

**The Ecological Native:
Indigenous Peoples' Movements and Eco-governmentality in Colombia**

**By
Astrid Ulloa
(aulloa@mincultura.gov.co)
Researcher Instituto Colombiano de Antropología e Historia-ICANH**

**Prepared for delivery at the 2003 meeting of the
Latin American Studies Association
Dallas, Texas, March 27-29, 2003**

Introduction

Many in Colombia and in the international community now view indigenous peoples as *ecological natives* who protect the environment and give hope in the face of the crisis of development. Consequently, representations of indigenous peoples have changed from “the savage colonial subject” to “the political-ecological agent.” One of the most important arguments among scholars who study indigenous movements’ political actions is the question of how and why indigenous movements have gained political power within national and international political and environmental arenas. Brysk (2000) argues that the indigenous movements’ political actions have been successful because of their identity and internationalization in transnational political arenas. Yashar (1999) observes that under the new neoliberal policies, indigenous peoples are challenging ideas of democracy; while Alvarez, Dagnino and Escobar (1998) argue that identity construction and cultural politics allow indigenous peoples to propose new ways of doing politics. In addition, Varese (1996) considers this process a result of indigenous peoples’ actions of resistance. Nonetheless, what these different analyses have in common is the recognition that indigenous peoples’ movements have been using political arenas that were recently opened during the third wave of democratization in Latin America to construct coalitions that have introduced them to long-established national and international political arenas. These approaches show how indigenous peoples have transformed nation-states’ constitutions, installed their leaders in traditional political arenas, and so on.

At the same time, at the international level, indigenous peoples’ rights have been recognized through legal international apparatuses such as the International Labor Organization’s (ILO) Convention No.169.

International law now accepts that indigenous peoples enjoy collective rights: to ownership, control and management of their lands and territories; to exercise of their customary laws; to represent themselves through their own representative institutions. It is also recognized that laws, policies and ‘development’ should not be imposed on them without their prior and informed consent (Colchester 2002:2).

Since the end of the 1970s, indigenous peoples’ political actions and processes of constructing identity have been related to ecology, environmentalism and conservation, which coincide with the process of the internationalization of environmental law. I argue in this paper that the emergence of the environmental crisis and environmental awareness has created a new political context not only for indigenous peoples but also for related social movements. This new context has created a global environmental discourse that is based on expert scientific knowledge and new supranational environmental institutions, such as the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the Global Environmental Facility (GEF), which is administered by the World Bank, and which have begun to regulate the environment in a way that constructs biodiversity as “a world currency” (McAfee 1999). As the metaphor suggests, global environmental discourse has taken form in economic terms under the capitalist framework of the international markets.

In this context, indigenous peoples’ movements seem to be a form of “empowerment,” making indigenous peoples “free” to establish relations with international agencies in “equal” conditions as social agents, self-represented, autonomous, and with control of their territories and resources. Private institutions now interact directly with indigenous peoples, without state intervention, to negotiate the use of their natural resources; for example, a petroleum corporation has established direct ties with the Huaorani people in Ecuador, and a pharmaceutical corporation has done the same with the Awa people. Simultaneously, there are international policies such as those generated by the World Intellectual Property Organization’s (WIPO) that are establishing policies for administering indigenous peoples’ property rights. Consequently, the CBD’s policies related to indigenous peoples’ knowledges have been displaced by the WIPO scenarios. This new environmental context has given rise to new political events and relations that do not conform to previous analyses of indigenous movements’ political actions.

I argue that indigenous peoples’ political actions and the emergence of “ecological” identities coincide with an internationalization of environmental law that has constructed indigenous peoples as subjects who can have full rights over their territories and resources in order to enter into the environmental market. However, these situations and policies are still being formulated and can also be manipulated by indigenous peoples for proposing changes and gaining power within environmental discourses by putting forward new forms of interaction between knowledge, nature and the management of natural resources that challenge globalization from the top by proposing counterglobalizations or countergovernmentalities.

In this context, understanding indigenous peoples' movements entails analyzing the indigenous peoples' historical construction of ecological identities and their new relationships with national and transnational environmental movements and global environmental law. It also necessitates an analysis of how, why, and in what ways indigenous peoples' movements are involved in neoliberal policies and global environmental law.

I consider that the processes of the construction of indigenous peoples' environmental identities is an interplay of local, national and transnational dynamics among indigenous peoples and environmental movements and discourses in relation to global environmental policies, and I also consider that the political effects that these processes have upon indigenous peoples are related to their autonomy, territories, resources, knowledges, identities, and representations.

For this analysis, it is important to understand how the indigenous peoples' cultural and environmental politics and their proposals have reached the national and transnational political spaces where they have successfully created a clear dialogue with both governmental and non-governmental organizations. This interaction among cultural dynamics, organizational processes and cultural and environmental politics has generated arenas for the negotiation and consolidation of indigenous people's demands. At the same time, indigenous peoples have consolidated themselves as *ecological natives*, which has placed them within a global eco-politics. However, as I show in this paper, these images have contradictory effects or are the effects of contradictory processes within the context addressed in this paper.

To develop this argument and in order to analyze critically and carefully the historical conditions of emergence related to the actual environmental circumstances of indigenous peoples, I use Foucault's concept of eventalization. An 'event,' for Foucault, is a situation that expresses the beginning of a new and uncontested relationship, in this case indigenous peoples and environmentalism (as a global discourse and practices related to environmental crises). Therefore, it is necessary to rediscover "the connections, encounters, supports, blockages, play of forces, strategies and so on which at a given moment establish what subsequently counts as being self-evident, universal and necessary" (Foucault 1991:77).

The relationship between indigenous peoples and environmentalism (which implies both discourses and practices) is explored in this paper¹ by looking for the multiple causalities, processes and interrelations that have helped to configure it. As Foucault writes, "Eventalization thus works by constructing around the singular event analyzed as a process, a 'polygon' or rather, a 'polyhedron' of intelligibility, the number of whose faces is not given in advance and can never properly be taken as finite" (1991:77).

I analyze the emergence of indigenous peoples' movements in Latin America and Colombia not only as a result of indigenous political power but also as responses to transformations generated since the 1970s by democratization and globalization processes; and I show how these are linked to the growth and the spread of communications technology which connect local-global processes and transform the temporal and spatial situations of social movements and at the same time articulate them to transnational scenarios. At the same time, indigenous peoples' circumstances are linked to the transformation of the state by decentralization and the implementation of neoliberal policies (including the privatization of state institutions, the abolition of subsidies, and the opening of the Colombian market to the international market), and specifically *neoliberal multiculturalisms*, in Hale's (2002) terms.

One example of the process of the spread of multiculturalism is how ILO Convention No. 169 eliminated some barriers that historically prevented indigenous peoples' attainment of full human rights. It also allowed the recognition of indigenous peoples' rights to self-determination and autonomy and initiated the need for political participation through indigenous organizations and representatives in the process of planning, discussing, and developing projects that affect their territories and lives.

In the 1970s, indigenous peoples and environmental norms both began to be recognized at the national and international level. They are related and they reinforce each other. This environmentalism invokes the *ecological native* as an essential actor of its discourse. Accordingly, indigenous peoples claim that the contribution from their cultures to the nation and the world is the respect that they have for the environment (Ulloa 2001). Also, these two processes (environmentalism and indigenism) share many features in terms of their

¹ In this paper I focus on a general theoretical framework to analysis indigenous peoples' movements in Colombia, a more detailed account it is developed in Ulloa 2003.

construction, their limitations in their scope, and their contradictions in relation to property rights in natural resources (Flórez 2001).

Throughout this paper, I explore the history of indigenous peoples' movements. I examine the construction and relation of the coalition of indigenous peoples' movements and environmentalism and how this relationship gives rise to new ideas of identity, representations, territory, autonomy and natural resources that have engaged indigenous peoples and prompted their actions within a specific framework of ideas (eco-governmentality) related to non-indigenous practices, discourses, political participation, territory, concepts of nature, and property rights.

I address the emergence and development of indigenous peoples' movements in Latin America and Colombia to analyze not only the political system and its opportunities and constraints, but also the political actions and trajectories of these movements and their interrelation with institutional political systems at the national and international levels (Brysk 2000). These situations allow me to identify national and transnational networks and their impact on national and transnational political arenas. I concentrate on the nature of these movements and their organizational dynamics.

I also argue that environmental awareness can be considered the birth of the new discursive formation (according to Foucault's concept of discourse) that produces a group of statements, which provide a language for talking about –a way of representing knowledge about– the environment and ecological agents. Discourse in Foucault's perspective is concerned with representation as a source for the production of social knowledge that is related to social practices and questions of power. For Foucault, analyses of representation have to be focused on the production of knowledge through discourses within their specific historical and social context.

Therefore, I locate the formation of this discourse. The global environmental discourse in question is characterized by a certain way of thinking about 'the environment' and is expressed in various texts, practices, conducts, policies, disciplines and objects that share the same rules or, in Foucault's words, belong to the same "discursive formation." Thus, the environment becomes a new space of knowledge that calls for special technical governance. This situation has allowed the beginning of a new specific governmentality (Foucault 1991a): an eco-governmentality². For Foucault, governmentality refers to "all projects or practices intending to direct social actors to behave in a particular manner and towards specified ends in which political government is but one of the means of regulating or directing actions" (Watts 1993/94).

Following Gupta (1998) and Luke (1999), I argue that this new eco-governmentality constructs international and national policies, discourses and practices that introduce indigenous peoples to new production and consumption circuits. Gupta (1998) notes that "we may be witnessing the birth of a new regime of discipline in which governmentality is un-hitched from the nation-state to be instituted anew on a global scale. In this project, global environmentalism comes together with other global accords and treaties, and the institutions through which these 'compacts' are monitored and enforced, to regulate the relationship between people and things on a global (not simply international) scale" (1998:321). In a similar way, Luke (1999) points out how "environments, therefore, emerge with biopower as an essential part of the constitution of modern 'man' who becomes the pretext for regulating life via politics" (1999:129).

Thus, I argue that we are facing an eco-governmentality in which global regulations that relate to new discussions of biodiversity and sustainable development are presented as necessary in order to defend the planet and its natural resources. Within this new eco-governmentality, Colombia and indigenous peoples, in general, have taken a prominent position because their territories and "natural resources" are some of the *hot spots* of biodiversity that are focal points of this discourse.

² Foucault's concept of governmentality has been used to analyze and critique environmental discourses: ecological governmentality (Rutherford 1999), environmental governmentality (Denier 1999), and environmentality (Luke 1999a). In am using the concept of eco-governmentality in a similar way; however, I address the specific historical interrelation of indigenous peoples and eco-governmentality.

The Cultural Politics of Indigenous Peoples' Movements

After many years of contesting their marginal position through political actions, indigenous peoples' movements³ have located their proposals within the national project. In this way, indigenous peoples have helped to rethink predominant notions of citizenship, development and democracy. Indigenous peoples' proposals are based not only on the recognition of their cultural differences, but also on conceptions of communitarian rather than individual relationships. In this way, they claim collective rights over their territories, and they defend their communal organization under *cabildo* jurisdiction, as in the Colombian case. Moreover, they have located their struggles for their territories within historical processes that relate to their pre-colonial situation with actual political processes.

Indigenous peoples have based their demands on their rights to self-representation and sovereignty over their territories and natural resources. Thus, indigenous movements define their members as *indigenous peoples* rather than ethnic minorities. Consequently, indigenous peoples call themselves 'original people'⁴ (legitimate territorial owners) or nations that demand restitution rights and ancestral sovereignty in their territories. Moreover, indigenous peoples establish political relationships with the state through their authorities. In this way, they reaffirm their autonomy and self-determination while they recognize the state's institutions. Indigenous peoples' movements demand a national understanding based on the recognition of the difference (Rappaport and Dover 1996). This assumption was manifested in one indigenous movement's campaign for the Colombian National Constituent Assembly "Because we defend our rights. We support the rights of everybody. Vote for the Indigenous Authorities candidate" (Findji 1992). According to Findji (1992), the indigenous peoples' fights for rights have initiated a new way of doing politics:

In the cultural order that surrounded the shaping of Colombian society, rights for most people have been precarious, and public discourse about them has been quite limited. To listen to the indigenous peoples demanding their rights immediately suggests another cultural order –a long, collective memory with which most Colombians, a relatively new people of colonizers of unused public lands, were unfamiliar (125).

Indigenous peoples' movements began to participate in the process of building new forms of democracy through civil practices that expanded the idea of citizens' rights. Moreover, these movements created spaces for a new kind of social relationships and political actions. Furthermore, their fights have led to the definition of national political practices that propose to establish relations with the state based on conceptions of reciprocity. Thus, indigenous peoples also "used" their claims for rights as indigenous peoples to expand democracy within the nation-state.

Indigenous peoples become political actors whose agencies allow them to build civil practices that can transform the modern notion of nation-state. Indigenous peoples' movements demand not only democratic spaces but also redefinition of ideas of rights, equality and difference, individuality and collectivity, among other concepts. Thus, indigenous movements have found visibility and recognition that help them to redefine a dominant political culture.

Indigenous peoples' movements, as in other new social movements, have introduced not only new discussions related to rights (civil, social and cultural), citizenship and identities, but have also opened new arenas for political participation. Moreover, indigenous peoples' processes of constructing collective identities and rethinking civil practices have found support in national and transnational non-governmental organizations (NGO's) and in the different social actors of civil society. These different actors (indigenous movements, ONGs, social networks, governmental and non-governmental institutions, among others) have helped not only to consolidate indigenous peoples' identities but also to produce social changes in national institutions.

