

# Ideology, control and exclusion in the intercultural studies and intercultural communication: a critical perspective<sup>1</sup>

**Carlos DEL VALLE ROJAS**

Professor, Ph.D.  
University of La Frontera, Temuco-Chile  
E-mail: carlos.delvalle@ufrontera.cl

**Juan DEL VALLE ROJAS**

University of La Frontera, Temuco-Chile  
E-mail: j.delvalle01@ufromail.cl

**Abstract:** *This work looks for an understanding of intercultural studies and intercultural communication from a genealogical and critical perspective. It seems they could belong to a functional emerging practice and a discourse for socio-political and economical objectives related to the conflict solving regarding ethnic reclaim and migratory processes. This work is divided into four parts: (1) Beginning of the intercultural studies*

---

1 Some previous spanish versions of this work have been published in: Journal *I/C*, nº 6, pp. 193-214; Journal *Sphera Pública*, nº 4, pp. 171-196; and Journal *Signo y Pensamiento*, Issue XXIV, nº 46, pp. 51-64.

The present work is part of the global results of the Project funded by the National Fund of Scientific and Technology Development, FONDECYT number 1150666: "The construction of the social imaginary of justice in journalistic stories published by the newspaper El Mercurio of Chile, between 1850 and 2014, in the context of the conflict Nation-State and the Mapuche People: Continuity and change"; and of the Project: "Cultural Narratives of Crisis and Renewal (CRIC)", of the Research and Innovation Staff Exchange (RISE): The Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions in Horizon 2020 (European Commission. Ref. 645666-CRIC, 2015-2019).

*and intercultural communication as ideology and control; (2) The efforts to develop the intercultural studies and la "intercultural communication"; (3) Consolidation of the paradigm of civilization and barbarism; (4) The media studies and their logic of inclusion and exclusion of ethnicity. To conclude, intercultural studies and communication constitutes a discourse and a functional and instrumentalized practice for the "resolution" of certain sociopolitical and economical conflicts, after the reivindicative and migratory processes.*

**Keywords:** *ideology; control; exclusion; intercultural studies; intercultural communication.*

## **Introduction**

In this work, there is an intention to understand intercultural studies and intercultural communication as a discourse and a functional practice for economical and sociopolitical targets. Likewise, the understanding as an attempt to epistemological, methodological and praxeological location of the object, as long as the discourse in determined social, political and ideological contexts. In this way, there will be an explanation of intercultural studies and intercultural communication from a critical and genealogical perspective.

In those hypothesis, it is argued that intercultural studies and intercultural communication come up as a tool to resolve certain sociopolitical and economical conflicts in the State-nations that are historically represented by etno-reivindicative and migratory processes along with the resulting coexistence of ethnic groups and immigrants, and the military intervention in different cultural sceneries during the global geopolitical realignment, especially from the World War II.

This work is based on four main parts. The first part deals with a genealogical and critical revision of intercultural studies and intercultural communication, understanding it as an ideology and control form. The second part deals with the idea of revision of the corresponding development and strengthening of those studies since the contributions of some theories and disciplines (linguistics, discourse, among others). The third part focuses on the inclusion/exclusion ethnic community case in some dichotomies such as urban/rural and modern/premodern. The last part also focuses on ethnic communities where there is a brief revision of their incorporation on the media centrist logic of the media social discourse. In all of the cases, there is an interest to deal with the comprehension/incomprehension relationship from the other as an individual using the full exercise of his/her subjectivity.

## **Beginning of the intercultural studies and intercultural communication as ideology and control**

There are many definitions of intercultural communication. But there is one definition set up by Stella Ting-Toomey that is especially interesting. Ting-Toomey (1999) established that the elements of intercultural communication are: two people (or two groups) of different cultures (with the definition of "culture" being quite broad) in interaction who negotiate common meaning. Although, this is a good example of what we should understand by intercultural communication, this is quite probably that the anthropologist Edward Hall (1959) is the first author who mentioned the intercultural Communicationconcept, whose notion was strongly consolidated in the '60s, particularly in ethnic minorities and afro-ascendant reivindications and demands and for the military conflict in Vietnam.

Nevertheless, the notion of interculturality can be early found in Georg Simmel's works (1908) and his notion of "stranger", whose work would have had an impact in the following works of the American philosopher Robert Ezra Park (1913). Park developed the concept of "marginal man" to refer to a person who is located in the limits or margins of two different cultural worlds, and who is not a member of none of them. For Park, whose work is focused on the racial assimilation, in particular the Afro-American case, the relationship between communication and culture is due to the culture is integrated for all of which is communicated. Communication makes possible the consensus and understanding among individuals who form the social group. Therefore, communication generates integrative conditions among different social elements, such as costumes, expectations, and others. In conclusion, according to Park, communication allows the functioning of society. By considering María Rosa Berganza's work (2000), we could say that Park and Simmel pointed out that the function of communication is keeping the unity and integrity of the cultural group according to two dimensions: time and space.

Park employed categories such as "social distance" and "acculturation" in his analyses, by understanding the first one as a "mind and culture's interpenetration" (1933). The author holds that the level of intimacy in our personal relationships calculates the influence that everyone has over the other (1914). In this context, and following the notion of "stranger" taken from Simmel (1971), as we can see it from Sartori nowadays, Park formulates the concept of "marginal man" which refers to the one who lives between two worlds, as a stranger (Park, 1928a), considering the "inter-racial" marriages or to the people with "mixed blood" who belong to two "races" (mulatto). The marginal man is a man in a permanent cultural conflict because he/she lives in two different societies and he/she cannot accept it completely.

