

## ***Indigenous Consultation in Chile. Retrospective Analysis of Indigenous Demands in 2016***

### ***Consulta indígena en Chile. Análisis retrospectivo de las demandas indígenas de 2016***

**Jaime González González\***  
**Esteban Valenzuela Van Treek\*\***

Received: January 24<sup>th</sup>, 2023

Accepted: July 15<sup>th</sup>, 2024

#### **ABSTRACT**

This article offers a retrospective and comparative analysis of the demands expressed by Aymara communities in the Arica and Parinacota region and by Mapuche communities in the Araucanía region and the Metropolitan Region of Santiago. The central research question guiding this study is: What are the main similarities and differences among these demands across the regions of Arica and Parinacota, Metropolitan Santiago, and Araucanía? The study is based on written agreements documented in the 2016 National Report on the Systematization of the Indigenous Consultation. The analysis draws on textual procedures characteristic of documentary research and the comparative method used in anthropology. The main findings indicate that the narratives recorded in the consultation minutes can be understood through the historical interaction between the state and Indigenous peoples and the bidirectional relations among culturally distinct groups situated in different regional so-

#### **RESUMEN**

El artículo analiza retrospectivamente, en clave comparada, las demandas indígenas de los aimaras en la región de Arica y Parinacota, y de los mapuches en las regiones de la Araucanía y Metropolitana de Santiago. La pregunta de investigación que guía el estudio es la siguiente: ¿cuáles son las principales semejanzas y diferencias entre estas demandas en las regiones de Arica y Parinacota, Metropolitana de Santiago y Araucanía? El análisis se basa en los acuerdos escritos recogidos en el Informe Nacional de Sistematización de la Consulta Indígena del año 2016. La metodología empleada combina procedimientos textuales propios de la investigación documental con el enfoque comparativo utilizado en la antropología. Los principales resultados muestran que las narrativas presentes en las actas pueden comprenderse tanto a partir de la interacción histórica entre el Estado y los pueblos indígenas, como por las relaciones bidireccionales entre colectivos culturales diversos situados en contextos sociales regionales. Se

\* Universidad Santo Tomás, Chile. E-mail: <jagonzag@yahoo.com>.

\*\* Universidad de Concepción, Chile. E-mail: <evalenzuelavt@gmail.com>.

cial contexts. The article concludes that the key similarities and differences in the demands are shaped by the political ideas and cultures embedded in discursive practices. In this regard, regional social contexts play a crucial role in shaping the narratives articulated in the written records of the consultation process.

concluye que las principales semejanzas y diferencias en las demandas están determinadas por las ideas y culturas políticas que operan en las prácticas discursivas. En este sentido, los contextos sociales regionales desempeñan un papel clave en la configuración de las narrativas que emergen en los textos escritos producidos en el marco de la consulta.

**Keywords:** Indigenous demands; dialogic texts; regional contexts; Chile.

**Palabras clave:** demandas indígenas; textos dialógicos; contextos regionales; Chile.

## Introduction

A wide range of theoretical approaches characterizes studies on the management of ethno-cultural diversity. On the one hand, some perspectives focus on state techniques of control and management of irregular migration (Bendixsen & Eriksen, 2024). On the other hand, some approaches center their analysis on the nationalism embedded in health policies, particularly through the national/foreigner dichotomy (Uzelac, Carol, David, & Malesevic, 2024). A third perspective prioritizes the analysis of the ideal models of national identity promoted by states and their role in generating conditions of peace or conflict (Flan, 2023a). In a different direction, some approaches center on the notion of race and the study of racialized experiences (Wade, 2022). Distinct from these are perspectives rooted in the analysis of conflicts motivated by access to natural resources and the defense of concrete interests (Schlee, 2022). Finally, the anthropology of the state offers an approach focused on the interaction between state agents and users of public policies (Gupta, 2012; Gupta, Nugent & Sreenath, 2015; Abrams, Gupta & Mitchell, 2015; Arias, 2016). Together, these debates reveal the complexity of the object of study and the multiple theoretical pathways through which it may be approached.

In the case of Latin American countries, research has primarily focused on the problematic dichotomy between assimilation and interculturality, often grounding inquiry in Indigenous populations. Within this line of research, perspectives range from those advocating for the notion of “acculturation” (Aguirre, 1991), to approaches that trace the discursive shift toward the concept of “interculturality” (Fábregas, 2012), to critical analyses of how educational policies promote the integration of Indigenous peoples (Ferraio, 2010; Barrios-Valenzuela & Palou-Julián, 2014; Dietz, 2014, 2017, 2023; Dietz & Gómez, 2023; Dietz & Mateos, 2024). Adding to this complexity is the controversy surrounding the concept

of interculturality itself, particularly shaped by the development of decolonial studies and the critical dialogue it has generated, as exemplified by the debate among David Lehmann (2023), Gustavo Lins Ribeiro (2023), and José Eduardo Zárata (2023). Finally, there are approaches rooted in the historical analysis of colonialism and its impact on the production of knowledge (González Casanova, 2006; De Sousa Santos, 2010, 2018; Quijano, 2014; Rivera, 2015). These contributions further underscore the complexity of the topic in light of the long-standing interethnic interaction in the subcontinent.

In the Chilean context, two main research currents can be identified. First, there is an extensive debate on the processes of cultural and identity assimilation promoted by the state in Indigenous territories —whether in the far north (Van Kessel, 1980; González, 2002; Castro, 2005; Zapata, 2007; Poblete, 2010; González, Gundermann & Hidalgo, 2014; Gundermann, González & Durston, 2018; Carrasco & Gavilán, 2020; González & González, 2023), in the Araucanía region (Aylwin, 2001; Tricot, 2009; De la Maza, 2012; Pairicán, 2014, 2018; Gutiérrez & Gálvez, 2017; Tricot & Bidegain, 2020; De la Maza & Huisca, 2020; De la Maza & Calfucura, 2021; Valenzuela, González & Mella, 2021; Figueroa, 2021; Tricot, Bidegain & Pairicán, 2022; Beróiza, Pilquiman, Cid, De la Maza & Cea, 2022; Gálvez, 2022; Gálvez & De la Maza, 2024; Marimán, 2023; Sanhueza & Rebolledo, 2024), or, in some cases, within and beyond national borders (Vergara & Gundermann, 2012; Antileo, 2019). A second line of research focuses on ethnic identification among Indigenous populations through population census data (Gundermann, Vergara & Foerster, 2005; González, 2021). From this latter approach emerges the relevance of examining ethnic identification as a product of social interactions shaped under a state-centered framework.

Four analytical perspectives are especially useful for the present article from this broader debate. The first stems from the anthropology of the state (Abrams, Gupta & Mitchell, 2015; Arias, 2016), which emphasizes the interaction between state agents and public policy recipients. This interaction is explored through ethnographic research focused on the relational practices of both groups. The second is found in the work of Synnøve Bendixsen and Thomas Eriksen (2024), who, through the concepts of “neoliberal welfare state” and “slow violence,” analyze state techniques for managing irregular migration based on interviews with migrant subjects. This approach is particularly relevant in highlighting the state’s role in managing ethno-cultural diversity. A third perspective is that of Goualo Lazare Flan, who investigates the problem through what he terms “models of identity construction” formulated by the state (Flan, 2023a), employing documentary analysis and interviews (Flan, 2023b). This view is valuable in that it addresses ethnic management in terms of the typologies of national identity promoted by states. Lastly, a fourth perspective draws on studies of ethnic identification in Chile based on census data (Gundermann, Vergara & Foerster, 2005; González, 2021), emphasizing the role of regional factors in shaping such identification. These four perspectives offer a bidirectional approach to our object of study, allowing for an analysis

of both state-collectivity interaction and the relationship between ethnic groups and their regional social contexts.

Drawing on this theoretical framework, the article examines the Indigenous demands expressed in Chile's "Indigenous Consultation" process in 2016. This reflection is particularly relevant in light of the results of the constitutional referendum held on September 4<sup>th</sup>, 2022, and the political setback it represented for the debate on plurinationality in Chile (Skewes & Guerra, 2022). The behavior of Indigenous collectivities under a state framework can be understood as an interactive and intersubjective process shaped within local/supralocal contexts.

This article offers a retrospective analysis of the Indigenous demands recorded during the National Indigenous Consultation conducted by the Chilean government between August 2016 and January 2017. The guiding research question is: What are the main similarities and differences in the demands articulated by Aymara and Mapuche communities in Arica and Parinacota, Metropolitan Santiago, and Araucanía? Two working hypotheses guide the investigation. The first posits that the principal similarities lie in demands for constitutional recognition of plurinationality, collective rights, and institutions dedicated to protecting Indigenous cultures. The second hypothesis suggests that the main differences emerge in identity-based demands and the cultural mechanisms employed to safeguard Indigenous material and intellectual heritage.

The article is organized as follows: The first section presents the theoretical and methodological framework. The second section compares the demands for Indigenous self-determination expressed by Aymara and Mapuche communities in the selected regions. The third section analyzes their claims regarding political rights. The article concludes with an analysis of their cultural and linguistic rights demands, followed by a final concluding section.

### ***Theoretical-Methodological Approach***

The analysis of the Indigenous Consultation requires considering what this process entails in the field of power structures that enable the actions making it possible. In this regard, three theoretical levels can be identified concerning the object of study: an international level, linked to both inter-state interactions and international law; a state level, which considers the territorial control of a given state and its room for maneuver in the face of international political pressure; and finally, a regional level, in which the state operates within supralocal social contexts that define the social positioning of group identities.

