to find how the footage is constantly reused and resignified according to the aims of the films, being situated in the new *locus of enunciation:* the indigenous space. The presence of tropes is not fought, or redefined, but discussed and displayed to convey also political dynamics of power through the image, without making, in many cases, direct commentary to it further that mentioning them. As a fabric, a new generation of films have seen the light to introduce new narratives towards the representation of the communities, being place in a *locus of enunciation* located in the border, creating constant dialogues in former and current colonial situations, but reviewed from different discursive frameworks.

Conclusion

Throughout this road, we have seen how indigenous communities in Latin America have been actively engaging in resistance movements to regain their right for self-representation by appropriating visual media, which has been a powerful tool to support their struggles against colonial situations. Although I have focused on the Latin experience, these movements are not exclusive or detached from the experience of other groups around the globe that have also engaged in a reflection towards the dynamics of power and representation, particularly in the anthropological field. I have tried to explore the roots of such unconformities, which has led me to review the dominant discourses, and in more tangible level, the narratives as a configuration of texts - in this case ethnographic films-, that have helped to frame the indigenous experiences and identities. I have found that the struggles indigenous communities have engaged with to fight these imaginaries and stereotypes, are taking place in contexts that are still reproducing colonial situations, despite the end of colonialization. If through the transition from the colonial to the post-colonial discourse, or from modernity to post modernity, the attempt has been to frame different moments in history, or geopolitical dynamics of power, this has only helped to reinforce tropes and stereotypes for the constitution of an anthropological Other by producing discourses based on the specific time and space of the *locus of enunciation* of the Western Self through specific disciplinary devices.

Despite the efforts of the latest modes of ethnographic film to address these ways of representation, it has been through the decolonial theory that multiple ideas have been put in practice to establish intercultural dynamics positioned from a different *locus of enunciation*, embracing a border thinking, and promoting a dialogue in the recognition of a pluriverse of knowledge. This has allowed to constitute a different narrative matrix according to the epistemological views of indigenous communities, which cannot be possible when ignoring dynamics of colonial situations. I have tried to expand this analysis to audiovisual texts by approaching a method based on both the Space of Theory and the Ideological Chronotope to provide a broader view upon power dynamics that can help to underline and review the political aspect of the image. This has been substantial, to help indigenous communities support their resistance movements while engaging in new dynamics of self-representation. I have taken three specific films to carry on this study looking forward to developing a mechanism to understand how these new narrative matrixes are emerging. Of course, this is a view on just one aspect of the multiple dynamics that have been taking place to fight economical and

epistemological extractivism, but I hope, in the future, this could be useful and further develop to support discussions towards the consolidation of 'own filmic narratives' and methods of representation towards the Self and the Other.

Truth, whatever it may be, is produced, constructed, on an unequal battlefield.

Jacques Derridá

References

Acheraïou, Amar 2011. Decolonizing Postcolonial Discourse. In: *Questioning Hybridity, Postcolonialism and Globalization*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 185-197.

Alcalde, M. Cristina 2020. Coloniality, belonging, and indigeneity in Peruvian migration narratives. *Latin American and Caribbean Ethnic Studies* 2020: 1-20.

Anthias, Penelope. 2017. "Ch'ixi landscapes: Indigeneity and capitalism in the Bolivian Chaco." *Geoforum.* 82: 268–75.

Ardevol, Elisenda 1994. *La mirada antropológica o la antropología de la mirada: De la representación audiovisual de las culturas a la investigación etnográfica con una cámara de video.* Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona. Doctoral Thesis.

Arias, Juan Carlos 2010. *La Vida que Resiste en la Imagen: Cine, Política y Acontecimiento.* Pontificia Universidad Javeriana. Bogotá – Colombia.

Barriendos, Joaquín 2011. La Colonialidad del Ver. Hacia un nuevo Diálogo Visual Interpistémico. *Nómadas.* 35: 13-19.

Blanco, Mercedes 2012. ¿Autobiografía o autoetnografía?. *Desacatos*, 38 [1]:169-178.

