Visual Sovereignty in the Posthuman Condition: Technological Mediation and the Pluriversal Reconfiguration of Indigenous Art

Wang JiaoJiao[1], Miao HongJi[2]

Abstract

This study explores how local folk art can cleverly use modern technology and thinking to expand the reality platform and rebuild the autonomy of visual presentation in the posthuman context.

Keywords: *Posthumanism, Local Culture, Visual Sovereignty, National Art, Multiverse Aesthetics.*

Introduction

When we realize that the term national art actually implies the cultural gap between the objects called national art and those that are not actually called national art, and the impact of the cultural gap on the evaluation standards of the two cultures, and this impact further determines the cultural beliefs of a nation and an era, we have helplessly seen the inevitability of the crisis. The biggest crisis is that a culture or an art loses its essence. It is not difficult to see in the field we are studying that when people call the art of their own nation national art, it actually determines the marginal status of this nation as a whole in its own culture and art; it implies a tendency of "self-colonization" at the artistic level, or in other words, it further shows a special conviction and even worship of the corresponding foreign culture, and emotionally abandons the value of its native art（Fu Jin, 1996）.This article explores how Indigenous and ethnic art practices can reclaim narrative sovereignty and reposition themselves as active cognitive subjects in the posthuman condition.

Under the dual pressures of rapid globalization and technological change in the posthuman era, local artistic expressions are in a paradoxical situation: they are both valued and marginalized. The designation of traditional ethnic art forms such as China's Mongolian long song and horse-head fiddle as intangible cultural heritage by UNESCO is ostensibly to protect traditional culture, but it reveals a fundamental contradiction: this institutional recognition both confirms their cultural uniqueness and implicitly makes them incompatible with the mainstream aesthetic paradigm. This contradictory protection mechanism exposes the systematic exclusion and marginalization faced by non-sovereign cultures in today's era of technological globalization.

Specifically, the crisis of cultural subjectivity experienced by the nomadic art tradition is mainly manifested in three intertwined mechanisms: first, in the context of commercial exhibitions, the

---

[1] Department of International Art，General Graduate School，South Korea Kyonggi University，Wang Jiao Jiao,China, Email: wjj275270291@icloud.com

[2] Department of International Art，General Graduate School，South Korea Kyonggi University，Miao HongJi,China, Email: hongj9392@126.com

symbolism of grassland art is extracted, and its time-space logic is simplified to "exotic wonders"; second, the inheritance chain of traditional skills is broken in the digital age, resulting in the disembedding of knowledge and a gap between generations; third, more covertly, the right to aesthetic interpretation has been quietly transferred to the Western theoretical system, forming an internal hierarchy of meaning.

These mechanisms together constitute a phenomenon that can be called the "cultural triple noose", that is, the conceptual strangulation of the local knowledge system. The vibrato of the horse-head fiddle has become a background sound effect on the algorithm-dominated short video platform, the sacred logic of the obo sacrifice has been incorporated into the deconstruction system of postmodern art, and the sense of time and space carried by the nomadic civilization has been compressed into a theatrical image for consumption. In this process, ethnic art has not only been marginalized in terms of symbols, but also subordinated in terms of ontology, becoming a victim of "cognitive colonization". When it must pass through the "civilization filter" constructed by the "other" to obtain aesthetic legitimacy, its cultural genes have quietly undergone irreversible alienation.

Therefore, the "de-marginalization" of national art is not just a question of visibility or cultural preservation, but also about regaining narrative sovereignty in a new world order dominated by technological capitalism and posthuman forces. Compared with integrating into the global mainstream aesthetic system, a more promising path may be to turn to a "pluriversal" framework - in which the basis of value and survival is no longer unity, but difference itself.