Later, Walter Wilcox (1929) and Julius Isaac (1947) incorporated the migratory phenomenon to an international level and its economical implications. Leopold Von Wiese and Howard Becker (1932) used the notion of “sacred stranger” in a “secular society” to refer marginality regarding to ethnicity and the relationship with the contrast countryside-city.

Lasswell (1936) was not so distant from the language of the era when he wrote “There are other cultures (‘primitive’ cultures) which take none of these things for granted. But the Western European pattern now holds most of mankind in its clutches” (Lasswell, 1936; 454). Although, he expresses so careful with the use of this description.

On the other hand, in specifically geographical contexts, Meyer Fortes (1956) carried out a work on the topic of demographic urbanization and distribution in Africa, and Rudolph Stavenhagen (1970) introduced the concepts of “ladinized indian” as an analogy of “marginal man” from Park. Milton Gordon (1964) also used the notion of marginality and “marginal man” to explain the conditions of the immigrant ethnic groups, especially afro-ascendants in his relationship with the Anglo-ascendant dominant majority. Another important contribution was carried out by Robert Redfield (1947) from the anthropology when he introduced the opposition “folk society” and “urban society”, by arguing that rural society is inevitably absorbed by the urban society. We think that it is not appropriate an opposition between urban and rural, considering that physical spaces have clear, defined and permanent borders, much less to confine Indian to rurality, to prove, then, that urban is modern.

By considering an interpretation from the political economy, Henri Favre (1971) reduced the conditions of indigenous and ethnic to explain the imperialist hegemony. Favre was supported by his empirical knowledge about Mayan’s situation Tzotzil and Tzeltal from Chiapas, arguing that we have to consider Indians as heirs of an idealized history (pre-colonial) and he underlines the necessity of understanding the ethnic processes as part of a permanent regression and ruralization. Indeed, we can’t have an unhistorical and crystallized vision of indigenous. But, Favre is not right when thinking that it is only possible a class movement and not an ethnic movement, or that he last one can be assimilated to the first one. This mistake is extensive and intensive on Marxist thought, and much more recurrent on Neomarxist thought. It does not mean that we are not recognizing working class fight that underlies the current struggles.

Intercultural studies and “intercultural communication” as a study field, ethnic as an object of study and indigenous and immigrant as subjects, they all emerge from the sociopolitical, economical and traumatic experiences: migrations on a large scale, political-social demands and reivindications. The political solution to

this “invented conflict”, considering public discourse, is evident: to socio-politically invisibilize and mediatically reveal differences and to “castrate” the conflict. In this sense, indigenism and indianism are also a way of invisibilization of the subject.

Up to here, in this epistemological analysis about the construction of ethnics in the theoretical and methodological discourse, we are allowed to observe some fundamental features in the configuration of ethnics as an object of study of the intercultural studies and “intercultural communication”.

1. An approach to intercultural phenomenon as experiences of interpersonal and international “conflict” toward indigenous and immigrants’ reivindications and demands.
2. Constant reproduction in the logic of conflict-as-negative: the called indigenous “conflict” produced by the growing demands of territorial, cultural, linguistics, and educative demands and reivindications, and the “conflict” caused by the migratory phenomenon in Europe.
3. The arrival of the intercultural studies and intercultural communication as a part of a discourse that, theoretically and methodological, is part of an economical and political discourse (where ethnic is, at the same time, studied and invisibilized; reduced to a proletarian-farmer-social issue or to an urban-modern issue versus rural-premodern). This discourse is reinforced by a positioning of the public “massmediatic” discourse studies, in which ethnic is revealed, as we will see later, through a treatment which is more focused on the media than in the ethnic, as an object of study.
4. An understanding of the intercultural phenomenon as “conflict” related to the state-nation crisis and, therefore, presented as “problems” to be solved. In this case, we will not just see “state reasons”, regarding indigenous demands and reivindications or migratory phenomenon, but an ideological lecture of the “conflict” as unavoidably negative which is necessary to overcome. From here on, conflict and development cannot coexist and logic will be: if we want to reach development, we must eliminate the obstacles that mean these conflicts and, as a consequence, the obstacle of ethnic that causes it.
5. A constant understanding of indigenous from different epistemological, methodological and praxeological fields: marginality theory, Marxist theory, culturalist theory, theory of dependency, discourse theory, general systems theory, symbolic interactionism general theory, to mention just the outstanding influences.

As we will see now, this work on intercultural studies and intercultural communication are presented from the research in interpersonal communication. In-

deed, Hall (1977) developed two main ideas for further researches: communication style on collective cultures, "high context"; and the communication style on individualist cultures, "low context". We have to consider that communication process is essentially part of the culture in which it takes place. It means that all the symbols and codes that are the supporters of the interpersonal communication process are located in cultures. The meaning that they convey is dependent of the shared cultural understanding (Hill, Watson, *et al.*, 2007).

It can be observed that reliance of the interpersonal communication studies in the common use of what is made on researches up to now of the term "cross-cultural communication", which is used to compare specific interpersonal variables, such as conversational distance, or conflict-solving styles in the crossing of two or more different cultures: "Although her original theory reflects a cross-cultural approach to communication, subsequent versions also suggest ways of bridging cultural differences" (Griffin, 2000:392).

It is also important to remember the huge influence that Mass Communication Research will have in the communication studies. Regarding that, it could be relevant the reflection suggested by Halloran (1978: 3) in the report for the UNESCO, which states that "mass communication research had developed as a response to the requirements of modern, industrial, urban society for empirical, quantitative, policy-related information about its operations". According to this genuine defense that Halloran states in favor of the Mass Communication Research, especially for the comprehension of his proposals and the inappropriate applications in other contexts, it is precisely the basis which explains its instrumental nature: emerging the answer to a particular kind of society, which substitutes the values of modernity, industrialization and urban, while at the same time, it tends to reject everything which comes from a world that is considered as pre-modern, non-developed and rural.