Brodkey, Linda 1987. Writing Critical Ethnographic Narratives. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly.* 18 (2): 67-76.

Bruner, Jerome 1991. The Narrative Construction of Reality. *Critical Inquiry.* 18 (1): 1-21.

Caicedo, Juan Diego 2010. Introduction. *La Vida que Resiste en la Imagen: Cine, Política y Acontecimiento,* Arias, Juan Carlos. Pontificia Universidad Javeriana. Bogotá – Colombia.

Castro-Gómez, Santiago 2000. Ciencias sociales, violencia epistémica y el problema de la invención del otro. In: CLACSO, Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales, *La colonialidad del saber: eurocentrismo y ciencias sociales. Perspectivas Latinoamericanas*, Buenos Aires: CLACSO, 88-98.

Chanan, Michael 2006. The Documentary Chronotope. *Jump Cut.* 2000 (43): 56-61.

Clifford, James 1995. *Dilemas de la Cultura*. Barcelona, Gedisa.

Córdova, Amalia. 2011. Estéticas enraizadas: Aproximaciones al video indígena en América Latina. *Comunicación y Medios*. 24: 81–107.

Crawford, Peter 1992. Film as Discourse: The Invention of Anthropological Realities, *Film as Ethnography*, Crawford, P.I. & Simonsen, J. Manchester University Press.

Deleuze, Gilles 1985a. *La imagen- movimiento*. Translation: Irene Agoff, Paidós, Barcelona

— 1985b. *La imagen-tiempo*. Translation: Irene Agoff, Paidós, Barcelona.

Deleuze, Gilles; Guattari, Félix 2000. *Mil mesetas*. Translation: José Vázquez Pérez, Pretextos, Valencia.

Dixit, Priya 2014. Decolonizing Visuality in Security Studies: Reflections on the Death of Osama bin Laden. *Critical Studies on Security*. 2 (3):338.

Elleström, Lars 2019. *Transmedial Narration. Narratives and Stories in Different Media.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Escobar, Arturo 2016. Thinking-feeling with the Earth: Territorial Strugglesand the Ontological Dimension of the Epistemologies of the South. *Revista de Antropología Iberoamericana*. 11 (1): 11 – 32.

Fabian, Johannes 1983. *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes its Object*. Columbia University Press, New York.

— 2004. On Recognizing Things. The "Ethnic Artefact" and the "Ethnographic Object". *L'Homme*. 2004 (170): 47- 60.

Focault, Michel (1966). *Les Mots et Les Choses.* Paris: Gallimard.

García Canclini, Néstor 2001. *Culturas Híbridas: Estrategias Para Entrar y Salir de la Modernidad.* Paidos.

Geertz, Clifford 1974. "From the Native's Point of View": On the Nature of Anthropological Understanding. *Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*. 28 (1): 26-45.

— 2005 [1972]. *Deep Play Notes on the Balinese Cockfight.* Dœdalus: American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Ginsburg, Faye 1994. Embedded Aesthetics: Creating a Discursive Space for Indigenous Media. *Cultural Anthropology* 9(3): 365–82.

Gliozzi, Giuliano 1978. Adamo e il nuovo mondo: La nascita dell' antropologia come ideologia coloniale, dalle genealogie bibliche alle teorie razziali (1500-1700). *The American Historical Review.* 83 (3): 709-710.

Gómez Arredondo, David 2015. América Latina Y El "Discurso Colonial": Perspectivas Críticas De Raíz Diversa. *Revista Especializada en Estudios Latinoamericanos* 2 (4): 79-99.

Grosfoguel, Ramón 2016. «Extractivismo Económico» al «Extractivismo Epistémico» y «Extractivismo Ontológico»: una Forma Destructiva de Conocer, Ser y Estar en el Mundo. *Tabula Rasa*. 2016 (24): 123-143.

Held, Mirjam B. E. 2019. Decolonizing Research Paradigms in the Context of Settler Colonialism: An Unsettling, Mutual, and Collaborative Effort. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*. 2019 (18): 1–16.

