

Oil Politics and Indigenous Resistance in the Peruvian Amazon: The Rhetoric of Modernity Against the Reality of Coloniality

Author(s): George Stetson

Source: *The Journal of Environment & Development*, Vol. 21, No. 1, Special Anniversary Issue: From Rio 1992 to Rio 2012 and Beyond: Taking Stock and Moving Forward in the Search for Sustainable Development (March 2012), pp. 76-97

Published by: Sage Publications, Inc.

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/26199413>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



Sage Publications, Inc. is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Environment & Development*

JSTOR

Oil Politics and Indigenous Resistance in the Peruvian Amazon: The Rhetoric of Modernity Against the Reality of Coloniality

Journal of Environment & Development

21(1) 76–97

© 2012 SAGE Publications

Reprints and permission:

sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav

DOI: 10.1177/1070496511433425

<http://jed.sagepub.com>



George Stetson¹

Abstract

In June of 2009, indigenous protest over the Peruvian government's natural resource policies erupted, tragically, in a violent confrontation where 33 Peruvians lost their lives. Conflicts over natural resources are bound to increase, especially in developing countries, as governments' development ambitions collide with indigenous peoples' territorial claims. This article, within the context of Peru's natural resource development agenda, examines the government's hydrocarbon development policies against indigenous resistance and protest. Turning to an alternative theoretical framework, modernity/coloniality, I argue that the government's development logic misrepresents indigenous perspectives on development, undermines indigenous territorial rights, and suppresses indigenous participation in Peru's natural resource agenda. A more complex reading of indigenous perspectives reveals a more sustainable approach to development, one that does not reject modern development, but does challenge the Eurocentric predilections of development.

Keywords

indigenous politics, modernity/coloniality, natural resource policies, oil development, Peruvian Amazon, sustainable development

¹Boise State University, Boise, ID, USA

Corresponding Author:

George Stetson, Department of Public Policy and Administration, Boise State University,

1910 University Drive, Boise, ID 83725-1935, USA

Email: georgestetson@boisestate.edu

On June 5, 2009, a deadly clash erupted between indigenous peoples and the Peruvian state in Amazonian province of Bagua. Official accounts placed the death toll at 33, 10 civilians and 23 police officers. Indigenous accounts of the event vary, but some reported that up to 40 indigenous persons were killed and several bodies were thrown into the river from police helicopters (Merino, 2010). The clash came on the heels of nearly 3 months of intense and widespread indigenous protest throughout the Peruvian Amazonia, the result of development policies designed to open up the region to private capital investments in oil, mining, logging, and agriculture on indigenous territories. The protests, and similar protests that took place in August of 2008, were designed to force the government to repeal a series of legislative decrees that were enacted by President Alan Garcia (2006–2011) as part of special powers delegated to the executive to facilitate the implementation of the Free Trade Agreement (FTA) with the United States. For indigenous activists, leaders, and local villagers, if not repealed, these decrees would have undermined the territorial integrity and environmental sustainability of indigenous lands.

In response to the event, the Peruvian government put together a short video that framed indigenous peoples as extremists and savages who had “brutally massacred innocent, humble policemen.” The 1 min video placed a news clip of Alberto Pizango, the president of the AIDSEP (Interethnic Association of Development of the Peruvian Amazon), declaring insurgency against the government. It proceeded to stage images of what appeared to be “war-crazed” indigenous protestors, holding spears, juxtaposed against photographs of beaten, massacred police officers. As these graphic images were displayed in the foreground, the video boldly announced that indigenous peoples want to “hold Peru back,” they want to prevent Peruvians from benefiting from the gas and petroleum from “their” subsoil. The spot ends with “May the Fatherland not forsake progress.”¹

This video provides a vivid example of how the Peruvian government represents indigenous peoples as antidevelopment. The government frames the Amazon region as an undeveloped space, full of unexploited natural resources, but lacking the technology and capital to fully develop the region. Indigenous peoples, accordingly, are guided by an irrational logic that seeks to prevent development at all costs. To counter this framing, I make the case that indigenous peoples are not enemies of development, but experience development from a distinct epistemological locus than the Peruvian state. Within the context of the 2008 and 2009 protest movement, I examine the case of indigenous resistance to President Garcia’s development agenda, in general, and resistance to the government’s hydrocarbon policy agenda, in particular. My main argument is that the government’s development logic not only misrepresents indigenous perspectives on development but also undermines indigenous territorial rights and suppresses indigenous participation in Peru’s natural resource development agenda, which increases political tension between indigenous peoples and the state.