³ See Brysk 1994, 1996, 2000, Varese 1995, 1996, 1996a, 1996b, Urban Greg & Joel Sherzer 1991, Yashar 1996, 1998, 1998a, 1999, Van Cott 1994, 2000, Assies et al 1998, König et al 1998, Tilley 2002, Hale 2002, Warren 1998, Gros 1998, 2000, Avirama and Márquez 1994, Findji 1992, Bengoa 2000, Berraondo 1996, Nash 1997, 2001, Laurent 2001, Nelson 1999, Ramos 1998, Hodgson 2002, Conklin 2002, Ulloa 2001, 2003, Chaves 2001, Zambrano 2001, Archila and Pardo 2001, Vasco 2002, and Warren and Jackson 2002, among others).

⁴ Stavenhagen (1990) presents how the concept of peoples differs from the concept of ethnic minority because the later is related to ethnic migrant groups who have no ancestral sovereignty over the territory.

In Colombia, indigenous peoples, under the new national constitution, have to be recognized as different in order to become citizens with ethnic rights. Thus, they claim cultural differences based on language, law, life conceptions, development and particular relations to their environment. Therefore, indigenous peoples were recognized under ideas of “nation” (unique tradition, identity, law, language and collective territory) within the state. In this way, indigenous peoples have constructed themselves as a “collective identity.” Consequently, indigenous peoples have to become “traditional” in order to be included in the national arenas, in Gros’ (1998) words, “being different in order to be modern (the paradox of identity).”

This process, in Comaroff and Comaroff’s (1997) perspective, could be seen as a result of the indigenous movements’ agency. Following their definition, the indigenous movements’ agency, as a meaningful activity, brings consequences and articulates discourses of representation in the nation-state. In addition, the indigenous movements’ actions have contested the law through the means of the law by negotiating and relocating itself within the national Constitution (Lazarus-Black and Hirsch 1994). In this way, they “use” their collective identity as a performance strategy in order to establish relations with the state (Gros 1998, Bourdieu 1977).

It is a political strategy that allows them to manipulate their cultural and historical situation. In this way, “collective identity” becomes a historical construction that allows the indigenous movements to struggle for their political and practical interests within the national and international arenas. Consequently, these minorities have, in Gros’ terms, an “open ethnicity” that means new conceptions of the indigenous as flexible in order to deal with the contradictions of modernity and the nation-state. In terms of Bourdieu, this shift could be the beginning of transforming the ‘official strategies’.

Thus, we can say that the collective identity of indigenous peoples’ movements originated in the three sources proposed by Castells (1997). One is the way indigenous peoples were recognized as ethnic actors through a dominant state institution, the national constitution in which they were considered as indigenous peoples, which in Castells’ terms is a *legitimizing identity*. Another is how indigenous’ political struggles since the 70’s have helped to define their identity as a result of processes of resistance or *resistance identity*. Finally, since the new constitution, the new indigenous movements are building for themselves new identities (*project identity*) based on ethnic traditions and in relation to transnational discourses of ecology, cultural diversity, alternative development and human rights that are different from the national identity, which in Castells’ terms is a *project identity*. Therefore, indigenous movements as collective identities have a political space to propose and challenge the official system. Moreover, indigenous movements have “manipulated” the legal system by not only using it, but also redefining it. In this way, following Castells’ (1997) ideas of social movements, the indigenous movements’ actions transform “the values and institutions of society” (3).

“Ecological” Identities of Indigenous Peoples: Historical Process of Construction

Since the end of the 1970s, indigenous peoples’ political actions and processes of identity construction have been related to ecology, environmentalism and conservation (Conklin and Graham 1995, Varese 1996b, Ramos 1998, Brosius 1999, 2000, Bengoa 2000, Brysk 2000, Ulloa 2001, 2003, Conklin 1997, 2002). This identity is related to images and representations of stewardships of nature, eco-heroes, or *ecological natives* who protect the environment and bring some hope to the global environmental crisis.

In these new representations, indigenous peoples are recognized as keepers of ancestral knowledge that allows the continuity of biological diversity. This knowledge is seen as the product of a close and harmonious relationship with nature. However, this identity is also embedded in new stereotypes about ethnic groups and local communities. According to these representations, indigenous peoples are located in a paradise in the middle of the tropical rainforest. Such images of *ecological natives* are, most of the time, independent of indigenous peoples’ systems of knowledges because these stereotypes originate elsewhere. They come from the romantic ideas of the mass media, environmentalist rhetoric, and Western idealism regarding a lost paradise that emerges as a byproduct of its environmental concern.

Some anthropologists and historians have traced the relationship between indigenous peoples and the environment to examine if there was or was not a harmonious relationship between them previous to colonial encounters. These scholars claim that this harmonious relationship was possible before the conquest, but it was broken by the introduction of commercial circuits of fur, feathers, pets and meat. In order to explain these

transformations, there are different approaches: indigenous peoples were seduced by the new commodities, but they did not lose their worldview; indigenous peoples had a spiritual crisis because of the encounter so that their relationship with nature was affected; and finally, indigenous people have maintained their relationship with nature because it has been part of their resistance strategies throughout their historical process (Luca 2001, Varese 1996b).

Varese (1996b) points out that the relationships of indigenous peoples with their environment are a response to a complex and a historical process of interrelation between cultural and ecological practices. He states that these relationships are political strategies of resistance that are related to four domains: the management of the universe through an ecological ethic; economic relationships based on reciprocity; the constant process of hiding the biological knowledges that have allowed them to explore and maintain biological diversity; and finally, political flexibility and the plasticity of the discourses of indigenous peoples.

Environmental identity is an interplay of power relationships between different agents. It resembles the construction of ethnic identity that is immersed within relations of power between colonizers and colonized in which rebellion and resistance also appear (Bonfil Batalla 1981). "Ethnic consciousness," as Comaroff and Comaroff (1997) point out, "has its origins in encounters between peoples who signify their differences and inequalities –in power, economic position, political ambitions, and historical imaginings– by cultural means. Typically, it is the subordinate, not the dominant, who are first marked and named" (388). Even though collective identity is a result of a "dialectical encounter", it is also an historical process that can be changed because it is "everywhere a relation, nowhere a thing" (Comaroff and Comaroff 1997: 388). Identity is not a monolithic entity, and thus in their terms:

[T]he *content* of any ethnic identity is a product of complex, drawn out historical processes: being a heterogeneous, fluid ensemble of signs and practices, a living culture is forged not merely in conversations, but also in the minutiae of everyday action, in the inscription of linguistic forms and material relations, in the course of struggle, contestation, and creative self assertion. (1997: 389)

The relationship between the environmental and indigenous peoples' movements allowed the consolidation of ecological identities during the 1970s. Since then, there has been a "natural alliance" between the environment and indigenous peoples. This relation has been confirmed through the national and international conventions related to the environment. Such recognition is a more visible effect of the political struggles of indigenous peoples which show how the cultural and environmental politics of indigenous peoples articulate a holistic perspective in which identity, cultural practices and territory are all integrated.

In 1992, during the quincentennial of the discovery of America, indigenous peoples consolidated their political process, their claims for autonomy, and their rights to manage their natural resources and territories according to cultural practices and conceptions of nature that differ from Western or modern notions. The quincentennial thus gave global visibility to the relationship between indigenous peoples and environmental awareness. In this manner, the cultural politics and identity construction within indigenous peoples' movements have located their proposals within national and transnational projects. In short, indigenous peoples' movements are arguing for a rethinking of modern categories, including nature.

Identity construction, as a general idea, is related to self-differentiation. As Barth (1969) pointed out long ago, ascription and identification of actors to specific ethnic groups are at the center of ethnic identity. The idea of self-differentiation has been an important aspect of the process of identity construction within social movements. However, the idea of self-differentiation cannot be seen as a fixed category; it has to be seen as constructed in a relational process to identities that are historically conferred by others. Hall (1990), analyzing the African Diaspora, stresses that cultural identities and their transformations are in a dialogic relation with the past (continuity) and the present (discontinuity and rupture). Identity construction is a negotiation among history, power, culture and the specific locations in which it takes place. Similarly, according to Wade (1997), identity has to be analyzed in relation to class, sexuality, gender, race and religion.

In a similar way, Scott (1995) stresses the necessity of historicizing the question of identity. His "strategy...is to introduce an analysis of its production, and thus an analysis of constructions of and conflicts about power; it is also, of course, to call into question the autonomy and stability of any particular identity as it claims to define and interpret a subject's existence" (1995:8). Identities have to be analyzed as relational, rather

than as the emergence of historically categorical entities. Identities are a result of repeated processes of enunciation of difference. Moreover, she argues that we should treat identity as “the unstable, never-secured effect of processes of enunciation of cultural differences” (1995:11). Ethnic identity can thus be considered an historical construction that is at the same time conferred, assumed and challenged not only by ethnic groups but also by Western thought.

In spite of their diverse orientations to the problem of identity, identity construction is a result of self-differentiation (continuity) in relation and opposition to conferred identities within specific historical processes and relations of power/knowledge that imply negotiations and conflicts. Historical encounters between “self” and the “others” have helped to construct specific categorical identities about the “other” (antimodern, primitive, undeveloped, etc.) and about the dominant self (civilized, tolerant with difference, multicultural, etc.).

Nevertheless, these identities have also helped ethnic groups to reconstruct and invent differences as a strategy that challenges their own social locations. Construction of identity allows individuals to become political subjects whose agency can transform the notion of subject itself. Therefore, identity can be contested, transformed, reinterpreted or, maybe, abolished. Furthermore, collective identity has always gone beyond the collectivity to form itself. Thus, the construction of ethnic collective identity conforms to an interplay of multiple agents and situations that allows it to redefine itself constantly as a new social “entity”.

Indigenous peoples are in constant interrelation and negotiation with actual global environmental processes that reshape both local and transnational practices, discourses and identities. In this interrelation different actors (the state, multilateral institutions, transnational corporations, environmental non-governmental organizations, social movements, expert knowledge, local actors and researchers) are constructing new conceptions of nature and environment. Moreover, the cultural politics of the indigenous movements is constantly challenging and reshaping these interventions and their results.

Indigenous ecological identities are interrelated because of intricate links between the cultural politics of the indigenous movements and global environmental policies. Tradition (territoriality, historical memory and a quotidian sharing) and new political strategies (new forms of organizations and a fluid identity) are part of the mechanisms that ethnic groups use to have historical continuity and that consequently produce political implications. Ecological identities are also built, transformed and taken up by the indigenous groups themselves.

Far from any stable or unitary integrated holism presupposed by Western discourses of primitivism, these characteristics have allowed indigenous peoples to construct different political strategies that are articulated to ecological practices expressed in the protection and respect for their ethnic identity based on the ever-changing political relationships of culture and territory.

Conceptual Basis of the Indigenous Peoples' Demands

During the last two decades, indigenous peoples' declarations and demands at national and international levels have been structured around general concepts that are interrelated to governmental and nongovernmental institutions' policies. Indigenous peoples' environmental proposals are based on four principal conceptual axes that articulate them: the relationship of culture and territory, autonomy and self-determination, communal life plans for the future, and the right to food (alimentary security). These axes are interrelated and they are complementary.

The philosophical foundation that sustains these four axes is the notion of nature that establishes bonds among territory, culture, identity, knowledges and natural resources as an integral unity. Indigenous peoples' knowledges envision nature and societal relations as reciprocal. For indigenous cultures, non-human beings have social behaviors, and they are regulated by social rules. This is based on the idea of nature as a unity of humans and non-humans. Thus, the relations among humans and non-humans are in constant transformation and reciprocity.

These knowledges and relationships are based on complex and different conceptions of nature that don't respond to Western categories –although they have been in relationship of interdependence with them⁵. These categories and conceptions articulate indigenous peoples' knowledges with territory, identity and historical,

⁵ See for example: Descola and Pálsson 1996, Ulloa 2001a, 2002a, Milton 1996, Gragson & Blount 1999, Nazarea 1999, Grim 2001, Ellen & Katsuyoshi Fukui 1996, among others.

ethnic, social and cultural traditions. The indigenous systems presume that the relationships among humans and non-humans are dynamic processes.

In general, indigenous peoples believe that nature is a live entity with agency, which can give permission to access its fauna or flora. Mother Nature (Mother Earth) is a being with which every one can talk and maintain relationships of reciprocity. They rethink the modern Western notions of nature because in indigenous notions nature is not seen as an external entity, and so they do not have the modern Western dualism of nature and culture. Therefore, they declare that decisions about biological resources cannot dispense with their notion of unity of nature and people.

The conception of nature that underlines the relationship of indigenous peoples and their environment fits well within one of the general tendencies of the environmental movement called alternative holism or the biocentric paradigm. Indigenous peoples' conceptions of nature are in dialogue with diverse philosophic positions: anti-industrial romanticism, anti-modernism, spiritualism, social ecology, populism and ecofeminism, among others. In particular, indigenous peoples around the world are locating their conceptions, perceptions and practices about nature as alternatives to the current environmental problems. Non-western systems of knowledge, specifically indigenous knowledges, are considered alternatives to the intellectual assumptions that have led to the current environmental crisis. This conception of nature sustains indigenous peoples demands for territory, self-determination and autonomy (autonomy is also related to continuity with pre-Columbian peoples, especially its connection to Mother-Earth) and the right to control, plan and receive the benefits of their cultural knowledges and natural resources (life plans and alimentary security).

