CUADERNOS.INFO Nº 48
Versión electrónica: ISSN 0719-367x
http://www.cuadernos.info
https://doi.org/10.7764/cdi.48.27811

BY-NC-SA

Received: 09-05-2019 / Accepted: 07-08-2020

Digital technologies, creative commons and new modes of cultural production in Chile

Tecnologías digitales, *creative commons* y nuevos modos de producción cultural en Chile

Tecnologias digitais, Creative Commons e novos modos de produção cultural no Chile

Andrés Maximiliano Tello, Universidad de Playa Ancha, Valparaíso, Chile (andres.tello@upla.cl)

Consuelo Dinamarca Noack, Universidad de Chile, Santiago, Chile (consuelodinamarcanoack@gmail.com)

Sebastián Escobar Pulgar, Universidad de Chile, Santiago, Chile (seba.escobarqt@gmail.com)

ABSTRACT | This article shows the results of a qualitative research on the uses of creative commons licenses in the Chilean cultural field. From 2005 to date, these tools have rapidly expanded into new forms of production, circulation, and consumption of works in the national cultural field. To trace the different social practices linked to the use of these technologies, we focus particularly on the experiences of cultural producers of netlabels and independent publishers. The study is based on information from twenty in-depth interviews with cultural agents from these subfields of production, who have registered their works with different types of creative commons licenses. The analysis of the interviews allows us to delve into the different uses associated with these technologies and new dynamics of the cultural field, characterized by the increasing digitalization of their practices and by the emergence of socio-material assemblages that alter traditional modes of cultural production. The study also shows that cultural agents' strategies tend to shape alternative practices to the commodification of culture and, at the same time, to question the dominant legitimation logics in the cultural field. Finally, from the analysis of the productive organization forms of these users of creative commons licenses in Chile, the political power of modes of association and collective invention based on collaboration and not on competition stands out.

KEYWORDS: digital technologies; Creative Commons; netlabels; independent publishers; culture.

HOW TO CITE

Tello, A. M., Dinamarca, C. & Escobar, S. (2021). Tecnologías digitales, *creative commons* y nuevos modos de producción cultural en Chile. *Cuadernos.info*, (48), 72-93. https://doi.org/10.7764/cdi.48.27811

RESUMEN | *Se presentan los resultados de una investigación cualitativa sobre los usos de las licencias creative commons en el campo cultural chileno. Desde 2005 hasta la fecha, estas herramientas se han expandido rápidamente en las nuevas formas de producción, circulación y consumo de obras en el campo cultural nacional. Con el fin de rastrear las distintas prácticas sociales vinculadas con el uso de estas tecnologías, nos enfocamos particularmente en las experiencias de los y las productoras culturales de sellos discográficos digitales y editoriales independientes. El estudio se basa en la información de veinte entrevistas en profundidad con agentes culturales de estos subcampos de producción que han inscrito sus obras con diferentes tipos de licencias. El análisis permite ahondar en los diferentes usos asociados a estas tecnologías y a nuevas dinámicas del campo cultural, caracterizadas por la creciente digitalización de sus prácticas y por la emergencia de ensamblajes socio-materiales que alteran los modos de producción cultural tradicionales. Muestra, además, que las estrategias de estos agentes culturales tienden a la conformación de prácticas alternativas a la mercantilización de la cultura y, al mismo tiempo, al cuestionamiento de las lógicas de legitimación dominantes en el campo cultural. Finalmente, se destaca la potencia política de modos de asociación e invención colectiva basados en la colaboración y no en la competencia.*

PALABRAS CLAVE: *tecnologías digitales; creative commons; netlabels; editoriales independientes; cultura.*

RESUMO | Este artigo apresenta os resultados de uma pesquisa qualitativa sobre os usos de um determinado tipo de tecnologias digitais no campo cultural chileno: as licenças Creative Commons. Desde o ano de 2005 até hoje, essas ferramentas se expandiram rapidamente para novas formas de produção, circulação e consumo de obras no campo cultural nacional. Com o objetivo de traçar as diferentes práticas sociais vinculadas ao uso dessas tecnologias, nos concentramos principalmente nas experiências de produtores culturais de selos discográficos digitais (netlabels) e editoras independentes. O estudo é baseado em informações de vinte entrevistas em profundidade com agentes culturais desses subcampos de produção que registraram suas obras com diferentes tipos de licenças Creative Commons. A análise das entrevistas permite aprofundar os diferentes usos associados a essas tecnologias e as novas dinâmicas do campo cultural, caracterizadas pela crescente digitalização das suas práticas e pelo surgimento de agenciamentos sócio-materiais que alteram os modos tradicionais de produção cultural. Além disso, o estudo mostra que as estratégias desses agentes culturais tendem a conformar práticas alternativas à mercantilização da cultura e, ao mesmo tempo, questionar as lógicas de legitimação dominantes no campo cultural. Finalmente, a partir da análise das formas de organização produtiva desses usuários de licenças Creative Commons no Chile, destaca-se o poder político dos modos de associação e invenção coletiva baseados na colaboração e não na competição.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: tecnologias digitais; Creative Commons; netlabels; editores independentes; cultura.

INTRODUCTION

During the first decades of the 21st century, the accelerated expansion of digital technologies in different dimensions of social life has implied profound economic, legal, and political changes, as well as a radical transformation of our sociocultural contexts and their traditional modes of knowledge and information production and distribution (Jenkins, 2008; Castells, 2009; Rifkin, 2014; Benkler, 2015; Van Dijck, 2016; Delfanti & Arvidsson, 2019). Thus, it could be argued that recent technological transformations transcend the digital space and directly affect the multiple forms of contemporary interaction, socialization, and social invention. In this regard, as the sociological gaze of Saskia Sassen (2012, 2017) proposes, the emergence of the so-called digital culture is characterized by generating new and complex socio-material ecologies, i.e., new sociotechnical assemblages that include non-digital variables, such as the formation of subjectivities or the working conditions of their users.