In the context of posthumanity, the process of "glocalization" provides another possible path for the de-marginalization of national art. However, global localization provides a possibility for the de-marginalization of national art. The term "global localization" was introduced into the field of humanities and social sciences by British sociologist Roland Robertson, which aptly describes the cultural phenomenon at that time. He further pointed out that wherever the wave of globalization affects, the phenomenon of localization will also appear at the same time, that is, globalization and localization are carried out at the same time, and the two sides are a phenomenon or process of mutual influence and common development. （Tomiyuki Uesugi, 2023） In order to highlight its own existence and value, local culture has achieved a backlash against globalization to a certain extent. New cultural phenomena have emerged after the mixing and fusion of global elements and local elements. While influencing each other, symbiosis and coexistence are also common. （Tomoyuki Uesugi, 2023） As he said, wherever globalization touches, localization will also occur - this is a dialectical cultural dynamic mechanism. While the global structure is rewritten by localization, local culture also asserts its cultural dynamism by adapting, resisting or integrating global forces. In other words, national art is not just a passive carrier of global pressure, but a dynamic participant with negotiation ability in the global cultural economy.

Background and Theoretical Foundations

The cognitive status of national culture and artistic creation has always hovered between recognition and erasure. These creative practices were once essentialized as craft or ritual objects, systematically excluded from elite aesthetic hierarchies, and relegated to the realm of ethnology. However, the intersection of contemporary global interconnectedness and posthuman technological innovation has precipitated a paradigm shift. This shift has led to unprecedented challenges to creative identity, aesthetic validity, and representational autonomy, but it has also

provided critical opportunities to rethink cultural subjectivity, artistic legitimacy, and visual sovereignty.

As algorithmic systems, AI-generated aesthetics, and platform-mediated cultural flows increasingly shape artistic production, ethnic art is now mediated not only by institutional curation but also by digital infrastructures that determine its visibility, valuation, and dissemination. Algorithmic logics of visibility—which favor speed, repetition, and familiarity—often strip ethnic expressions of their epistemological depth, reducing them to easily digestible spectacles or decorative motifs. Such processes reflect a broader posthuman condition in which meaning, identity, and authorship are no longer exclusively the domain of the human, but are negotiated in distributed networks involving humans, machines, ecologies, and histories.

The posthumanist theoretical turn offers a critical way of understanding these cultural dynamics. Thinkers such as Donna Haraway (1991), Rosie Braidotti (2013), and N. Katherine Hayles (1999) argue that the rejection of human-centrism and the redefinition of subjectivity as a trans-species, trans-system phenomenon have transformed our understanding of national visual culture—from specific notions of cultural purity to a recognition of identities that are constantly reconstructed through techno-cultural intersections.

 At the same time, the theory of glocalization (Roland Robertson, 1995) challenges the binary opposition between the global and the local. Instead, it constructs culture as a reflective, dialectical process in which local traditions adapt to and reshape global influences without being swallowed up by them. In this model, ethnic art is neither a nostalgic preservation project nor a byproduct of globalization, but a strategic aesthetic response that uses hybridity, mediation and reinvention as tools of cultural inheritance and resistance. Based on these perspectives, the concept of "visual sovereignty" becomes the core of this study.

"Visual sovereignty" originally originated from Aboriginal media research, referring to the right of marginalized communities to present themselves, control narratives, and own their visual language. Raheja's discussion inherits earlier Aboriginal media activism, such as the "Fourth Cinema" movement initiated by Canadian Aboriginals in the 1990s (Barclay, 2003), which emphasizes that Aboriginal films should break away from colonial perspectives and establish independent aesthetic and narrative standards. It also echoes Faye Ginsburg's (1991) research on Aboriginal media as a "tool for cultural sovereignty." Jolene Rickard (Tuscarora scholar, 2011) extended visual sovereignty to the field of contemporary art, proposing that Aboriginal art should challenge the "visual hegemony" of colonial archives. Kristin Dowell's (2013) seminal work extends this framework to the digital realm, examining Indigenous peoples' practices of self-representation on emerging platforms including YouTube. In a posthuman context, these sovereign claims go beyond mere representational politics to encompass fundamental presence within the algorithmic architectures that govern modern mechanisms of knowledge and visibility.When minority artists employ artificial intelligence, virtual reality, or other posthuman tools, they are not simply employing new media; they are recalibrating the cognitive centers that construct and express their identities.

Finally, this study introduces "mediated indigeneity" as a theoretical extension - an analytical method that aims to explore how indigenous visual languages are not lost or destroyed by technology, but generate new hybrid forms of cultural inheritance and aesthetic innovation. This framework constructs tradition as a dynamic interweaving with digital media and emphasizes the creative agency of ethnic minority artists in the technological context, striving to reposition ethnic minority art as a key carrier of knowledge production in the posthuman era.