Transnational Relationship between Indigenous Peoples and Environmentalism

Indigenous peoples' demands related to collective concepts such as territory, political self-determination and autonomy allowed them to establish a clear connection between territory and environment. At the same time the discussions of the environmental movements during the 1970s and their proliferation in the 1980s allowed their integration with indigenous peoples' movements (Bengoa 2000.)

Indigenous peoples consider that encounters and coalitions with environmentalists have fostered initiatives that recognize and respect the rights and vital needs of indigenous peoples in conjunction with the need to preserve biological diversity. As a result, environmentalists and indigenous populations have built new perspectives (COICA 2001). The coalition between the indigenous and environmentalists can be productive, as the Coordinadora de las Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazónica (COICA) states:

These alliances have given indigenous peoples the possibility of a wider and more active participation in debates and discussions in the international and the United Nations agendas. Therefore, the various alliances are a valid and efficient alternative to globalized struggles, resistances and solidarities of indigenous peoples. Also, these alliances have helped to reaffirm technical and financial cooperation towards indigenous peoples. (COICA 2001:57)

Likewise environmentalists and conservationists benefit from the indigenous peoples' conceptual support. In countries such as Ecuador, Brazil, Mexico, Nicaragua and Colombia, indigenous people s and environmentalists have struggled against oil and lumber companies, development programs, hydroelectric and highway developments, and bioprospecting research. The consolidation of this coalition took place during the decade of 1990s.

A Short History of the Coalition in International Political Arenas

In 1971 the Man and the Biosphere (MAB) program of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization-UNESCO, began the promotion of scientific investigation and the gathering of information related to traditional knowledge about the use of the resources. Likewise, the close relationship of the local communities with conservation and sustainable use of natural resources was promoted. In 1972 the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage promoted the relationship between indigenous peoples and the environment. It began to integrate actions to protect cultural identities and conserve nature. This could be considered the first international and "official" approach that included the relationship between indigenous peoples and environmental concerns.

In 1980, The World Conservation Union-IUCN, through the World Conservation Strategy, highlighted the relationship between ethnic groups and the conservation of nature, ratifying a correlation between indigenous cultures' practices and the conservation of ecosystems of importance for biological diversity. Likewise, it stated that the management of protected areas should also promote economic development of the local residents, which opened a space for the links of conservation with humans. In a similar way, during the 1980s, due to the scientific concern related to the environmental crisis (global warming, deforestation, pollution, among others) environmentalists linked their concerns with indigenous peoples' demands for the recovery of their territories.

In 1990, in Iquitos (Peru) indigenous peoples and environmentalists wrote a declaration that stated that indigenous peoples and their territory are one. To destroy one is to destroy the other. "We hold that legal recognition and defense of the territorial rights of indigenous peoples is an essential component in the management and conservation of the Amazon" (Declaration of the Alliance 1990). Later, in 1993, in Washington "A Working Conference to Protect the Indigenous Rights" was held. Both of these historic meetings were inspired by COICA. COICA participants argued that the best defense of the Amazon Basin came through support of indigenous peoples' claims to territory and urged environmentalists to develop policies and strategies according to cultural practices.

This was the beginning of the coalition between indigenous peoples and representatives of COICA and U.S.- based environmental organizations that formed the Amazon Alliance for Indigenous and Traditional Peoples of the Amazon Basin. This alliance works to defend the territorial and the environmental rights of indigenous peoples and traditional peoples of the Amazon Basin around the following thematic axes: legislation and international agreements, economic strategies and plans for life according to cultural practices, environment and territories, and human rights.

The general coalition at the international organisms was ratified historically in 1991 when UNESCO carried out an indigenous meeting in Paris as a preparation of the World Summit. In 1992, in Santiago de Chile, the United Nations Technical Conference on Indigenous Peoples and the Environment established some basic principles that ratified the relationship between indigenous peoples and territory and the right to their self-determination.

In the 1980s and early 1990s, there was widespread optimism that the best way to protect the integrity of environment was to secure native lands rights, thereby keeping the control of environmental resources in the hands of Native peoples who has protected those resources for centuries. (Conklin 2002:1054)

Finally, in 1992, in Rio de Janeiro, the United Nations Conference on Environmental Development (UNCED) consolidated the union of indigenous peoples and environmental discourses, which is confirmed (although not completely in the terms proposed by indigenous peoples) in the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), in its articles 8j and 10c, and in the Agenda 21. From this moment the leaders of the whole world recognized openly that the indigenous knowledges are related to the protection and conservation of the environment. Indigenous peoples considered these events very important because, in them, indigenous peoples are recognized as environmentalists.

At that time, indigenous leaders established links with environmentalists, as in the case of Davi Kopenawa, a Yanomami shaman, Rapni, a Kayapó elder chief, and Payakan, a Kayapó leader, who participated in different environmental events that helped locate the indigenous peoples' environmental and territorial discourses within transnational ecopolitics (Conklin 1997).

The articulation of indigenous peoples and the environment ratified in Rio-1992, generated a series of initiatives like those of the Earth Council⁶ and the Fetzer Institute⁷ who carried out different meetings to reaffirm

⁶ The Earth Council is "an international non-governmental organization (NGO) that was created in September 1992 to promote and advance the implementation of the Earth Summit agreements. Three fundamental objectives have guided the work of the Earth Council since its inception: to promote awareness for the needed transition to more sustainable and equitable patterns of development, to encourage public participation in decision- making processes at all levels of government, and to build bridges of understanding and cooperation between important actors of civil society and governments worldwide." (http://www.itpcentre.org/madre_index.htm)

⁷ The Fetzer Institute is a non-profit research and educational organization dedicated to pursuing the implications of mind-body-spirit unity in a variety of arenas.

the bonds among the environment, spirituality and indigenous peoples' rights in a combined way. These institutions have carried out the project "Indigenous Peoples, Mother Earth and Spirituality" through consultations and meeting in Costa Rica (1996), Argentina (1998) and Honduras (1998). These meetings have generated declarations, official statements and processes that recognize the knowledge that indigenous peoples possess to manage natural resources in a sustainable way and with due respect for Mother Earth.

Likewise, through the coalitions between environmental NGOs and indigenous peoples' organizations, alliances have been built that allow common purposes between them. That is the case of the International Alliance of the Indigenous-Tribal Peoples of the Tropical Forests-IAIP (<http://iaip.gn.apc.org>) that was formed in 1992 in Malaysia with delegates of environmentalist NGOs that represent indigenous peoples and indigenous leaders. Their actions are centered in the rights of indigenous peoples of tropical forests related to the environment, natural resources and international law.

In 1993, the World Wildlife Fund-WWF and the IAIP made an agreement to produce a general policy related to conservation and indigenous peoples. This agreement recaptures the principles of the current Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People -UN recognizing territorial rights of indigenous peoples and the necessity of a free, prior and informed consent to develop any activity between NGOs and indigenous peoples. In a similar way, in 1996 the IUCN approved resolutions concerning indigenous peoples following the Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People -UN whereby IUCN recognizes the territorial and collective rights of indigenous peoples (COICA 2001).

The relationship of indigenous peoples and the environment has been ratified through different agreements, conventions, declarations and transnational arenas such as the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity (1996), the Ad Hoc Open-Ended Inter-sessional Working Group on Article 8 (j) and Related Provisions of the Convention on Biological Diversity (2000), the Ad-Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Access and Benefit-Sharing (2001), the International Forum of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities on Climate Change (2000), the Indigenous Peoples' International Summit on Sustainable Development, and the Johannesburg declaration, among others.

As a result, *transnational environmental indigenous peoples' movements*⁸ have been constructed. The philosophy that sustains this coalition is a discourse that presents a relationship between humans and non-humans in order and balance. "It has been constituted in a symbolic force, true or false it does not matter, about what was and what can be the system of life, in which natural orders, the order of the men (and women) with other men (and women) and the order of these with nature are restored" (Bengoa 2.000:75). Ecological identities have thus been constructed as and interplay of local, national and transnational as well as academic discourses.

Actions of *transnational environmental indigenous peoples' movements*, as in the case of indigenous peoples in Colombia, could be seen as powerful and victorious; a triumphal movement that in the last decade has changed global and national environmental law, and transnational nongovernmental and governmental institutions, by introducing demands for the recognition of indigenous peoples' collective rights in the national and international arenas.

However, transnational institutions and movements have had contradictory effects in national and local settings because they have specific ideas of *ecological natives* and specific ideas of leaders that are not always representative of indigenous communities but fit within transnational expectations of an *ecological native* because of his/her dress or discourse. As Tilley (2002) states in relation to Transnational Indigenous Peoples Movements (TIPM), "each institution assumes its own incontestable authority, as a morally-driven actor, to arbitrate that discourse's tenets" (553).

These transnational movements construct the idea of qualities, needs and actions that indigenous peoples have to have to resolve their problems. Tilley states "TIPM concepts, as deployed locally, manifested as a newly hegemonic discourse of indigeneity" (Tilley 2002: 553). As she shows in the case of Salvadorean indigenous peoples, when local organizations or movements do not fit in with the transnational standards, the results are

⁸ I borrow and modify the term of Tilley (2002) of Transnational Indigenous Peoples Movements (TIPM) that is defined as a "global network of native peoples' movements and representatives –and of sympathetic institutions, non governmental organizations (NGOs) and scholars- which, through decades of international conferences, have formulated certain framing norms for indigenous politics now expressed in several international legal instruments" (Tilley 2002:526).

contradictions among or negations of local indigenous identities or, at worst, indigenous peoples who do not fit with the transnational model are considered non-indigenous.

Transnational environmental movements and NGOs have an idea of indigenous peoples and their practices that are described as a total interrelation between nature and culture. In this way they are affirming the Western dual conception of nature and culture. In this view, indigenous peoples' societies are external natural entities in which everything is interrelated without control, while Western societies are "rational" cultures governed by domains separate from nature.

Accepting these images implies that local organizations should shape their proposal, projects and requests for financial support within this model. These ideas are framed by the environmental discourse that introduces indigenous peoples into planning and the elaboration of management programs of natural resources. For example, the international discourse of Unesco related to culture heritage and biodiversity links indigenous peoples to ideals of traditional and ecological standards. In the international arenas indigenous peoples are defined as unique and defined by "cultural autonomy, homogeneity and rigidity (visually inscribed in dress and other practices)" (Tilley 2002: 553).

Transnational environmental indigenous peoples' movements have helped to create a multiple bureaucracy to coordinate indigenous peoples' work under standards types of organization. Organized movements receive more financial support the more they can be portrayed as "traditional" and "ecological." Such ideas reaffirm and essentialize images of indigenous peoples.

However, just as the environmental discourses have diverse meanings, coalitions of indigenous peoples and environmentalists also present multiple versions with diverse implications for one another. Inside these coalitions, there are relationships among environmentalists and indigenous peoples that address these diverse interests, from protecting biodiversity and indigenous territories to promoting eco-tourism, ethno-tourism and bioprospecting actions in their territories.

Although there are specific successful alliances between indigenous peoples and environmentalists, there is a conceptual divergence between them related to the environmental crisis. According to COICA (2001), indigenous peoples highlight the following causes of the environmental crisis: the modern social structure, the dominion over nature as a result of the idea of man's dominion over women, and, finally, the hegemonic market-economy and development model. This conceptual difference is reflected in strategies and actions that the indigenous propose as means to address the environmental crisis.

For indigenous peoples conservation necessarily goes with the recognition of our territorial rights, the protection of our cultural and intellectual patrimony, the harmonic use of natural resources that allow the survival of our cultures, and the overcoming of our situation of being dominated by others. (COICA 2001: 192)

Nonetheless, within these transnational environmental and indigenous movements indigenous peoples have located their demands and positions. They are thus recognized as *ecological natives* by national and international institutions that allow them to be important agents within transnational eco-politics. Both transnational institutions and indigenous peoples' discourses thus interrelate and feed each other.

The Power of Ecological Identities: Alternative Ways of Acting and Thinking within a Global locality

Indigenous peoples' struggles related to the environment and their construction of ecological identities have been important political strategies that have appealed to transnational actors by establishing bonds, coalitions and networks (from financial help to political and conceptual support) that give them more political power within nation-states. These multiple, dynamic identities and loyalties (conservationist, NGO, indigenous nations, etc.) locate indigenous peoples' movements within a new dimension of citizenship within the nation-state as new agents in transnational eco-politics.

Indigenous peoples had found in Western *ecological native* representations and environmental policies an arena for better recognition within national and transnational environmental discourses. They also consider such representations as opportunities to consolidate their historical struggles to defend and recover their territories and as a way to become autonomous and to have their own life plans. Despite all the implications of the *ecological native* representations, indigenous peoples' movements and their various national and transnational

bonds and relationships (notions of territory, indigenous' rights, women's rights and ecological rights) are also transforming ideas of identities and loyalties, not only within the nation-state, but also in transnational arenas and among non-indigenous. Indigenous peoples' actions and identities and their interrelation with different social actors have socio-economic and political implications for all of these actors according to their specific social circumstances.

A multiform dimension of territory, social networks and political relations that transcend national borders constructs what I call a *transnational indigenous peoples' virtual ecological community* based on indigenous peoples movements' cultural and environmental politics. This community is opening a political arena that is changing the social reality in Colombia, promoting alternative ecological conceptions, and having national and international effects. Ecological identities have enabled indigenous peoples to transform environmental disciplinary mechanisms (an eco-governmentality and its practices, discourses and representations) into tactics of resistance.