### **The efforts to develop the intercultural studies and "intercultural communication"**

Since the 80's, and because of the emerging strengthening of communication as an autonomous discipline within social sciences, it begins the construction process of control (object of study and methodology) of intercultural studies and intercultural communication.

There is one author who was going to be relevant in this period collaborating with different contributions. William Gudykunst (1988a, 1988b) held the idea that communication was a symbolic transactional activity which implied prediction and reduction of uncertainty: it is communication among strangers the major uncertainty (like the "stranger" from Simmel). In this sense, intercultural studies and "intercultural communication" would be part of the communication with stran-

gers from different national cultures where should be taking into account the cultural effects of their behaviors (Asunción-Lande, 1986). It is from now the contributions of Nobleza Asunción-Lande (1986) who held an approach to compulsory intercultural studies and “intercultural communication” which is not free of phraseological wishes. Indeed, the author developed a section on intercultural practice which presents some methods to get intercultural skills (1986: 189), with emphasis to an experimental learning (1986: 190), which finishes with a set of simulation games (1986: 191). This contribution has an excessive practical orientation where:

“intercultural communication can help to create an atmosphere that promotes cooperation and understanding among different cultures [although] intercultural communication knowledge cannot be considered by itself as enough to solve communication problems coming up [in short] intercultural communication is a subject oriented to practice [and] the ability in intercultural communication can be applied to company administration, development of work, consultancy, law, journalism, army, student board, social work and teaching” (Asunción-Lande, 1986: 179-181).

In this way, the author proves intercultural studies and “intercultural communication” as a study field based on their practical orientations. Nevertheless, her work describes clearly the state of this study field until the 80’s, arguing their objectives in order to provide a definition from the interdisciplinary which this study field covers by rightly criticizing that this range of approaches become confusing. Asunción-Lande came up with a discussion that is so accurate expressing that those studies emphasizes cultural aspects instead of emphasizing in the intercultural contacting communication aspects (1986). This is a quite interesting reflection because, in spite of both attempts, they do not suitably articulate each other.

Eileen Mcentee (1998) presents intercultural studies and “intercultural communication” highlighting the importance of cultural diversity, especially when we talk about internationalism, globalization and “intercultural communication”. Mcentee (1998) points out that “intercultural communication” refers to the “process of human communication when it is happening between individuals and groups that have experienced different cultural experiences. Culture needs intercommunication to become strong and developed. The author suggests that communicating through cultures involves not only integration of cultures in a major system, but also involves the preservation of cultures by which communication happens. The critical question is: Is it communication designed to make all the cultures be resembled or is it designed to preserve its variety? In this context, the author states the following: “1º Every culture has dignity and values that must be respected and preserved; 2º People have the right and responsibility to develop their culture; 3º Because of its rich variety and diversity, and because of its mutual

influences that puts one over the others, all the cultures are part of the common legacy that belongs to all humanity<sup>2</sup>”.

It seems that Mcintee (1998) wish that every culture would be given the possibility of conserving and/or modifying its patterns without imposition, but valuing diversity by itself and enjoying the cultural differences without feeling threatened for them.

On the other hand, Liliba Tamagno (2001) worked in the problems of ethnic identity as a social construction by attempting to break the dichotomist vision that interprets it as a concept that is abnegator and conservator by itself. Therefore, in a previous article (1984), specifically, in a theoretical revision of the concepts “identity”, the author go deep in the problematization of ethnic identity by understanding it as a phenomenon of a huge social dimension and as a complex process as historical as social, involved to social structure in its powerful ability to make decisions expressing in a contradictory way the relations of “domination/subordination” based on its dependency on the top of society by itself. With what is in agreement with the processes that allow us to understand dynamics of interethnic asymmetric relationships in terms of cultural control pointed out by Guillermo Bonfil (1986). In this context, Alejandro Grimson (2000) developed a very critical and praxeological argument that deals with two fundamental characteristics of the cultural processes, to know, historicity and power: culture is historic and none society can understand it without attending to its historicity, and its transformations and current sociocultural conflicts are part of the power and interest disputes that are sentimentally and imaginatively articulated, which are the result of the social relations located and constituted historically (2000: 24, 25 y 129).

Indeed, critics that are proposed in this work are focused on the excessive emphasize on one area to another: cultural preponderancy in the sociological and anthropological studies (rural/urban; modern/pre-modern; stranger, marginal man, working class fight, and others), and then, preponderancy from communication (interpersonal communication, communicative skills, effective communication, and others).

On his behalf, Ting-Toomey (1988) focused on Hall’s proposal, in the way of constructing an approach to the conflict from the conflictivist and individualist orientation to each culture. William Gudykunst (1988b) used a comparative approach similar to Ting-Toomey’s (1988) for the differentiation of accommodation cultural theory. This author focused primarily on intercultural encounters. “What happens when a stranger tries to communicate effectively within a different culture?” (Griffin, 2000: 392).

---

2 The data was taken from the Declaration of Principles of the International Cooperation in Cultural matters. ONU 1966, in Harms, 1973: 134.

According to Gallois, Giles, Jones, Cargile and Ota (1995), we can establish a theoretical and methodological itinerary of discourse analysis (especially conversational, which is strongly developed in the United States) and the symbolic interactionism; and in a lesser grade, cultural studies. In this moment, we can state the following general considerations:

In general terms, it deals with theories that are empirically applied through linguistics, conversational and discursive analyses.

It is mainly about theories that are supported by group and interpersonal situations.

It is about theories in which culture is understood as a relatively permanent structure.