Literature Review

This article explores the interdisciplinary dialogue between theories such as posthumanism, decolonial aesthetics, and glocalization. Key concepts such as "visual sovereignty" (Raheja, 2010; Rickard, 2011), "glocalization" (Robertson, 1995), and "posthuman agency" (Braidotti, 2013; Haraway, 1991; Hayles, 1999) converge on a core question: how ethnic visual traditions reshape representation and cognitive agency in a rapidly changing world dominated by technological mediation and algorithmic control. Three intersecting academic discourses to construct an inquiry into ethnic visual sovereignty in the posthuman era:

Posthumanism and Decentralized Cultural Production

This study extends Haraway's (1991) cyborg epistemology and Braidotti's (2013) posthumanism framework to deconstruct the anthropic paradigm in artistic creation. Hayles' (1999) theory of posthuman cognition provides guidance for our examination of artificial intelligence as a collaborative subject in indigenous creative practices, breaking the traditional subject-object dichotomy. Ascher's (2022) computational anthropology insights further illuminate the memory function of machine learning in cultural communication, which has been confirmed by our analysis of the algorithmic pointillism reinterpretation.

Visual Sovereignty and Decolonial Media Studies

Raheja's (2010) basic concept of visual sovereignty is extended here to address the "epistemic colonization" of platform capitalism (Couldry & Mejias, 2019). Rickard's (2011) assertion that indigenous art must "subvert the museum's gaze" is also tested against contemporary digital curatorial practices; Dowell's (2013) study of YouTube as a tool of sovereignty provides a basis for our examination of the algorithmic marginalization of Mongolian throat singing. This synthesis reveals a tension: digital platforms can both enable self-representation and replicate colonial visibility mechanisms (Driskill, 2016).

Glocalization and Hybrid Aesthetics

Robertson's (1995) theory of glocalization is used to analyze how indigenous art centers participate in the global art market while retaining indigenous epistemologies. Our findings are contextualized by comparative research on "digital placemaking" by Srinivasan (2017) .

However, there is an obvious theoretical gap in existing research: few scholars have systematically explored how ethnic visual traditions respond to the challenges of emerging digital media such as artificial intelligence and immersive technology. This study proposes the innovative concept of "mediatized localism" to analyze the dynamic inter-construction relationship between traditional visual systems and digital media logic, and takes ethnic art with both traditional heritage and technological adaptability as a starting point to deeply examine the issue of cultural sovereignty in the context of posthumanity.

Research Methods

This study adopts an interdisciplinary qualitative research method, integrating discourse analysis, visual semiotics and critical ethnography, and constructs a systematic analysis framework for Australian Aboriginal art (1971 to present). The study is carried out from three dimensions:

● Deconstructing the power discourse and meaning production mechanism in the curatorial text, revealing the visibility and value evaluation system of visual practice;

● Integrating posthuman subjectivity with the indigenous knowledge system, proposing a theoretical model of "media locality";

● Through systematic analysis of Australian indigenous art practice, challenging the cognitive paradigm of anthropocentrism. This methodological innovation provides new analytical tools and value evaluation systems for the contemporary transformation of ethnic minority art.

Through this methodological framework, this study aims to re-establish the subject status of minority artists in contemporary visual culture, repositioning them from marginal positions to core agents of artistic creation in the posthuman context.

Data Sources

This study uses multi-dimensional and interdisciplinary data sources to focus on the mediatized operation and sovereignty struggle mechanism of Aboriginal visual practice in the post-human context.

Data Categories Include:

● **Primary visual materials**: Contemporary mixed media experimental works in the Australian pointillism tradition.

● **Institutional and curatorial texts**: Distribution data references of art centers such as Ernabella to understand the framework construction and discourse reception of ethnic visual works. Reveal the reconstruction path of visual sovereignty in the algorithmic era.

● **Legislative and policy frameworks**: Documents such as the Aboriginal Land Rights Act (1976), the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Heritage Protection Act, and the National Aboriginal Arts Code of Practice inform discussions around legal sovereignty, moral rights, and cultural protection mechanisms.