This argument is based on the application of modernity/coloniality (M/C), a theoretical approach that is particularly useful for studying development conflicts between “modern” states and indigenous peoples. Not only does this approach pay close attention

to the contemporary legacies of colonialism, something that often gets minimized in mainstream debates that tend to place indigenous/state conflicts on a left/right continuum, but also M/C suggests that indigenous perspectives of development might reflect an alternative modernity rather than an alternative to modernity.² In the first section, I present the case study of indigenous resistance to hydrocarbon development. In the following sections, I apply the M/C lens to this case, first synthesizing M/C and then examining state policies and indigenous resistance to them. I conclude by gesturing toward a decolonization of environmental policies to incorporate indigenous territorial claims.

Case Study: Indigenous Resistance in the Peruvian Amazon

Indigenous protest in 2008 and 2009 was, above all, a reaction to the Garcia government's aggressive natural resource policy in the Amazon region, which was based on bringing in private capital to develop the region's vast natural resources. This included oil and gas development, mining, forestry projects, the privatization of water resources, and biofuel development. The FTA with the United States was critical in that it represented an attempt by the government to institutionalize this development agenda. Arguing that it needed special powers to adapt Peruvian legislation to the terms of the agreement with the United States, in December of 2007, Congress approved a law (No. 29157) that granted the executive branch the faculty to legislate for 180 calendar days. As a result, in the first semester of 2008, the Garcia government promulgated 99 legislative decrees that, in theory, were linked to the FTA (Barandiarán-Gómez, 2008).³

Garcia's main argument was that the Amazon region lacked the financial capital, modern technology, and legal framework to fully exploit its vast, untapped resources. To attract foreign investment required a new legal framework to open up land (much of it indigenous) that the government considered unproductive. Environmental activists and indigenous leaders referred to this legislative package as the "law of the jungle" because it would undermine collective property rights, open up undeveloped lands to lumber, mining, and oil companies, privatize the use of public water (irrigation projects), lower the restrictions on transgenic seeds and promote biofuel plantations, and weaken environmentally protective measures in national parks and other specially protected areas (Rénique, 2010, p. 118).

In this context, Garcia embarked on an aggressive natural resource policy that included mining, forestry, biofuels, and oil and gas development. Oil and gas development exemplified this aggressive approach. In a relatively short time span, hydrocarbon development in the Amazon region increased dramatically. In 2004, approximately 13% of the region was slated for oil and gas exploration; by 2007, that number had skyrocketed to 70%. By 2009, there were 92 oil and gas contracts in force. Private investments amounted to US\$797 million (Finer & Orta-Martínez, 2010a). The majority of these oil and gas concessions overlap indigenous titled territories, indigenous

reserves for “isolated peoples,” territorial reserves, and other environmentally protected areas (Finer & Orta-Martínez, 2010b, pp. 1-2).

The ethnic diversity in the region makes it difficult to be precise about the extent of indigenous opposition to hydrocarbon policy. However, there is ample evidence of widespread opposition. AIDESEP, the most formidable indigenous organization in the region, has consistently maintained a strong position against oil development on indigenous territories, indigenous reserves, and other environmentally protected areas. The organization is made up of 6 regional organizations, 57 federations, representing 1,350 communities and, according to its web site, some 350,000 indigenous individuals (www.aidesep.org.pe). In 2008, as part of an official platform, AIDESEP listed the “suspension of all territorial concessions in indigenous territories to companies or natural persons for the exploration and exploitation of hydrocarbons, mining, tourism, and forestry” as part of its principal demands to the government (AIDESEP, 2008).

Regional, subregional, and village-level indigenous organizations have also expressed their opposition. For example, the subregional Achuar-based organization, the Federation of Native Communities of the Corrientes River Basin (FECONACO), made of multiple smaller level organizations that represent up to 29 communities, has been especially instrumental in demands against Oxy Petroleum and Pluspetrol for severe environmental contamination and health-related issues in the Northern region of the Peruvian Amazon. Strong statements against the government’s hydrocarbon agenda have also been made from organizations in the Northern Marañón region, from the central Amazon region, and from the Southern region (especially surrounding the Camisea gas project). Such statements have come in distinct contexts, from multiple organizations, and generally reflect opposition to oil development (Servindi, 2006, 2007a, 2007b, 2008a, 2008b, 2009a, 2009b).