Heider, Karl G. 1976 [1974]. *Ethnographic Film*. University of Texas.

Hermans, Theo 1999. Translation in Systems. *Descriptive and Systemic Approaches Explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Hwansuk, Kim 2019. Decolonization and the Ontological Turn of Sociology. *Journal of Asian Sociology.* 48 (4): 443-454

Ilbeykyna, Mariya I. 2014. Indigenous Peoples as a Research Space of Visual Anthropology. Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities and Social Sciences 9. 2014(7): 1472-1493.

Jauregui, Carlos 2005. *Canibalia: Canibalismo, Calibanismo, Antropofagia Cultural y Consumo en américa Latina*. Fondo Editorial Casa de las Américas. La Habana, Cuba.

Kuenhast, Kathleen 1992. Visual Imperialism and the Export of Prejudice: An Exploration of Ethnographic Film. In: Crawford, P.I. and D. Turton (eds.), *Film as Ethnography,* Manchester: 183-195.

Lavagnino, Nicolás 2011. Tropología, Agencia y Lenguajes Históricos en Hayden White. *Ideas y Valores.* 145: 87-111.

Lotman,Yuri 1990. *Universe of the Mind: A Semiotic Theory of Culture*. Trans. Shukman A.

Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

MacDougall, David 1994. Whose Story is It?. In L. Taylor (ed.), *Visualizing Theory: Selected Essays From V.A.R*. Routledge: 27-36.

Maldonado-Torres, Nelson 2008. La descolonización y el giro des-colonial. *Tabula Rasa*. 2008 (9): 61-72.

— 2011. Thinking through the Decolonial Turn: Post-continental Interventions in Theory, Philosophy, and Critique—An Introduction. *TRANSMODERNITY: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World* 1 (2): 1-15.

— 2012. Epistemology, Ethics, and the Time/Space of Decolonization: Perspectives from the Caribbean and the Latina/o Americas. In: Isasi-Díaz, Ada María.; Mendieta, Eduardo. (Eds.) *Decolonizing Epistemologies: Latina/o Theology and Philosophy: Latina/o Theology and Philosophy*, New York: Fordham University Press: 193-206

Marcus, George 2002. Beyond Malinowski and After Writing Culture: On the Future of Cultural Anthropology and the Predicament of Ethnography. *Australian Journal of Anthropology.* 13 (2): 191-199.

Mendieta, Eduardo 2005. Re-Mapping Latin American Studies: Postcolonialism, Subaltern Studies, Postoccidentalism and Globalization Theory. *Dispositio*. 25 (52): 179-202.

Mignolo, Walter 1989. Afterword: From Colonial Discourse to Colonial Semiosis. *Dispositio*. 14 (36/38): 333–337.

— 1992. The Darker side of the Renaissance: Colonization and the discontinuity of the Classical Tradition. *Renaissance Quarterly.* Winter, 45 (4):808-828.

— 1993. Colonial and Postcolonial Discourse: Cultural Critique or Academic Colonialism? *Latin American Research Review*. 28 (3): 120-134.

— 2005. La Semiosis Decolonial: La dialéctica Entre Representaciones Fracturadas y Hermeneúticas Pluritópicas. *AdVersuS.* 3:1-10.

— 2012. Decolonizing Western Epistemology /Building Decolonial Epistemologies. In: Isasi-Díaz, Ada María.; Mendieta, Eduardo. (Eds.), *Decolonizing Epistemologies: Latina/o Theology and Philosophy: Latina/o Theology and Philosophy*. New York: Fordham University Press: 19-43.

— 2013 [2011]. *De la Hermenéutica y la Semiosis Colonial al Pensar Descolonial*. Quito-Ecuador: Editorial Universitaria Abya-Yala.

— 2013. Geopolitics of Sensing and knowing: On (de)Coloniality, Border Thinking and Epistemic Disobedience. *Confero*. 1 (1): 129-150.