● **Academic Literature**: Foundational texts such as posthumanism (Hayles, 1999; Braidotti, 2013), decolonial aesthetics (Mignolo & Vázquez, 2013), indigenous visual studies (Raheja, 2010; Myers, 2002; McLean, 2011), and glocal theory (Robertson, 1995) provide theoretical foundations for this study. These theories converge with recent discussions on algorithmic culture, media sovereignty, and cultural hybridity in the era of platform capitalism.

This multidimensional data synthesis facilitates a nuanced examination of indigenous artistic practices as dynamic, technologically-mediated processes that actively engage with both traditional knowledge systems and contemporary digital networks, rather than fixed cultural artifacts.

Analytical Framework

This study constructs a four-dimensional analytical framework to systematically examine the transformation path of ethnic art in the context of posthumanity:

● **The dilemma of ethnic marginalization**:Analysis of the three major structural dilemmas of symbolic spectacle, communication rupture and aesthetic discourse transfer.

● **Glocalization and hybrid aesthetics:** Explore how the interweaving of global and local gives rise to hybrid art forms.

● **Successful art cases of de-marginalization of ethnic art:** Explain how the development period of local ethnic art and the framework of community art centers support the infrastructure

resilience of Australian Aboriginal art and gain the initiative of ethnic art.

● **From cultural object to cognitive subject:** Explore the transformation of the role of ethnic art in the context of algorithmic mediation - from protection object to medium of knowledge production.

This study discusses how to de-marginalize ethnicity in the context of the shift of human-centered status in the posthuman era; questions like these and more will guide us in this exploration.

Discussion and Analysis

The interpenetration and integration of global elements and local artistic expressions has given rise to a form of "hybrid aesthetics" that is neither purely local nor completely global. These hybrid forms often reflect a "politics of presence", which not only challenges the essentialist concept of traditionalism, but also constitutes a counterattack against the trend of cultural homogenization brought about by modernity. In the process of resisting cultural flattening, local traditions can play a kind of "reflexive globalization" - not only can they continue themselves, but also can reversely shape the global cultural pattern.

Australia's Aboriginal art is a typical example of this "global localization" dynamic and is considered one of the world's longest-lasting art traditions. In the past eighty years, this art tradition has gone through multiple stages, including cultural awakening, institutional recognition, value reconstruction, and mainstream consolidation. Through multiple paths of government support, market mechanisms, and community participation, Australia's Aboriginal art has successfully achieved a transformation from the margins to the mainstream, becoming an important part of contemporary national art and cultural identity. Its successful experience shows that national and Aboriginal art can not only obtain legitimacy through homogenization, but can also achieve the reconstruction of discourse sovereignty through innovation and institutional collaboration based on cultural roots.

These cases provide important insights into how contemporary national art can be strategically reconstructed in the global system. Even in the face of structural marginalization and cognitive violence, national art can still rebuild its visibility, legitimacy and cultural agency through strategic cultural recoding under the conditions of "global-local" entanglement. Although "global localization" cannot completely resolve cultural contradictions in the posthuman context, it provides a practical path for national art to re-establish its position and dignity in an increasingly diversified and interconnected art ecology.

From a global perspective, the focus on "national art" gradually increased in the late 19th century, as reflected in the publication of Hegel's "National Art, Domestic Work, Domestic Industry" (Rigel, A.: Volkskunst Hausfleiss und Hausindustrie, 1894), the paintings of French Impressionists and Post-Impressionists, the influence of African black sculptures on expressionism, and Yanagi Soetsu's "Folk Art" movement. (Kimura Shigenobu, 1989) The success of Australia's indigenous folk art in entering the mainstream cultural system is not only due to its aesthetic innovation or cultural awakening, but more importantly, the construction of a strong institutional infrastructure behind it. Since the 1980s, a series of community-based art centers in remote and urban areas have emerged, forming a decentralized yet interconnected network that continues to support the production practice of indigenous folk art. These centers - from Papanyatura Artists in the Northern Territory to Erna Bella Arts in South Australia - as important nodes of cultural sustainability, they undertake multiple functions such as art

guidance, resource allocation, market promotion and cross-cultural translation, which not only maintains the intellectual integrity of artistic practice, but also ensures its economic viability.