Hence, it is necessary to ask who has access to the different types of digital technologies, as well as "what it takes to get access, and what different users might be able to extract from existing digital domains" (Sassen, 2017, p. 72). In this vein, we present the results of an exploratory study that focused on the different uses and users of a very specific digital technology, creative commons licenses (from now on CCL), whose broad impact on contemporary culture forms of production is hard to ignore.

According to a recent Creative Commons report, this type of digital tool has experienced a notable increase around the world: if in 2006 the number of cultural productions (music, books, videos, photographs, etc.) that used these licenses reached fifty million on the Internet, in 2017 the works licensed with CCL was close to one and a half billion (Creative Commons, 2018). CCL are at the same time a public legal instrument –which gives any user the possibility of reproducing, sharing and distributing all kinds of works under different conditions, less restrictive than traditional copyright– and a more complex technology, since they assign "tags" to each work that "are then linked to machine-readable versions of these same licenses, which allow computers to automatically identify content that can be easily shared" (Lessig, 2005, p. 227). Below, we will delve into the transformations and new modes of use that the introduction of these licenses and their digital technologies generate in our country's cultural field (Bourdieu, 2013; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 2014), with focus on the field of independent publishing and on digital record labels (also called netlabels[1]).

1. Netlabel refers to record labels that distribute their music primarily in digital formats over the Internet, in formats such as MP3, OGG, or WAV. These labels generally emphasize online distribution of their music, via free downloads and CCL. Since the 2000s, netlabels have become very popular on the web.

EMERGENCE OF CREATIVE COMMONS LICENSES

CCLs are linked to the emergence of the copyleft movement in the field of computing, at the beginning of the eighties, whose main objective was to promote the production of free software (Broussard, 2007; Busaniche, 2010; Frantsvog , 2012; Owen, 2014; Fuster Morell, Subirats, Berlinguer, Martínez, & Salcedo, 2015). Producing open or free software codes basically implies converting the design of computer programs into an accessible, transparent, modification-susceptible type of production, therefore allowing the realization of progressive software improvements through cooperative and voluntary work between different programmers and users. Thus, the copyleft movement emerges as a reaction to the privatization of the source code of operating systems, which drives the millionaire business of the software industry to this day. The development of copyleft licenses –and specifically an initial type, the General Public License (GNU)– would soon appear as a kind of alternative model to the traditional copyright policy (Vaidhyanathan, 2017), the expansion of which threatens to codify the whole cultural production on the Internet (Lessig, 2005; Busaniche, 2010; Frantsvog, 2012; Olwan, 2013; Owen, 2014).

Along with the influence of the counter-cultural movement in favor of free software, another important milestone for the creation of CCL was the enactment in 1998 of the Copyright Term Extension Act (CTEA) in the United States, which would extend the terms of copyright, i.e., of restrictive economic rights over literary, artistic or scientific works; since then, the act prevents them from entering the public domain for 70 years after the death of their author and, in the case of corporate authorship, 120 years later of its creation. That same year, the Digital Millennium Copyright Act was also implemented, a US law that toughens penalties for copyright infringements on the Internet, setting the standard that other countries around the world will follow later (Lessig, 2005). In response to this context, in 2001 a group of cyber-law and intellectual property experts founded the non-profit organization Creative Commons in Massachusetts, with the aim of developing a set of alternative licenses that would allow increasing the creation of works and their free Internet access, to "combat the international trend towards increasingly restrictive intellectual property laws" (Olwan, 2013, p. 327).

One of the most prominent figures behind the development of CCLs, the American lawyer and academic Lawrence Lessig, argues that the advance of control over the works that promote copyright laws becomes a barrier to the dynamics and development of digital culture or, rather, a threat to "free culture" on the Internet, one that leaves "much of it open to others to build on it", thus enabling creation and innovation based on works available in our cultural heritage (Lessig 2005, p. 38).

CC BY: This license allows reusers to distribute, remix, adapt, and build upon the material in any medium or format, so long as attribution is given to the creator. The license allows for commercial use.

CC BY-NC: This license allows reusers to distribute, remix, adapt, and build upon the material in any medium or format for noncommercial purposes only, and only so long as attribution is given to the creator.

CC BY-NC-SA: This license allows reusers to distribute, remix, adapt, and build upon the material in any medium or format for noncommercial purposes only, and only so long as attribution is given to the creator. If you remix, adapt, or build upon the material, you must license the modified material under identical terms.

CC BY-NC-ND: This license allows reusers to copy and distribute the material in any medium or format in unadapted form only, for noncommercial purposes only, and only so long as attribution is given to the creator.

CC BY-SA: This license allows reusers to distribute, remix, adapt, and build upon the material in any medium or format, so long as attribution is given to the creator. The license allows for commercial use. If you remix, adapt, or build upon the material, you must license the modified material under identical terms.

CC BY-ND: This license allows reusers to copy and distribute the material in any medium or format in unadapted form only, and only so long as attribution is given to the creator. The license allows for commercial use.

Figure 1. CCL types

Source: Creative Commons.org

From there, the rapid expansion of CCLs in cultural productions disseminated on the Internet is also part of the gestation of the so-called free culture movement (Lessig, 2005; Busaniche, 2010; Frantsvog, 2012; Fuster Morell et al., 2015). Currently, there are six basic types of CCLs, whose symbology works as a label for their digital processing and specific legal description, as shown in figure 1.

These six types of basic licenses were launched by the Creative Commons organization in 2002 in the United States (Lessig, 2005), and three years later they were adopted in Chile. Since then, an increasing number of national creators (writers, musicians, designers, filmmakers, etc.) have chosen to register their works under this alternative form of licensing, which allows not only a greater diffusion of their works on digital platforms, but also gives producers and users the possibility to share them freely (Cerda & Ruiz, 2010; Gainza, 2018).