Access to International Regimes and Strengthening Global Civil Society

Indigenous peoples' movements are constructing alliances with scholars, transnational indigenous peoples' movements and with ecological organizations, among others, that allow them to claim "new rights" and build ties with environmental networks and academic communities in local and transnational settings. Furthermore, these alliances have helped to locate this ethnic identity in national and international contexts.

Although these alliances with environmental organizations can cause contradictions and disagreements, transnational environmental organizations have helped to locate indigenous movements in international arenas as *ecological natives*, and this identity has provided a strategy for the defense of their territories and natural resources. Indigenous peoples and their transnational political links have helped to form a global civil society that, at the same time, has impacted local civil society by expanding rights, mediating between local and state relationships, empowering local social movements and achieving non-state authority. The interests, ideas, conceptions, practices and identities of all these actors mediate these links. In fact, transnational actors such as human rights organizations constitute ties with them to denounce torture and discrimination. These coalitions thus affect and transform local/global situations (Brysk 2000, Wapner 1995).

In Latin America, democratic social movements emerged at the same time as nongovernmental and grassroots organizations that have had important roles in the transformation of political arenas and discourses. The emergence of NGOs and grassroots organizations was a response to authoritarian regimes and the economic crisis of Latin America. The spread of these organizations allowed NGOs to begin to replace state functions (Pardo 1997). Environmental NGOs have been powerful actors in the reconfiguration of "Third World" environmental politics. There are different type of ENGOS (from first world-based to third world-based) and environmental interests (from preservation to livelihood issues). ENGOS have become influential actors that have challenged national and transnational borders. In the same way, ENGOS have influenced transnational corporations, local and global policies, as well as patterns of consumption of average citizens around the world. ENGOS have thus established links between the local and the international political contexts (Princen 1994, Sethi 1993, and Wapner 1994, 1995).

However, at the same time, ENGOS have helped to implement sustainable development programs without consideration of local conceptions of nature or development. Therefore, it is important to mark the differences among ENGOS because a generalization of their importance prevents us from seeing contradictions among them and their particular interests. ENGOS are also part of governmental institutions, nongovernmental organizations and local grassroots that erase boundaries among local, regional, national and transnational relationships.

There are also other actors such as researchers (local or not) who influence processes of decision-making about the environment by discussion of their scientific aspects. These actors form what are called "epistemic communities" (Haas 1989, 1992) because they share beliefs and political actions, in this case, in relation to environmental changes. Researchers in natural, social or technical sciences produce "expert knowledge" that is legitimate within academic and political discourses. Thus, their recommendations and descriptions have been important for states, NGOs and grassroots policies. In fact, some grassroots organizations have won different environmental claims by using "scientific expert knowledges." Thus, the role of experts has been essential. For these reasons, these actors are an important part of the environmental puzzle.

The coalitions between indigenous peoples and NGOs have allowed the international diffusion of indigenous peoples' claims for self-determination. At the same time, human's rights, legal and peace commissions have played an important role in the consolidation of indigenous peoples' rights. In Latin America, the Catholic Church has also been an important actor that has supported and formed indigenous organizations.

According to Brysk (1993), these international regimes can make "a variety of contributions to social change". Also, she argues that these international regimes show that "social movements that lack conventional power can turn their weakness into strength by projecting cognitive and affective information to form international alliances" (261). In this way, she argues that coalitions between sub-national and transnational actors can not only transform the state, but also give "information and legitimacy as a source of countervailing power in this process" (281).

Construction of Transnational Pan-ethnic Networks and Communities

Indigenous peoples have established relations with ethnic communities and indigenous nations around the world that transcend national boundaries in order to reaffirm a pan-indigenous identity (Brysk 2000, Castells 1997, Bonfil Batalla 1981). The coordination of these networks has been possible due to the transnational support for indigenous peoples who face similar environmental and cultural problems. These networks use the new communication technologies that allow them fast interaction with and access to support from indigenous peoples from different parts of the world. Most indigenous peoples' grassroots organizations have a webpage and they have links with other organizations, and in this way they are conforming a virtual indigenous network⁹.

Examples of these indigenous transnational networks are *Natiweb*, whose objectives are to protect the Mother Earth and to defend indigenous peoples' rights around the world, and *Indigenous Environmental Network-IEN* that promotes the protection of Mother Earth from contamination and pollution by strengthening, maintaining and respecting traditional techniques and "natural law." These two networks articulate the relationships among different indigenous peoples and their relationships with the environment.

These indigenous peoples' national and transnational networks that work for indigenous peoples' rights have intensified since the 1990s due to the technical and conceptual support of governmental and nongovernmental organizations and the efforts of the indigenous peoples own organizations. In the Latin America context, COICA has been an important network that has helped to locate indigenous peoples' demands in the international political arena.

Consolidation of Transnational and National Arenas for Discussing Indigenous Peoples' Issues

Indigenous peoples demands for participation have been basic and constant in all the indigenous' peoples declarations, and they began to be concretized after the Earth Summit in Rio (1992). The articulations among indigenous peoples' demands and the United Nations' policies have created different international arenas for discussing indigenous peoples' problems. In this way, indigenous peoples have consolidated their participation in some political arenas such as: International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity (1996), The Ad Hoc Open-Ended Inter-sessional Working Group on Article 8 (j) and Related Provisions of the Convention on Biological Diversity (2000), Ad-Hoc Open-ended Working Group on Access and Benefit-Sharing (2001), International Forum of Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities on Climate Change (2000), Indigenous Peoples' International Summit on Sustainable Development, Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (July 28/2000), Working Group on the Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Advisory Group of the UN Voluntary Fund for the International Decade of the World's Indigenous Peoples, and the Working Group to prepare the Draft American Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, among others.

Influencing and Changing Environmental Discourses and Conceptions of Nature and Re-defining Management Strategies

Indigenous peoples' conceptions of nature have influenced global environmental discourse by offering to national and transnational ENGOs conceptual tools to produce new relationships between society and the environment. In the same way, they have contributed to the redefinition of the strategies of natural conservation of those organizations. The emergence of environmental awareness confronts modern conceptions of nature and allows the emergence of other conceptions and meanings. This change has had to do with developments in the natural

⁹ A list of Indigenous Organizations collected over the years by the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) in Geneva is now available on its website <http://www.unhcr.ch/indigenous/indlist.htm>.

and social sciences and with the articulation of environmental and indigenous peoples' discourses. These changes have helped to rethink the modern frontiers between nature and culture, and to outline a new notion of nature as multiple and culturally constructed.

Among all these reconsiderations of the modern conceptions of nature, indigenous peoples have been important in bringing into the social sciences and the modern thought in general new conceptions in which distinctions of nature and culture are inapplicable. Indigenous peoples' worldviews and conceptions have thus promoted visions of nature and humanity as interrelated.

The more immediate effects of the recognition of alternative visions of nature have to do with the possibility of generating management strategies according to alternative cultural practices. In this way, Western environmentalist strategies such as protected areas, national parks without people or scientific preservation, among others, have been questioned by new alternatives that arise from the local practices. In this way, the non-western systems of knowledge, especially indigenous knowledges are considered as an alternative to the environmental crisis.

Redefinition of Strategies of Management of Natural Resources

Indigenous peoples have discussed and confronted Western management strategies by proposing a new perspective on management of natural resources according to their cultural practices but guarantee the alimentary and territorial security of indigenous peoples. In this way, they want to share their knowledges to contribute to the solution of the conservation of natural resources in the world.

J. Benerian-Surkin (2000) describes how in Bolivia the High and Low Izozog organization (CABI) and their alliances with environmental movements have allowed wider political arenas for the natives and the power they need to follow decentralized strategies of sustainable developments for the Izoceño-Guaraníes communities.

Environmentalists and governmental programs began processes of redefinition of management strategies with local people's participation to protect the biodiversity. These actions responded to diverse interests and political agendas that promote: local participation so that the indigenous are agents of their own development and conservation programs; empowerment of local people so that they confront the local, national and transnational powers; and recognition of the rights, the knowledge and the culture of the local residents. However, indigenous peoples consider as a high-priority for generating conservation strategies the recognition of self-determination and territorial rights, and the location of the discussion of management natural resources in a political arena rather than an ecological one.

Counter-hegemonic Globalizations

Santos (1998) considers that indigenous peoples' demands for collective rights of self-determination allow alternative forms of law and justice and new regimen of citizenship that could be considered parts of a counter-hegemonic globalization. In fact, indigenous peoples' collective rights to self-determination go beyond the state toward local-transnational bonds. Their view of rights questions the notion of sovereignty of the state by demanding a new kind of sovereignty based on a sharing and polyphonic multiculturalism. Finally, indigenous peoples' self-determination implies a communitarian life, but one linked to transnational processes.

For Santos (1998) cosmopolitanism and the common heritage of humankind are globalizations from below or counter-hegemonic globalizations. These are expressions of resistances from, for example, grassroots, indigenous movements and local organizations that "try to counteract social exclusion, opening up arenas for democratic participation, for community building, for alternatives to dominant forms of development and knowledge, in sum, for social inclusion" (1998: 58). These two globalizations are unknown by the hegemonic globalizations. However, counter-hegemonic globalizations allow participatory democracy, alternative production systems, emancipatory multiculturalism, justices and citizenships that can strengthen civil society.

In a similar way, Leff (2002) states that the logic based on neoliberal economic values has generated a socio-environmental degradation. There is "emerging a politics of the place, space and time (Leff, 2001c) mobilized by the peoples' new rights to cultural identity (CNDH, 1999; Sandoval y García, 1999), legitimizing more plural and democratic rules of social interaction." Under this perspective, indigenous peoples and their interrelation with their territories have been promoting processes of interrelation with and control of nature that give rise to options that differ from those of economic globalization.

A new politics of place and difference has been built from the sense of the time in the current struggles for identity, autonomy and territory. What underlies the clamor for the recognition of survival, cultural

diversity and quality of life's rights of the peoples, is the politics of being; it is a politics of becoming and transforming that valorizes the meaning of the utopia like each individual and community right to forge their own future. (Leff 2002:13)

Indigenous Peoples' Environmental Politics, New Recognition?

Indigenous peoples' movements have consolidated new ways of doing politics and have located their knowledges as an alternative for managing natural resources. However, since the colonial period, we know that equality did not arise from the recognition of difference. Indigenous peoples are still without clear access to social rights. In the same way, indigenous peoples are still displaced from their territories because of violence, drug traffickers and guerrillas. In addition, indigenous leaders have been persecuted violently by large landowners (Avirama and Márquez 1994). Furthermore, there are many internal divisions within indigenous organizations that have led to political competition for national and international financial resources. Thus, indigenous movements are still fighting for more participation in political affairs, as well as making proposals related to social, environmental and economic development.

Nevertheless, the new political context in Colombia, allows the cultural politics of the indigenous peoples' movements to open spaces for locating cultural differences and rights within the national political arena. This is a new process in Colombia because for the first time the indigenous peoples are in a political position that allows them to have political, civil, social and cultural rights. In this way, indigenous peoples are enjoying formal citizenship, and they are opening arenas for the recognition and implementation of their substantive citizenship. At the same time, there is a national and international recognition of indigenous peoples' practices and knowledges. Moreover, in Colombia, indigenous peoples have rights over their territories and natural resources that allow them to propose alternative developments based on their practices.

According to the situations described above, it seems that indigenous peoples have particular historical circumstances for locating themselves as powerful political actors within the global eco-political arena. Their recognition has required a shift in modern conceptions of democracy, which allows the consideration of indigenous rights and the recognition of their difference and, by extension, their notions about nature.

In the last decades, some states have recognized multiculturalism or special rights for different ethnic groups. It seems that multiculturalism and the recognition of difference can be seen as a result of collective identitarian actions. However, some scholars consider that multiculturalism is not a new element in the process of constructing nationalism. They argue that diversity has been part of the idea of nation at different historical moments (Wade, 1997, Bhabha 1994).

Bhabha (1994) describes how different narratives can coexist within the nation. "The people are not simply historical events or parts of a patriotic body politic. They are also a complex rhetorical strategy of social reference: their claim to be representative provokes a crisis within the process of signification and discursive address" (145). Moreover, minorities and their political struggles and resistance to the unique ideal of nation have always been part of the complexity of the nation, and, at the same time, they are necessary for the constitution of the nation. In this way, the modern nation not only constrains diversity but also produces it.

According to Collier, Maurer and Suarez-Navaz (1995), this recognition of difference is part of the "bourgeois law," which "has the major role in producing such differences." They consider that "bourgeois law" produces difference in two ways. "First, by declaring everyone equal before the law, it constructs a realm outside of law where inequality flourishes. The ideal of equal treatment before the law not only makes it difficult for law to address, and thus to redress, the differences in power and privilege that law defines as occurring outside of or before it, but legal processes actually enforce and confirm inequalities among people in the processes. Second, bourgeois law demands difference even as it disclaims it, both soliciting expressions of difference and enforcing the right of people to express their differences even as law requires people to stress their similarities in order to enjoy equality" (2).

Other scholars consider that the inclusion of minorities is only a new way of controlling these minorities that could not otherwise be integrated into the nation-state. Consequently, they consider that these changes seem to continue the unique vision of liberal law. Wade (1997) notes that strategies of recognition "often seem to obey motives of political control, and this indicates that these new trends are still subject to the play of power and resources" (1997:105).

According to Hernandez and Ortiz (1994), when the legal system recognizes the indigenous, it does so because of political struggles of indigenous movements and because, in this way, it creates new forms of control. Other scholars consider that when the state is defined as multicultural and multiethnic, the state could be considered as “part of an increasingly global discourse of cultural identities and the particular position of the nation-state in the larger political economy of such discourse” (Motzafi-Haller 1995).