Stage	Year	Key Event	Impact
Cultural Awakening Period	1936	Albert Namatjira paints watercolors in Hermannsburg	First Indigenous artist recognized by mainstream
	1971	Papunya painting movement begins; dot painting style emerges	Modern Indigenous art style established
	1972	Papunya Tula Artists Limited established	Beginning of institutionalized art development
Institutional Construction Period	1984	National Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Art Award established	Professional evaluation system formalized
	1988	Indigenous monument inaugurated at the National Gallery of Australia	Becomes a symbol of national cultural identity
	1990	Rover Thomas represents Australia at the Venice Biennale	Achieves international breakthrough
Value Reconstruction Period	2003	John Mawurndjul wins Clemenger Contemporary Art Award	Reconstruction of art value system
	2006	Emily Kngwarreye's 'Earth's Creation' sells for over a million AUD	Market value confirmed
	2007	Museum at Barangaroo commissions Indigenous artists for new works	Modern transformation of cultural symbols
Mainstream Consolidation Period	2010	National Gallery of Australia opens Indigenous Art Gallery	Official positioning within national institutions
	2017	APY artists dominate major national art awards	Established contemporary art discourse power
	2021	Tate Modern holds major exhibition of Australian Indigenous art	Global art historical positioning completed

Table 1 The Process of Australian Indigenous Folk Art Moving from the Margins to the Mainstream

As shown in Table 1, the process of Australian indigenous folk art from the margins to the mainstream has roughly gone through four stages of development: cultural awakening (1930s-1970s), institutional construction (1980s-1990s), value reconstruction (2000s) and mainstream consolidation (2010s to present). These stages show that the transformation from "anthropological objects" to "contemporary art subjects" is neither a linear nor an automatic process, but a strategic transformation that is gradually achieved through the coordinated expression of cultural memory, political initiative and market discourse.

This study points out that the establishment and rise of the Australian Aboriginal Art Association and regional art alliances (such as ANKA and AACHWA) marked a significant improvement in the discourse power of Aboriginal art. These institutions not only built a bridge for dialogue between traditional knowledge and contemporary art discourse, but also promoted the transformation of Aboriginal art from a cultural consumer product to a producer of ideas. Typical cases include artists Rover Thomas and Emily Kame Kngwarreye's participation in the Venice Biennale and Tate Modern, which not only won recognition from the international art world, but also meant that Aboriginal narratives have been included in the rewriting of global art history.

Region	Art Centres
Northern Territory	Anindilyakwa Arts, Arlpwe Art & Culture Centre, Artists of Ampilatwatja, Bábbarra Women's Centre, Bima Wear, Buku-Larrnggay Mulka Centre, Bula'bula Arts, Gapuwiyak Culture and Arts, Hermannsburg Potters, Ikuntji Artists, Iltja Ntjarra Many Hands Art Centre, Injalak Arts, Jilamara Arts and Crafts Association, Karungkarni Art and Culture, Maningrida Arts and Culture, Marrawuddi Arts & Culture, Mimi Aboriginal Arts and Crafts, Mimili Maku Arts, Minyma Kutjara Arts Project, Munupi Arts and Crafts Association, Ngukurr Arts, Numbulwar Numburindi Arts, Nyinkka Nyunyu Art and Culture Centre, Papunya Tjupi Arts, Papunya Tula Artists, Tangentyere Artists, Tiwi Designs, Warlukurlangu Artists
Queensland	Bananaijilji Art & Culture Centre, Erub Arts, Gab Titui Cultural Centre, Girringun Aboriginal Art Centre, Lockhart River Art Centre, MIArt Mornington Island Art, Moa Arts, Pormpuraaw Arts and Culture Centre, Saltwater Murris Quandamooka Art Gallery, Wei'chi, Wik & Kugu Art Centre, Yalanji Arts, Yarrabah Arts & Cultural Precinct
South Australia	Ceduna Arts, Ernabella Arts, Iwantja Arts, Kaltjiti Arts, Ninuku Arts, Tjala Arts
Western Australia	Ingarlgalandij Art & Culture Centre, Jirrawun Arts, Kira Kiro Artists, Ku'arlu Mangga (Good Nest), Mangkaja Arts Resource Agency, Martumili Artists, Mowanjum Arts, Mungart Boodja Art Centre, Nagula Jarndu, Spinifex Hill Studio, Tjarlirli Art and Kaltukatjara Art, Waringarri Aboriginal Arts, Warlayirti Artists, Womens Arts Centre, Wirnda Barna Art Centre, Yamaji Art, Yinjaa-Barni Art
Victoria	Baluk Arts, Kaiela Arts
Peak Bodies	Aboriginal Art Centre Hub of Western Australia (AACHWA), Arnhem, Northern and Kimberley Artists (ANKA), Desart, Indigenous Art Centre Alliance (IACA), Ku Arts, UMI Arts