CULTURAL FIELD AND CREATIVE COMMONS LICENSES

The massive adoption of CCLs in works disseminated on the Internet could be considered as an important feature of the symbolic goods production practices

in the current cultural field. According to Bourdieu's sociological theory (2013; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 2014), modern societies differ in relatively autonomous social fields (political, economic, scientific, religious, legal, etc.), which develop interests, objects, and specific challenges. Each social field structure depends on the state of the power relations between its various agents or institutions, i.e., on the struggle for an hegemonic position in a determined field and for the definition of the specific symbolic capital for that space. Each field thus imposes a vision and a division of the world on those who become involved and tacitly accept the presuppositions or rules of said social space (Albright & Hartman, 2018). Concerning the cultural field, the relations between its different agents or cultural producers depend on the position they occupy "in the hierarchy established under the relation of cultural legitimacy within the field of the relations of symbolic goods production and diffusion" (Bourdieu, 2013, p. 135).

However, Bourdieu's sociology proposes that not all agents can occupy the same hierarchical positions that structure the cultural field, i.e., not all agents reach the same consecration degree in the cultural field (Bourdieu, 2013). The consecration operates mainly in the "restricted production field", which Bourdieu distinguishes from the "great symbolic production system", since the latter is mainly adjusted to market demand and, therefore, has commercial criteria, while the former should be understood as a "system that produces symbolic goods (and instruments for their appropriation) objectively destined (at least in the short term) to a public of producers of symbolic goods that produce, they too, for producers of symbolic goods" (Bourdieu, 2013, p. 90). Thus, the restricted production field tends to generate its norms and criteria for the evaluation of works from the recognition granted between groups of peers, i.e., between other cultural field agents who turn out to be consumers and competitors at the same time. We could then ask ourselves if the massive adoption of CCLs in the contemporary cultural field alters this functioning of the restricted production field by promoting new modes of production and diffusion of symbolic goods, allowing its agents to develop alternative paths to the cultural legitimation traditional ways.

METHODOLOGY

To delve into the transformations of the dynamics of the Chilean cultural field linked to the adoption of CCLs since the 2000s, our research focused on what we could call an independent scene within the field of cultural production, i.e., in those cultural producers and production companies who register (or have registered) their works under one of the different types of CCL. Furthermore, we specifically focus on two subfields where these digital technologies that multiply the creative commons

are present to a greater extent: independent publishers and digital record labels[2]. Thus, our objective was to analyze, from a qualitative perspective, the practices, motivations, and meanings embedded in the different uses of CCLs by the cultural agents of independent publishers and national netlabels. Thus, we conducted 20 in-depth, semi-structured interviews, corresponding to 10 independent publishing agents and 10 digital label agents from the Metropolitan Region and the Valparaíso Region, which concentrate more than 80% of the cultural producers are concentrated (Brodsky, Negrón, & Pössel, 2014). The procedure used to select the informants was a snowball sampling, which managed to bring together twenty cultural producers who have registered their works under five of the six types of CCL: two cultural agents with Recognition CCL (BY); three with CCL Recognition-Non-commercial (BY-NC); 11 with CCL Attribution-Non-commercial-Share under the same terms (BY-NC-SA); three with CLL Recognition-Non-commercial-No derivative work (BY-NC-ND), and one with CLL Recognition-Share under the same terms (BY-SA).

Considering the above, the selection of the interviewees was guided by the need to grant heterogeneity to the sample regarding the specific types of alternative licensing, but also regarding different forms of cultural production (in the case of independent publishers, these are publications focused on narrative, political thought, poetry, and philosophy, while in the case of netlabels they are electronic, experimental, rock, hip hop and folk music labels). Each interview was recorded, transcribed, and coded using the AtlasTi 7.0 software, according to key themes linked to the research objectives. For this purpose, through the analysis of the qualitative content of the information collected, we explored the particularity of a scene of the national cultural field based on the production of creative common

2. It should be noted that, according to data from the Cultural Policy Observatory (OPC, 2016), the music industry sector is one of the fastest growing in recent years: between 2005 and 2013 its growth was of 536%; in addition, 82.5% corresponds to micro-businesses and 16.1%, to small businesses. According to CNCA data (2012-2014), 78% of music production is done in digital format, and more than 60% of this corresponds to cultural productions licensed with Creative Commons (Gainza, 2016, in OPC, 2016). As in the music production sector, during the last decade the independent publishing sector has increased notably, since about 83% of the publishing houses of the current independent scene have been founded between 2008 and 2014 (Fuentes, Ferretti, Castro, & Ortega, 2015). Finally, it is important to note that the independent publishers and netlabels that constitute this study's sample produce works mainly in digital format, although in some cases (mainly in publishers) they also do it in analogue or physical format. However, whether in physical or digital format, the works are licensed under creative commons.

goods (Lessig, 2005) to draw –at the same time– a descriptive radiography of the uses and types of CCL users.

RESULTS

Uses and users of CCLs in the digital transformation of the cultural field

The question about the modes of use of digital technologies, as in the case of CCLs, must account for something more than the existence of the latter and, therefore, recognize the "socio-material conditions" of their access forms, which also imply the distinction of its users based on local and contingent variables (Sassen, 2017, pp. 72-73). In the cases collected in the interviews in this research, most of the ways in which CCLs are used arise from cultural producers who disseminate their works through their own publishing houses and digital labels, performing different tasks simultaneously (such as authorship of works, their edition, management, diffusion, and distribution, among others). This means that the cultural producers of netlabels and independent publishers are characterized by a marked polyfunctionality in their work. At the same time, most of CCL users assume their cultural production as a form of work, i.e., this activity is not about a hobby or a pastime, but rather a work that aspires to a certain professionalism: it is not a question of "something on the fly, it is something that has a job behind it... even if it is free, the idea is that it is not badly made, it is something professional" (Interview label No. 4). The cultural producers interviewed are mostly independent or self-employed workers, which coincides with what was detected in the registry of cultural work conducted by the Trama Project, which shows that 56.6% of the national cultural producers are in the same condition (Brodsky et al., 2014) [3]. In addition, most of the CCL users interviewed have university studies, other paid work that is not linked to their cultural work, and a predominant age range between twenty and forty years.