According to the National Ombudsman’s Office, just in February of 2009, of the 218 cases of social conflict in Peru, more than half of them were directly related to mining, hydrocarbon development, and other related issues (Huancas, 2009). Indigenous opposition to oil development follows this trend. While related to the broader protest of the government’s development policies, between March and April of 2009, there were multiple incidents of protest: more than 100 Secoya and Kichwa communities from Northern Peru denounced the entrance of Petrobras, a Brazilian company, on their territories (AIDESEP, 2009a). In a similar act, more than 80 Kichua communities came together to protest the U.K.-based Perenco for contaminating activities on their land (AIDESEP, 2009b; Servindi, 2009a); in the Northeastern Amazon, thousands of Mateses peoples declared that they would not allow the Colombian oil company Pacific Stratus to enter their lands (AIDESEP, 2009b; Servindi, 2009b); in the Southwestern part of the Amazon region, Nomatsiguenga and Ashánika peoples in 45 different communities demanded that the government suspend all concessions and offers of hydrocarbon blocks that overlap their indigenous territories (AIDESEP, 2009c). These examples typify the consistent pattern of opposition throughout the Amazon region since 2006 and continuing to the present.⁴

Not unlike the more well-known cases of opposition in Ecuadorian Amazon (Chevron), the Niger Delta (Shell), Ireland (Rosspoint), Myanmar (Unocal), and others, oil development symbolizes the power of the state and transnational companies to dramatically impact the livelihoods of local peoples. In Peru, the infamous history of oil development in the Northern Amazonian region is still etched in the memory of indigenous peoples (La Torre Lopez, 1999). As such, much of the protests were pointed directly at the petroleum industry. In several coordinated efforts throughout the region, for example, protestors forcibly took over oil and gas infrastructure, in some cases leading to the halting of operations. At one point, up to 41 energy-related vessels were stuck along the jungle rivers because of the protests (Aquino, 2009, May 15). In May of 2009, in fact, the government was forced to declare a state of emergency because the protests threatened the production of hydrocarbons ("Declare State of Emergency," 2009, May 9).

Indigenous resistance in the Peruvian Amazon is clearly part of a larger trend in Latin America and elsewhere of local people rising up against neoliberal policies that seek to place natural resource development in the hands of private entities. President Garcia became a "declared enemy" of many indigenous peoples in the region because of aggressive neoliberal policies that, according to experts, represented a categorical attack on indigenous territorial rights (see Manacés-Valverde & Gomez-Calleja, 2010). Peru's aggressive neoliberal orientation is certainly one explanation for understanding indigenous resistance (see Hughes, 2010, and Rénique, 2009). Like in other countries, the government's intention to privatize and commodify natural resources on indigenous territorial spaces constitutes a serious threat to the integrity of indigenous lands. However, here I suggest that neoliberalism only partly explains indigenous resistance. For a distinct reading of this conflict, I turn to modernity/coloniality, which offers an alternative explanation of the state's development agenda and indigenous resistance to it.

Modernity/Coloniality and Eurocentric Development

Modernity/coloniality (M/C) is a theoretical approach inspired by the work of scholars, mostly from Latin America, including Walter Dignolo (Argentina), Enrique Dussel (Mexico), Anibal Quijano (Peru), Arturo Escobar (Colombia), who claim that the idea of modernity, along with its corollaries development and modernization, are heavily influenced by a Eurocentric perspective. Here eurocentric modernity is guided by a logic that informs political, economic, and social thought and is not only predominant in mainstream institutions like the World Bank, IMF, and the WTO, but also permeates political institutions like the "modern" nation-state.⁵

Modernity is most often associated with the intellectual effort on the part of Enlightenment thinkers to develop objective science, to accumulate knowledge, and to dominate and control nature. For Harvey, modernity is related to the pursuit of human emancipation by free and autonomous individuals, leading to rational forms of

social organization and thought that liberate humans from irrational notions of myth, religion, and superstition (1989, p. 12). Modernity, thus, reorients the idea of history and progress around the logic of development, where “perpetual betterment” is always possible (Escobar, 2007, pp. 181-182). According to most classical (Kant, Hegel, Weber, Marx, etc.) and critical thinkers (Habermas, Giddens, Taylor, Touraine, Lyotard, Rorty, and Foucault), the origins of modernity are generally located in France, Germany, and England around the time of the Reformation, the Enlightenment, and the French Revolution and became consolidated with the Industrial Revolution. Together, these views suggests that modernity can be explained by factors that are generally internal to Europe (Escobar, 2007, p. 181).