In this way, configuration of the object of study that is typically for intercultural phenomenon in the communication field, there will be from interpersonal communication and international communication. For instance, the extensive use that Gudykunst (1995) carried out in the area of the intercultural communication of the "Uncertainty Reduction Theory", which belongs to the interpersonal communication field developed by Berger and Calabrese (1975); or the use that is also made from the interpersonal communication, it is the case of the "Expectancy Violations Theory" developed by Burgoon (1978); and the "Communication Accommodation Theory" that came up from the necessity for sophisticated theories of intercultural communication when it became increasingly important (Gallois, Giles, *et al.*, 1995). The "Expectancy Violations Theory" or EVT looks at how individuals react to the communication of others. Either communication is reinforced in a positive manner (smiling, agreeing, eye contact, etc) or in a negative manner (frowning, creating a physical distance, etc.). We learnt what we consider to be appropriate through our interactions with others and our culture (Burgoon, 1993). In the case of the "Uncertainty Reduction Theory" or URT, it is defined as the initial interactions between strangers that are characterized by information seeking in order to reduce uncertainty. This uncertainty is reduced as levels of self-disclosure, non-verbal warmth, and similarity increase (Berger & Calabrese, 1975). Finally, we have the case of the "Communication Accommodation Theory" or CAT, which contributes to the understanding of interactions by focusing attention on the language, non-verbal behavior, and paralinguage used by interlocutors to realize moves of speech (convergence and divergence), that is, linguistic moves to decrease and increase communicative distance (Gallois, Giles, *et al.*, 1995). The resulting construction of the ethnic and indigenous will also be from those explicative models.

We can also consider scientific, formal and international knowledge that is currently recognized in the intercultural communication field. It is focused on the United States because there are a few of current indexed publications (ISI) about the subject: Journal of Communication, Human Communication Research y Com-

munication Theory published by the International Communication Association); and the only specialized publication of Intercultural Communication Theory, which still is not indexed. In this restricted Anglophone list, there are included the contributions in the 80's from Asunción-Lande that were mentioned above: International and Intercultural Communication Annual (published by the *National Communication Association*), International Journal of Intercultural Relations (officially published by the International Academy for Intercultural Research).

### **Consolidation of the paradigm of civilization versus barbarism**

Ethnic as an object of study is a “discovery” from the 60's in the anthropological and sociological field, especially in the United States, since a very specific situation: meanwhile indigenous were kept in rural zones and immigrants out of the borders, they were considered “exotics” and even “remarkable”. But, when they started to get into cities, they are seen as “the indigenous problem” or “immigration problems” that fortified the ideological lectures of urbanity as a liberating and modern force of human and rurality as a negation of the previous values.

Indeed, when it is spoken in Latin America about “indigenous”, it is presented as a problem or conflict while it is an obstacle of capitalist modernization or development of societies. According to this logic, indigenous, due to their demands and territorial reivindications appear as the opposite of modernization because it is precisely on land or territory that is being reivindicaded (recovered/taken) where it is intended to move forward to modernization. It is there where they are making drawings and buildings of hydro-electric plants, airports, etc. All of these, as it will be reviewed afterwards, is kept prevailed in social discourses of the media. In this way, ethnic, indigenous or immigrant will be confused with social constructions from new invented spaces in the city and urbanity as a frenetic opposition. For that reason, and because of a temporary extrapolation, there will be translated into other social representations as the *Hobo*, an American working class from the XIX and XX centuries, characterized as an itinerant and eventual worker, or the *Gang*. It is not intended as a critic of those images per se, but as a suggested suspicious that in such “constructions” from and for the city it covers up for ethnic, indigenous or immigrants, that come from rural spaces or, simply, from the outside of the city they can be revealed or integrated to other social constructions. This can be clearly seen in the rural/urban opposition of Robert Redfield (1947), where urban is heterogeneous, changing and secular – which are precious goods of modernity – and rural is conceived as homogeneous, stable and sacralized. In this way, we can come to an agreement with the critics carried out by Redfield in the sense of not considering rural as subsidiary of urban, but, on the contrary, to emancipate its sense and planning its range.

Simmel encourages the debate by proposing a more hybrid perspective of the city, recognizing that it is not only a space of freedom, but also of alienation. In this way, the city becomes sacralized pretending to lead the sacred sense of rurality to be covered of profanity, but in reality, it just gets a new way of sacralization. The city stops being an exclusive and exclusively liberating and modernizing space. Ethnic (indigenous and immigrant) stops being a threat for freedom. But, it will stay being an obstacle for modernization and, therefore, a referent of appealing of the social, political, economical and media discourse.

As a summary, there is a perception of the object (Ethnic) and subject (indigenous and immigrants) that has kept invisible and transparent in several theoretical and methodological constructions: marginal man, urban/rural, media, discourse and interaction, among others.

According to the previous information, it can be argued that, for instance, in the particular case of migration of indigenous-mapuche communities from the rural periphery to the urban centers in Chile, there is an approach from the intercultural perspective as a communicative fact immersed in a system of difference, power and social control relationships whose difference will be produced by conflict and not the other way around (Grimson, 2000:34). And this migratory and intra-regional phenomenon, from rural to urban, is not a recent and minor phenomenon because, according to the estimates considered for the following ten years, only three out of five persons will live in urban areas (Bodei, 2000: 155). Therefore, this requires overcoming the dichotomy and ideological vision of urban/rural, although, it serves to placing from other dichotomies. In this sense, it is important to understand the differences in our societies -particularly in those migratory stages- as differences-in-context and not as isolated differences or mere punctual and resistance reactions: "we cannot assume a different identity without distinguishing it in context and, in the process of making this distinction, I am affirming the context [and itself] I cannot destroy a context without destroying at the same time the identity of the particular subject that carries out destruction" (Laclau, 2000:260).