Given these socio-material conditions of production, the question immediately arises about the motivation to register their works under licenses that allow open circulation, which generally translates into a free distribution of the products of their cultural work and, therefore, without a monetary retribution. Concerning this last point, it should be noted, firstly, that one of the main reasons for the use of CCLs stated by the cultural producers interviewed is fundamentally pragmatic, i.e., their adoption is derived from the execution of their own work on the independent

3. The relationship between new forms of cultural production and precariousness of work hinted in this point, and which is also seen in the interviews, supposes a much deeper reflection that we cannot develop here, but that we hope to develop in a future publication.

scene. In other words, using CCLs allows them to operate as cultural producers in different degrees of effective independence or self-management regarding economic demands, geographical barriers or institutional obstacles related to the registration of intellectual property:

> (...) Basically, you do the procedure from your home, the registration, you do not have to go anywhere, you do not have to spend money on transport, or on tickets, you do the registration from your home, and it gives you the option that most suits you. And you do not have to pay the Creative Commons licenses to obtain them, you just register them at the moment, and that is as well automated. When you upload it to the site www.archive.org, where we have the music hosted, there is the option; "What kind of licenses do you want?" and you registry your choice when uploading the music, is integrated, so everything is simplified (Interview label No. 3).

> I started to use the license because, living in Valparaíso, I was faced to the problem of obtaining the intellectual property over the Internet, you make the payment, the documentation is very simple, but as it happens in all the spaces that are centralized, there is a lot of bureaucracy, thus to obtain the certificate with the number was very slow, and it did not allow me to take it to the printer, or finish the processing of the book (Interview publisher No. 10).

The easy access to the CCLs, which allows to avoid the bureaucratic and institutional barriers that the traditional forms of licensing present, is then shown as an element integrated into the very work of production of this independent scene of the national cultural field. However, most of the digital labels and independent publishers interviewed coincide in pointing out that not only the CCLs are adopted because of their accessibility, but also because they allow their works or cultural productions to be disseminated more easily over the Internet, with a national and international scope. Along with this, the interviews confirm that it is "often difficult for creators to use the work of another artist due to the difficulties of finding the right holder and negotiating a license", whereas the CCLs "facilitate the sharing and distribution of works that would otherwise be impossible", so that these licenses "are enormously revitalizing the flow of information and creation" (Bollier, 2016b, p. 63). Therefore, this link between CCLs and digital environments is crucial to analyze the development of the independent scene made up by CCL users within the current cultural field.

In this regard, digital technologies reconfigure the cultural field at the beginning of the 21st century and it could be argued that there are at least two essential transformations. First, the broad set of "skills" and "digital competences" associated with the uses of new technologies today becomes a supplementary form

of "symbolic capital", a kind of "informational capital" that allows agents to better position themselves within the cultural field (Ragnedda, 2018). In fact, it is precisely the incorporation and management of new digital technologies in their independent production work (use of editing programs, design tools, creation, and content management on web pages, etc.) that allows netlabels and independent publishers to be established as such from the most minimal resources (a computer and Internet connection), i.e., despite not having the infrastructure and equipment of the large industries in the field. Therefore, the cultural producers of this independent scene mainly resort to online dissemination and self-distribution of their works, thus bypassing the usual operating mechanisms of the large publishing and recording industry, which coincides with what has been pointed out by other more general information studies on the recent configuration of these areas of the national cultural field (Consejo Nacional de la Cultura y las Artes, 2014, pp. 174-197; Fuentes et al., 2015, p. 30; Observatorio de Política Culturales, 2016, p. 69).

All the cultural producers that make up the sample of this study have a digital presence, i.e., they create and manage content on different digital platforms that work with Creative Commons[4], on their own websites or through their different social networks. This leads us to a second fundamental change in the cultural field: the current process of digitization of the dynamics of production and diffusion of symbolic goods enables the incorporation of new agents into the field of restricted production (Bourdieu, 2013), who tend to omit "traditional cultural intermediaries" (Pecourt & Rius, 2018, p. 81). The use of CCLs and other digital technologies then allows the emergence of an independent scene that revolves around free culture (Lessig, 2005), where the trajectories of its new agents do not necessarily coincide with traditional forms of legitimation (academies, conservatories, specialized critics, etc.), an issue that generates certain tensions or conflicts between established producers and those who are perceived only as aspirants (Bourdieu, 2013). As one of the producers interviewed points out, with the digitization of the cultural field "anyone can be a musician... anyone in the house with a computer can be the director of a label, there are people who think that it is positive and others, that it is negative" (Interview label No. 5). Of course, this opening of the cultural field brought about by digital technologies does not simply imply that all consumers of literature or music immediately become cultural producers, as suggested by optimistic visions such as that of media convergence (Jenkins, 2008);

4. In the case of producers of musical works, some of the digital platforms that work with CCL are Jamendo, Soundcloud, Audionity, FreeMusic Project, Vimeo, and YouTube. In the case of literary works, the platforms for the promotion of free culture such as Open Library, Online Computer Library Center, Internet Archive, among many others, stand out.

on the contrary, most of the interviewees relate long and arduous paths traveled to achieve a certain recognition within that own independent scene.

As evidenced by the experiences gathered in this research, although the inclusion of new agents in the independent scene fostered by the digitization of the cultural field implies a certain democratization of it, there are those who argue that this process goes hand in hand with the erosion of the autonomy of the forms of cultural production, which give way to the strategies of "self-promotion" and the "superficiality" of content that would be characteristic of digital platforms (Pecourt & Rius, 2018, p. 82). However, the artistic and cultural contribution of digital labels and independent publishers to the national art scene can hardly be reduced.

Many of those interviewed in this study have achieved recognition of their works by traditional institutions in the cultural field (specialized press, cultural magazines, universities, etc.), forming part of a scene of CCL users who have contributed to reactivate national cultural production at the beginning of the 21st century (Observatorio de Política Culturales, 2016; Fuentes et al., 2015). However, it could be argued that the independent free culture scene also configures a new field of digital cultural production, i.e., a cultural scene that produces symbolic goods intended primarily for an online audience, which in turn participates in the works' production. The latter would differ from the "great field of symbolic production" oriented exclusively to the conquest of a market (Bourdieu, 2013, p. 90). Ultimately, it is about the reconfiguration of an alternative scene within the field of digital cultural production, which is opposed to the exclusive commercial valorization of works, operating outside the traditional music and book industry.