M/C scholars, conversely, explain the origins of modernity as external to Europe, beginning with Conquest of the Americas and the economic control of the Atlantic. Drawing from Wallerstein’s world systems analysis, the “modern” world (capitalist) system was born in the 16th century when European powers began to expand their reaches through colonial domination. This emphasizes the role that the extraction of precious minerals and (later) the production of agriculture commodities played in financing the Industrial Revolution and fomenting the modern world capitalist system (see Dussel, 2002, p. 223; Wolf, 1982/1997). Rather than understand modernity as a process where European Enlightenment thinkers introduced (i.e., Locke, Smith, Descartes, Comte) a new logic and rationality, M/C highlights the fact that *European* modernity (as a logical structure) was based on the imposition of a Eurocentric representation of knowledge and power that suppressed and marginalized other forms of knowledge in a hegemonic project of modern development (Escobar, 2004, p. 217).

Coloniality, argues Mignolo, is “the reverse and unavoidable side of ‘modernity’—its darker side, like the part of the moon that we do not see when we observe it from the earth” (2000, p. 22). Not the same as colonialism, which refers to specific historical periods, rather, coloniality refers to the “logical structure of colonial domination” that maintained Spanish, Dutch, British, and U.S. dominance in Latin America throughout history (Mignolo, 2005, p. 7) and permitted the genocidal acts against indigenous peoples and Africans and the marginalization of knowledges, religions, and of “nonmodern” cultures. When the logic of coloniality surfaces, it is explained through rhetoric or promise of modernity, where all problems can be corrected with modern development. Critically, this logic has been alive since the 16th century when the Spanish crown appropriated massive amounts of land and brutally exploited indigenous peoples and slaves, all justified in the name of the logic of salvation and progress (Mignolo, 2005, pp. 10-11).

The Rhetoric of Modernity

To illustrate how the rhetoric of modernity works in this particular conflict, I focus on what has been described as President García’s *perro del hortelano* discourse, which became the center of a national debate on indigenous territorial rights. Between October of 2007 and March of 2008, the president wrote a series of four editorials in

Peru's national newspaper, *El Comercio*, in which he used the *perro del hortelano* (gardener's dog) fable to make an argument for the use of big capital and modern technology to develop Peru's vast natural resources. The fable is based on the story of a dog that irrationally protects its master's garden from farm animals that need nourishment from the garden. The dog doesn't realize that it is in everyone's best interest to allow the animals to eat from the garden. Translated to the Peruvian context, Garcia argues that there are "millions of hectares" held by communities that remain idle and that will never be cultivated because of a *perro del hortelano* mentality that sees any development as an infringement on their rights (2007, October 28).

From the perspective of M/C, land is a critical source of capital because the appropriation of land increases the power and potential of capital to work toward modernity (Mignolo, 2007a, p. 480). This connection between capital and land is highlighted in President Garcia's discourse, where the Amazon is viewed as an idle space that is undercapitalized. The solution is to create large extensions of land (via multinational oil, gas, mining, logging concessions) where large capital investments are feasible. Garcia points out that there are "sixty million hectares" in the Amazon region that could be converted into large spaces of ownership (5 to 20,000 hectares) to secure formal investment and high technology. Responding to those (many on the left) that argue against privatizing indigenous lands in the Amazon, Garcia suggests that current restrictions against privatization of indigenous lands are preventing large capital investments that would create thousands of formal jobs for Peruvians that live in the poorest areas (2007, October 28). For Garcia it is necessary to make available significant extensions of land to the largest companies, who have the capital and resources necessary to invest, which will create jobs and reduce poverty.