At the international level, state action is understood as part of an inter-state power structure (Waltz, 2000), characterized by the absence of centralized government (Bull, 2005) but nevertheless shaped by efforts toward legal regulation through international regimes

(Keohane & Nye, 1988). From this perspective, core-periphery relations are established both among states (Waltz, 2000) and among productive zones within the global capitalist system (Wallerstein, 1979, 2006), producing what Aníbal Quijano (2014) conceptualized as a “coloniality of power” between world regions. The state’s room for maneuver is thus determined by its social positioning within this global structure: peripheral states possess significantly less autonomy than their metropolitan counterparts. Within this context, ILO Convention No. 169 —guaranteeing respect for the cultures and worldviews of Indigenous peoples— was ratified by numerous Latin American states, including Chile (Gómez, 1995). International agencies, under such conditions, play a key role in shaping internal state policies (Gaché, 1997a, 1997b; Assies, 1999), a dynamic that Henri Favre (1999) analyzes through the concept of the “neoliberal state” in Latin America. From this standpoint, Latin American states promote Indigenous policies that encourage the population’s strategic differentiation for public policy design and implementation. Within this contingency, Indigenous consultations organized by states should be understood. In the Chilean case, Camila Peralta (2019) defines the consultation process as an “imposed asymmetry” since this policy is constructed from above, imposing a state-driven agenda in the encounters between the state and Indigenous peoples. In this light, prior consultation with Indigenous collectivities can be viewed as part of broader state practices, which Damián Gálvez and Francisca de la Maza (2024) describe as “multicultural policy”. In this sense, Indigenous consultation is understood as a state practice triggered by international pressure but implemented according to state interests.

At the national level, state practice operates through the political control of the population to organize and sustain production relations within a defined territory (O’Donnell, 2009). Within this framework, the management of ethno-cultural diversity can be understood either as a technique of control and management of difference —particularly when directed toward foreign collectivities (Bendixsen & Eriksen, 2024)— or as a set of identity construction models designed to incorporate culturally and ethnically distinct local populations into a unified state project (Flan, 2023a).

At the regional level, the state interacts asymmetrically with supralocal power structures that define the “social positioning of identity” (Vergara & Gundermann, 2012), the “spaces of interethnic interaction” (Gundermann, González & Durston, 2018), and the various Indigenous ethno-territorial demands addressed to the state. A differentiated power relationship emerges between state agents convening the consultation and the Indigenous participants articulating their demands. In this way, Indigenous consultation is understood as a mode of state management of ethno-cultural diversity that, while adhering to international treaties signed by Chile guaranteeing the rights of Indigenous peoples, ultimately constitutes a top-down administration of ethnic differentiation, shaping the design and implementation of public policies affecting Indigenous populations.

Conversely, Indigenous demands articulated during consultation processes must be understood as the subordinate dimension of this relationship. These constitute a series of practices generated within an asymmetrical social and political interaction, wherein Indigenous actors seek to introduce an ethnic and cultural agenda to the state, either in hopes of being recognized and benefited by state action or, at the very least, to avoid harm from it. This article centers its analysis on these latter practices.

Once the conceptual framework of the object of study has been clarified, it becomes essential to define the methodology by which we approach the data. Analyzing information produced under a state framework requires close attention to the specific characteristics of the empirical material. Equally important is an awareness of the social and symbolic context in which the data are generated, as this enables a more precise understanding of the scope of the documentation and the inferences that can be drawn from it.

This study is based on records produced during state-convened and self-organized meetings of the “Indigenous Consultation” held in 2016 (AMBJ, 2018). These documents were compiled into a national report by the University of Chile titled *Systematization of the Participatory Constituent Process with Indigenous Peoples* (2017).

According to the document *Systematization of the Consultation Process with Indigenous Peoples on Specific Matters Related to the Draft Bill Creating the Biodiversity and Protected Areas Service and the National System of Protected Areas* (Ministry of the Environment, 2017), the “dialogue stage” of the consultation varied in format depending on the geographical and cultural characteristics of each region. In ten regions, the dialogue phase concluded with regional-level meetings. It concluded through local encounters in four regions —specifically, nineteen local closure sessions. Nationwide, 33 dialogue meetings were held, combining regional and local formats.

The consultation followed a local dialogue format in the region of Arica and Parinacota, involving 85 participants across the localities of Arica, Putre, General Lagos, and Camarones. In the Araucanía region, the process followed a regional dialogue format, with 126 participants attending two meetings in the city of Temuco. The most exceptional case was the Metropolitan Region of Santiago, where no dialogue sessions were held before drafting the consultation records that were later compiled in the 2017 report.

The national report highlights the methodological complexity of the Indigenous consultation process, particularly concerning data collection. Information was gathered through a series of state-convened and self-organized meetings held at local and supralocal levels, and this was triangulated with an online survey targeting individual participants. The meetings generated a set of written records composed in various formats, languages, and narrative styles. These records were later systematized using qualitative data analysis software (ATLAS.ti) to organize the material and provide coherence to the dialogues and opinions expressed. According to the report, the records constitute a diverse array of texts, both dialogical and multi-vocal.



Delving further into the recording procedures described in the report, participants engaged in the consultation through three distinct modalities. The first consisted of *state-convened meetings* in which organizations (communities and associations) and traditional Indigenous authorities took part. These meetings were directly organized and implemented by the Regional Committee in collaboration with a network of contracted universities. The universities acted as facilitators, assuming responsibility for the development of the meetings following the Regional Committee's planning and programming. This process resulted in 255 meetings involving a total of 5 354 participants.

The second modality consisted of *self-organized meetings* in which Indigenous organizations and/or collectives independently conducted participatory sessions. These groups were responsible for organizing, facilitating, carrying out their meetings, and preparing a content report based on a standardized template. The organizations registered through a state-managed online platform. This mechanism led to 350 self-organized meetings involving a total of 11 124 participants. Lastly, a third modality consisted of *individual participation via questionnaire*, allowing individuals to engage with the process through a self-administered online survey. This third channel recorded 538 participants.

For the purposes of this article, our analytical interest lies primarily in the first two modalities. In contrast to the digital survey, both the state-convened and self-organized meetings generated written narratives that provided access to participants' discursive practices and more extensive articulations of their demands toward the state.

The analysis of these systematized records, as compiled in the national report, poses a methodological challenge for interpreting Indigenous demands. The documents produced during these meetings emerged from face-to-face encounters among various Indigenous actors, including ancestral authorities, community leaders, and members of Indigenous associations and communities. In other words, the records are the product of social interactions generated through spoken language, which were ultimately codified in writing as agreements formalized after each consultation. Additionally, the process occurred during the second half of 2016, necessitating a retrospective reflection. To this end, we consider it essential to interpret the narratives contained in this official report as the result of a series of cultural practices taking place within what historiography refers to as *episodic time* (Braudel, 1970) —that is, a brief historical stage marked by the predominance of political action. From this perspective, the consultation process may be situated within a contingency that Immanuel Wallerstein (1997) conceptualizes as an *ideological-cyclical time-space*. In this sense, the consultation occurred in a very different temporal and political context than the one Chile is currently experiencing —namely, during the second administration of President Michelle Bachelet, a historical period characterized by ideological polarization and widespread public distrust toward institutions (Lindh, Fábrega & González, 2019).

From a textual standpoint, the narratives presented in the official report are understood in this article as *dialogical texts* (Ginzburg, 2010). They are written records produced in dialogue between individuals and groups during state-convened and self-organized meetings. In this respect, Anthony Giddens' (2003) concept of *double hermeneutics* proves especially useful, as it allows us to interpret these documents as sites of intersubjective interaction —where individual awareness is intertwined with the social forms and instruments utilized by the participating agents.

A crucial dimension in generating this information lies in the state's action. Whether state-convened or self-organized, the Indigenous consultation process unfolded under the umbrella of the nation-state, which obliges us to adopt theoretical-methodological approaches capable of interpreting the symbolic context of this documentation. In this regard, the proposals developed by Bendixsen and Eriksen (2024), alongside the conceptual contributions of Flan (2023a, 2023b), offer numerous insights for analyzing the dominant dimension of the consultation's final report.

In terms of identifying recurring themes within Indigenous demands, we draw on two complementary sets of approaches: on the one hand, those that examine the role of political culture in shaping the practices of Indigenous collectivities (Gutiérrez & Gálvez, 2017; Gálvez, 2022); and on the other, perspectives that explore the models of ethnic identity produced and reproduced by Indigenous intellectuals and professionals (González, 2022). From this angle, documentary research allows us to identify “identity construction models” (Flan, 2023b) operating within the textual production of the consultation records.

The Indigenous demands will be analyzed from a comparative perspective. To do so, we draw upon two typologies developed in Chile for analyzing ethnic identity within regional social contexts: 1) the *regional identity field model* (Vergara & Gundermann, 2012), and 2) the *spaces of interethnicity framework* (Gundermann, González & Durston, 2018). These frameworks will be used to compare Mapuche demands in the Araucanía and Metropolitan Santiago regions with Aymara demands in the Arica and Parinacota region. On this basis, we establish similarity and difference criteria to analyze the 2016 Indigenous Consultation's subordinate dimension comparatively. Given the broad thematic diversity addressed in the national report, our analysis will focus on three specific dimensions: 1) demands for Indigenous self-determination, 2) demands for Indigenous political rights, and 3) demands for Indigenous cultural and linguistic rights. These are the subjects of the following sections.