The use of CCLs as political-cultural resistance

Another of the distinctive features of this new field of digital cultural production that CCL users make up in Chile is their suspicion of the traditional forms of intellectual property licensing that govern the great field of symbolic production, i.e., that of the exclusively commercial cultural production. Most of the interviewees refuse to register their works in this way, not because they are against the forms of recognition or attributing the work to an author, but rather because, from their perspectives, copyright would be part of a political-economic management of artistic work and, by extension, of the literary or musical field, which would negatively affect the dynamics of production itself in the middle of the digital scene, as it becomes a device of commodification of culture. The users of CCLs conceive their own modes of cultural production as part of an alternative economy to which the logic of the market and the great symbolic production go through:

> (...) Choosing that license was finally about that; it did not have a commercial attribution, because we wanted the music to be downloaded for free, and also

> because of the discourse that we had, at least in my songs or those around me, it made sense to do it ourselves, so it was non-commercial... It couldn't be any other way, and there were things that could be shared, well, there are documentaries that talk about that. But, for example, if there are people who wanted to do a remix or a matchup on that, or to build a sample from that, that option also gives the possibility, it is supposed to give that possibility (Interview label No. 7).

Thus, the option for open access to works acts as a common principle of the production modes of the different agents of this digital cultural field independent scene. CCL users aspire to share their works with the largest number of users, opening in many cases the option of modifying those same works or turning them into inputs for the creation of new works. At the same time, it can be stated that CCLs have promoted certain general principles in these new forms of cultural production, such as the non-commercial objective of the works, the rejection of the exclusive rights of the author, and the liberation of cultural products. Open access is also understood here as a condition for the possibility of the generation of culture itself in the digital environment; in this regard, the use of metaphors such as the sampler or the remix could describe not only a type of artistic work enhanced by new technologies, but also the very mode of operation that creative work acquires in our time. The latter is what Lessig (2012) also remarks when he argues that the expansion of the Internet makes a "remix culture" flourish, characterized by forms of creative work in which remixing takes place within a new community of remixers, whose members "partly create for each other, showing each other how they know how to create" (Lessig, 2012, p. 111).

In this sense, the emergence and proliferation of CCLs makes explicit the barrier that copyright represents for creative work on the Internet and on digital platforms, questioning its viability in a context of cultural production profoundly transformed by the new information and communications technologies (Lessig, 2012; Rifkin, 2014; Benkler, 2015). New forms of creative work do not conform to copyright regulations, focused on restricting access and privatizing culture. As Siva Vaidhyanathan (2017) puts it, it is a mismatch with a whole copyright policy, i.e., with a complex system of interactions between various institutions and agents: international organizations (starting with the World Intellectual Property Organization), governmental (such as the National Institute of Intellectual Property or the Department of Intellectual Rights), state legislatures, national copyright management entities (such as the Chilean Copyright Society, SCD, by its Spanish acronym), "private sector contracts and the habits of writers,

artists and musicians [that] influence the way the copyright system operates" (Vaidhyanathan, 2017, p. XXXIII).

All these institutions and hegemonic agents of the cultural field seem to conflict with the new independent scene linked to CCLs:

> Intellectual property policies are governed by international standards in Chile, right? (...). But I think that all this hides the truth about what human culture is and where it emanates from, and how it is being created (...) that is what we care to remind, how human culture has been formed and how it is being created, and I think these policies make that invisible... They treat the creation of culture in the same way they treat any other resource (Interview publisher No. 4).

With the idea that the process of cultural creation and innovation is based on a relationship independent of commercial exchange and alien to a copyright economic rationality, an imaginary of the digital cultural field is drawn as a space fundamentally constituted by the share and open access to cultural works. Thus, the agents of the independent scene seem, in the first instance, to have in common a certain critical look on the production of works and the economy of culture in digital environments. As one of the interviewees points out: "The license, without asking anything in return, allows you, by using it, to be part of an international community of creators, of cultural producers who share a certain vision, it is an ideological position on the production of cultural elements" (Interview publisher No. 2). However, this ideological position on the modes of cultural production is by no means homogeneous, because although most of the political views of the interviewees could be located within what is traditionally considered as a left-wing trend, these positions range in and out of the broad spectrum of the latter.

Thus, in the interviews we find cultural producers who openly define themselves as supporters of a certain political ideology, which would also be present in the content of their works, but we also find those who detach themselves from any political position, although they highlight their critical stance versus culture commodification. This reinforces what has been pointed out regarding the Free Culture movement. Second, even though in principle it could be assumed that the choice of each of the different licenses would also respond to different political positions, the ideological positions of each cultural producer are not necessarily reflected in the choice of a specific type of licenses; in other words, there is no correspondence between the beliefs and visions of the cultural field of each one of the producers and the different types of CCL of their works. In this way, for example, those who opt for a license that requires equal sharing of derivative works –i.e., under the same CLL– do not differ substantially in their positions

from those who register their works with a more restrictive CLL, as in the case of one that does not allow derivative works or prevents commercial use. Therefore, the use of a specific type of the range of six licenses by the interviewees does not necessarily imply specific political positions or ideological approaches, beyond a common rejection of the policies of privatization of culture or copyright expansion.

However, even though the ideological position of the independent scene cannot be limited to an exclusive political position, the majority of those interviewed coincide in maintaining their rejection of copyright policies, which they associate with the dominance of the traditional books and music cultural industry. Faced with the commercial importance that traditional forms of intellectual property try to establish on the digital scene, the cultural producers in our study prefer to explore "the idea of more collective authorship, or authorships that seek to be assembled or complemented with others" (Interview publisher No. 8). This means that LCC users contest the fetishized idea of authorship, which has turned intellectual property into "the fictitious merchandise par excellence of our historical epoch" (Sádaba, 2008, p. 83). The interviewees conceive copyright as a legal framework to be questioned and the technologies linked to CCL as alternative tools compared to the exclusive figure exercised by the conventional copyright registry. This opposition to proprietary rights is combined with a conception of culture as a living movement, which fluctuates and becomes its own circulation, and with an organizational practice that involves an alternative mode of production to that of commercial culture. In this regard, the independent scene implies new forms of self-management, cooperation, and horizontal work that simultaneously constitute forms of cultural resistance, as defined by Stuart Hall (2017), since the use of CCLs is associated with various formations and counter-hegemonic forces of the cultural establishment and copyright politics. The importance of these forms of cultural resistance in the digital scene should not be disregarded, since as Hall warns it, they "create the possibility of new subjectivities", although the truth is that "they do not guarantee by themselves their progressive or reactionary content. To articulate them to specific political positions, it is still necessary to appeal to social and political practices" (2017, p. 252).