Gros (1998:32), analyzing Colombia, claims that the state constructs different identities because it “needs ethnic actors, well-defined, recognized and legitimate, in order to negotiate its own intervention.” Thus, the state creates not only a general idea of “collective identity” –the other as indigenous– but also identities under this collective unit. Moreover, the state gives them the basic conditions for their organization (legal recognition, economic resources, just to name a few) in order to “mediate with all its power but with a new language, to pervade the communities with its rationality and instrumental modernity.”

Hale (2002) states that the recognition of multiculturalism is also related to neoliberal policies that embrace the rights of recognition. “The state does not merely ‘recognize’ community, civil society, indigenous culture and the like, but actively, re-constitutes them in its own image, sheering them of radical excess, inciting them to do the work of subject-formation that otherwise would fall to the state itself” (496)

Other scholars (Nelson 1999, Hernandez and Ortiz 1994, Sierra 1990) note that indigenous rights and the conformation of pan-indigenous identity have also generated conflicts within indigenous and peasant communities. Ortiz and Hernandez (1996) point out how, in Mexico, indigenous and mestizo women have contested generic notions of indigenous rights because these pan-ethnic identities do not consider, for example, particular conceptions and situations of women within indigenous communities. In a similar way, indigenous women criticize ethnic cultural revivals that give indigenous traditions a status of purity by questioning inequalities that mark women’s daily lives.

Edelman (2001) calls attention to the problems of identity-based mobilizations, noting that they constitute opportunities to gain political participation while, at the same time, they also pose risks of political fragmentation for emerging social groups. He states “claims of difference can fortify demands for new rights, but they can imply an abdication of rights as well” (299). Finally, Edelman following Klein (1999:115), calls attention to the effects of identity related to corporate marketing and states “‘diversity’ is now ‘the mantra of global capital,’ used to absorb identity imagery for all kinds in order to peddle ‘mono-multiculturalism’ across myriad differentiated markets” (300).

Within the social-movements theories there is also the recognition of the indigenous peoples’ autonomy as one of the successes of indigenous movements and their particular identities, and some scholars consider that this recognitions is new. However as Colchester states:

Some of the jurisprudence that underpins the contemporary recognition of indigenous peoples is as old as the history of conquest. Conquering powers since the Romans have recognized that native peoples should enjoy some measure of self-governance and their rights to exercise their customary laws. Policies of ‘indirect rule’ were also widely favoured by the British and Dutch in their colonies. It seems likely that such policies were adopted not so much out of respect for cultural differences, but rather as the least contentious and cheapest way of maintaining imperial control [...]. Nonetheless colonial laws, to a surprising extent, affirmed the principles that native peoples have the right to apply customary law and represent themselves through their own institutions. In the 18th and 19th centuries, the colonial powers did not hesitate to deal with native peoples as ‘nations’ and to sign treaties with them –often with the aim of cheating them out their sovereignty and lands, is true. But these legal precedents have provided the basis for the emergence of new jurisprudence which establishes current notions of ‘aboriginal rights’ and doctrines of legal pluralism (Colchester 2002:2).

In the last decades, the indigenous peoples’ identity construction process has been related to ecological ideas. Indigenous peoples have established a dialogue with national and transnational discourses about environmental changes. These processes are related to the rise of environmental awareness of the differing ecological practices around the world. In the same way, the indigenous peoples’ practices, conceptions and knowledges about humans and nonhuman and nature and non-nature relationships have influenced national and international environmental NGOs.

At the same time, these NGOs have helped to recognize the indigenous peoples' conceptions about nature. In this way, an ecological identity has been conferred on indigenous peoples who, at the same time, have constructed this identity by reaffirming their practices and conceptions related to nature.

However, critical analyses have to be done in order to consider the different actors that are involved in these changes, not only as a consequence of indigenous peoples' struggles, but also in the context of global environmental policies.

Final Remarks: Indigenous Peoples within Eco-governmentality?

Instead of proffering conclusions, this part presents some final thoughts about the contradictions, paradoxes, and implications of the relationship between indigenous peoples and environmentalism. These processes are in constant transformation and it is difficult to say if there are winners or losers. However, I want to highlight some specific points concerning the introduction of indigenous peoples into new eco-economic circuits. These points have to be considered in order to rethink triumphalist analyses of indigenous peoples' movements. However, of course, these processes are open ended and there is no final answer. They can be used or transformed by indigenous peoples, or they can be used to exploit indigenous peoples' natural resources.

I agree that indigenous peoples' current political actions are the result of their empowerment through social movements, and that their political actions have to be understood in terms of their own agency. Indigenous peoples' struggles related to their identities have been important strategies that have appealed to transnational agents by establishing bonds, coalitions and networks that give indigenous people more political power within nation-states. These multiple, dynamic, identities and loyalties (between environmentalists, NGOs, human-rights organizations, indigenous nations, etc.) locate indigenous peoples' movements within a new dimension of citizenship within the nation-state.

Indigenous peoples movements can be seen as victorious in having positioned their ecological identities in national and transnational environmental discourses and within global eco-politics. Indigenous peoples have found in Western *ecological native* representations and environmental policies a arena for better recognition within national and transnational environmental discourses. They also consider these as opportunities to consolidate their historical struggles for defending and recovering their territories and as a way of being autonomous and making their own life plans. The relationship of indigenous peoples and environmentalism also enables indigenous peoples to construct ecological identities and transform ecological representations about themselves. These representations have been an important political strategy for indigenous and environmental movements insofar as the documents and positions they formulate related to environmental concerns go beyond Western environmental discourses and consolidate their own worldview. They create the possibility of contesting, challenging or transforming western approaches to environmental problems and solutions.

However, the processes of economic globalization that affect biodiversity mean that the relationship between indigenous peoples and environmentalism has to be analyzed according to new relationships of power/knowledge due to the globalization of the environmental strategies designed to "protect" nature and promote eco-governmentality. However, within the new Western version of the environmental regime, or eco-governmentality, neoliberal policies are reaffirmed because indigenous peoples need to be free and autonomous to negotiate their territories, resources and knowledges that now are seen as useful to environmental markets.

The construction of indigenous peoples' ecological identities (which portrays them as *ecological natives*) promotes new ideas related to territory and autonomy, genetic resources and environmental rights. These new relationships are linked to economic processes that have generated a new conceptualization of nature as a human heritage and as an eco-commodity, but which implies various contradictions (table 1).

Contradictions within Eco-governmentality

There are some important points that I want to address regarding the actual social, economical, political and cultural situations that confront indigenous peoples, in general, and indigenous peoples of the SNSM, in particular. The emergence of an eco-governmentality related to global environmental policies, and the recognition of multiculturalism imply new situations and contradictions of which three are pertinent in the present context: the relationship between national sovereignty and indigenous self-determination; the emergence of new conceptions of nature; and the separation between indigenous peoples' rights and environmental rights (table 1).

National Sovereignty Versus Indigenous Peoples' Self-determination

One of the contradictions is that the new international environmental policies reinforce the idea of individual property rights in natural resources while also recognizing the collective autonomy of indigenous peoples. The recognition of biodiversity as a new commodity that can be measured, accounted and bought creates new political, economic and cultural situations for indigenous peoples. These situations have allowed indigenous peoples' presence in international arenas because they have territories with biodiversity, and they imply that if indigenous peoples have the rights over their resources, they can manage their territories in a sovereign way and sell them to the best consumer.

The Search for New Raw Materials and Genetic Resources

Biodiversity, however, is geographically located basically in "third-world" countries, therefore "third-world" countries claim their sovereignty over their territories and natural resources, so transnational corporations have to deal with the nation-state rather than indigenous peoples. In the end, because of natural resources, "third world" nation-states are reinforcing their idea of national territory and sovereignty to resist neoliberal transnational policies. Even though they often implement policies that break the model of nation-state unity by reinforcing decentralization and transnational participation at the local levels, as in the case of indigenous peoples, they also have to resist those policies, otherwise they lose their sovereignty over biodiversity.

This interplay between the international and national policies of multiculturalism and environmental policies that recognizes indigenous peoples' rights and a global environmental law based on property rights designed to protect biodiversity affects the idea of national sovereignty over natural resources. National laws recognize the idea of multiculturalism and indigenous peoples' rights to decide the management of natural resources in their territories, which means that those peoples can deal directly with transnational corporations and erase the state's power in those negotiations. At the same time, indigenous peoples have been empowered to negotiate with transnational corporations regarding their natural resources as nation-states, which contradicts neoliberal policies of the reduction of states' power by creating (recognizing) multiple micro nation-states with power at a micro scale.

The state thus continues to refuse indigenous peoples' rights of autonomy and territorial control; for if the state allowed self-determination in the territories, it would imply the loss of state sovereignty over natural resources and the environment. As Escobar points out (1999), the indigenous communities are being recognized as owners of their territories, but only to the extent that they function like "environmental capital" useful for development purposes. In a similar way, the Working Group on the Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples is still discussing the implication of the indigenous peoples' right of self-determination.

The situation of indigenous peoples shows these contradictions also. Indigenous peoples have not been able to consolidate their autonomy and self-determination demands over their territories and resources because of the interrelation processes with national and global policies that affect their territories and resources and call for the introduction of indigenous peoples' territories within the international circuits of eco-commodities. In this context, the nation-state demands sovereignty over natural resources, though it has recognized in the national constitution indigenous peoples' autonomy.

Indigenous peoples have the right to control their resources instead of that control being mediated by the state. However, some environmentalists consider that under state policies it could be easier to enforce environmental policies. On the contrary, other people consider that local governments are corrupt, so there is a need for global environmental law. Thus, they believe that is better to have transnational corporations ruling the local.

The new economic valuation processes involving biological diversity have generated many expectations regarding indigenous people' territories because of their great biodiversity. Consequently, there is a search for new raw materials and genetic resources throughout their lands.

Table 1. Some Contradictions within Eco-governmentality

TOPIC	CONTRADICTIONS	EFFECTS FOR INDIGENOUS PEOPLES
❖ Conceptions of Territory and Sovereignty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ National territory ▲ Indigenous peoples' territories ✓ National Property and intellectual property rights ▲ Indigenous peoples' collective property rights 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> → The state is sovereign over its territory and resources, so its has to deny indigenous peoples' rights previously recognized → Indigenous peoples' rights of self-determination allow a direct negotiation with transnational corporations → Genetic resources are national, so indigenous peoples can not negotiate their resources → Indigenous peoples have collective property rights so they can sell their resources without the state's control
❖ Conceptions of Nature	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Cultural construct ▲ Natural thing ✓ Preservation of nature ▲ Selling nature ✓ Ecological Knowledges and traditions to recover ▲ Ecological Knowledges and traditions to fix the other 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> → Indigenous peoples are the owners of their resources, so they can sell them → Indigenous peoples are not the owners of their natural resources, so they are a global heritage → Indigenous peoples' territories are biological empty spaces → Indigenous people's territories are introduced within eco-economic circuits → Indigenous peoples' knowledges related to environmental practices are reconstructed and reinvented → Ideal images of noble savage are imposed
❖ Separation of Indigenous Peoples and Environmental Rights	<p>Indigenous Peoples' Rights:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ They are not implemented by all the states, and they are not recognized in all their extension <p>Environmental Rights:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▲ Environmental rights are based on modern notions of nature ▲ Environmental rights are not recognized 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> → Indigenous peoples are not fully recognized as <i>peoples</i> → Indigenous peoples' territories are affected because their resources are now a global heritage → Environmental strategies are implemented to fix development impacts

Likewise, these are territories with unprospected oil and mineral reserves, because for a long time they were outside of modern economic concerns due to their previous unimportance to state centralism and visions of national territory and their distance from national internal frontiers. These factors left these regions at the margins of modernization. Now, these same factors have repositioned these territories within the national and global context as new unexploited sources of raw material and genetic resources.

Indigenous peoples seem to have autonomy and rights over their resources, which means that access to genetic resources and their ownership have to be established under the new legal and institutional negotiation parameters of biodiversity frameworks. However, the access to these resources cannot be direct since the state has national sovereignty over these genetic resources, and a unique transnational regulation model has been developed within the international arena that includes: the ILO Convention 169, the CDB Agreement (8j and 10c) and the Andean Decision 391 of 1996.

This context has several implications for indigenous peoples' territories that affect their territoriality, governability, autonomy, self-determination and legal systems. At the same time, it affects cultural value systems related to "nature," which has multiple representations and dimensions that are not necessarily related to biological and genetic considerations. In general these conflicting agencies have generated discussions about access to genetic resources, intellectual property rights and indigenous knowledges.

In Colombia, the current discussion about this theme revolves around the CBD (8j and 10c) and the Andean Decision 391, specifically Articles 7, 8 temporary and 9 temporary. However, Decision 391 has problems since it has not been implemented or regulated. It has gaps and contradictions, and needs a political action framework that provides guarantees to indigenous peoples' rights, culture, territory, and knowledges. Also, there has not been any previous consultation or dissemination of the topic within indigenous peoples' communities. Moreover, the legal context of the CNC-91 and the ILO 169 has not been recognized. There is no a national consultation to involve ethnic groups and local communities to discuss this theme. Therefore there is a conflict of interests between the national state and indigenous peoples.