### ***Demands for Indigenous self-determination***

The Indigenous demands presented in the report are written in Spanish and framed within Western political and legal nomenclature. This reflects the dominant dimension of the con-



sultation process in shaping the final text. Within the report's subaltern dimension, the demands for Indigenous self-determination in the Arica and Parinacota region are characterized by the understanding that constitutional recognition must serve as the foundation for *plurinationality*. From this perspective, the Chilean Constitution should incorporate key elements of each Indigenous people, including their culture, worldview, language, traditions, and territorial relations, thus enabling each Indigenous nation to manage its territorial resources and define its own development model.

The Aymara participants interpret plurinationality as the constitutional recognition of the different Indigenous peoples as nations, each possessing distinct rights and development projects. In contrast, *pluriculturalidad* is a more limited concept, referring to the coexistence of various cultural groups that do not necessarily qualify as Indigenous peoples and, therefore, possess a different legal status.

In the political dimension of self-determination, the participants assert that any state or corporate project affecting Indigenous territories must be subjected to free, prior, and informed consultation. According to the Aymara participants, such consultation processes are often poorly publicized or scheduled at times, which is impractical for rural populations. Nevertheless, consultation is seen as a valuable tool for dialogue between Indigenous peoples and the Chilean state.

A cornerstone of autonomy and self-determination is the right to act upon a "territory of one's own," which includes ownership and access to land and natural resources under forms of care, protection, and extraction as defined by Indigenous traditions. Additionally, the Aymara demand that the Constitution prescribe collective rights and Indigenous customary law. Based on these principles, the Constitution should also establish the economic autonomy of Indigenous populations, allowing each nation the right to a culturally grounded development model. Finally, the Aymara assert that each Indigenous people should possess its governmental institutions —though this does not imply a complete separation from the Chilean political system. Rather, self-governance should coexist with participation in the broader society, for example through the establishment of a *National Indigenous Council* and an *Indigenous Parliament*.

In the Araucanía region, the demands for self-determination center on the view that constitutional recognition is a "significant step" in the relationship between Indigenous peoples and the Chilean state. The Mapuche participants demand respect from the state, private companies, and Chilean society as a whole. Based on this, a debate emerges around how Indigenous peoples should be recognized. The participants conclude that they should be acknowledged as original peoples and not simply as "ethnic groups" or "Indigenous peoples". Recognition, in their view, involves not only formal acknowledgment but also respect for Indigenous knowledge systems, languages, philosophies, and rights over natural resources.

From this standpoint, the concept of a plurinational state is seen as a foundational step toward recognition. Both plurinationality and pluriculturalidad are understood as implying

that not all inhabitants of Chile are culturally or politically “Chilean”. Accordingly, a future constitution must explicitly recognize the coexistence of multiple peoples within Chile and affirm the Mapuche as a nation.

In the political dimension of self-determination, participants stress that any state or corporate intervention in Indigenous or adjacent territories must involve binding consultation enshrined in the Constitution. The cornerstone of Mapuche autonomy and self-determination lies in the recovery of ancestral territories. As such, these territories and their resources—which currently fall under national park designation or private economic exploitation—must be returned to Mapuche communities to be managed communally by Indigenous populations.

Participants propose that these communities should establish a territorial statute to regulate the governance of these lands and resources. These would be managed through territorial corporate units grounded in Mapuche social organization. This structure should be based on Indigenous institutions’ recovery and territorial activation.

A distinctive feature of Mapuche self-determination demands is the call for the repeal of the Anti-Terrorism Law, the demilitarization of Indigenous territories, and the release of Mapuche political prisoners. Participants also call for creating special courts that uphold the principle of legal pluralism when prosecuting Mapuche individuals, ensuring equality before the law and respect for traditional Indigenous authorities.

Additionally, participants demand the recognition of equal rights for men and women, specifically calling for the Constitution to recognize and distinguish Mapuche women from other rural women. Two further core elements of the Mapuche demands relate to development models and Indigenous governance. Regarding the former, autonomy and self-determination are contingent upon a development model rooted in ancestral territorial recovery. Regarding the latter, participants argue that Indigenous self-governance requires a distinct political-administrative structure based on Mapuche institutions.

They also advocated for creating a Mapuche nation-state founded on a network of territorial self-governments. To this end, the Chilean state must allocate resources directly administered by Indigenous communities. Finally, the participants asserted that the governments of Chile and Argentina must guarantee the free mobility of Mapuche people across both national territories.

In the case of the Metropolitan Region of Santiago, the demands for self-determination center around the themes of consultation, territory, Indigenous customary law, culturally grounded development models, and Indigenous governance. In this context, participants emphasize that any state or corporate intervention in Indigenous or adjacent territories must be subjected to binding democratic consultation, serving as a mechanism for communities to deliberate on public policies, programs, or projects that directly affect their lives and territories.

From a legal standpoint, participants demand that the state formally recognize Indigenous normative frameworks. As in the Araucanía case, they propose the creation of special courts and an exclusive judicial system for Indigenous peoples, enshrining in the Constitution the collective rights prescribed by Indigenous legal and cultural systems. Likewise, they call for the cessation of the Anti-Terrorism Law.

In economic terms, participants argue that material life in Indigenous territories should be governed according to each community's customs, administrative practices, and ancestral traditions. Regarding self-governance, they demand that each Indigenous people be recognized as a nation and that this status enable them to rely on their own deliberative political institutions, envisioned as communitarian republics grounded in the principle of self-government. Some even propose the drafting of an Indigenous constitution for the Mapuche people.

All of the aforementioned demands are summarized in the following table:

**Table 1**  
 Indigenous Self-Determination Demands

<b>Demands</b>	<b>Arica and Parinacota</b>	<b>Araucanía</b>	<b>Metropolitan Region of Santiago</b>
<i>Plurinationality</i>	Constitutional recognition as the foundation for "plurinationality"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Recognition as an "original people"</li> <li>- Plurinationality as the first step toward acknowledging the coexistence of multiple peoples in Chile</li> </ul>	- No explicit demand
<i>Consultation</i>	Free, prior, and informed consultation. Seen as a tool for dialogue between the State and Indigenous peoples	Binding consultation guaranteed by the Constitution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Binding democratic consultations</li> <li>- Consultation as a deliberative mechanism for "communities" on public policy</li> </ul>
<i>Territory</i>	Constitutional access to Indigenous territories and their resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Recovery of ancestral lands as the basis of self-determination</li> <li>- Community-managed territorial statute</li> <li>- Territorial corporate units</li> </ul>	Indigenous territories under the ownership and administration of Indigenous communities

(continuación)

<b>Demands</b>	<b>Arica and Parinacota</b>	<b>Araucanía</b>	<b>Metropolitan Region of Santiago</b>
<i>Customary Law</i>	The new Constitution must enshrine both “collective rights” and Indigenous “customary law”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Recovery of institutions and Mapuche customary law</li> <li>- Repeal of the Anti-Terrorism Law</li> <li>- Release of Mapuche political prisoners</li> <li>- Creation of Indigenous special courts</li> <li>- Legal equality between men and women</li> <li>- Legal recognition of Mapuche women’s distinct status</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- State recognition of Indigenous legal frameworks</li> <li>- Creation of Indigenous special courts</li> <li>- Exclusive judicial system for Indigenous peoples</li> <li>- The Constitution must enshrine collective rights</li> <li>- Repeal of the Anti-Terrorism Law and end to criminalization and repression of Indigenous peoples</li> </ul>
<i>Development Model</i>	Constitutional right to a development model grounded in Indigenous culture	Development model rooted in the recovery of ancestral lands	Development model based on the administration, customs, and ancestral traditions of the “communities” themselves
<i>Indigenous Governance</i>	“Indigenous self-government” with the right to participate in national-level entities such as a “National Indigenous Council” and an “Indigenous Parliament”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Independent political structure</li> <li>- Mapuche nation-state</li> <li>- Free mobility of Mapuche people between Chile and Argentina</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Each Indigenous people should be recognized as a nation</li> <li>- Each with its own deliberative political institutions</li> <li>- Indigenous nations should constitute “communitarian republics”</li> <li>- Creation of a “Mapuche Constitution”</li> </ul>

Source: Compiled by the author based on AMBJ (2018).

The table reveals that the demands articulated in the 2016 Indigenous Consultation exhibit both similarities and differences across topics such as plurinationality, Indigenous consultation, territory, customary law, development models, and Indigenous governance. The main patterns of convergence among these demands center on several key elements: the call for

constitutional recognition of plurinationality in Chile; Indigenous consultation as a mechanism for deliberation and dialogue with the state; access to Indigenous territory and its resources, guaranteed by the new Constitution; and the inclusion of collective and customary Indigenous rights within the constitutional framework.

The principal divergences appear first in the Metropolitan Region of Santiago, where the issue of plurinationality is not explicitly addressed. A second difference emerges in the Araucanía region, where the territorial dimension involves the notion of ancestral land recovery, the establishment of a territorial statute administered by Indigenous communities, and the creation of territorial corporate units. Regarding customary law, both Araucanía and the Metropolitan Region differ from Arica and Parinacota in their emphasis on the political issue of militarization in Mapuche territory. In addition, these two regions differ from the northern context in their demand for the creation of Indigenous special courts and the legal recognition of the role of Indigenous women. A similar pattern is found concerning Indigenous self-governance: while Aymara participants advocate for participation in national-level political entities—proposing the creation of national organizations to represent all Indigenous peoples in Chile—Mapuche participants in Araucanía defend the right to establish a distinct political structure, including the creation of a Mapuche nation-state.