Common creativity and patterns of sociotechnical organization

The use of CCLs has allowed the development of new modalities of cultural production marked by collaboration and horizontal associativity among its various agents; likewise, the various uses of CCLs contribute to reinforce the organizational self-management of the processes of creation, promotion, and dissemination of works in our country's independent publishers and digital labels. In principle, the users of the technologies associated with CCL seem to constitute what Jeremy Rifkin (2014) calls a "collaborative common" that, unlike the capitalist market,

"is motivated by collaborative interest and driven by a deep desire to connect and share with others. If the former promotes property rights and the search for autonomy, the second promotes selfless innovation, transparency, and the creation of community" (Rifkin 2014, p. 32). The various uses of CCLs that characterize the independent scene of the digital cultural field could be inserted within the broad set of self-managed, cooperative, and decentralized social practices that also characterize the collaborative economies of different producer communities in the digital scenario, which manage collective resources and alternately organize their creative forces (Vercelli, 2010; Benkler, 2015; Bollier, 2016a). According to the interviews, there is a clear coincidence between the producers of the independent scene when it comes to pointing out that CCLs "generated a cooperativity between different people" (Interview label No. 4), allowing in some way that "those who are interested in sharing, we are meeting" (Interview publisher No. 4); in other words, CCLs work as a technology that brings together productive affinities between different agents of the digital cultural field. This is what one of the interviewees reflects in an exemplary way, from the organizational experience of a digital label:

> (...) generate a network of people who work under the same concepts, i.e., if the label distributed free music, if the label never wanted to have sponsors, or ask people to donate or pay for the music, from the beginning we said: well, if this label is not a business, the idea is that the relationship between the musicians is not a business either. And we said, 'at this moment we are all going to collaborate, we are all going to put their work free with a common goal, which is to build the platform and we are all going to benefit each other from what we do'. For example, I was the designer so I did the covers for the records, [another friend did] the mastering of the records, I had a friend who was a musician and an English teacher... he did the translations of all the press releases, another friend who had speakers would bring them to the parties, and so each one worked for the label in the sense that the objective was the same... and this network of friends was created and things continued to expand (Interview label No. 5).

The production modes of the independent scene of the digital cultural field are traversed by these forms of cooperation and horizontal organization of work. However, this last point requires caution, since a certain liberal perspective (Benkler, 2015; Bollier, 2016a) assumes that these new modes of cultural production and their forms of self-organization would work as a complement to the capitalist market, by correcting in some way the shortcomings of its competition mechanisms, strengthening a productive sector but without questioning its accumulation logic. Contrary to these perspectives, here it is proposed that the dynamics of the independent scene of the digital cultural field makes it possible to think "social

cooperation as the a priori of all economic processes, rather than a specific form among others or a posterior reconciliation of economic and social life" (Terranova, 2010, p. 19). In other words, by demonstrating that cooperation is the basis of any economic process and not the initiative of individual actors, this type of practice exhibits the political power of the processes of collective invention and the generation of common knowledge. Of course, this implies rejecting the immediacy of the most optimistic views on the political nature of digital technologies, which see the Internet as a privileged space for the democratization of society (Jenkins, 2008; Benlker, 2015), but also distancing from the more pessimistic theses about the Free Culture movement that argue that "Internet limits cooperation and political criticism, it does not promote them" (Rendueles, 2013, p. 56), generating a kind of "technological individualism" (Rendueles & Sádaba, 2009, p. 108).

Based on the results of this study, it is possible to argue that the radical nature of cooperative practices in the independent scene cannot be appreciated when considering the isolated use of digital technologies or the Internet, but rather considering the formation of their complex socio-materials assemblages (Sassen, 2017). In those, digital infrastructures are part of multiple combinations with other analog dimensions and, therefore, with other types of objects, techniques, forms of interaction, and social organization. In the case of independent publishers and digital labels, this becomes evident above all in spaces such as fairs, parties, or gigs, where the forms of digital interaction are articulated with the encounter and proxemics of bodies, the protagonism of analog objects (such as books and vinyls), non-digital techniques (such as artisan paste, dance, etc.), and emergent or contingent forms of cooperation, which continue to forge more lasting societal ties. In fact, this new independent scene of the digital cultural field is unthinkable without these meeting spaces and their various sociotechnical dimensions. As one of the interviewees puts it:

> I feel full of joy that there are spaces where things can be shared, and that there are people who are in the same vein, because that is the space where we make community. Indeed, the emerging fairs, the space of people who do not believe in the established system, makes a community, and people who do not identify themselves perhaps in the most progressive political trends –those who go to these great cultural venues or to these large cultural events. These are smaller, more limited spaces (Interview publisher No. 1).

Therefore, the use of digital technologies by the cultural producers of the independent scene points not only to the free circulation of information or online access to works, but also to the generation of alternative spaces of physical meeting, where there are instances of commercialization or barter of works and forms of

community cooperation. For independent publishers, fairs are the times when the sale of books is most auspicious, while, in the case of netlabels, gigs or parties are the instances where they can raise profits and broadcast their music live. Both types of activities also depend on the use that cultural producers make of digital platforms, to disseminate events and calls, i.e., the use of networks and digital information flows generates other non-digital meeting spaces, socio-materials assemblages where the collaborative work that takes place online is complemented with forms of cooperation and face-to-face work.