For that reason, we must effort to understand conflict and difference as foundational factors of our relation system and not as obstacle to such relations. Conflict is, then, the basis of cultural development and dynamic, particularly in indigenous communities. By means of conflict, those communities have faced emerging spaces and from those conflicts emerge the differences. The conflict dynamic can be also understood in the universal/particular and global/local relationship, in the Laclau's point of view: "Paradox can't be resolved, but its no-resolution is the same pre-condition of democracy. The solution to this paradox would imply that a particular body would have been found, that would be the true body of univer-

sality. But, in this case, universality would have found its necessary location and democracy will be impossible" (Laclau, 2000: 267 y 268).

Referring to what is specifically local; the objective is to self-produce the subjects-and/in-the-community to strengthening endogenous processes: recovering collective memory, filling sense of nature, providing identifiers and referents of belonging:

"Traditional societies dedicate a lot of time and energy to produce subjects and the social organization which keep them united [...] Traditional societies dedicate a lot of time to ceremonial and ritual activities that are modeling the subjects in their mental and motor habits that locate them in the relationship systems, in the village, in the fauna environment, flora, of the elements and beings that settle their magical and religious internal worlds [...] They are not productive activities in the common sense of the term [...] However, they are productive activities in a different way, but equally essential: produce human beings and sociability" (Warnier, 1999).

As a summary, it is intended to prepare individuals to facing permanent changing contexts. Although new economical globalization dynamics of culture are introduced to communities and, even, they transform them. They are a symbolic production processes that guarantees survivals of such cultures where local ways of life are removed and refill with "prototypes" that socially and spatially proceed to completely different places (Beck, 1999).

The consolidation of this paradigm is expressed, on one hand, in the diagnoses and, on the other hand, in the political originated decisions, especially when the entities such as the World Bank are the responsible of that. In a recent mention of the World Bank, it can be read:

"Ethnicity can be a powerful tool in the creation of human and social capital, but, if politicized, ethnicity can destroy capital [citing to Bates , Rui *et al.*, 1998...] Ethnic diversity is dysfunctional when it generates conflict [...] finds that the likelihood of incidence of violent conflict, its escalation, persistence and reemergence once ceased is greatest when there are two to three ethnic groups in a society (as compared to high levels of ethnic diversity or ethnic homogeneity) [citing to Collier, 1998]" (The World Bank Web, "Social Capital and Ethnicity").

It prevails, as we can see, the relationship among ethnicity, conflict and violence; ethnicity, politics and development crisis.

## **The media studies and their logic of inclusion and exclusion of ethnicity**

The studies that are made from ethnic groups are traditionally focused on the representations that are delivered in the media social discourses, so that prevail two epistemological and methodological bias: those that are frequently considered as unhistorical representations. It means that they are conceived as a bare discontinuous and punctual construction, and more centered in the media as a subject of study than in the ethnic groups. Those are excuses for studying the media behavior as included in studies that are funded by media corporations, and also as wide studies addressed to several audience. In both cases, there is a clear epistemological, symbolic and concrete disregard of ethnicity.

All of the previously mentioned is part of the researches on "mass media" as a study object in which case the ethnic tends to invisibility. It is the particular case of the studies on social construction of the "mapuche conflict" in Chile in the social media discourse, in both national and international. However, those studies are focused on exogenous aspects, in two directions: they are social constructions from the media and social constructions of non-mapuche.

Who are we talking about, then, in this comprehensive exercise? We think that we understand the other communities in these analyses, but what we do is just self-referring, and in this constant self-reference, we create two effects: we unavoidably deform the "other" from "us", and even if we understand the "others", we cannot avoid such deformation. When we do not talk about the "other", we make a logic self-reference, a separation as Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (1998) analyses it, where reference produce temporary estrangement that is mostly presented as unhistorical and/or spatial as if it were a study on a museum piece permanently analyzed and assessed whose representative elements are chosen by the observers in an inventive exercise of what they observe. She focused on how people and cultures at various points of encounter with the material world organize that world for interaction, interpretation and presentation (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 1998).

We cannot indefinitely continue our searching on the social media discourse as they are just relationships in mediations, foreign exotic discovery and self-referent constructions. It is there the hegemonic power of the cultural media industry, but it is not the study object of the intercultural studies and "intercultural communication". We cannot know the other, if at all is possible, only by social media discourses: neither media nor mediation but subjectivities, an emancipatory hermeneutic of the subject.

Finally, if we just follow the "game" that is produced by the media, we could not see clearly that identity is definitely sustained by the conflict that generates the non-similarity. And the current ways of constructing relationship system are based on the homogenization and uniformization of our complex universe that is one of the media global strategies. Here is the core of the discussion. Identity,

then, is related to beliefs, ideologies, values, stereotypes, prejudices, codes, semantics, senses, referents, history (past), reivindications (which was initially a group) and demands (which such a group considers to have lost due to the disadvantaged context where they are) (Del Valle, C., 2001, 2002a, 2002b, 2003a, 2003b, 2003c, 2004a, 2004b, 2004c, 2005a, 2005b y 2009). We live in immigration societies (among countries, regions, etc.) and the problem is not immigration by itself, but the pictures that are circulating of it (Cohn-Bendit and Schmid, 1992).

## Conclusions

As a conclusion of the genealogical and critical perspective about intercultural studies and intercultural communication, it can be established some final considerations, they are:

The intercultural studies and “intercultural communication”, from a genealogical perspective, establish a functional and instrumentalized discourse and practice to “resolve” the given sociopolitical and economical conflicts, after the reivindicative and migratory processes.

The intercultural studies and “intercultural communication” come up from other specific fields: interpersonal communication and international communication.

The phenomenon that sets up intercultural communication of the study object constitutes a post-traumatic construction as a product of the reivindicative and migratory processes.