Turning now to analysis, the main patterns of convergence across the demands demonstrate the use of a shared political and legal lexicon rooted in Western traditions, including terms such as “Constitution,” “plurinationality,” “territory,” and “customary rights.” This common framework may be understood as the result of the historical interaction in Chile between the state and Indigenous peoples, as well as the bidirectional relations between regional collective actors within the supralocal contexts in which the consultation took place in 2016.

The most recurrent distinctions emerge between Aymara and Mapuche demands regarding the divergences. The Aymara, for instance, call for participation in national political institutions. In contrast, Mapuche participants in Araucanía advocate for creating an autonomous political structure, which includes the recovery of ancestral territories, the development of a territorial statute managed by local communities, and the establishment of territorial corporate units. They also demand Indigenous special courts and the legal recognition of the specific role of Indigenous women. Their proposals include the creation of a Mapuche nation-state.

In the case of the Mapuche in Santiago, what distinguishes their demands the most is the absence of an explicit position on plurinationality. Nevertheless, they share with their counterparts in Araucanía a similar stance on the issue of militarization in Mapuche territories.

These differences can be interpreted in light of the historical patterns of regional inter-ethnic interaction among the participants and the Indigenous political cultures that may be shaping their practices. In this regard, the Aymara are characterized by a long-standing trajectory of state-population interaction—a situation markedly different from that of the

Mapuche, especially those in Araucanía. Thus, the observed differences reflect divergent regional contexts regarding the state's and Indigenous peoples' relationship and the dynamics among culturally distinct collectivities within supralocal power structures.

Finally, the demands also reflect Indigenous participants' efforts to introduce an ethnic and cultural agenda into a state-led process. However, the textual practice embodied in the final report also reveals that these demands are the product of a long interaction history with Western political culture.

### ***Demands for Indigenous political rights***

The Aymara participants from the Arica and Parinacota region demand that the Constitution enshrines the right of Indigenous peoples to political participation and representation. To this end, the state must adapt its mechanisms and legal frameworks to incorporate the Aymara people into national decision-making processes. According to these narratives, it is essential for Indigenous peoples to have political representation within the legislative branch. The future Constitution should guarantee exclusive parliamentary seats for Indigenous peoples, with quotas ranging from 10 % to 50 %, as well as proportional Indigenous representation in each region.

These parliamentarians should be democratically elected through deliberation processes organized by the communities. Candidates must be individuals who belong to Indigenous communities, possess cultural knowledge, speak the Indigenous language, and be locally validated. All elected officials must be barred from re-election and from holding lifetime positions in order to prevent corruption. In addition, the participants demand Indigenous representation at all levels of government —regional, provincial, and municipal— and call for Indigenous quotas in ministries, secretariats, and public services.

Furthermore, the creation of a Division for Indigenous Women within the Ministry of Women and Gender Equality is proposed, along with the establishment of a Ministry for Indigenous Peoples (or an equivalent body) and a Ministry for Indigenous Economic Development. Participants also call for appointing Indigenous judges and/or representatives within the judiciary to ensure respect for Indigenous worldviews and legal traditions.

Complementing these proposals, participants advocate for promoting Indigenous political parties as mechanisms of political participation, enabling the election of Indigenous senators, deputies, and other political representatives. Finally, the Aymara demand administrative and fiscal decentralization, granting regions greater authority, for instance, in regional authorities' elections. Accordingly, the state should increase subsidies for residents of remote areas and implement the decentralization of services and public institutions.



In the Araucanía region, Mapuche participants call for reserved seats in an Indigenous Parliament, with candidates elected at the communal level or through mechanisms determined by Indigenous groups themselves. These seats should uphold gender parity between men and women. Some consultation meetings suggested that the number of seats should be proportional to the Indigenous population, meaning that the Mapuche —being the largest Indigenous group— should have more representatives than smaller collectivities.

Participants also call for the promotion and legal recognition of traditional authorities, who may serve as representatives of the Mapuche people. They demand Indigenous representation in local institutions, including positions such as municipal councilors, regional councilors (CORES), and regional governors (*intendentes*).

A distinctive feature of the Mapuche demands in Araucanía is the defense of Indigenous authorities and institutions within the Chilean state. In this regard, participants underscore the need for a legitimate interlocutor when engaging with non-Indigenous authorities and institutions, insisting that such representatives should be included in the presidential political committee. Regardless of the institutional figure, participants agree that these representatives must be involved in drafting any future constitution.

Aligned with this vision of autonomous institutions, participants express deep mistrust toward non-Indigenous political parties and politicians, viewing them as untrustworthy due to unmet promises. For the Mapuche, the challenge is to develop leaders who represent the Mapuche people, not political parties. While some participants consider forming a Mapuche political party, others argue that representatives should remain independent.

Regarding political-administrative structure, participants demand a greater role for regions and communes in decision-making, alongside the active inclusion of Indigenous representatives. Government programs developed at the national level should incorporate local Mapuche participation to better address regional needs.

From this perspective, participants insist that communities should hold more authority than national agencies such as the National Corporation for Indigenous Development (CONADI), particularly in economic matters. Accordingly, the state should mediate between corporations and Indigenous peoples and allocate resources equitably among communes and communities, thereby fostering economic decentralization. Lastly, participants demand that large corporations operating on Indigenous lands pay a percentage of their profits to the communities, the commune, and the region.

In the Metropolitan Region of Santiago, participants demand reserved parliamentary seats in both chambers of Congress to ensure their political representation. They also insist that spaces for political participation and deliberation closest to the communities should remain under their control. In this vein, Indigenous representation must reflect communal and regional expressions, enabling the election of, for example, Mapuche mayors.

Participants further assert that the Mapuche people must be represented in state agencies and public administration institutions, including ministries and programs related to Indigenous affairs. As in the Araucanía case, they demand the creation of a Ministry for Indigenous Affairs and the establishment of a Department for Indigenous Women within the Ministry of Women and Gender Equality, together with the decentralization of CONADI.

Likewise, Mapuche participants in Santiago emphasize the need to have Mapuche members in the judiciary. They also call for including a constituent assembly as a binding mechanism for participation within the new Constitution.

Regarding the political-administrative structure, participants demand that Indigenous peoples in general—and the Mapuche in particular—receive compensation or profit-sharing benefits from large corporations engaged in extractive activities on their lands. Finally, participants call for public policies to reach all Indigenous peoples nationwide.

The demands detailed above are summarized in the following table.

**Table 2**  
 Demands for Indigenous Political Rights

Demands	Arica and Parinacota	Araucanía	Metropolitan Region of Santiago
<i>Political Participation and Representation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Right to Indigenous political participation and representation</li> <li>- Exclusive parliamentary seats</li> <li>- Indigenous parliamentarians elected by the “communities”</li> <li>- No right to re-election</li> <li>- No lifetime appointments</li> <li>- Indigenous presence in public institutions and all levels of government</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reserved seats in an “Indigenous Parliament”</li> <li>- Candidates elected at the “communal level” or through mechanisms determined by the communities</li> <li>- Quotas ensuring “gender parity”</li> <li>- Representation proportional to the size of the Indigenous population</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- “Reserved parliamentary seats” in both legislative chambers</li> <li>- Representation of Indigenous peoples must include “communal” and “regional” forms</li> <li>- Mapuche presence in state agencies and public institutions</li> <li>- Creation of a “Ministry of Indigenous Affairs”</li> <li>- Creation of a “Department for Indigenous Women”</li> </ul>

(continuación)

Demands	Arica and Parinacota	Araucanía	Metropolitan Region of Santiago
<i>Political Participation and Representation</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Promotion and legal recognition of “traditional authorities”</li> <li>- Indigenous representatives in “local institutions” (e.g., councilors, regional councilors [CORES], governors)</li> <li>- Designation of “legitimate interlocutors” between the state and Indigenous communities (e.g., “observers” or “ancestral ombudspersons”)</li> <li>- Ongoing debate on the formation of a “Mapuche political party”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Decentralization of CONADI</li> <li>- Mapuche presence in the judiciary</li> <li>- Constitutional reform through a “constituent assembly”</li> </ul>
<i>Political-Administrative Structure</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Creation of a “Division for Indigenous Women” within the Ministry of Women</li> <li>- Creation of a “Ministry of Indigenous Economic Development”</li> <li>- Creation of Indigenous judges and/or representatives within the judiciary</li> <li>- Formation of Indigenous political parties</li> <li>- Decentralization of political-administrative powers and public resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Greater decision-making authority for regions and communes</li> <li>- Inclusion of Indigenous representatives in decision-making processes</li> <li>- Mapuche participation in the design of national programs</li> <li>- Greater authority for “communities” over state agencies</li> <li>- The state must act as an intermediary between companies and Indigenous peoples</li> <li>- Public funds should be allocated to “communes” and “communities” for local management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Compensation for Indigenous peoples in general—and the Mapuche in particular—by companies profiting from extractive activities on Indigenous territories</li> <li>- Public policies should ensure full coverage for all Indigenous peoples throughout Chile</li> </ul>

Source: Compiled by the author based on AMBJ (2018).

The most recurrent similarities among these practices lie in the demand to establish exclusive conditions for integrating Indigenous actors into the national political system. Aymara participants in Arica and Parinacota, as well as Mapuche participants in both Araucanía and Santiago, call for exclusive parliamentary seats, Indigenous presence in public institutions and government bodies at various levels, and the requirement that Indigenous representatives be community members, locally rooted, and elected exclusively by their communities.