New Notions of Nature

The emergence of environmental awareness has generated new concerns about the relationship between humans and nonhumans, as well as new concerns related to the best way to use natural resources (sustainable development). Environmental discourses employ various notions of nature. The monistic notion promotes environmental discourses that seek human unity and interrelation with nature, while a notion of nature as separated from society promotes new notions of biodiversity and sustainable development. The emergence of the idea of biodiversity has also generated the notion of genetic resources. This notion participates in two conceptions of environmental discourses: as a "natural thing" and as a "constructed thing."

These two conceptions seem to be contradictory and different but they have similar implications for indigenous peoples. If genetic resources are "natural things" belonging to humanity, then indigenous peoples have to share these natural resources. If genetic resources are socially constructed as belonging to local people, then indigenous peoples can sell their resources as a commodity. The recognition of indigenous peoples' rights is not only an alternative system for managing resources in a more productive way, but also a system for reinforcing indigenous "traditions" (from the Western point of view), and making inventories and collections that resemble colonial processes.

The Preservation of Nature Versus Selling Nature

The protection of nature and the search for ways to use it without causing deterioration have become global priorities. Areas considered better conserved and with more biodiversity are thus perceived as global heritage sites. Actions of different global agents have focused on the idea of conservation, as it is a concern for all humans. However, one fundamental problem is that in these areas live different indigenous peoples that, according to the global view, possess knowledges that can save humanity from global environmental destruction because they have developed during millennia the ability to maintain environment equilibrium in these last natural reservations.

However, this global need for conservation and natural balance principally expressed in developed industrial countries makes it evident that the destruction imposed by the markets of developed countries has

surpassed all the limits of natural balance. For this reason, the idea to conserve these areas while exploiting nature in a sustainable way has become a new paradigm (and paradox). The Western solution has been to outline political strategies based on sustainable development, however these strategies generate conflicts with local populations and at the same time motivate the formation of new social dynamics such as the creation of ecological identities, and the emergence of new agents with power within the global context, such as environmentalists and NGOs, among others, which control environmental practices.

Some scholars (Varese 1996a, Grunberg 1995, Arvelo-Jimenez 1995, Conklin 2002) consider that this coalition (indigenous/environmental movements), although strategic, has negative implications for indigenous autonomy within their territories and over their resources. The sustainable development projects that have been introduced in "Third World" countries impose a global management of natural resources without recognizing indigenous peoples' practices and strategies. Moreover, some environmental movements of biocentric perspective promote the preservation of wilderness without considering the indigenous peoples use of their own territories.

In a parallel manner, the economic interest in biodiversity and the lack of regulation of the article 8j of CBD, at national and international level, is also a threat to indigenous peoples' autonomy and their territories, especially in places designated protected areas or areas of great biodiversity in indigenous peoples territories. Likewise, this approach introduces them into a Western logic where conceptions of individuality and natural resources with economic value displace indigenous conceptions of nature and spirituality in their juridical systems. Lorenzo Muelas (1998) has criticized these processes and highlighted the implications they have, for example, those the CBD has had, on indigenous peoples self-determination by regulating in new ways relationships that they have maintained with nature for centuries.

Separation of Indigenous Peoples' Rights and Environmental Rights

Indigenous peoples' rights and environmental rights have been ratified in international and national contexts in a parallel way. International environmental and indigenous peoples' laws are totally interrelated. However, the development and the implementation of these rights have been slow and sometimes ignored. Juridical analyses show that the basic notions that sustain the rights of indigenous peoples are not applied fully because they are not recognized completely as sovereign *peoples*. On the other hand, environmental actions are restricted by notions of sustainable development based on a modern notion of nature that doesn't correspond to indigenous peoples' notions of development (Flórez 2001).

In the case of the CBD, indigenous peoples are not recognized as sovereign *peoples*, neither in their rights to self-determination and autonomy over their territories and resources, nor in their collective intellectual property rights in their knowledges. The CBD recognizes the right of free and prior informed consent in relation to the states, but it is not clear if this right also belongs to indigenous peoples. In a same way, the CBD has several implicit and vaguely stated ideas regarding the relevance of indigenous knowledges, innovations and practices pertinent to conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. Therefore, it is not clear what the CBD means by "relevance" or what is considered relevant in "traditional styles of life." Finally, the CBD doesn't recognize indigenous peoples' juridical systems.

The UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues doesn't even include in its name a recognition of the indigenous as sovereign *peoples*. Likewise, it doesn't have the power to generate recommendations to members of UN. The indigenous peoples members of the forum participate as individual experts rather than representatives of indigenous peoples (Coica 2001).

However, it is important to notice that in the Political Declaration of Johannesburg (2002), in their paragraph 22 (bis), and thanks to the pressure of indigenous peoples, a text was included that says: "We reaffirm the vital role of indigenous peoples in sustainable development." This was the first time that the term of *Indigenous Peoples* was included in this context.

In the Colombian context, indigenous peoples have rights over their territories and resources. In the same way, the ILO Convention No. 169 or Law 21 of 1991 propose previous consultation as a fundamental right of indigenous peoples in their efforts to determine their own priorities and as an instrument to defend their cultural integrity, political participation and autonomy. However, independent of the decisions that indigenous peoples make through previous consultation what is decided doesn't force any environmental authority to make a final

decision. In the last declaration of ONIC, indigenous peoples stated that development projects are forced onto their territories, and consequently they are losing their rights of political autonomy and participation. Separation from these rights has generated new discussions of their significance in relation to property rights over natural resources.

The Introduction of Indigenous Peoples to New Circuits of Production and Consumption

The contradictions that we have already seen and the processes of economic globalization around biodiversity require that the relationship between indigenous peoples and environmentalism be analyzed according to new relationships of power/knowledge due to the globalization of environmental strategies to “protect” nature. These new relationships are linked to economic processes that have generated a new conceptualization of nature as a human heritage and as an eco-commodity.

Following Gupta (1998), I argue that the rise of interest in indigenous peoples is ambivalent. Interest in indigenous peoples is deeply connected to the colonial and nationalist imaginings of indigenous peoples' traditions that pervade development projects. Gupta (1998) shows how indigenous knowledges could also be related to capitalist processes that introduce them into circuits of capitalist production and consumption through tourism (eco and ethnic), the search for raw materials for industry and medicine (timber, petroleum and minerals), the quest for new genetic resources, and actual processes of colonization of “low-density frontiers” in the nations in the so-called “Third World.” He explains that the increasing attention paid to indigenous peoples' knowledges among non-indigenous people is based on the recognition of their economic value. Moreover, he shows how the inclusion of indigenous peoples' knowledges has been an important part of transnational ecological, agronomic and development discourses because indigenous peoples serve as informants to these projects. In fact, the inclusion of indigenous knowledges in bio-prospecting processes reduces costs and increases benefits for transnational pharmaceutical corporations.

At the beginning of the 1980s, global environmental policies were generated as fruit of the emergence of the environmental awareness, the environmental crisis and the search for new economic alternatives for the development crisis. These policies were related to maintaining natural resources as well as solving long-term economic and social problems under the banner of sustainable development.

Within the articulation of the environment and development appeared new scenarios regarding natural resources within the conservation logic, as in the case of the World Conservation Strategy (UICN 1980) that related protected areas to the economic development of local inhabitants of these areas. Further, this interrelation generated actions of institutions and programs such as the Environmental Program of the United Nations (UNEP) and the World Park Congress (1982) that in a more explicit manner brought together conservation, people and development.

The relationship among conservation, people and development generated several processes: eco-tourism programs under the premise that poverty could be diminished due to economic exchange between developed-country tourists with “non-developed” country inhabitants who have environmental resources; the introduction of new territories with biological diversity to global processes of control under the logic of “global heritage;” and the economic valuation of biodiversity as a new global commodity in the case of eco-products and green markets.

In sum, the opening of new territories with biodiversity under the sustainable-development rubric introduced not only territories but also peoples to green markets, generating new products under the eco-product criteria and developing new industries such as eco-tourism and ethno-tourism.

Eco and Ethno-Tourism

Since 1980s, tourism was transformed toward an eco-tourism for different reasons: the romantic search for natural areas without human intervention; the enjoyment of nature under a “non-consuming” premise as an answer to environmental awareness; and the contribution to the site's conservation, through tourism activities as well as the involvement of local inhabitants in those activities. For example, local people come into the eco-tourism through their “cultural attractions” and with the expectations that such participation can be a solution to their economic situation (Campos 2002).

The search for natural or pristine sites generated eco-tourism in national protected areas because they were considered wild and untouched spaces. However, in most countries, these areas belong to ethnic groups and

indigenous peoples involved in two parallel processes: the recognition of indigenous peoples' and local communities' rights and new globalization processes involving the implementation of sustainable development. The meeting of these processes has caused many conflicts and contradictions.

Eco-tourism has had an unusual development and an important role within the agendas of national and international development institutions as an economic strategy to promote local and foreign tourism. Within eco-tourism, and based on the reality that these natural places belong to "real people," the *ecological native* began to take part of in these economic circuits, creating special destinations for "ethno-tourism." These ethnic and eco-tourism images are constructed and reconstructed mainly through mass media, and through national development policies.

in relation to new industries.

Evidently, biological diversity and indigenous peoples are used as part of marketing discourses. Visits to indigenous peoples' communities are offered in several plans. Indigenous peoples are portrayed as exotic objects and in some form are "exhibited" as products that can be assimilated to the landscape. This interaction of indigenous peoples and nature is presented as based on the idea of a spiritual connection in the middle of an exuberant landscape. This spiritual connection is also for consumption of urban tourists that want to get into "wild" contact and escape from the cities. This is an advertising strategy that creates the images of a pristine nature and *ecological natives*.

Eco-products

In ethno-tourism sites there are also different eco-products or souvenirs that are made for the consumption of tourists. These products have to be made from eco-safe products (which, of course, is a contradiction if they are also supposed to protect the environment), and hand made, especially by women or elders, which signifies spirituality and a special contact with nature. These eco-products usually are representations of animals and spirits of nature represented on earrings or necklaces made in wood or natural surfaces. These products eventually become industrial productions: the quantity and quality detaches the cultural object from its cultural context and converts it into a pure commodity.

Indigenous Peoples' Knowledges, a New Commodity

Since colonial times, indigenous knowledges¹⁰ have played an important role in the development of medicines, conservation ideas and Western science (Grove 1995, Nieto 2000, Ellen, Parkes and Bicker 2000). However, under the modern Western expansion of infallible expert scientific knowledge, different knowledges were also ignored, marginalized, undervalued and persecuted (Ellen, Parkes and Bicker 2000). However, indigenous peoples' knowledges have acquired new, positive connotations in light of new processes of valuation of biodiversity that locate them in national and transnational contexts.

These knowledges that previously were ignored now enter into the game of biodiversity for different reasons: the emergence of environmental awareness, the cultural politics of indigenous movements, the repositioning of indigenous representations, the recognition of indigenous practices within environmental and developmental discourses, the change in conceptualizations of nature; the necessity of constructing a new society due to the crisis of economic development; the epistemological shift in natural and social sciences concerning notions of nature; and the introduction of the territories and resources of indigenous peoples into commercial circuits, among others.

However, I want to focus here on the economic reasons for the recognition of these knowledges. The relationship between the new economic valuation of knowledges and indigenous peoples is enunciated in different global policies such as the CBD. In Colombia, in different environmental policies such Law 99 the importance of indigenous people's knowledge is established thus: "the Ministry of Environment and national scientific institutes will promote the development and dissemination of knowledges, values and technologies related to the management of the environments that have indigenous peoples and ethnic groups." However, this

¹⁰ Indigenous knowledges have been named in different ways: native, aboriginal, folk, traditional, local, people's science, and rural people's knowledge, among others (see Ellen, Parkes and Bicker (2000), Long Martello (2001), Brush and Stabinsky (1996), among others).

new source of information has economic value insofar as it reduces costs, legitimates processes and becomes a new product to be patented.

Reduction of Costs

The inclusion of indigenous peoples' knowledges in bioprospecting processes reduces costs and increases the economic benefits of transnational pharmaceutical corporations. This happens now because "nature" has become an imminent global commodity that faces environmental destruction, and indigenous peoples practices are therefore necessary to the viability of this new "eco-free market" (McAfee 1999, Gupta 1998, Escobar 1999, Sachs 1999).

In parallel, in the past few years, local peoples began to be included in projects of biological research. Local people (indigenous, peasants, etc.) are hired as local biologists or researchers who make the collection of data and, in some cases, they systematize the information. It is important to ask the implications of this methodological strategy, and how institutions and NGOs can recognize local participants' intellectual property rights. It seems that local researchers are only included in the task of putting before NGOs and research institutions knowledges that now have a new economic value.

Indigenous peoples' knowledges and their importance for ecological conservation were recognized by the CBD, however the economic implications of these knowledges introduced them into the discussions of WIPO, which exchanged their ecological importance for an economical one. These conceptual changes imply that indigenous knowledges related to environmental issues are displaced from environmental discussions when considered in discussions of the WIPO and World Trade Organization-WTO that are related to notions of individual property rights and how to introduce these knowledges into global circuits of commercialization.

Legitimization of Sustainable Development and Economic Processes

The inclusion of indigenous peoples' knowledges has been important for transnational development, as well as ecological and agro-ecological discourses, because indigenous peoples have served as informants and as tools of validation to implement these programs (Gupta 1998). Though this methodological strategy, every day there are more indigenous peoples "qualified" to speak in the language of development. In fact, the WB pays for the training of indigenous peoples in strategies of development.