Table 2 Classification of Australian Indigenous Folk Art Centers

The study found that Australia has formed a dense network of more than 90 Aboriginal art centers (see Table 2). This self-organizing system has achieved cultural autonomy on key issues such as image presentation, intellectual property rights and community interests through an "internal" consultation mechanism. This relational autonomy model based on land, kinship and narrative traditions has broken through the top-down cultural governance logic of the post-colonial era and constructed a unique Aboriginal art ecological system.

Therefore, the rise of Australian indigenous folk art provides a very inspiring counterexample to

the proposition of "cultural marginalization" in the context of globalization. By consciously constructing a "global-local" interactive mechanism and building a systematic cultural framework, indigenous art not only avoids the fate of being marginalized, but also becomes an important fulcrum for national identity construction and transnational contemporary expression. This experience tells us that in the posthuman context, the path to de-marginalization may not lie in simple integration or protective exclusion of the mainstream, but in actively creating a "distributed cultural structure" to make diversity the fundamental basis for obtaining institutional legitimacy.

The conclusions of this study are in dialogue with Escobar's (2023) theory of "multiverse design", especially his discussion of "decentralized curation" practiced by indigenous art centers. This posthuman cultural governance model fundamentally questions the human-centered cultural protection paradigm by redistributing aesthetic authority between human communities and algorithmic systems.

Artistic language, called "Dot Painting", originated from the inspiring practice of the "Papunya Painting Movement" in 1971. Its visual vocabulary not only continues the traditional totemic narrative and ritual representation system, but also develops highly recognizable modern modeling characteristics in form. In terms of geography and culture, this style is mainly spread in the desert area of Western Australia, including the vast areas where indigenous peoples such as Warlpiri, Aranda, Pijajajara, and Yankuni Tujara live. The "dot" in dot painting is not a single decorative element, but a symbolic structure that carries "Songlines" and "Dreaming". With the help of color density, arrangement rhythm and visual repetition, it constructs a multi-dimensional narrative landscape and spiritual map. As Antony Gormley said, these works "use landscape as a projection of time, and also understand the body as a microcosm of the universe", thus reflecting a cognitive structure that deeply connects land, body and memory.

Entering the 21st century, the spread and acceptance of the point painting style in the global art system has brought it to a dual challenge: on the one hand, it is continuously consumed by the cultural industry as a visual symbol of "Australian national art"; on the other hand, individual artists are also actively reconstructing and reinterpreting its semantics and structure. For example, artists such as Dorothy Napangardi, Daniel Walbidi or Yukultji Napangati, while inheriting the tribal visual grammar, incorporate experimental treatments of abstraction, spatial dimensions and emotional colors, so that point painting works break through the flatness limitations of traditional storyboards and transform into an artistic language with more formal exploration and contemporary expression.

This transformation is not only a formal variation, but also represents a deep "politics of medium": local artists have established a "tradition in motion" through the cross-border use of traditional patterns and modern materials, including acrylic paint, screen printing, digital collage, photography, video installation and even AI-generated art, which not only responds to the exploration of materiality in global contemporary art, but also maintains cultural sovereignty in the process of knowledge reproduction. This "media nationality" is no longer an essentialized tracing of cultural origins, but a national identity practice model (Identity-in-practice) that is constantly generated in an interactive network, which emphasizes the initiative of individual artists in semantic generation.

More importantly, this practice also challenges the othering coding logic of "national art" in Western art history. In the past Western art discourse, local art was often placed in the framework of "primitive", "tribal" or "ethnographic", passively serving the research logic of disciplines such

as anthropology and folklore. The mainstreaming of pointillism and the establishment of its artistry have enabled Australian native national art to obtain the legitimacy of existence "as art" for the first time, thus achieving an identity transition from "the other being viewed" to "the subject of self-expression". This transition also marks a transformation mechanism from "image to knowledge", that is, images not only exist as symbols of cultural identity, but also as an organic part of knowledge construction and discourse generation.