Embodying the promise of modernity, Garcia claims that many environmental problems are the result of a lack of technology and capital, which creates chaotic, unregulated conditions that inevitably lead to the destruction of the environment. The current mining problems, he says, are a result of "yesterday's mines," arguing that modern technology has overcome problems of environmental contamination (2007, October 28). Again, the key is to bring in large capital investments, which will end the destruction of the environment (Perez-Maura, 2008). In this context, imbued with this spirit of modernity, problems associated with extractive development should be dealt with through large capital investments that will bring technology, reduce poverty, and improve environmental conditions.

Finally, the *perro del hortelano* discourse advances a teleological notion of development that frames the region as a historically backward space, in a sense, waiting for capital investments and technology. Part of this is related to Garcia's critique of small landholdings, which are presented as historical relics that create conditions of poverty. Garcia writes that "the *minifundista* model without technology is a vicious circle of misery." This commentary on small landholdings carries with it an implicit and explicit critique of Amazonian indigenous peoples, who are framed, like the territorial spaces in which they reside, as undeveloped and un-modern. Garcia says that he respects both "virgin forest" and "native peoples" but, again, comments that this model

has only led to “unregulated concessions, cocaine production, and illegal logging.” Extolling the potential of Amazonian lands, he states that “it is shameful that Chile exports two billion dollars in timber without having one Amazonian hectare” (2007, October 28).

Garcia’s critique of indigenous peoples is, however, also explicit, even challenging the notion that indigenous people have a special relationship to the land. Questioning the “sacredness” of indigenous lands, he argues that “demagoguery and trickery” have caused indigenous peoples to believe that “native” communities are the original indigenous form of organizing, when, in reality, it was a creation of the Spanish Crown that ended up pushing indigenous peoples to “unproductive” lands (2007, October 28). Leaving aside the historical accuracy of this argument, he implies that indigenous peoples have been tricked into believing that they have special rights to the land and suggests that indigenous territories are obstacles to progress and development. Accordingly, they are historical relics that do not fit within the modern scheme of development.

In short, the *perro del hortelano* discourse suggests that the promise of Amazonian development lies in bringing in large capital investments to the region. In its current state, the region is undeveloped, backwards, lacking sufficient capital and technology to create the necessary investment conditions. Indigenous peoples are seen as misguided by an irrational mindset (*el perro del hortelano*) that wants to protect the region from all development, sacrificing the well-being of the nation. This discourse implies that indigenous peoples have been manipulated to believe that they deserve “special” treatment, when, in fact, they themselves are creating obstacles to their own development path. After all, modernity will create jobs, alleviate poverty, and protect the environment.

The Logic of Coloniality

This section examines the ways in which Garcia’s development agenda works around the logic of coloniality and explains how government policies undermine indigenous economic, political, and epistemic control over indigenous territorial spaces. According to Mignolo, the logic of coloniality works through certain domains of human experience (the economic, the political, the civic, and the epistemic) that create a colonial matrix that is “invisible to the distracted eye” but works to marginalize peoples who do not subscribe to the hegemonic logic (Mignolo, 2005, p. 11). Here, focusing on three of these domains, I examine both the legislative decrees, the specific policies used to implement the *perro del hortelano* discourse, and the government’s hydrocarbon policies on indigenous territorial spaces. I argue that both cases embody a logic of coloniality that, in the end, undermines indigenous rights and territorial claims.

First, several of the legislative decrees (LD) were designed to provide the government with economic control over indigenous lands for development purposes. The idea was to “expand the agriculture frontier” to make land that the government deemed unproductive, productive, which required implementing a new political, economic,

and legal framework. Several decrees, for example, would create new legal mechanisms to ease the restrictions for extractive development by private entities on indigenous territorial spaces (LD 994, 1064). The decrees were designed to facilitate infrastructure projects for mining and hydrocarbon development, to apply forced easements, and to implement a new legal regime for private investment. In addition, LD 1089 mandated that COFOPRI (the Organization for the Formalization of Informal Property) an urban agency controlled by the Garcia government, finish the task of titling *all* indigenous territories yet to be titled. Given the difficulty of the task and the institutional capacity of COFOPRI, experts argued that the intentions of the government were to hastily finish the titling process, so that more land would legally be made available for development (see Bandariarán-Gomez, 2008).