From a communicative point of view, indigenous mapuche communities’ studies in Chile are mainly focused on representations of them in the social discourses, especially in the media.

These studies are characterized by: (a) showed as unhistorical, and (b) constructing analysis more focused in the media than the indigenous communities.

Studies on mapuche indigenous community representations in Chile, carried out by massmediatic and historiographic public discourses, are tended to show: (a) an observer self-referencing by the observing subjects, (b) a dichotomy game: rural/urban; sacred/profane; modern/premodern, (c) a discursive two-faced: negative presence and passive absence.

During the construction and reflection about city and urban, in opposition to rurality, it arises an indigenous and ethnic representation as an invasion and “problem” that, from the rural-non modernity, it infringes the city along with its emancipator modernization. It arises, as previously pointed out, in the indigenous and immigrant representations that acquire the appearance of the *hobo* (proletarian) and *gangster* in the cities.

Finally, in relation to “post-structuralists” extended proposals (Derrida, Deleuze, Guattari, among others), this is a proposal that we are not intended to develop in this time. However, we are allowed to propose a Question: Is it pos-

sible to think about a conflict and the ethnocultural reivindications since the given proposal? Well, these conflicts and reivindications necessarily and unavoidably operate from identity absolutist processes to establish an interlocution from this extreme polarization. Indeed, it is not possible to understand the ethnic reivindications in Latin America apart from the identity radicalization where there is a denial of indigenous and non-indigenous hybrid blending. Only in this way, it can be a reivindication of territory identity owned by the Indigenous and non-indigenous people. A mestizo also would share such reivindications and the reivindicative discourse would tend to fade away. There are no reivindications and conflicts if there is not a dichotomy game, without a binary space since the reivindicative utopia takes place through a binary model as a necessity.

## References

1. Abril, G. (1997). *Teoría General de la Información. Datos, relatos y ritos*. Madrid: Cátedra.
2. Aladro, E. (1999). *Teoría de la información y la comunicación efectiva*. Madrid: Fragua.
3. Asunción-Lande, N. (1986). Comunicación intercultural. In Fernández, C.; Dahnke, G. (Eds.): *Comunicación humana ciencia social*. México: Mc Graw-Hill, pp. 179-193.
4. Barth, F. (1976). *Los grupos étnicos y sus fronteras. La organización social de las diferencias culturales*. México D.F.: FCE.
5. Beck, U. (1999). *What is globalization?* Cambridge: Polity Press.
6. Berganza, M. (2000). *Comunicación, opinión pública y prensa en la sociología de Robert Park*. Madrid: Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas.
7. Berger, Ch. & Calabrese, R. (1975). Some explorations in initial interaction and beyond: toward a developmental theory of interpersonal communication. In *Human Communication Research*, Vol. 1. Issue 2, 99–112.
8. Beriain, J. (Coord.) (1997). Niklas Luhmann. Hacia una teoría científica de la sociedad. In *Revista ANTHROPOS*, N° 173-174.
9. Berrigan, F. (1978). *Manual sobre los medios de comunicación social en relación con la población y el desarrollo*. París: UNESCO.
10. Berrigan, F. (1981). *La comunicación comunitaria: cometido de los medios de comunicación comunitaria en el desarrollo*. París: UNESCO.
11. Bodei, R. (2000). *Los sin patria*. In Silveira, H. (Ed.): *Identidades comunitarias y democracia*. Madrid: Trotta, pp. 153-165.
12. Boisier, S. (2001). *Sociedad del conocimiento, conocimiento social y gestión territorial*. Sevilla: Instituto de Desarrollo Regional, Universidad de Sevilla.
13. Bonfil, G. (1983): Lo Propio y Lo Ajeno. Una aproximación al problema del control cultural. In UNESCO: *Educación, Etnias y Descolonización en América Latina*, Vol. 1, 249-256.
14. Bonfil, G. (1986). La teoría de control cultural en el estudio de los procesos étnicos. *Anuario Antropológico*, Brasilia: Editora Universidade de Brasilia.

15. Bonfil, G. (1987). *México Profundo: Una Civilización Negada*. México: Secretaría de Educación Pública y Centro de Investigaciones y Estudio Superiores en Antropología Social.
16. Burgoon, J. (1978). A communication model of personal space violations: explanation and initial test. In *Human Communication Research*, Vol. 4., 129-142.
17. Burgoon, J. (1993). Interpersonal expectations, expectancy violations and emotional. In *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 12(1-2), 30-48. Doi: 10.1177/0261927X931211003.
18. Burgoon, J. (1995). Cross-cultural and intercultural applications of Expectancy Violations Theory. In Wiseman, R. (Ed.). *Intercultural Communication Theory*, volume XIX. California: Sage Publications, 194-214.
19. Cohn-Bendit, D.; Schmid, T. (1992). *Heimat Babylon. Das Wagnis der multikulturellen Demokratie*, Hoffmann. Hamburg: U. Campe.
20. Condon, J.; Yousef, F. (1975). *An introduction to intercultural communication*. New York: Bobbs-Merrill.
21. Del Valle, C. (2001). El uso de descripciones factuales como estrategias comunicativas de legitimación discursiva: el recurso de Ley de Seguridad del estado en el proceso judicial de 12 mapuches en la IX Región (Dic. 1997-Abril 1999). In *Estudios Criminológicos y Penitenciarios*, N° 3, 117-130.
22. Del Valle, C. (2002a). Los desafíos interculturales de la justicia en Chile: De la violencia y el racismo del lenguaje a la tecnologización y economía del lenguaje y los procedimientos. In *Orígenes, Revista Virtual Mensual*.
23. Del Valle, C. (2002b). El proceso judicial de 12 mapuches en Chile: entre el racismo de estado y la violencia del lenguaje". In *Razón y Palabra*, 26.
24. Del Valle, C. (2003a). La identidad en un doble juego: resistencia y apertura... o el aprendizaje del cinismo. La construcción social del llamado "conflicto mapuche" en Chile, in publicaciones periódicas electrónicas realizadas por los propios mapuches. In *Revista Diálogos de la Comunicación*, N° 66 (FELAFACS).
25. Del Valle, C. (2003b). Interculturalidad y justicia en Chile: de la violencia de la escritura a la economía de la oralidad. In *Ámbitos. Revista Andaluza de Comunicación*, Nos 9 y 10.
26. Del Valle, C. (2003c). Políticas culturales en Chile durante los últimos 30 años: de la invisibilización a la politización de la cultura. In Sierra, F. (Ed.). *Economía Política de la Comunicación*. Sevilla: Instituto Europeo de Comunicación y Desarrollo.
27. Del Valle, C. (2004a). Genealogía crítica de la comunicación intercultural: medio-centrismo e invisibilización de lo étnico en los estudios interculturales. In *Sphera Pública. Revista de Ciencias Sociales y de la Comunicación*, n° 4, 171-196.
28. Del Valle, C. (2004b). Los indígenas de Chile en las *Relaciones de Sucesos* españolas: Representación y memoria desde la interculturalidad. In *Zer. Revista de Estudios de Comunicación*, n° 16, 121-136.