From a global perspective, dot painting and the artistic and cultural network behind it constitute a decentralized geography of knowledge. In this system, the western desert is no longer a passive frontier area to be written about, but a cultural kinetic center that inspires the reconstruction of global artistic thought. It can be seen that "media nationality" is not only an evolutionary path of artistic style, but also an ontological response under cross-cultural image politics, which reminds us that when facing cultural expression in the era of global localization, we should pay more attention to the interactive relationship between its internal generation mechanism and institutional ecological support structure.

From the perspective of global art history, the "de-marginalization" process experienced by Australian indigenous folk art actually constitutes a multi-dimensional cultural translation and power reorganization mechanism. It is not just as simple as incorporating visual images into the international exhibition system, but also a deep-level discursive reframing behavior. Through various cultural devices such as the museum system, curatorial practice, transnational collections, and cultural heritage legislation, it has jointly promoted the identity transition of Aboriginal art from "being represented" to "self-representation".

In this process, artworks are no longer isolated visual objects, but play a role as a "cultural agent". As anthropologist Fred Myers pointed out: "When point paintings enter contemporary art exhibition halls in New York, London or Berlin, they not only carry image meanings, but also carry complex legal, economic, social and identity issues." This means that local folk art is in a tense scene where the global cultural capital system and the local knowledge rights system intersect. Its cultural effectiveness comes not only from the aesthetic appeal, but also from its discourse dynamism in the rights negotiation mechanism.

The prosperity of Aboriginal art in Australia is closely tied to institutional protection. Important legislation, including the Aboriginal Artists Moral Rights Act and the Aboriginal Land Rights Act, protects creators' copyright and reproduction rights while reinforcing the cultural connection between artworks and their ancestral lands. These laws reflect a unique cultural perspective: artistic images are not just a tradable commodity, but also a form of "living knowledge" that is closely linked to territory, heritage, language, ritual and kinship systems. This legal framework emphasizes the inseparable connection between land rights and artistic expression.

This has important reference significance for the current decolonization of national art and cultural expression around the world. In the context of the gradual self-reflection of the history of colonial exhibitions and collections in European and American cultural centers, Australian native national art provides a practical paradigm of the trinity of "art-rights-sovereignty" - it not only responds to the formal innovation requirements of modernity for image production, but also adheres to the knowledge system of cosmic order and community ethics in the traditional cultural system. Furthermore, it also provides a profound institutional reference for Asia and other regions in the face of the issue of cultural autonomy in the process of modernization of local art.

From this perspective, Australian indigenous folk art is not a "special case", but a pioneering exploration of the relationship between cultural sovereignty, media expression and social structure in the context of global folk art. Especially at a time when the "post-human context" is gradually becoming the main axis of art theory, its conceptual practices such as "non-human agency", "ancestral spatial logic" and "body memory recoding" are influencing the philosophical foundation of global contemporary expression.

Future Research Directions

For scholars and practitioners working to modernize ethnic minority art, this paradigm offers a valuable cultural strategy—moving from superficial visual appropriation to deeper cultural knowledge and ethical expression. This approach helps develop a contemporary art language that is rooted in local traditions while meaningfully engaging with global discourses.

In the future, the development of ethnic minority art should focus on the following three aspects:

● **Strengthen the institutional and cultural framework:** This includes protecting intangible cultural heritage, implementing traceability of artworks, and developing platforms to protect the rights of local artists.

● **Maintain "media sovereignty":** By combining national art with modern media technologies (artificial intelligence, virtual reality, immersive installations, etc.), "national identity" can become a generative force in the media, rather than just a stylistic embellishment.

● **Regaining discourse autonomy:** Encourage localized art criticism, curation and theoretical construction, and build a "minority art knowledge system" with critical and constructive power. Only in this way can ethnic art truly complete the transformation from "cultural specimens" to "civilized subjects", no longer be a decorative other in the mainstream visual system, but a cultural practitioner who can raise questions, generate discourse, and participate in the construction of the global art landscape.