Mora, Pablo 2014. Lo propio y lo ajeno del otro cine. Un panorama de la producción audiovisual indígena de Colombia. In: León, Christian (ed.), *El Documental En La Era De La Complejidad*, Quito-Ecuador: Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar, 57-78.

— 2015. *Poéticas de la resistencia: el video indigena en Colombia*. Bogotá-Colombia: Cinemateca Distrital.

Muñoz, Laura 2018. Desplazamientos y Movilidad en el Cine Colombiano de las Comunidades Arhuaca y Emberá. *Hispanic Studies Review*. 3(2): 120-135.

Myerhoff, Barbara; Ruby, Jay 1982. Introduction. *A Crack in the Mirror Reflexive Perspectives in Anthropology*, Ruby, Jay. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Nichols, Bill 1997. *Representación de la Realidad*, Ediciones Paidós Ibérica. Barcelona, España.

Rancière, Jacques 2005. *La fábula cinematográfica*. Translation: Carles Roche, Paidós, Barcelona.

Restrepo, Paula; Manosalva, Kelly; Benjumea, Erika; Noreña, Melissa 2014. Del Cine Etnográfico al Documental intercultural: Entre la Representación y el Cambio Social. *Nexus*. 15: 144-157.

Robinson, Douglas 1997. *Translation and Empire: Postcolonial Theories Explained.* Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Robyns, Clem. (1994). Translation and Discursive Identity. *Poetics Today* 15(3): 405-428

Salazar, Juan Francisco; Córdova, Amalia 2019. Indigenous Media Cultures in Abya Ayala. *Media Cultures in Latin America: Key Concepts and New Debates*. Pertierra, A.C., & Salazar, J.F. (Eds.). Routledge.

Said, Edward 2003 [1977]. *Orientalism.* London, England: Penguin Books Ltd.

Sanjinés, Iván. 2013. Usando el audiovisual como una estrategia de sobrevivencia y de lucha, de creación y recreación de un imaginario propio. *Revista Chilena de Antropología Visual*. 21: 32–50.

Schiwy, Freya 2003. Decolonizing the Frame: Indigenous Video in the Andes. *Framework: The Journal of Cinema and Media* 44 (1): 116–132.

— 2016. "¿Hay un común posible?". In: Magallanes Blanco, Claudia; Ramos, José (eds.), *Miradas propias: Pueblos indígenas, comunicación y medios en la sociedad global*, Puebla, Mexico: Universidad Iberoamericana Puebla and CIESPAL, 17–43.

Seed, Patricia 1991. Colonial and Postcolonial Discourse. *Latin American Research Review* 26 (3): 181-200.

Schiwy, Freya 2009. *Indianizing film. Decolonization, the Andres and the Question of Technology.* Rutgers.

Shohat, Ella 1992. Notes on the "Post-Colonial". *Social Text* 1992 (31/32) :99-113.

Sütiste, Elin; Torop, Peeter 2007. Processual boundaries of translation: Semiotics and translation studies. *Semiotica* 163(1/4): 187-207.

Tomaselli, Kayan. 1996 [1999]. *Appropriating Images: The Semiotics of Visual Representation.* Denmark: Intervention Press.

Torop, Peeter 2000. Intersemiosis and Intersemiotic Translation. *S: European Journal for Semiotic Studies* 12 (1): 71-100.

— 2013.The Ideological Aspect of Intersemiotic Translation and Montage. *Sign Systems Studies* 41 (2/3): 241–265

Verdesio, Gustavo 2013 [2011] In: Abya-Yala (eds.), *De la Hermenéutica y la Semiosis Colonial al Pensar Descolonial*. Quito-Ecuador: Editorial Universitaria Abya-Yala. 9-23.

White, Hayden 1973. *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP.

White, Hayden. *Tropics of Discourse. Essays in Cultural Criticism.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Whitinui, Paul 2013. Indigenous Autoethnography: Exploring, Engaging, and Experiencing "Self" as a Native Method of Inquiry. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*. 43(4): 456–487.