Another point of convergence is the proposed creation of a Ministry for Indigenous Affairs and an Indigenous Women's Division within the Ministry of Women and Gender Equality—as observed in the Arica and Parinacota and Metropolitan Region cases—alongside demands for economic and politico-administrative decentralization in Chile. Finally, there is a shared, cross-regional demand for Indigenous representation within the judicial branch, regardless of the specific institutional mechanisms proposed.

The main divergences are found in the organizational structure of Indigenous politics, particularly at local and supralocal levels. In this regard, the Aymara advocate for the creation of Indigenous political parties, whereas Mapuche participants in Araucanía express skepticism regarding the viability of this political form. Meanwhile, Mapuche participants in Santiago strongly support the notion of reserved seats in the national Congress, along with the decentralization of CONADI.

While both the Aymara and Santiago-based Mapuche articulate political organization models that transcend the local community, the Araucanía Mapuche emphasize a communitarian discourse that resists power structures perceived to undermine community autonomy. In fact, Mapuche participants in Santiago also demand national-level coverage of public policies directed toward Indigenous populations—an indication of a distinct cultural orientation compared to their southern counterparts.

From an analytical standpoint, the main regularities in these demands once again reveal the use of a political and legal vocabulary rooted in Western institutional frameworks—including terms such as “exclusive parliamentary seats,” “ministries,” or “decentralization.” This trend can be understood in light of the historical and ongoing interactions between Indigenous peoples and various national and international agencies operating under the umbrella of the Chilean state.

Regarding differences, the most salient patterns appear in the domain of the organizational structure of Indigenous politics. Concepts such as Indigenous political parties among the Aymara, national congress, reserved seats, and CONADI decentralization among the Mapuche in Santiago point to a shared cultural-political relationship with the Chilean state. However, they also signal a clear contrast with the relationship between the Araucanía Mapuche and the state. In this context, a distinct Indigenous political culture appears to be operating, shaped by both regional history and the specific trajectory of state-society interaction.

These cultural distinctions become most visible in the realm of symbolic rights—a topic that will be addressed in the next chapter.

### ***Demands for Indigenous cultural and linguistic rights***

The Aymara from the Arica and Parinacota region demand that the Constitution establish mechanisms to facilitate the development and strengthening of Indigenous identity. Youth migration to urban areas and their integration into urban lifestyles are perceived as factors that disconnect them from their communities. As a result, young people are said to lose their identity, becoming immersed in individualism, consumerism, and normalized environmental degradation—conditions that undermine the Indigenous principle of *buen vivir* and strain intergenerational relationships.

In this context, participants demand not only freedom of religion but also the promotion of Aymara customs. Specifically, they call for June 21<sup>st</sup>—Aymara New Year—to be declared a national holiday and for the public recognition of Indigenous festivities such as El Carnaval de Arica con la Fuerza del Sol, the Fiesta de los Membrillazos in Codpa, the *pachallampe* (planting festival), *floreo*, llama shearing rituals, and *wilancha* ceremonies.

Concerning cultural heritage, participants call for protecting Indigenous peoples' tangible and intangible heritage. This includes the natural environment of Indigenous territories, which Indigenous communities themselves should administer through institutions such as museums—for example, in the case of the Chinchorro mummies—or community-run organizations that preserve and transmit ancestral knowledge to younger generations.

They also demand that Indigenous peoples patent ancestral plants and other cultural products under a designation of origin and explicitly reject the use of transgenic seeds. Indigenous communities must retain control over their seeds' origin and free use. Finally, participants demand constitutional recognition of the Aymara language and the declaration of a multilingual state that actively promotes Aymara across public institutions.

In the Araucanía region, Mapuche demands focus on the right to the free development of their customs. Participants express that they do not feel represented by *Winka* (non-Indigenous Chilean) ceremonies and celebrations. Consequently, they call for recognizing their right to raise children according to Mapuche educational practices, affirm plurinationality as a core part of their identity, and strengthen ancestral authorities such as *lonkos*, *machis*, and *werkén*.

Participants explicitly state that they identify as Mapuche rather than Chilean. For this reason, they request that national identity cards include their Indigenous affiliation alongside Chilean nationality. They further ask that Mapuche authorities be permitted to wear traditional dress in their ID photos. Participants demand a reinterpretation of the history

of the occupation of Araucanía, which currently excludes Indigenous perspectives. They also call for June 24<sup>th</sup> to be declared a national holiday in honor of *Wetripantu*, the Mapuche New Year.

In symbolic terms, they seek official recognition of Mapuche symbols, including their flags and the *kultrún*, and call for a ban on the commercial use of Mapuche names or symbols by non-Indigenous people or the state. Mapuche participants demand the protection of ceremonial spaces and sustainable development to maintain harmony in Indigenous life. This includes safeguarding sacred territories, vital natural resources, ceremonies, and customs, as well as greater respect from Catholic and Evangelical religious institutions for Mapuche worldviews and traditions.

They also demand the return of culturally significant sites —such as ceremonial spaces and areas for harvesting medicinal herbs— currently occupied by large corporations. Respect for traditional authorities and their ceremonies is essential. For example, *machis* should be granted the authority to issue death diagnoses or burial permits. On this basis, participants again demand an end to the persecution of Indigenous authorities, arguing that these leaders should receive the same state salary as other recognized public figures and that they should be granted constitutional recognition. These figures are seen as essential to maintaining community order and preventing violence or property destruction.

Another key demand involves the recognition and protection of Indigenous cultural and intellectual property, especially its collective nature, and an end to the forced relocation of Mapuche *lof* (territorial communities). Mapuche women's role in transmitting and preserving ancestral knowledge must also be recognized and valued.

On the issue of cultural heritage, participants demand that plants and seeds cultivated by Mapuche communities be declared Mapuche heritage, thus constituting community property. They call for the protection of native seeds, which should not be patentable, as the Mapuche people collectively own them. To this end, they propose the creation of a native seed market and a seed bank to safeguard this genetic material, explicitly rejecting the use of imported or transgenic seeds.

Finally, the Mapuche demand the teaching of *Mapudungun* at the national level, with territorial and regional consultation to ensure cultural relevance. They propose declaring Chile a multilingual or plurilingual state. The Constitution must recognize *Mapudungun* as an official language in regions where Mapuche populations reside.

In the Metropolitan Region, Mapuche participants demand the creation of mechanisms to preserve ancestral surnames passed down from parents and grandparents. They also call for access to historical research on Indigenous peoples so that they may learn about themselves and disseminate accurate representations of Mapuche history and culture.

Participants emphasize the need for recognition and respect for the Mapuche worldview, advocating for freedom of religion and protecting traditional authorities. Accordingly, they



demand an end to the political persecution and imprisonment of machis and call for official recognition of *chachay* (grandparents) as custodians of ancestral wisdom.

Within this framework, participants request the right to have a Mapuche cemetery —a space grounded in their cosmology and ideas surrounding death and dignified passing. Finally, Mapuche participants from Santiago demand the recognition of both the tangible and intangible heritage of Indigenous peoples and the creation of mechanisms to control how that heritage is reproduced.

The Constitution must explicitly protect and preserve Indigenous science, knowledge, and ancestral wisdom, particularly in fields such as health and education. Along these lines, participants propose revitalizing Indigenous languages in general and Mapudungun and Aymara in both oral and written forms.

The state must recognize linguistic rights in the Constitution, making teaching Indigenous languages mandatory within formal education and granting them equal legal status to Spanish —not as dialects, but as full languages, both in written and spoken forms.

The Indigenous cultural and symbolic demands summarized above are outlined in the following table.

**Table 3**  
 Demands for Indigenous Cultural and Linguistic Rights

Demands	Arica and Parinacota	Araucanía	Metropolitan Region of Santiago
<i>Identities</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Creation of mechanisms to facilitate the development of Indigenous identity</li> <li>- Promotion of Aymara customs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Recognition of the “free development of Mapuche customs”</li> <li>- Childrearing according to Mapuche practices</li> <li>- Strengthening of ancestral authorities</li> <li>- Do not identify as Chilean</li> <li>- National ID card should indicate Indigenous affiliation alongside Chilean nationality</li> <li>- Reinterpretation of Mapuche history from an Indigenous perspective</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Mechanisms to preserve ancestral surnames (from parents and grandparents)</li> <li>- Access to historical research on Indigenous peoples to promote self-knowledge and dissemination of accurate Mapuche history and culture</li> </ul>

(continuación)

Demands	Arica and Parinacota	Araucanía	Metropolitan Region of Santiago
<i>Cosmovision and Beliefs</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Right to buen vivir based on the Aymara worldview</li> <li>- Effective freedom of religious practices</li> <li>- Recognition of traditional Indigenous authorities as legitimate representatives of their collectivity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Protection of sacred territories, vital natural resources, ceremonies, and customs</li> <li>- Respect for the Mapuche worldview and traditions by Catholic and Evangelical institutions</li> <li>- Restoration of culturally and medicinally significant spaces</li> <li>- Respect for traditional authorities and their ceremonies</li> <li>- End to persecution of Indigenous authorities</li> <li>- Institutional role of Indigenous authorities in maintaining community order</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Recognition and appreciation of the Mapuche worldview</li> <li>- Protection of religious freedom and traditional authorities</li> <li>- End to political persecution and imprisonment of machis</li> <li>- Recognition of <i>chachay</i> (grandparents) as guardians of ancestral knowledge</li> <li>- Right to a “Mapuche cemetery” grounded in traditional beliefs about death and dignified passing</li> </ul>
<i>Heritage</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The State must guarantee the promotion and protection of local heritage</li> <li>- Protection of tangible and intangible Indigenous heritage</li> <li>- Patent protection (via designation of origin) for ancestral plants and cultural products</li> <li>- Rejection of transgenic seeds</li> <li>- Protection and free use of traditional seeds by Indigenous peoples</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Recognition and protection of Indigenous “intellectual and cultural property,” emphasizing its collective nature</li> <li>- Respect and appreciation of Mapuche women for their role in transmitting and preserving “ancestral knowledge”</li> <li>- Seeds cultivated by Mapuche culture should be declared cultural heritage and held as a collective property of the “communities”</li> <li>- Explicit rejection of foreign and transgenic seeds</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Recognition of the tangible and intangible heritage of Indigenous peoples</li> <li>- Protection and preservation of ancestral science, knowledge, and wisdom</li> </ul>