Second, M/C suggests that the control of the indigenous territories requires political control. Legislative decrees 1015 and 1073 would have changed the requirements to facilitate private development on indigenous lands from two thirds of the entire community to only 50% of attendees at a community assembly. LD 1090 would have taken power away from indigenous authorities who participated in the National Forestry Policy Consultative Council to make decisions related to forestry development. Taken together, these legislative decrees were considered a violation of indigenous rights to consultation (ILO 169), a further reminder of how these policies would undermine the political authority of indigenous peoples.

Finally, the recategorization of land undermines indigenous epistemological claims to the land. Indigenous advocates have always argued that for indigenous peoples land has a much broader meaning than simply economics or production. Many of the gains around indigenous rights achieved in the mid 1970s were related to expanding the definition of land, to include hunting, fishing, gathering, recreation, and religion. Several decrees (LD 994, 1064, and 1090), however, would have narrowed the definition of land, so that “fallow” and “deforested” land would be considered “apt for agriculture use.” The idea that “fallow” land is unproductive works very much toward the control of knowledge and subjectivity. From a Eurocentric perspective, it is a way to create and control the epistemological terms that define modern development. Deforested and fallow land are defined economically, which directly challenges indigenous conceptualizations of territory.

The logic of coloniality also helps to explain the government’s hydrocarbon development practices on indigenous territories. While a host of state entities are involved in hydrocarbon development, the two principal agencies that are responsible for the promotion and implementation of oil and gas development in Peru are the Ministry of Energy and Mines (MINEM) and Perúpetro, Peru’s hydrocarbon licensing agency. MINEM is the state entity in charge of both promoting and regulating oil and gas development in Peru and Perúpetro represents the state in its dealings with private companies interested in investing in oil and gas development. Both entities are responsible for not only informing indigenous peoples of hydrocarbon development but also for establishing relations between the state, indigenous communities, and private companies.

In theory, indigenous peoples participate in the hydrocarbon process in two distinct, but related practices: (a) informative workshops and (b) public audiences to approve Environmental Impact Studies (EIS). Both practices revolve around the elaboration and execution of a series of environmental and social studies to ensure that hydrocarbon activity takes place without harming the environment, natural resources, or people (Supreme Decree No. 012-2008-EM). Perúpetro is responsible for holding the events and MINEM is in charge of evaluating and approving the environmental studies (Ministry of Energy and Mines [MINEM], 2008). Officially, informative workshops bring together representatives from native communities, companies, and regional and local authorities to inform the public of the details of the proposed oil and gas project.

Before any hydrocarbon activity takes place, the contracted company must present to the competent authority an EIS that contains a baseline account of socioeconomic conditions of the area, all potential impacts (social, economic, and health) to indigenous and *peasant* communities, and the specific measures that should be adopted to prevent, minimize, or eliminate these effects (DS 003-2000-EM, Art. 2; DS 046-93-EM Art. 10; DS 041-2001-EM Art. 2). After these studies are evaluated by MINEM, they are then subject to a public audience where all actors, in theory, are allowed to express their opinion. MINEM states that the EIS should inform the population about the details of the hydrocarbon project, collect observations and suggestions from the population and local authorities, and include these observations in a required evaluation (MINEM, 2008).

Much of the controversy surrounding oil and gas development on indigenous territorial spaces is related to Free, Prior, Informed Consent (FPIC), a concept that is expressed in the United Nation's Declaration on Indigenous Rights (2007) and International Labour Organization (ILO) Convention 169 (1989), in both of which Peru is a signatory. Article 3 of the UN Declaration stipulates that indigenous peoples have the "right to self-determination" and, "[by] virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, and cultural development" (UN, 2007). In a similar vein, ILO 169 recognizes the rights of indigenous peoples to maintain their own way of life (language, identities, and religion), to exercise control over their own institutions, and calls attention to the distinct contributions of indigenous peoples to humankind, including cultural diversity and social and ecological harmony (ILO 169).