Wiley, David. 1982. 'Using 'Tribe' and 'Tribalism' Categories to Misunderstand African Societies'. *New England Social Studies Bulletin* 39 (2) :15-17.

Filmography

Acebes, Hector n.d. *La gente de Aluaka.*

Ereira, Alan 1990. *The Heart of The World: Elder Brother's Warning.*

Monnikedam, Vicent 1995. *Mother Dao, con Forma de Tortuga.*

Rozo, Vidal Antonio 1960. *El Valle de los Arhuacos.*

Villafaña, Amado 2010. *Nebusímake: Memorias de una independencia*. Available from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=45vwMJc2Oic; accesed on 15 January 2021.

— 2011. *Resistencia en la Línea Negra.* Available from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CiYIreL9BYo; accesed on 15 January 2021.

— 2012. *Sey Arimaku o la Otra Oscuridad.* Available from https://vimeo.com/473484437; accesed on 21 January 2021.

Annexes

Annex 1. Still frames of *Nebusímake: Memorias de una independencia* (2010), and *La Gente de Aluaka* (n.d).

Annex 2. Still Frames of *Resistencia en la Línea Negra* (2011), and *El Valle de los Arhuacos* (1960).

Annex 3. Still frames of *Sey Arimaku o la Otra Oscuridad* (2012), and *The Heart of the World: Elder Brother's Warning* (1990).

Magistritöö kokkuvõte

(DE)KOLONISEERIVAD NARRATIIVID ETNOGRAAFILISES FILMIS: DISKURSUSEST REPRESENTATSIOONINI

Viimastel aastakümnetel on erinevad Ladina-Ameerika põlisrahvaste rühmad osalenud vastupanuliikumistes nn kultuurilisele hegemooniale. Visuaalse meedia omaksvõtmine 1980-ndatel aastatel on olnud nendele kogukondadele oluline, et luua uusi võimalusi (enese)representatsiooniks, et võidelda antropoloogilisel väljal antropoloogilise Teise sätestamise käigus loodud erinevate kujutlustega. Selle lõputöö eesmärk on vaadata, kuidas erinevad diskursused on kujundanud narratiivse maatriksi loomist läbi seadmete ja tekstide nagu näiteks etnograafilised filmid, et suhestada Mina ja Teise identiteeti. Uurimustöö üheks eesmärgiks on ühtlasi luua arusaama, kuidas põlisrahvaste liikumised on osalenud poliitilises vastupanus läbi audiovisuaalse materjali, et taasloodud enesetähistuse kaudu tühistada pealesunnitud representatsioonid ja võidelda praeguste koloniaalolukordade vastu. Eesmärgi saavutamiseks analüüsitakse koloniaalsemioosi dünaamikat Amado Villafaña filmides Nebusímake: Memorias de una Independencia (2010), Resistencia en la Línea Negra (2011), ja Sey Arimaku o la Otra Oscuridad (2012).

Non-exclusive license to reproduce thesis and make thesis public

I, Verónica Cuello Blanco,

1. Herewith I grant the University of Tartu a free permit (non-exclusive licence) to reproduce, for the purpose of preservation, including for adding to the DSpace digital archives until the expiry of the term of copyright, *(De)colonizing Narratives in Ethnographic Film: from Discourse to Representation*, supervised by professor Peeter Torop.

2. I grant the University of Tartu a permit to make the work specified in p. 1 available to the public via the web environment of the University of Tartu, including via the DSpace digital archives, under the Creative Commons license CC BY NC ND 3.0, which allows, by giving appropriate credit to the author, to reproduce, distribute the work and communicate it to the public, and prohibits the creation of derivative works and any commercial use of the work until the expiry of the term of copyright.

3. I am aware of the fact that the author retains the rights specified in p. 1 and 2.

4. I certify that granting the non-exclusive license does not infringe other persons' intellectual property rights or rights arising from the personal data protection legislation.

Verónica Cuello Blanco
20/01/2022