(continuación)

Demands	Arica and Parinacota	Araucanía	Metropolitan Region of Santiago
<i>Indigenous Languages</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Constitutional recognition of Aymara and other Indigenous languages as “official languages” alongside Spanish</li> <li>- Support for a multi-lingual state</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- National-level teaching of Mapudungun, with regional and territorial relevance and consultation</li> <li>- Declaration of Chile as a multilingual/plurilingual country</li> <li>- Recognition of Mapudungun as an official language in regions with Mapuche populations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Revitalization of Indigenous languages in general, and of Mapudungun and Aymara in particular, in both oral and written forms</li> <li>- Constitutional recognition of the linguistic rights of Indigenous peoples</li> <li>- Mandatory inclusion of Indigenous languages in formal education, with legal status equivalent to Spanish</li> </ul>

Source: Compiled by the author based on AMBJ (2018).

Based on the table, the main patterns of convergence among the demands center on establishing institutional mechanisms to support the development of Indigenous identity—particularly through respect, protection, and promotion of Indigenous cultures. A second point of convergence lies in the valuation of *buen vivir*, rooted in Indigenous worldviews that emphasize environmental respect and balance between humanity and nature. A third similarity appears in the defense of freedom of religion and the call for respect toward Indigenous cosmologies and traditional authorities.

Another shared concern is the demand to protect both tangible and intangible heritage, including traditional knowledge and the collective rights associated with cultural products such as native seeds. There is explicit opposition to genetically modified seeds in both the Aymara and the Mapuche in Araucanía cases. Finally, in the linguistic domain, there is a strong convergence around the constitutional recognition of Indigenous languages as official languages alongside Spanish and support for a multilingual state.

The most consistent divergences are found in the identity-related demands of the Mapuche from Araucanía. Their narratives clearly state that they do not consider themselves Chilean but Mapuche, and they call for formal recognition of this distinction in official identification documents, in the use of ethnic symbols, and the reinterpretation of their people’s history. This contrasts with the Mapuche in Santiago, who explicitly request access to historiographical sources on their people in order to learn more about themselves and to promote their culture.

Regarding cosmology, there is also a contrast between Mapuche participants from Araucanía and those from the capital. While both demand an end to the persecution of Indigenous authorities, participants from Araucanía emphasize that these authorities are the

only ones capable of regulating conflicts and preventing violent acts within their communities. In Santiago, participants stress the right to establish a Mapuche cemetery, grounded in their religious rituals and views on death.

Regarding heritage, a significant difference emerges in interpreting native seed protection. The Aymara advocate for patenting ancestral plants through a designation of origin, while the Mapuche from Araucanía reject all forms of patenting, asserting that seeds are the collective property of the communities. In the linguistic domain, a notable demand from the Mapuche in Santiago is the mandatory teaching of Indigenous languages within formal education, with equal legal status to Spanish. This echoes a pattern previously identified in the analysis of self-determination demands.

From an analytical perspective, the similarities across regions reflect the shared use of political and legal categories derived from Western traditions —such as freedom of religion, tangible and intangible heritage, and constitutional recognition. Once again, this can be understood in relation to the historical interaction between the state and Indigenous peoples.

The differences, on the other hand, highlight the specificity of interethnic interaction in the Araucanía region and its historical relationship with the Chilean state. Participants from this region distinguish themselves by identifying as Mapuche rather than Chilean and by their strong commitment to the communal defense of agricultural seeds. While the Aymara support the patenting of seeds and the Mapuche from Santiago seek access to historical narratives and the establishment of Indigenous cemeteries, Mapuche participants in Araucanía emphasize the defense of their communal way of life.

This again suggests the presence of a distinct Indigenous political culture shaped by the particular historical interaction between the Chilean state and the Mapuche people in this region —a dynamic not observed among participants from Santiago or the far north. It also indicates the existence of a political practice in which the community and local authorities play a central role.

## Conclusions

In an early work, Mexican anthropologist Luis Vázquez León (2010) argued that the notions of Indigenous people, ethnicity, and nation belong to the discursive repertoire of individuals who are educated and capable of acting within the public political sphere. He also noted that such nomenclatures require a certain degree of fixity to sustain ethnic domination. Finally, he proposed that other related concepts —such as rights, culture, and territory— likewise aspire to permanence and essentiality to uphold a static worldview.

When linking this reflection to our theoretical approach to the Indigenous consultation process in Chile, we find that language and ideas operate as both intellectual and state

instruments for managing ethno-cultural diversity. In our case study, the retrospective analysis of written texts generated through a state-led documentation process requires, among other things, situating this information within the contingency in which it was produced. Given that these are written practices by Indigenous actors in the recent past, they must be understood in relation to the historical period under examination and distinguished from the present. The 2016 Indigenous Consultation took place within a political time-space quite different from the current post-lockdown moment in Chile. The pandemic's economic, technological, and demographic consequences have significantly altered the political landscape since this state record was produced.

The records systematized in the official report reflect a series of written texts produced in dialogue with the state framework in which they were generated and the participants involved in the process. Added to this is the role played by the regional social settings where the consultation was conducted. In this way, the narratives reveal discursive practices of individuals and groups in co-presence, enabled by the registration modalities prescribed by the national political system. Thus, the information produced during the consultation resulted from various interactions between the state and the Indigenous participants and the relationship between these participants and the regional social contexts from which they emerged. The individual voices of participants reflect the social formulas shaped by the symbolic environments they inhabit and which they reproduce according to context.

Based on the regularities identified in the Indigenous demands recorded in the 2016 consultation, the following conclusions can be drawn:

The main similarities in demands for Indigenous self-determination lie in the call for constitutional recognition of plurinationality and the collective rights of Indigenous peoples in Chile —the most significant differences concern how Indigenous groups identify with or distinguish themselves from the Chilean political system.

The most consistent similarities in demands for Indigenous political rights involve creating exclusive mechanisms for integrating Indigenous actors into the national political system. The main differences pertain to the organizational structure of Indigenous politics, which the regional cultural contexts of the consulted populations can explain.

The primary similarities in demands for Indigenous cultural and linguistic rights are found in the call for institutional mechanisms that protect Indigenous identity, culture, and languages. The most salient differences appear in the identity-based demands of Mapuche communities in Araucanía, in contrast to the Aymara of the far north or Mapuche communities in Santiago. These are characterized by a national distinction between Mapuche and Chilean identities and the defense of community-based cultural mechanisms to safeguard Mapuche material and intellectual heritage.

The recorded demands reflect political ideas and cultures operating through discursive practices. They reveal notions of ethnic/national identity that closely resemble Western

thought, thereby situating these political behaviors within the global conceptual framework of identity, ethnicity, and nation. The demands directed at the political system —and the contrasts between the Arica and Parinacota and Metropolitan regions on the one hand and Araucanía on the other— reflect historical regional differences in the interaction between Indigenous collectivities and the state. In this sense, typologies of regional social and symbolic contexts prove useful for making comparative analyses of Indigenous territorial demands in state documentation.

In sum, the 2016 Indigenous Consultation report reflects two primary axes of interaction: 1) the relationship between the state and Indigenous peoples, and 2) the relationship between Indigenous peoples and their respective regional social contexts. Both are evident in the linguistic hybridity of the text and the presence of political and legal concepts rooted in Western traditions. The Indigenous demands are articulated in Spanish and reflect regional social and political issues while drawing on Western models of identity construction.

A notable gap in the report lies in its limited engagement with the intersubjective interactions that likely shaped the narratives presented. This shortcoming could be addressed through future studies of the original records and complementary textual analysis methodologies.

This study's main contribution is offering a preliminary comparative overview of Indigenous demands. Further research is needed to include additional Indigenous groups participating in the 2016 consultation. A future study should also involve a monographic analysis of the consultation records produced during the meetings. Close reading and analysis of these original texts would yield a deeper qualitative understanding of the discursive practices of the study's participants. Such documents may reveal the writing behaviors of certain actors and the dialogical and multi-vocal situations that led to consensus in the consultation process. Both case studies and comparative research stand to benefit from an in-depth investigation of these materials, enhancing our understanding of Indigenous ethnic identity and political culture in Chile.



## About the authors

**JAIME GONZÁLEZ GONZÁLEZ** holds a PhD in Anthropology from the Universidad de Tarapacá–Universidad Católica del Norte, Chile. His research interests include the social anthropology of ethnicity, nationalism, and intercultural education policies. Among his most recent publications are: “*Discurso etnopolítico. Un modelo teórico con base en las prácticas discursivas de intelectuales aimara*” (2024) *Revista Palimpsesto*, 14(24); “*Discursos de identidad nacional bajo el régimen de Pinochet. El caso del currículum de historia del año 1980*” (2024) in Benjamín Silva (ed.), *Historia social de la educación chilena. Los años del neoliberalismo: instalación, auge ¿y crisis? 1973 hasta el presente. Agentes educativos*, vol. 9, Ediciones Universidad Tecnológica Metropolitana.