In this sense, CCLs are a technology and "an arrangement of what exists that constitutes the real in a certain way, which has dynamized cultural practices of resistance based on the ways of life within which it developed (and which it contributed to develop)" (Ortiz & Winik, 2012, p. 202). The latter would then lead us to coincide with the perspectives that link the development of CCLs not only with issues around intellectual property, but also with the emergence of a set of daily practices of community existence outside of the practices derived of the institutionalization of private property and its regimes of appropriation of material and immaterial goods, questioning various premises of classical economics and traditional political paradigms.

CONCLUSION

The digitization of the cultural field at the beginning of the 21st century transforms the main dynamics and modes of production of its various agents. This is clear in the case of independent publishers and netlabels in Chile, especially in the use that cultural producers make of technologies such as CCLs, linked to a set of new digital skills and competencies. These tools have allowed independent publishers and digital labels to function autonomously, generating self-management methods and alternative dissemination channels. In this regard, CCLs have been crucial for the emergence of new cultural agents and for the configuration of an emerging scene that, paraphrasing Bourdieu (2013), we could affirm that operates as a new field of restricted digital production, by rejecting the forms of valorization of artistic work that predominate in the circuits of commercial culture and the entertainment industry. At the same time, this independent scene shares in its CCL uses a critique of the forms of privatization that copyright policies conduct in the cultural field, betting on alternative forms of licensing and shared uses of works. Thus, the users of CCLs embody in their modes of production forms a cultural resistance to the productive models imposed in the world of culture, and that suppose the extension of a commercializing logic over the collective creative forces.

Finally, it is worth nothing that even if CCLs promote forms of cooperation and productive decentralization through networking, the formation of producer communities that these technologies promote cannot be reduced only to a digital dimension. The production modes of these new cultural agents involve rather complex sociotechnical assemblages (Sassen, 2012, 2017), where digital technologies are one element among many other non-digital aspects. This is clearly seen in the case of independent publishers and netlabels, whose active generation of meeting spaces such as fairs, festivals or concerts is a fundamental part of an

FINANCING

This article is part of the development of the FONDECYT Initiation No. 11201122 project and the work of the csoc 02-1718 project, financed by the General Directorate of Research of the Universidad de Playa Ancha.

REFERENCES

Albright, J. & Hartman, D. (2018). Introduction: On Doing Field Analysis. In J. Albright, D. Hartman, & J. Widin (Eds.), *Bourdieu's Field Theory and the Social Sciences* (pp. 1-15). Singapore: Palgrave Macmillan.

Benkler, Y. (2015). *La riqueza de las redes. Cómo la producción social transforma los mercados y la libertad* (The Wealth of Networks. How Social Productions Transforms Market and Freedom). Barcelona, Spain: Icaria.

Bollier, D. (2016a). *Pensar desde los comunes. Una breve introducción* (Think like a Commoner. A short introduction of the life of the commons). Madrid, Spain: Traficantes de sueños.

Bollier, D. (2016b). El ascenso del paradigma de los bienes comunes (The rise of the commons good paradigm). In C. Hess & E. Ostrom (Eds.), *Los bienes comunes del conocimiento* (Understanding Knowlegde as a Commons. From theory to practice) (pp. 51-64). Madrid, Spain: Traficantes de sueños.

Bourdieu, P. (2013). *El sentido social del gusto. Elementos para una sociología de la cultura* (The Social Sense of Taste. Elements for a Sociology of Culture). Buenos Aires, Argentina: Siglo XXI.

Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant, L. (2014). *Una invitación a la sociología reflexiva* (An invitation to reflexive sociology). Buenos Aires, Argentina: Siglo XXI.

Brodsky, J., Negrón, B., & Pössel, A. (2014). *El escenario del trabajador cultural en Chile* (The Cultural Worker Scene in Chile). Santiago, Chile: Proyecto Trama/OPC.

Broussard, S. (2007). The Copy*left* Movement: Creative Commons Licensing. *Communication Research Trends*, *26*(3), 3-17. Retrieved from http://cscc.scu.edu/trends/v26/v26_n3.pdf

Busaniche, B. (Ed.). (2010). *Argentina copyleft: la crisis del modelo de derecho de autor y las prácticas para democratizar la cultura* (Argentina Copyleft: The Crisis of Copyright and Practices to Democratize Culture). Villa Allende, Argentina: Fundación Vía Libre.

independent scene that has emerged under the wing of the 21st century digital culture production field. The organization of these instances is essential to gauge the political potential of these production modes of creative commons, since the latter demonstrate that it is cooperation that acts as the engine of their inventive and creative forces.

Castells, M. (2009). *Comunicación y poder* (Communication and Power). Madrid, Spain: Alianza.

Cerda, A. & Ruiz, C. (2010). *Internet, Copyright y Derecho. Opiniones contingentes* (Internet, Copyright and Law. Outstanding opinions). Santiago, Chile: ONG Derechos Digitales.

Consejo Nacional de la Cultura y las Artes (CNCA). (2014). *Mapa de las industrias creativas en Chile. Caracterización y dimensionamiento* (Chilean Creative Industries' Map. Characterization and Measurement). Santiago de Chile: CNCA.

Creative Commons. (2018). State of the Commons. Retrieved from https://stateof.creativecommons.org/

Delfanti, A. & Arvidsson, A. (2019). *Introduction to digital media*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Frantsvog, D. (2012). All rights reversed: A Study of Copyleft, Open-Source, and Open-Content Licensing. *Contemporary Issues In Education Research, 5*(1), 15-22. https://doi.org/10.19030/cier.v5i1.6782

Fuentes, L., Ferretti, P., Castro, F., & Ortega, R. (2015). *La edición independiente en Chile. Estudio e historia de la pequeña industria (2009-2014)* (Independent publishing in Chile. Small production's research and history (2009-2014)). Santiago, Chile: Cooperativa de Editores de la Furia.

Fuster Morell, M., Subirats, J., Berlinguer, M., Martínez, R., & Salcedo, J. (2015). *Procomún digital y cultura libre ¿Hacia un cambio de época?* (Digital Commons and Free Culture. Towards a Change of Era?). Barcelona, Spain: Icaria.