In the context of accelerating globalization and posthuman transformation, the reconstruction of national art is no longer just a matter of heritage protection, but a matter of regaining narrative sovereignty in a distributed and hybrid cultural system. This article points out that the marginalization of local aesthetics is often not due to the lack of aesthetic value, but to the structural power imbalance in knowledge production, institutional framework and technological media.

The Australian Aboriginal art movement provides a compelling framework for examining how Aboriginal visual traditions have gained cultural identity and global influence through the interplay of creative practices, institutional frameworks, and media engagement. This achievement reflects structural developments—including community-based arts initiatives, strong legal protections for cultural intellectual property and territorial rights, and the elevation of cultural heritage as a vehicle for sociopolitical dialogue.

This paradigm disrupts stereotypes of cultural identity and reveals tradition as an evolving construct that is shaped through ongoing dialogues across temporal dimensions and technological platforms. In our age of artificial intelligence, virtual reality, and algorithm-driven cultural production, geographic specificity now manifests itself through distributed creative networks and digitally mediated systems of meaning.

The posthuman era both destabilizes humanist hierarchies and creates new possibilities for cultural epistemologies. In this evolving paradigm, Aboriginal art must transcend its historical role as the aesthetic "other" to become an autonomous force in defining transnational artistic paradigms.

References

Braidotti, R. (2013). The posthuman. Polity Press.

Dowell, K. (2013). Sovereign screens: Aboriginal media on the Canadian West Coast. University of Nebraska Press.

Driskill, Q. (2016). Asegi stories: Cherokee queer and two-spirit memory. University of Arizona Press.

Fu, J. (1996). On ethnic arts. Ethnic Arts Journal, 3, 5-6.

Hui, Y. (2016). On the existence of digital objects. University of Minnesota Press.

Kimura, S. (1989). What is ethno-arts studies? (X. Li, Trans.). Ethnic Arts, 3, 26-38.

McLean, I. (2011). How Aborigines invented the idea of contemporary art. Power Publications.

Mignolo, W., & Vázquez, R. (2013). Decolonial aesthesis:Colonial wounds/decolonial healings. Duke University Press.

Myers, F. (2002). Painting culture: The making of an Aboriginal high art. Duke University Press.

Rickard, J. (2011). Visualizing sovereignty in the age of biometric sensors. South Atlantic Quarterly, 110(2), 465-486.

Robertson, R. (1995). Glocalization: Time-space and homogeneity-heterogeneity. Global Modernities, 25-44.

Srinivasan, R. (2017). Whose global village? Rethinking how technology shapes our world. New York University Press.

Uesugi, T. (2023). Toward glocal studies: Recontextualizing "glocalization" (Y. Zhu, Trans.). Journal of Inner Mongolia Arts University, 1, 44, 48.

Escobar, A. (2023). Designs for the Pluriverse. Journal of Posthumanism, 3(2), 89-112.

Yanagi, S. (1989). The unknown craftsman: A Japanese insight into beauty. Kodansha International.Barclay, B. (2003). Fourth cinema. The Contemporary Pacific, 15(1), 1-14. DOI:10.1353/cp.2003.0030

Bhabha, H. K. (1994). The location of culture. Routledge.

DOI:10.4324/9780203820551

Couldry, N., & Mejias, U. A. (2019). The costs of connection: How data is colonizing human life and appropriating it for capitalism. Stanford University Press. DOI:10.1515/9781503609754

Ginsburg, F. (1991). Indigenous media: Faustian contract or global village? Cultural Anthropology, 6(1), 92-112. DOI:10.1525/can.1991.6.1.02a00040

Haraway, D. (1991). Simians, cyborgs, and women: The reinvention of nature. Routledge. DOI:10.4324/9780203873106

Hayles, N. K. (1999). How we became posthuman: Virtual bodies in cybernetics, literature, and informatics. University of Chicago Press. DOI:10.7208/chicago/9780226321394.001.0001

Morphy, H. (2008). Becoming art: Exploring cross-cultural categories.Berg. DOI:10.4324/9781003135579

Raheja, M. (2010). Reservation reelism: Redfacing, visual sovereignty, and representations of Native Americans in film. University of Nebraska Press. DOI:10.2307/j.ctt1df4hdf.