**ESTEBAN VALENZUELA VAN TREEK** holds a PhD in History from the Universidad de Valencia, Spain. His research focuses on decentralization, territorial social movements, and Indigenous autonomies. Among his most recent publications are: “*Diez dimensiones para medir la gestión municipal por organización y servicios garantizados: la certificación de excelencia de Concepción, Chile*” (2022) *Revista del CLAD. Reforma y Democracia*, 84; “*Estructuras políticas yuxtapuestas en la cultura indígena. El caso Mapuche en Chile*” (2021) *Revista Mexicana de Ciencias Políticas y Sociales*, 66(241).

## References

- Abrams, Philip; Gupta, Akhil & Timothy Mitchell (2015) *Antropología del estado*. FCE.
- Aguirre Beltrán, Gonzalo (1991) *Regiones de refugio. El desarrollo de la comunidad y el proceso dominical en Mestizoamérica*. FCE.
- Antileo, Enrique (2019) “La politización de la cultura y la tradición en los movimientos indígenas de Chile y Bolivia” *Revista Chilena de Antropología*, 40: 169-188 [online]. Retrieved from: <<https://revistadeantropologia.uchile.cl/index.php/RCA/article/view/55766>>
- Archivo Michelle Bachelet Jeria (AMBJ) (2018) *Unidad Documental Simple 37 - Sistematización del proceso participativo constituyente indígena* [online]. Retrieved from: <<http://archivospresidenciales.archivonacional.cl/index.php/sistematizacion-del-proceso-participativo-constituyente-indigena>>
- Arias, Julio (2016) “La antropología del estado desde Akhil Gupta: a proposito de Red Tape. Burocracia, violencia estructural y pobreza en India” *Revista Universitas Humanística* (82) [online]. Retrieved from: <<https://go.gale.com/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CA489080996&sid=googleScholar&v=2.1&it=r&linkaccess=abs&issn=01204807&p=IFME&sw=w&userGroupName=anon%7Ef817eb05&aty=open-web-entry>>

- Assies, Willem (1999) "Pueblos indígenas y reforma del Estado en América Latina" in Assies, Willem et al. (eds.) *El reto de la diversidad*. COLMICH, pp. 1-16.
- Aylwin, José (2001) "Los conflictos en el territorio mapuche: antecedentes y perspectivas" in Aylwin, José (comp.) *Políticas públicas y pueblo mapuche*. IEI/ UFRO/ Escaparate Ediciones, pp. 25-55.
- Barrios-Valenzuela, Llarena & Berta Palou-Julián (2014) "Educación intercultural en Chile: la integración del alumnado extranjero en el sistema escolar" *Educación y Educadores*, 17(3): 405-426 [online]. Retrieved from: <<http://educacionyeducadores.unisabana.edu.co/index.php/eye/article/view/3770/3804>>
- Beróiza, Cristian; Pilquiman, Marisela; Cid, Beatriz; De la Maza, Francisca & Edward Cea (2022) "Patrimonialización turística y autonomías en territorios indígenas protegidos: experiencias contemporáneas del alto Biobío, Chile" *Diálogo Andino*, 67: 346-357.
- Bendixsen, Synnøve & Thomas Eriksen (2024) "The neoliberal welfare state and its discontents. Slow violence against irregular migrants in Norway" *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 50(11): 1-20. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2023.2298544>
- Braudel, Fernand (1970) *La historia y las ciencias sociales*. Alianza Editorial.
- Bull, Hedley (2005) *La sociedad anárquica*. Catarata.
- Carrasco, Ana María & Vivian Gavilán (2020) "Sexualidad, reproducción y relaciones simbólicas entre los géneros. La fiesta de carnaval entre los aymaras del norte de Chile" *Interciencia*, 45(10): 449-453.
- Castro, Luis (2005) *Regionalismo y Desarrollo Regional: Debate público, proyectos económicos y actores locales (Tarapacá 1880-1930)*. CEIP Ediciones, Universidad de Valparaíso/ UST.
- De la Maza, Francisca (2012) "Construir el Estado en el espacio rural e indígena: un análisis desde la etnografía del Estado en la Araucanía, Chile" *Ruris*, 6(2): 239-266.
- De la Maza, Francisca & Eugenia Huisca (2020) "El relato turístico mapuche: identidad, territorio y políticas públicas" *CUHSO*, 30(2): 98-118.
- De la Maza, Francisca & Enrique Calfucura (2021) "Turismo y pueblos indígenas: políticas, irrupción y reivindicación en Chile" *Chungara*, 53(3): 526-542.
- De Sousa Santos, Boaventura (2010) *Refundación del Estado en América Latina. Perspectivas desde una epistemología del sur*. Instituto de Derecho y Sociedad- Programa de Democracia y transformación global.
- De Sousa Santos, Boaventura (2018) "Introducción a las Epistemologías del Sur" in Meneses, María Paula y Karina Bidaseca (coord.) *Epistemologías del sur*. CLACSO/ CES.
- Dietz, Gunther (2014) "Universidades interculturales en México" *Revista de investigación educativa*, 19: 319-326.
- Dietz, Gunther (2017) "Interculturalidad: una aproximación antropológica" *Perfiles educativos*, 39(156): 192-207 [online]. Retrieved from: <[http://www.scielo.org.mx/scielo.php?script=sci\\_arttext&pid=S0185-26982017000200192](http://www.scielo.org.mx/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0185-26982017000200192)>

- Dietz, Gunther (2023) “¿Cómo ruralizar la universidad? Reflexiones sobre interculturalidad y plurilingüismo en la educación superior” *Revista Iberoamericana de Educación Rural*, 1(1): 135-141.
- Dietz, Gunther & Eloy Gómez (2023) “Los pueblos indígenas, el derecho a la consulta y las (in) competencias interculturales del estado-nación” *AIBR: Revista de Antropología Iberoamericana*, 18(1): 7-16.
- Dietz, Gunther & Laura Mateos (2024) “Interculturalidad crítica en la educación superior: hacia un análisis interseccional comparativo de experiencias estudiantiles de jóvenes indígenas” *Ichan Tecolotl*, 35(382) [online]. Retrieved from: <[https://ichan.ciesas.edu.mx/interculturalidad-critica-en-la-educacion-superiorhacia-un-analisis-interseccional-comparativo-de-experiencias-estudiantilesde-jovenes-indigenas/?fbclid=IwZX-h0bgNhZW0CMTEAAR1ab6vvGthnZLD7XQOO76dFgK\\_3skpi6evjF\\_FOnq2itzvoWp-Na5mb39LI\\_aem\\_ARD5vuEsPKEhILcdwpHxgVEXL1l0POOIxtTo66o6rwAipZx-Qr9QZJXhr-Dnf7aUCHEkmNYHBoD\\_-muMMOGapMJM4](https://ichan.ciesas.edu.mx/interculturalidad-critica-en-la-educacion-superiorhacia-un-analisis-interseccional-comparativo-de-experiencias-estudiantilesde-jovenes-indigenas/?fbclid=IwZX-h0bgNhZW0CMTEAAR1ab6vvGthnZLD7XQOO76dFgK_3skpi6evjF_FOnq2itzvoWp-Na5mb39LI_aem_ARD5vuEsPKEhILcdwpHxgVEXL1l0POOIxtTo66o6rwAipZx-Qr9QZJXhr-Dnf7aUCHEkmNYHBoD_-muMMOGapMJM4)>
- Fábregas, Andrés (2012) “De la teoría de la aculturación a la teoría de la interculturalidad educación y asimilación: el caso mexicano” *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 20(1): 1-8.
- Favre, Henri (1999) *El indigenismo*. FCE.
- Ferrão, Vera (2010) “Educación Intercultural en América Latina: Distintas concepciones y tensiones actuales” *Estudios Pedagógicos*, 36(2): 333-342.
- Figueroa Huencho, Verónica (2021) “Políticas públicas y Pueblo Mapuche: brechas y desafíos para una agenda insuficiente” *Anuario del Conflicto Social*, 11: 17-35. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1344/ACS2020.11.3>
- Flan, Goualo L. (2023a) “Gestión de la diversidad etnocultural en la construcción identitaria en África subsahariana. El caso de Costa de Marfil” *Ciencias Sociales y Educación*, 12(23): 211-233.
- Flan, Goualo L. (2023b) “Avatares de la implementación del modelo étnico-cultural de nación en la construcción identitaria en África subsahariana: un estudio de caso”. *Revista Humanidades*, 13(2): 1-24. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15517/h.v13i2.53887>
- Gálvez, Damián (2022) *La politización de la etnicidad en la posdictadura chilena*. Refubium/ Freie Universität Berlin Repository, PhD thesis.
- Gálvez, Damián & Francisca De la Maza (2024) “Políticas indígenas, políticas turísticas y multiculturalismo en Chile: un análisis desde el turismo mapuche” *Indiana*, 41(1): 83-106.
- Gasché, Jorge (1997a) “Educación intercultural vista desde la amazonia peruana” in Bertely, María et al. (coord.) *Indígenas en la escuela*. Consejo Mexicano de Investigación Educativa, pp. 147-158.
- Gasché, Jorge (1997b) “Más allá de la cultura: lo político. Teoría y práctica en un programa de formación de maestros indígenas amazónicos de Perú” in Bertely, María et al. (coord.) *Indígenas en la escuela*. Consejo Mexicano de Investigación Educativa, pp. 219-244.