29. Del Valle, C. (2004c). *Comunicación intercultural y desarrollo endógeno*. In Encina, J. (Ed.). *Democracias participativas e intervención social comunitaria desde Andalucía*, Editorial Atrapasueños/Universidad Pablo de Olavide, Sevilla, España, pp. 221-252.
30. Del Valle, C. (2005a). Mediacentrismo e invisibilización de lo étnico como objeto de estudio: una genealogía crítica de la comunicación intercultural. In *Signo y Pensamiento*, v. XXIV, nº 46, 51-64.
31. Del Valle, C. (2005b). "Interculturalidad e intraculturalidad en el discurso de la prensa: cobertura y tratamiento del discurso de las fuentes en el 'conflicto indígena mapuche', desde el discurso político. In *Redes.Com. Revista de Estudios para el Desarrollo Social de la Comunicación*, nº 2, 83-111.
32. Del Valle, C. & Poblete, T. (2009). Genealogía Crítica de los Estudios Interculturales y la 'Comunicación Intercultural' en América. In *I/C- Revista Científica de Información y Comunicación*, nº 6, 193-214.
33. Durston, J. (1997). *Sustentabilidad cultural y desarrollo indígena*. Santiago de Chile: CEPAL.
34. Durston, J. (1999). Construyendo capital social comunitario. In *Revista de la CEPAL*, Santiago de Chile: CEPAL, 103-118.
35. Durston, J. (2001). *Capacitación micro- empresarial de jóvenes rurales indígenas de Chile. Lecciones del Programa Chile Joven en dos comunidades mapuches*. In Pieck, E. (Coord.): *Los jóvenes y el trabajo: La educación frente a la exclusión social*. México: UNICEF.
36. Fabregat, C. (1984). *Estado, etnicidad y biculturalismo*. Barcelona: Ediciones Península.
37. Favre, H. (1971). *Changement et continuité chez les Mayas du Mexique*. París: Anthropos.
38. Fortes, M. (1956). Social implications of industrialization and urbanization. In *Africa South of the Sahara*, París-Unesco, the International African Institute.
39. Gallois, C.; Giles, H., et al. (1995). "Accommodating intercultural encounters. Elaborations and extensions", en WISEMAN, Richard (Ed.): *Intercultural Communication Theory*, volume XIX. California: Sage Publications.
40. Gordon, M. (1964). *Assimilation in American Life*. Nueva York: Oxford University Press.
41. Griffin, E. (2000). *Communication. A first look at communication theory*. Boston: Mc Graw-Hill.
42. Grimson, A. (2000). *Interculturalidad y comunicación*. Buenos Aires: Grupo Editorial Norma.
43. Gudykunst, W.; Ting-Toomey, S. (1988a). *Culture and interpersonal communication*. California: Sage Publications.
44. Gudykunst, W. (1988b). *Uncertainty and anxiety*. In Y. Kim & W. Gudykunst (Eds.). *Theories of Intercultural Communication*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, pp. 123-156.

45. Gudykunst, W. (1995). *Anxiety/Uncertainty Management (AUM) Theory. Current status*. In Wiseman, Richard (Ed.). *Intercultural Communication Theory*, volume XIX, California: Sage Publications.
46. Hall, E. (1959). *The silence language*. New York: Doubleday.
47. Hall, E. (1963). A system of notation of proxemic behavior. In *American Anthropologist*, Vol. 41.
48. Hall, E. (1966). *The hidden dimensión*. New York: Doubleday.
49. Hall, E. (1977). *Beyond culture*. New York: Anchor.
50. Halloran, James (1978). The context of mass communication research. In *International Commission for the study of communication problems*. París: UNESCO.
51. Harms, L. (1973). *Intercultural communication*. New York: Harper and Row.
52. Harms, L. (1974). *Human Communication: The New Fundamentals*. New York: Harper and Row.
53. Hill, A.; Watson, J. et al. (2007). *Key Themes in interpersonal Communication: Culture, Identities and Performance*. McGraw-Hill, Open University Press.
54. Hofstadter, D. (1979). *Gödel, Escher, Bach: an eternal golden braid*. Nueva York: Random House.
55. Ibáñez, T. (1990). *Aproximaciones a la Psicología Social*. Barcelona: Sendai Editores.
56. Isaac, J. (1947). *Economics of Migration*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co.
57. Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, B. (1998). *Destination culture: tourism, museums and heritage*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
58. Laclau, E. (2000). *Universalismo, particularismo y el tema de la identidad*. In Silveira, H. (Ed.). *Identidades comunitarias y democracia*. Madrid: Trotta.
59. Larraín, J. (1996). *Modernidad, razón e identidad en América Latina*. Santiago de Chile: Andrés Bello.
60. Laswell, Harold (1936): *Politics: Who Gets What, When, How*. New York: Whittlesey House, McGraw-Hill.
61. Lévi-Strauss, C. (1966). *The Savage Mind*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
62. Lévi-Strauss, C. (1978). *Myth and Meaning: Cracking the Code of Culture*. Routledge & Kegan Paul, UK, Taylor & Francis Group.
63. Lévi-Strauss, C. (1981). *The Naked Man. Mythologiques*, Volume 4. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
64. Lewis, C.S. (1944). *The abolition of man*. New York: MacMillan.
65. Mafessoli, M. (1996). *The Time of the Tribes. The Decline of Individualism in Mass Society*. Sage Publications.
66. Martín Serrano, M. (1986). *La producción social de comunicación*. Madrid: Alianza.
67. Max-Neef, M. (1993). *Desarrollo a escala humana. Conceptos, aplicaciones y reflexiones*. Barcelona: Icaria.
68. McEntee, E. (1998). *Comunicación intercultural: Bases para la comunicación efectiva en el mundo actual*. D.F. México: McGraw Hill Interamericana de México.