In most of the cases the supposed dialogue between different knowledges introduces indigenous peoples to the logic of environmental programs and development that then ignores their knowledges and encourages local support for this new logic. Most of international economic donations for environmental programs and development have as a basic requirement "local participation." Therefore, participation becomes an imperative including local representatives as basic to the development of the programs and to the "civilization" of indigenous peoples.

Marketing Knowledge

Although indigenous peoples are recognized as bearers of ancestral knowledges, these knowledges become a product in themselves. This conceptual change in understanding indigenous knowledges separates them from their integral relationship with territory. Knowledge becomes a product independent from culture; that is to say, a commodity that can be patented and marketed independent of the socio-cultural contexts in which it takes place. The displacement of politics for the creation of a standard way to manage and control these knowledges through databases and formats descontextualizes them and relegates cultural particularities to a second plane.

Indigenous knowledges began as parts of the discussions of the CBD related to conservation strategies, but now they are parts of the discussions of intellectual property rights in the WIPO. Indigenous peoples' knowledges now have a dual image. One is based on the relationship of indigenous peoples with the conservation of biodiversity, and the other is the possibility of exploiting nature without destroying it. Nevertheless, Western knowledge is the one that decides the final form that knowledge and conservation of nature will take. Therefore, it also decides how to conserve territories with biodiversity and associated knowledges, thus echoing development discourse and promoting the negation of cultural differences. As Escobar (1999) argues, sustainable development promotes "the belief that it should be—once again—the benevolent hand of the Westerner that saves

the earth [...] westerners are those who must reconcile humanity with nature. Only in a second instance are other communities invited to share their "traditional knowledge" (84).

Indigenous knowledges are seen by Western science as a useful tool in the scientific conquest of biodiversity. For example, indigenous peoples' knowledges of flora and their knowledges of medicinal plants are alternatives for treating terminal diseases. In this sense, knowledges that indigenous peoples possess are taken into account for their economic value or utility in medicine or scientific research, a vision that implies an understanding of indigenous peoples' knowledges in terms of property, land use and the exploitation of nature. Genetic patents, then, raise a whole set of new conflicts.

In this context, it should be mentioned that the world market in medicinal plants and their derived products is estimated at US\$20 trillion, and the herbal-medicine market grows ten percent annually in Europe and North America. Colombia has a great potential in genetic resources that can be exploited industrially to generate sustainable economic development in indigenous communities. However, the global tendency has been toward patenting products without considering indigenous peoples' collective property rights (biopiracy). As Escobar (1999) writes, "The protection of intellectual property of living matter is being promoted by international entities not as a form of protecting communities of the Third World, but to assure its privatization and exploitation for capital"(95).

The urgency to preserve, conserve and protect nature comes from a capitalist conception that sees in nature and its associated knowledge an economic potential, a commodity that can offer a variety of products and services. In that dimension, the protection of the environment is seen as offering possibilities to development or sustainable development. Eco-products are then developed under this rubric with the willing or unwilling cooperation of indigenous peoples' communities.

The production of these new eco-products are thought of as a form of offering them (indigenous peoples) alternative forms of development that nonetheless feed the demands of international markets avid for "eco-products," and a means to recover cultural traditions (it is thought that any natural manufacturing processes are cultural ones). Environmental services are also promoted, such as the sale of "clean air," since Colombia has territories with great forest biodiversity (most of them belonging to indigenous peoples) ready to be offered to foreign investors as a means to diminish the contamination of the planet by creating carbon dioxide sinks to clean the pollution from developed countries. National environmental policies are sustained by the demands of global environmental policies that emphasize sustainable development and the profits that can be generated from the Colombian environment and its high biodiversity. Nature is a source that should be exploited, and that necessitates implementing a national policy related to genetic resources, such as that of the Institute von Humboldt whose objective is related to the economic development of genetic resources in relation to indigenous knowledges. This policy seeks the best way to "protect traditional knowledge" through empowerment in the market place where it can give indigenous peoples economic benefits that they are not currently exploiting.

Bringing Traditions to Modernity

The consumption of indigenous peoples' environmental knowledges demands that indigenous peoples show their "indigenouness" and "difference." These situations have given indigenous peoples a way of "recovering their traditions." At the same time, these "traditions" have to be related to specific topics, in this case environmental practices, and in this way indigenous peoples have to be "traditional" in order to be *ecological natives*. Recovering traditions can be considered a good part of the process especially for people who consider that indigenous people are a thing of the past. However, these traditions and the reinvention of them are answers to Western problems and ideals of Others' cultures. These traditions are selective insofar as the traditions recovered are the ones that fit with an eco-postmodernity and its associated new economic processes. For example, knowledges related to medical plants fit into bioprospecting processes, and notions of space fit into the new necessities of delimiting ethnic territories.

Ecological Natives, Winners or Losers?

All the situations analyzed through all the paper generate different questions: Who will deal with these new entities (indigenous peoples' territories and autonomy)? In what arenas will occur the interrelation of indigenous peoples and multinational corporations? One possible answer would be multilateral institutions that include

indigenous peoples. We can see how in the last five years indigenous peoples have been included in international spaces. However, after this general overview, there are other questions: Are indigenous peoples gaining or losing terrain? What will happen after they negotiate all their natural resources and even territories for international eco-tourism or eco-products? What will happen to their "unique identity" after it has been consumed by international markets? What are the strategies to deal with new contexts in which all natural resources can be bought or sold? What will indigenous power be based on? What are their options? If they are subsumed under the green market (ecological products), how long will the ecological era last? (In fact, some have said that the ecological era is ending). Finally, are they proposing counter-globalizations, countergovernmentalities and alternative modernities, or are they within a hegemonic western eco-governmentality?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Albo, Xavier. 1995. Our Identity Starting from Pluralism in the Base. In *The Postmodernism Debate in Latin America*. John Beverley, Michael Aronna and Jose Oviedo (eds.). London: Duke University Press.

Alvarez, Sonia, Evelina, Dagnino & Arturo Escobar (eds.). 1998. *Cultures of Politics, Politics of Cultures. Re-visioning Latin America Social Movements*. Westview Press.

Archila, Mauricio and Mauricio Pardo (eds.). 2001. *Movimientos sociales, estado y democracia en Colombia*. Bogotá: ICANH-CES-Universidad Nacional.

Arvelo-Jimenez, Nelly. 1995. Los pueblos indígenas y las tesis ambientalistas sobre el manejo global de sus recursos. In *Articulación de la diversidad. Pluralidad étnica, autonomía y democratización en América Latina*. Grupo de Barbados. Grunberg, Georg (Cord.). Quito: Biblioteca Abya-Yala No.27.

Assies, William, Gemma van der Haar, and André Hoekema (eds.). 1998. *The Challenge of Diversity. Indigenous Peoples and Reform of the State in Latin America*. Amsterdam: Thela Thesis.

Avirama, Jesús & Rayda Márquez. 1994. The Indigenous Movement in Colombia. In: *Indigenous Peoples and Democracy in Latin America*. Donna Lee Van Cott (ed.). New York : St. Martin's Press.

Barth, Frederick. 1969. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries. The Social Organization of Cultural Difference*. London: George Allen and Unwin.

Beneria-Surkin, J. 2001. De guerreros a negociadores: un análisis de la sustentabilidad de la Capitanía del Alto y Bajo Izozog (CABI) estrategias de conservación y desarrollo. In *Desarrollo sostenible en la Amazonia. ¿Mito o realidad?*. Mario Hiraoka y Santiago Mora (eds). Quito: Colección: Hombre y Ambiente No.63-64. Número Monográfico. ABYA YALA.
Bengoa, José. 2000. *La emergencia indígena en América Latina*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Berraondo, Miguel. 1999. *Los derechos medioambientales de los pueblos indígenas. La situación de la región amazónica*. Quito: Ediciones Abya-Yala.

Bhabha, Homi. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.

Bonfil Batalla, Guillermo. 1981. *Utopía y Revolución: El pensamiento político contemporáneo de los indios en América Latina*. México: Editorial Nueva Imagen.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge University Press.

Brosius, J. Peter. 2000. Endangered Forest, Endangered People: Environmentalists Representations of Indigenous Knowledge. In *Indigenous Environmental Knowledge and its Transformations. Critical Anthropological Perspectives*. Ellen, Roy, Peter Parkes and Alan Bicker (eds). Amsterdam: OPA (Overseas Publisher Association).

1999. Green Dots, Pink Hearts: Displacing Politics from the Malaysian Rain Forest. *American Anthropologist*. 101(1).
1999a. Analyses and Interventions. Anthropological Engagements with Environmentalism. *Current Anthropology* Vol.40, Number 3.

- Brush Stephen and Doreen Stabinsky (edis.). 1996. *Valuing Local Knowledge. Indigenous People and Intellectual Property Rights*. Washington: Island Press.
- Brysk, Alison. 1993. Social Movements, the International System, and Human Rights in Argentina. *Comparative Political Studies*. Vol.26: 3. Sage Periodical.
1994. Acting Globally: Indian Rights and International Politics in Latin America. In *Indigenous Peoples and Democracy in Latin America*. Donna Lee Van Cott (ed.). New York: St. Martin's Press.
1996. Turning Weakness into Strength: the Internationalization of Indians' Rights,. *Latin American Perspectives*. Special issue on Ethnicity and Class in Latin America, 23 (2).
2000. *From Local Village to Global Village: Indian Rights and International Relations in Latin America*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Campos, Claudia. 2002. El etnoturismo y el ecoturismo en territorios de pueblos indígenas en Colombia. Bogotá: ICANH. (Manuscript).
- Castells, Manuel. 1997. *The Power of Identity*. Blackwell.
- COICA. 2001. *Los pueblos indígenas amazónicos y su participación en la agenda internacional*. Bogotá: COICA.
- Cohen, Jean. 1985. Strategy or identity; New Theoretical Paradigms and Contemporary Social Movements. *Social Research*. 52(4).
- Colchester, Marcus. 2002. Indigenous Rights and the Collective Conscious. *Anthropology Today*. Vol.18(1): 1-3. February.
- Collier, Jane, Bill Maurer and Liliana Suarez-Navas. 1995. Sanctioned Identities: Legal Construction of Modern Personhood. *Identities*, Vol 2 (1-2).
- Comaroff, John L. & Comaroff, Jean. 1997. *Of Revelation and Revolution*. Vol. Two. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Conklin, Beth. 2002. Shamans versus Pirates in the Amazonian Treasure Chest. *American Anthropologist* 104(4):1050-1061.
1997. Body paint, feathers, and vcrs: aesthetics and authenticity in Amazonian activism. *American Ethnologist* 24(4):711-737.
- Conklin, Beth and Laura Graham. 1995. The Shifting Middle Ground: Amazonian Indians and Eco-Politics. *American Anthropologist* 97(4):695-710.
- Chaves, Margarita. 2001. Discursos subalternos de identidad y movimiento indígena en el Putumayo. In *Movimientos sociales, estado y democracia en Colombia*. Mauricio Archila and Mauricio Pardo (eds.). Bogotá: ICANH-CES-Universidad Nacional.
- Dagnino, Evelina. 1998. Culture, Citizenship, and Democracy: Changing Discourses and Practices of the Latin America Left. In *Cultures of Politics, Politics of Cultures. Re-visioning Latin America Social Movements*. Alvarez, Sonia, Evelina, Dagnino & Arturo Escobar (eds.) Westview Press.
- Danier, Éric (ed.). 1999. *Discourses of the Environment*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Descola Philippe & Gisli Pálsson (eds.). 1996. *Nature and Society. Anthropological Perspectives*. London: Routledge
- Dover, Robert V.H. and Joanne Rappaport. 1996. Introduction. *Journal of Latin America Anthropology* 1 (2).
- Edelman, Marc. 2001. Social Movements: Changing Paradigms and Forms of Politics. *Annual. Review of. Anthropology* 30:285-317.
- Ellen, Roy, Peter Parkes and Alan Bicker (Eds). 2000. *Indigenous Environmental Knowledge and its Transformations. Critical Anthropological Perspectives*. Amsterdam: OPA (Overseas Publisher Association).
- Ellen, Roy & Katsuyoshi Fukui (eds.). 1996. *Redefining Nature. Ecology, Culture and Domestication*. Oxford: Berg.