- Giddens, Anthony (2003) *La constitución de la Sociedad: bases para la teoría de la estructuración*. Amorrortu.
- Ginzburg, Carlo (2010) *El hilo y las huellas*. FCE.
- Gómez, Magdalena (1995) *Derechos indígenas. Lectura comentada del Convenio 169 de la Organización Internacional del Trabajo*. Instituto Nacional Indigenista.
- González, Héctor; Gundermann, Hans & Jorge Hidalgo (2014) “Comunidad indígena y construcción histórica del espacio entre los aymara del norte de Chile” *Chungara*, 46(2): 233-246. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0717-73562014000200005>
- González, Jaime (1988) “Modelos de identidad étnica. Discursos intelectuales aimara en el extremo norte de Chile” *Revista del Museo de Antropología*, 15(3): 137-150. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31048/1852.4826.v15.n3.33631>
- González, Jaime (2021) “Identificación étnica indígena en la Región del Maule. Aproximación antropológica desde datos censales” in Gartenlaub, Andrea & Felipe Tello (eds.) *El Maule hoy: Perspectivas y aproximaciones socio-históricas, económicas y medioambientales del Valle Central*. RIL Editores/ UA, pp. 241-266.
- González, Jaime & Esteban Valenzuela (1988) “Mapa de demandas etno-territoriales indígenas en Chile: mapuches-rapa nui-diaguitas rebeldes, aymaras-atacameños conso-ciativos” *Revista Iberoamericana de Estudios Municipales* (16): 79-106. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32457/riem.vi16.336>
- González, Sergio (2002) *Chilenizando a Tunupa. La escuela pública en el Tarapacá andino (1880-1990)*. DIBAM/ Centro de Investigaciones Diego Barros Arana/ UNAP.
- González Casanova, Pablo (2006) “El colonialismo interno” in *Sociología de la explotación*. CLACSO, pp. 185-205.
- González Miranda, Sergio & Sergio González Pizarro (2023) “Capitalismo internacional en la periferia. La frontera sur del Perú y el proceso de invasión-sucesión en la industria salitrera de Tarapacá (1869-1884)” *Diálogo Andino*, 70: 190-200.
- Gundermann, Hans; Vergara, Jorge I. & Rolf Foerster (2005) “Contar a los indígenas en Chile. Autoadscripción étnica en la experiencia censal de 1992 y 2002” *Estudios atacameños*, 30: 91-115.
- Gundermann, Hans; González, Héctor & John Durston (2018) “Interetnicidad y relaciones sociales en el espacio atacameño” *Estudios atacameños*, 57: 161-179. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0718-10432018005000501>
- Gupta, Akhil (2012) *Red Tape: Bureaucracy, Structural Violence, and Poverty in India*. Duke University Press.
- Gupta, Akhil; Nugent, David & Shreyas Sreenath (2015) “State, corruption, postcoloniality: A conversation with Akhil Gupta on the 20th anniversary of “Blurred Boundaries”” *American Ethnologist*, 42(4): 581-591.

- Gutiérrez, Natividad & Damián Gálvez (2017) “La cultura política en el pueblo mapuche: el caso Wallmapuwen” *Revista Mexicana de Ciencias Políticas y Sociales*, 62(231): 137-165. DOI: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0185-1918\(17\)30041-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0185-1918(17)30041-7)
- Keohane, Robert & Joseph Nye (1988) *Poder e interdependencia. La política mundial en transición*. GEL.
- Lehmann, David (2023) “Más allá de la decolonialidad: discusión de algunos conceptos claves” *Encartes*, 6(12): 5-34.
- Lindh, Jaime; Fábrega, Jorge & Jorge González (2019) “La fragilidad de los consensos. Polarización ideológica en el Chile post Pinochet” *Revista de Ciencia Política*, 39(1): 99-127.
- Lins Ribeiro, Gustavo (2023) “Critizando la decolonialidad y su crítica” *Encartes*, 6(12): 35-48. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.29340/en.v6n12.336>
- Marimán, José (2023) “A Future Crossroads in Rebellious and Pandemic Times: National Pluralism and Indigenous Self-government in Chile” in González, Miguel et al. (eds.) *Indigenous Territorial Autonomy and Self-government in the Diverse Americas*. University of Calgary Press, pp. 221-256.
- Ministerio del Medio Ambiente (2017) *Sistematización del proceso de Consulta a los Pueblos Indígenas sobre materias específicas para elaborar indicaciones al Proyecto de Ley que crea el Servicio de Biodiversidad y Áreas Protegidas y el Sistema Nacional de Áreas Protegidas* [pdf]. Retrieved from: <<https://consultaindigena.mma.gob.cl/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Informe-Consulta-Indigena-PL-SBAP-Pueblo-Rapa-Nui.pdf>>
- O'Donnell, Guillermo (2009) *El estado burocrático autoritario*. Prometeo Libros.
- Pairicán, Fernando (2014) *Malón. La rebelión del movimiento mapuche 1990-2013*. Pehuén Editores.
- Pairicán, Fernando (2018) “Los gobiernos de la concertación y su política indígena: el multiculturalismo” *Revista Anales*, 15: 165-182.
- Peralta, Camila (2019) *Consulta previa indígena en Chile: La larga historia de una asimetría impuesta*. Documento de Trabajo ICSO xx/xx.
- Poblete, Daniel (2010) *Movimientos y organizaciones políticas y sociales del pueblo aymara: el caso de Arica-Parinacota y Tarapacá, Chile*. Universidad Complutense de Madrid, PhD thesis.
- Quijano, Anibal (2014) *Cuestiones y horizontes: de la dependencia histórico-estructural a la colonialidad/descolonialidad del poder*. CLACSO.
- Rivera Cusicanqui, Silvia (2015) *Sociología de la imagen*. Tinta Limón/Colección Nociones Comunes.
- Skewes, Juan C. & Debbie Guerra (2022) “Entre la esperanza y la desazón: los desafíos para el Estado y el pueblo Mapuche a partir del Estallido y la Constituyente” *Anuari del Conflict Social*, 13: 1-21.
- Sanhueza, Alexis & Raquel Rebolledo (2024) “Aportes histórico-culturales desde la memoria social mapuche a la enseñanza de la historia en Chile” *Pensamiento Educativo*, 61(1): 1-15. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7764/PEL.61.1.2024.7>



- Schlee, Gunther (2022) *How enemies are made: Towards a theory of ethnic and religious conflict*. Berghahn Books. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780857450609>
- Tricot, Tito (2009) "Lumako: punto de inflexión en el desarrollo del nuevo movimiento mapuche" *Historia Actual Online*, 19: 77-96. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36132/hao.v0i19.300>
- Tricot, Víctor & Germán Bidegain (2020) "En busca de la representación política: el partido mapuche Wallmapuwen en Chile" *Estudios sociológicos*, 38(113): 375-407. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24201/es.2020v38n113.1805>
- Tricot, Víctor; Bidegain, Germán & Fernando Pairicán (2022) "Convención Constitucional y Participación de los Escaños Reservados Mapuche" *Anuario Del Conflicto Social* (13). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1344/ACS2022.13.5>
- Uzelac, Gordana; Carol, Sarah; David, Lea & Siniša Malešević (2024) "My Country First: Vaccine Nationalism in England?" *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 30(3): 1-24. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13537113.2023.2285088>
- Valenzuela, Esteban; González, Jaime y Magaly Mella (2021) "Estructuras políticas yuxtapuestas en la cultura indígena. El caso Mapuche en Chile" *Revista Mexicana de Ciencias Políticas y Sociales*, 66(241): 381-404. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22201/fcpys.2448492xe.2020.241.69986>
- Van Kessel, Juan (1980) *Holocausto al progreso: los aymaras de Tarapacá*. Centro de Estudios y Documentación Latinoamericanos.
- Vázquez, Luis (2010) *Multitud y distopía*. UNAM.
- Vergara, Jorge & Hans Gundermann (2012) "Conformación y dinámica interna del campo identitario regional en Tarapacá y Los Lagos" *Chungara*, 44(1): 115-134. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0717-73562012000100009>
- Wade, Peter (2022) "El concepto raza y la lucha contra el racismo" *Estudios Sociológicos*, 40(esp.): 163-192. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24201/es.2022v40nne.2071>
- Wallerstein, Immanuel (1979) *El moderno sistema mundial. La agricultura capitalista y los orígenes de la economía-mundo europea en el siglo XVI*. Siglo XXI.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel (1997) "El espacio tiempo como base del conocimiento" *Análisis Político*, 32: 3-15.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel (2006) *Análisis de sistemas-mundo. Una introducción*. Siglo XXI.
- Waltz, Kenneth N. (2000) "Structural Realism after the Cold War" *International Security*, 25(1): 5-41 [online]. Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2626772>
- Zapata, Claudia (2007) "Memoria e Historia: El proyecto de una identidad colectiva entre los aymaras de Chile" *Chungara*, 39(2): 171-183. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0717-73562007000200002>
- Zárate, Eduardo (2023) "Las otras voces del decolonialismo. Comentario a "Más allá de la decolonialidad: discusión de algunos conceptos claves" de David Lehmann" *Encartes*, 6(12): 59-68. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.29340/en.v6n12.335>