69. Merino, M.E. (2002). El prejuicio étnico en el discurso de los no mapuches de la ciudad de Temuco. In *Segundo Encuentro Nacional de Estudios del Discurso*. Santiago de Chile: Universidad Católica de Chile.
70. Park, R. (1913). Negro home life and standards of living. In *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, nº 49, 147-163.
71. Park, R. (1914). Racial assimilation in secondary groups with particular reference to Negro. In *American Journal of Sociology*, Nº 19, 606-623.
72. Park, R. (1919). The conflict and fusion of cultures. In *Journal of Negro History*, Nº 4, 111-133.
73. Park, R. (1923). Negro race consciousness as reflected in race literature. In *American Review*, Nº 3, 195-205.
74. Park, R. (1925). The immigrant community and immigrant press. In *American Review*, Nº 3, 143-152.
75. Park, R. (1928a). Human migration and the marginal man. In *American Journal of Sociology*, nº 33, 6, 881-893.
76. Park, R. (1928b). The bases of race prejudice. In *Annals of the American academy of political and Social Science*, Nº 140, 11-20.
77. Park, R. (1933). Abstract in racial contacts and social research. In *Proceedings American sociological society*, Nº 27, 101-102.
78. Parker, C. (1993). *Otra lógica en América Latina. Religión popular y modernización capitalista*. Santiago de Chile: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
79. Philipsen, G. (1992). *Speaking culturally: exploration in social communication*. Albany: State University of New York.
80. Prosser, M. (1978). *The cultural dialogue: an introduction to intercultural communication*. New York: Harper and Row.
81. Redfield, R. (1947). The Folk Society. In *American Journal of Society*, 52, 4, 293-308.
82. Rosengren, K. (2000). *Communication. An introduction*. London: Sage Publications.
83. Samovar, L.; Richard, P. & Nemi, J. (1981). *Understanding intercultural communication*. California: Wadsworth.
84. Schütz, A. (1974). *Estudios sobre teoría social*. Buenos Aires: Amorrortu.
85. Sierra, F. (2000). *Comunicación, educación y desarrollo: apuntes para la historia de la comunicación educativa*. Sevilla: Comunicación Crítica.
86. Simmel, G. (1908). *Soziologie. Untersuchungen über die Formen der Vergesellschaftung*. Leipzig: Duncker y Humblot.
87. Simmel, G. (1971). The stranger. In Levine, D. (Ed.). *Georg Simmel*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
88. Sloterdijk, P. (1983). *Critique de la raison cynique*. Burgois: Broché.
89. Stavenhagen, R. (1970). Classes colonialism and acculturation. In *Masses in Latin America*. Nueva York: Oxford University Press.
90. Tamagno L. (1984). *La construcción social de la identidad étnica*.

91. Tamagno, L. (2001). *Los Tobas en la casa del hombre blanco. Identidad, memoria y utopía*. Argentina: Ediciones Al Margen.
92. The World Bank. (s/f). *Social Capital and Ethnicity*. <<http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTSOCIALDEVELOPMENT/EXTTSOCIALCAPITAL/0,,contentMDK:20185286~isCURL:Y~menuPK:418213~pagePK:148956~piPK:216618~theSitePK:401015,00.html>> [Consulta: 20 de marzo de 2016].
93. Thomas, W. & Thomas, D. (1928). *The child in America*. New York: Knopf.
94. Ting-Toomey, S. (1988). Intercultural conflict styles: a face-negotiation theory. In *Theories in intercultural communication*. California: Sage.
95. Ting-Toomey, S. (1999). *Communicating across cultures*. New York; London: The Guilford Press. (The Guilford communication series).
96. Todorov, T. (1988). *Cruce de culturas y mestizaje*. Madrid: Jucar.
97. Touraine, A. (1989). *América Latina. Política y Sociedad*. Madrid: España-Calpe.
98. Warnier, J.P. (1999). *La mondialisation de la culture* [Mundialisation of Culture]. Paris: La Découverte.
99. Watzlawick, Paul (1978): *The language of change*. New York: W.W. Norton.
100. Wiese, von L. & Becker, H. (1932). *Systematic sociology*. New York: Wiley.
101. Wilcox, W.F. (1929). International migrations. In *National Bureau of Economic Research*, New York.
102. Wolf, M. (1985). *Teorie della comunicazione di massa*. Milán: Bompiani.