- Epstein, Barbara. 1990. Rethinking Social Movements Theory. *Socialist Review* 20(1).
- Escobar, Arturo. 1992. Culture, Economics, and Politics in Latin American Social Movements Theory and Research. In *The Making of Social Movements in Latin America*. Escobar, Arturo & Sonia Alvarez (eds.). Westview Press.
1999. *El final del Salvaje. Naturaleza, cultura y política en la antropología contemporánea*. Bogotá: ICANH-Cerec.
- Escobar, Arturo & Sonia Alvarez (eds.). 1992. *The Making of Social Movements in Latin America*. Westview Press.
- Escobar, Arturo & Álvaro Pedrosa (eds.). 1996. *Pacífico, desarrollo o diversidad?* Bogotá. Cerec-Ecofondo.
- Findji, Maria Teresa. 1992. The Indigenous Authorities Movement in Colombia. In *The Making of Social Movements in Latin America*. Escobar, Arturo & Sonia Alvarez (eds.). Westview Press.
- Flórez, Margarita. 2001. Protección del conocimiento tradicional y tratamiento legal internacional de los Pueblos Indígenas. ICANH. (Manuscript).
- Foucault, Michel. 1991. Questions of Method, In: *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. Burchell, Gordon & Miller (eds.). University Chicago Press.
- 1991a. Governmentality. In *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. University . Burchell, Gordon & Miller (eds.). Chicago Press.
- Grim, John (ed.). 2001. *Indigenous Traditions and Ecology*. Cambridge: Harvard University, Center for the Study of old Religions.
- Gragson Ted y Ben G. Blount (eds.) 1999. *Ethnoecology. Knowledge, Resources and Rights*. Athens-London: University of Georgia Press.
- Griswold, Esther. 1995. State Hegemony at Large: International Law and Indigenous Rights. *Polar*: Vol. 19, No.1.
- Gros, Christian. 1991. *Colombia Indígena. Identidad cultural y cambio social*. Bogotá: Fondo Editorial Cerec.
1997. *Indigenismo y Etnicidad: El desafío neoliberal*. In *Antropología en la Modernidad*. Maria V. Uribe and Eduardo Restrepo (eds.) Bogotá: Instituto Colombiano de Antropología.
1998. Ser diferente por (para) ser moderno, o la paradoja de la modernidad. (Manuscript).
2000. *Políticas de la etnicidad: identidad, estado y modernidad*. Bogotá: ICANH.
- Grueso, Libia, Carlos Rosero & Arturo Escobar. 1998. The Process of Black Community Organization in the Southern Pacific Coast Region of Colombia. In *Cultures of Politics, Politics of Cultures. Re-visioning Latin America Social Movements*. Alvarez, Sonia, Evelina, Dagnino & Arturo Escobar (eds.). Westview Press.
- Gupta, Akhil. 1998. *Postcolonial Developments. Agriculture in the Making of Modern India*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Hale, Charles. 2002. Does multiculturalism menace? Governace, cultural rights and the politics of identity in Guatemala. *J. Latin Am. Stud.* 34:481-524.
- Hall, Stuart. 1997. *Representation. Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. Sage Publications.
1990. Cultural Identity and Diaspora. In *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*. Jonathan Rutherford (ed.). London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Haas, Peter. 1989. "Do regimes matter? Epistemic communities and Mediterranean pollution control." *International Organisation* Vol. 43, No.3, (Summer 1989).
1992. "Introduction: Epistemic communities and international policy coordination." *International Organisation* Vol. 46, No. 1, Winter 1992.

Hernandez , Aida and Ortiz Francisco. 1994. Las Demandas de la Mujer Indígena en Chiapas. *Nueva Antropología*. No.49. México. G V Editores.

Hodgson, Dorothy. 2002. Comparative Perspectives on the Indigenous Rights Movements in Africa and the Americas. *American Anthropologist* 104(4):1037-1049.

Icanh-Instituto von Humboldt-Colciencias. 2002. *Memorias del Taller Nacional: Pueblos indígenas, comunidades tradicionales y medio ambiente*. Bogotá. (Manuscript).

König, Hans-Joachim et al. 1998. *El indio como sujeto y objeto de la historia latinoamericana. Pasado y presente*. Frankfurt: Vervuert. American Eystettensin.

Kymlicka, Will. 1996. Three Forms of group differentiated citizenship in Canada. In *Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Political*, Seyla Benhabib, editor. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Laurent, Virginie. 2001. Pueblos indígenas y espacios políticos en Colombia. Motivaciones, campos de acción e impactos (1990-1998). Informe final, Convocatoria Becas Nacionales Ministerio de Cultura. Bogotá. (Manuscript).

Lazarus-Black, Mindie and Susan F. Hirsch. 1994. *Contested States. Law, Hegemony and Resistance*. Routledge.

Leff, Enrique. 2002. La Geopolítica de la Biodiversidad y el Desarrollo Sustentable: economización del mundo, racionalidad ambiental y reapropiación social de la naturaleza. (Manuscript).

Luca, Frank. 2001. *Serpents in the Garden and the Amerindian "paradise lost" or Rattlesnakes and Indians, Real and Imaginary: An examination of the "Ecological Indian" myth, 1492-1992*. (Manuscript).

Luke, Timothy. 1997. *Ecocritique: Contesting the Politics of Nature, Economy, and Culture*. University of Minnesota Press. Minneapolis -London.

1999. *Capitalism, Democracy, and Ecology*. University of Illinois Press.

1999a. Environmentality as Green Governmentality. In *Discourses of the Environment*. Danier Eric (ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers

McAdams, D. J. McCarthy and Mayer Zald. 1996. Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Framing Process—Toward a Synthetic, Comparative Perspective on Social Movements. In *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings*. McAdams, D. J. McCarthy and Mayer Zald (eds). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McAfee, Kathleen. 1999. Selling Nature to Save it? Biodiversity and Green Developmentalism. *Society and Space*. Vol. 17, No. 2.

Melucci, Alberto. 1980. The New Social Movements: A Theoretical Approach. *Social Science Information sur les Sciences Sociales*. Sage Publications.

1985. The Symbolic Challenge of Contemporary Movements. *Social Research* 52(4):789-816.

1993. Social Movements and the Democratization of Everyday Life. In *Civil Society and the State*. John Keane (ed.). New York: Verso.

Milton, Kay. 1996. *Environmentalism and Cultural Theory*. London and New York: Routledge.

Motzafi-Haller, Pnina. 1995. Liberal Discourses of Cultural Diversity and Hegemonic Constructions of Difference: Basarwa in Contemporary Botswana. *Polar*. Vol.No.2

Muelas, Lorenzo. 1996. Acceso a los recurso de la biodiversidad y pueblos indígenas. In: *Diversidad biológica y cultural*. Margarita Flórez (ed.). Bogotá: ILSA.

Nash, June. 2001. *Mayan Visions. The Quest for Autonomy in an Age of Globalization*. New York: Routledge.

Nazarena, Virginia D. (ed). 1999. *Ethnoecology, Situated Knowledge/located Lives*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

- Nelson, Diane. 1999. *A Finger in the Wound. Body Politics in Quincentennial Guatemala*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Nieto, Mauricio. 2001. Remedios para el imperio. Historia natural y apropiación del Nuevo Mundo. Bogotá: Instituto Colombiano de Antropología e Historia.
- Pardo, Mauricio. 1997. Movimientos sociales y actores no gubernamentales. In *Antropología en la Modernidad*. María V. Uribe & Eduardo Restrepo (eds.). Bogotá: ICAN.
- Princen, Thomas. 1994. NGOs: Creating a Niche in Environmental Diplomacy. In *Environmental NGOs in World Politics. Linking the local and the Global*. Princen, Thomas and Matthias Finger (eds.). London and New York: Routledge.
- Ramos, Alcida. 1998. *Indigenism: Ethnic politics in Brazil*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Rutherford, Paul. 1999. Ecological Modernization and Environmental Risk. In *Discourses of the Environment*. Daniel Eric (ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers
- Sachs, Wolfgang. 1999. Planet Dialectics. Exploration in Environment & Development. London: Zed Books.
- Santos, Boaventura de Sousa. 1998. *La Globalización del derecho. Los nuevos caminos de la regulación y la emancipación*. Bogotá. Universidad Nacional-ILSA.
- Sethi, Harsh. 1993. Survival and Democracy: Ecological Struggles in India. In *New Social Movements in the South*. Wignaraja, Ponna (ed.). London and New Jersey: Zed Books.
- Scott, Alan. 1990. General Theories of Social Movements: Functionalism and Marxism. In *Ideology and the New Social Movements*.
- Sierra, Maria Teresa. 1990. Lenguaje, prácticas jurídicas y derecho consuetudinario indígena. In *Entre la ley y la costumbre. El derecho consuetudinario indígena en América Latina*. Rodolfo Stavenhagen and Diego Iturralde (eds.). México: Instituto Indigenista Americanista-Instituto Interamericano de Derechos Humanos.
- Slater, David. 1988. New Social Movements and Old Political Questions: Some Problems of Socialist Theory with Relation to Latin America. Paper presented at the International Congress of Americanists, Amsterdam, July 4-8. (Manuscript).
- Scott, Joan. 1995. *Multiculturalism and the Politics of Identity*. In *The Identity in Question*. : Rajchman, Jonh (ed.). Routledge.
- Stavenhagen, Rodolfo. 1990. Derecho consuetudinario indígena en América Latina. In *Entre la ley y la costumbre. El derecho consuetudinario indígena en América Latina*. Rodolfo Stavenhagen and Diego Iturralde (eds.). México: Instituto Indigenista Americanista-Instituto Interamericano de Derechos Humanos.
- Taylor, Charles. 1992. The Politics of Recognition. In *Multiculturalism and the Politics of Recognition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Tarrow, Sidney. 1998. *Power in Movement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tilley, Virginia. 2002. New Help or New Hegemony? The Transnational Indigenous Peoples' Movements and 'Being Indian' in El Salvador. *J. Latin Am. Stud.* 34:525-554.
- Touraine, Alain. 1985. An Introduction to the Study of Social Movements. *Social Research* 52(4).
- Ulloa, Astrid. 2003. The Ecological Native: Indigenous Peoples' Movements and Eco-governmentality in Colombia. Dissertation. Department of Anthropology. University of California, Irvine.

- 2002a. ed. *Rostros culturales de la fauna. Las relaciones entre los humanos y los animales en el contexto colombiano*. Bogotá: Instituto Colombiano de Antropología e Historia-Fundación Natura.
- 2002b. De una naturaleza dual a la proliferación de sentido: la discusión antropológica en torno a la naturaleza, la ecología y el medio ambiente. In *Repensando la naturaleza. Encuentros y desencuentros disciplinarios en torno a lo ambiental*. Palacio, Germán and Astrid Ulloa (eds.). Bogotá: UNAL-Sede Leticia-Imani-Icanh-Colciencias.
- 2002c. Pensando verde: el surgimiento y desarrollo de la conciencia ambiental global. In *Repensando la naturaleza. Encuentros y desencuentros disciplinarios en torno a lo ambiental*. Palacio, Germán and Astrid Ulloa (eds.). Bogotá: UNAL-Sede Leticia-Imani-Icanh-Colciencias.
2001. El nativo ecológico. Movimientos indígenas y medio Ambiente en Colombia. In *Movimientos sociales, estado y democracia en Colombia*. Mauricio Archila y Mauricio Pardo (eds.). Bogotá: ICANH-CES-Universidad Nacional.
- 2001a. Transformaciones en las investigaciones antropológicas sobre naturaleza, ecología y medio ambiente. *Revista Colombiana de Antropología*. No. 37: 188-232.
- Urban Greg & Joel Sherzer (eds.) 1991. *Nation-Satates and Indians in Latin America*. Austin: University of texas Press.
- van Cott, Donna Lee. 2000. *The Friendly Liquidation of the Past. The Politics of Diversity in Latin America*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Varese, Stefano. 1995. Pueblos indígenas y globalización en el umbral del tercer milenio. In *Articulación de la Diversidad. Pluralidad étnica, autonomía y democratización en América Latina*. Grunberg, Georg (Cord.). Grupo de Barbados. Quito: Biblioteca Abya-Yala No.27.
1996. *Pueblos Indios, Soberanía y Globalismo*. Ediciones Abya-yala. No. 32.
- 1996a Parroquialismo y globalización. Las etnicidades indígenas ante el tercer milenio. In *Pueblos Indios, Soberanía y Globalismo*. Varese Stefano (Cord.). Quito: Ediciones Abya-yala.
- 1996b. The New Environmentalist Movement of Latin American Indigenous People. In *Valuing Local Knowledge. Indigenous People and Intellectual Property Rights*. Stephen B. Brush and Doreen Stabinsky (editores). Washington: Island Press.
- Vasco, Luis Guillermo. 2002. Entre selva y páramo, viviendo y pensando la lucha India. Bogotá: ICANH.
- Wade, Peter. 1997. *Race and Ethnicity in Latin America*. London: Pluto Press
- Wapner, Paul. 1995. Environmental Activism and Global Civil Society. *Dissent*. Summer 41.
1994. Politics Beyond the State: Environmental Activism and World Civic Politics. *World Politics*. Vol.47. No.3.
- Watts, Rob. 1993/1994. Government and Modernity: An Essay in Thinking Governmentality. *Arena Journal* 2.
- Warren, Kay B. 1998. *Indigenous Movements and Their Critics*. Princeton University Press.
- Warren, Kay and Jackson Jean (eds.) 2002. *Indigenous Movements, Self-Representation, and the State in Latin. America*. Univiversity of Texas Press.
- Yashar, Deborah. 1996. Indigenous Protest and Democracy in Latin America. In *Constructing Democratic Governance: Latin America and the Caribbean*. Jorge I. Domínguez & Abraham F. Lowenthal (eds.). London: Johns Hopkins University Press.
1998. Contesting Citizenship. Indigenous Movements and Democracy in Latin America. *Comparative Politics* October 1998. 23-42.
- 1998a. The Post-liberal Challenge in Latin America. Prepared for Delivery at the 1998 Annual American Political Science Association Conference. Boston Massachusetts. (Manuscript).
1999. Democracy, Indigenous Movements, and the Postliberal Challenge in Latin America. *World Politics* 52.1. 76-104.
- Zambrano, Carlos. 1998. Conflictos y cambios en el proceso de modernización del macizo colombiano. Un caso de alteridad étnica. In *Modernidad, identidad y desarrollo*. María Lucía Sotomayor (ed.). Bogotá: Instituto Colombiano de Antropología-Colciencias.
2001. Un análisis del movimiento social y étnico del macizo Colombiano. In *Movimientos sociales, estado y democracia en Colombia*. Mauricio Archila and Mauricio Pardo (eds.). Bogotá: ICANH-CES-Universidad Nacional.