Gainza, C. (2018). *Narrativas y poéticas digitales en América Latina. Producción literaria en el capitalismo informacional* (Digital narratives and poetics on Latin America. Literacy production on informational capitalism). Santiago, Chile: Cuarto Propio.

Hall, S. (2017). *Estudios culturales 1983: una historia teorética* (Cultural Studies 1983. A Theoretical History). Buenos Aires, Argentina: Paidós.

Jenkins, H. (2008). *Convergence culture. La cultura de la convergencia de los medios de comunicación* (Convergence culture. Where old and new media collide). Barcelona, Spain: Paidós.

Lessig, L. (2005). *Cultura libre. Cómo los grandes medios usan la tecnología y las leyes para encerrar la cultura y controlar la creatividad* (Free Culture. How Big Media uses technology and the law lo lock down culture and control creativity). Santiago, Chile: LOM.

Lessig, L. (2012). *Remix. Cultura de la remezcla y derechos de autor en el entorno digital* (Remix. Making Art Commerce Thrive in the Hybrid Economy). Barcelona, Spain: Icaria.

Observatorio Políticas Culturales (OPC). (2016). *La industria musical independiente en Chile. Cifras y datos para una caracterización* (Indie music industry in Chile. Data framing for a characterization). Santiago, Chile: OPC/IMICHILE.

Olwan, R. (2013). *Intellectual Property and Development. Theory and Practice*. Heidelberg, Germany: Springer-Verlag.

Ortiz, N. & Winik, M. (2012). Políticas de los afectos. La cultura crítica entre licencias, ferias y libros independientes (Politics of affections. The critical culture between licenses, fairs and independent books). In S. Lago Martínez (Comp.), *Ciberespacio y resistencias. Exploración en la cultura digital* (Ciberspace and Resistances. An Exploration on Digital Culture) (pp. 197-212). Buenos Aires, Argentina: Hekht libros.

Owen, L. (2014). *Selling Rights*. London, UK: Routledge.

Pecourt, J. & Rius, J. (2018). La digitalización del campo cultural y los intermediarios culturales: una crítica social del utopismo digital (Digitalization of the Cultural Field and Cultural Intermediaries: A Social Critique of Digital Utopianism). *REIS. Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas*, (162), 73-90. https://doi.org/10.5477/cis/reis.162.73

Ragnedda, M. (2018). Conceptualizing Digital Capital. *Telematics and Informatics*, *35*(8), 2366-2375. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2018.10.006

Rendueles, C. (2013). *Sociofobia. El cambio político en la era de la utopía digital* (Socio-phobia: Political Change in the Digital Utopía). Madrid, Spain: Capitán Swing.

Rendueles, C. & Sádaba, I. (2009). Ciberfetichismo y cooperación (Cyber-fetichism and cooperation). In I. Sádaba (Ed.), *Dominio abierto. Conocimiento libre y cooperación* (Open Domain. Free Knowledge and Cooperation) (pp. 103-127). Madrid, Spain: Círculo de Bellas Artes.

Rifkin, J. (2014). *La sociedad de coste marginal cero. El internet de las cosas, el procomún colaborativo y el eclipse del capitalismo* (The zero marginal cost society. The internet of things, the collaborative commons and the eclipse of capitalism). Barcelona, Spain: Paidós.

Sádaba, I. (2008). *Propiedad intelectual ¿Bienes públicos o mercancías privadas?* (Intellectual Property. Public Goods or Private Commodity?). Madrid, Spain: Los libros de la Catarata.

Sassen, S. (2017). Digital Cultures of Use and their Infraestructures. In J. Wajcman& N. Dodd (Eds.), *The Sociology of Speed. Digital, Organizational, and Social Temporalities* (pp. 72-85). Oxford, UK: Oxford UniversityPress.

Sassen, S. (2012). Interactions of the Technical and the Social: Digital formations of the powerful and the powerless. *Information, Communication & Society*, *15*(4), 455-478. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2012.667912

Terranova, T. (2010). Una altra vida: cooperació social i vida anorgànica (Another Life: social cooperation and a-organic life). *Digithum*, (12), 15-21. Retrieved from https://www.raco.cat/index.php/Digithum/article/view/227618

Vaidhyanathan, S. (2017). *Copyrights y copywrongs. El ascenso de la propiedad intelectual y su amenaza a la creatividad* (Copyrights and Copywrongs. The Rise of Intelectual Property and How It Threatens Creativity). Bogota, Colombia: Ediciones Uniandes.

Van Dijk, J. (2016). *La cultura de la conectividad: una historia crítica de las redes sociales* (The Culture of Connectivity. A critical story of Social Media). Buenos Aires, Argentina: Siglo XXI.

Vercelli, A. (2010). Reconsiderando las tecnologías sociales como bienes comunes. (Reconsidering Social Technologies as Common Goods). *Íconos*, (37), 55-64. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/10469/2067

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

ANDRÉS MAXIMILIANO TELLO, sociologist from the Universidad de Concepción, master in Latin American Studies from the Universidad de Chile and Ph.D. in Philosophy from Universidad de Salamanca and the Universidad de Valladolid, Spain. Professor at the Department of Sociology of the Universidad de Playa Ancha, Valparaíso. Researcher in charge of FONDECYT Initiation No. 11201122..

https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6518-4619

CONSUELO DINAMARCA NOACK, sociologist from the Universidad de Playa Ancha, she also holds a master's degree in Gender and Culture Studies from the Universidad de Chile. Feminist activist and dissident from Valparaíso. Research professional of the PIASOC 180025 project "Women and mathematics in Chile". Professor of Social Work at the Universidad Bolivariana, and in the OTEC PRASOC's Gender and Social Intervention Diploma.

https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7206-7085

SEBASTIÁN ESCOBAR PULGAR, sociologist from the Universidad de Playa Ancha and candidate for a master's degree in Social Communication from the Universidad de Chile. He works for the Ministry of Housing and Urbanism's program Quiero mi barrio (I love my neighborhood) in the Municipality of Maipú, Santiago de Chile. He is a professor in the Professional Photography career at the Instituto Profesional ARCOS, Viña del Mar headquarters.

https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5009-6440