To be clear, in its organizational literature, MINEM does emphasize that it complies with ILO 169 (MINEM, 2008, p. 14). In special literature given to private companies, it even provides summaries of articles 15 and 16 of ILO 169 as they apply to hydrocarbon development (MINEM, 2008, p. 14). In a similar vein, Perúpetro maintains that it operates in full compliance with ILO 169, emphasizing a "harmonious relation" with indigenous communities, who receive benefits and participate in hydrocarbon project (<http://mirror.perupetro.com.pe/protamb-s.asp>). These organizations, however, maintain that indigenous rights are limited to simply providing information about hydrocarbon projects. According to one governmental decree, "the object of the

process of public information and diffusion is to consider and incorporate community criteria; this process does not imply the right to veto nor is it binding" (No.-015-2006-EM). Furthermore, the government often points out the state is rightful owner of all natural resources, which leaves indigenous peoples with little power to prevent or modify extractive development (Article 66, Peruvian Constitution). Finally, both informative workshops and the EISs take place *after* the government has already negotiated and signed leases with oil and gas companies, which suggest that the government is probably not likely to cancel already signed concessions.

The government's insistence on the "informative" content of the workshops is palpable. In 2004, the government replaced the legislation that was titled "Regulation for Consultation and Citizen Participation in Proceedings to Approve Environmental Studies in the Energy and Mining Sector" with "Regulation of Citizen Participation in the Realization of Energy Activity Administrative Proceedings for Environmental Study Evaluations (RM 535-2004-MEM/DM)." As Greenspan points out, the word "consultation" was removed from both the title and the text, to be replaced with "informational workshops" and public hearings. Moreover, as Greenspan states, the government describes itself as "simply an information provider" and "does not offer a single space for communities to influence . . . resource use decisions" (Greenspan, 2006, p. 11).

Human rights lawyer and advocate Lilly La Torre provides insights on the way that indigenous peoples typically participate in these venues. She explains that petroleum companies, Perúpetro, and MINEM arrive in a village together—usually in a helicopter or airplane—to announce that they are in the village to discuss a legally binding contract that the government has already signed with a private company. The government representative explains to the community *how* they will benefit from and *how* they will participate in the project. For La Torre, the state manipulates the process so that any genuine dialogue between the state entities and indigenous people is eliminated (L. La Torre, personal interview, January 10, 2008). For Cezar Ipenza, a Peruvian environmentalist who now works for the Ministry of the Environment, the workshops often end up distorting information. He recalled in one case how a lawyer representing Perúpetro, "defying all logic," used ILO 169 to argue that indigenous lands were actually superimposed on state hydrocarbon resources. Furthermore, says Ipenza, workshops are couched in esoteric language that few indigenous people understand (C. Ipenza, personal interview, January 2008).

Petroleum companies, in conjunction with state officials, have also been known to make explicit offers to indigenous peoples in the form of health centers, roads, electricity, telephone service, boat motors, and even things like soccer jerseys, toys for kids, and "cases of beer" (see La Torre-Lopez, 1999, p. 186). These cases have been well documented in the past in Peru, Ecuador, and other places (Kimberling, 1991; Sawyer, 2004). Within the context of the Garcia government, more recently, a Shipibo woman explained how in a government visit to Shipibo village community members told her they had been offered roughly US\$17,000 and if they did not accept the terms of the contract that army would come (personal interview in 2008). According to

Robert Guimaraes, former vice president of AIDSESEP, these types of offers are common. The government often takes advantage of the needs and vulnerability of indigenous peoples who live in remote jungle areas and, if communities are not well informed, says Guimaraes, they are “especially susceptible to these types of offers” (R. Guimaraes, personal interview, January 2008).

The public audiences surrounding the EISs are also venues designed to inform the public (i.e., indigenous peoples) about the details of the final study. Yet there are no provisions that provide indigenous peoples the opportunity to reject the claims made in these studies or, in reality, is there potential for debate or dialogue. While these forums typically include a question and answer session (see RM 596-2002-EM/DM), La Torre says that they are simply informative meetings that are dressed in overly technical language, conducted in such a way that there is little room for input, little time to understand the complexity of the studies, and virtually no opportunity to dispute the validity of the claims presented (L. La Torre, personal interview, January 2008).

In summary, the government uses informative workshops and EISs to claim that it is upholding indigenous rights to consultation under the stipulations of ILO 169, when in practice it excludes indigenous peoples from the process of hydrocarbon development. Working from the logic of coloniality, the government seeks to control the political authority related to the use of natural resources on indigenous lands. The government does advertize a certain “respect for indigenous rights,” but only within the context of a previously made decision to go forward with hydrocarbon development projects. As the logic of coloniality dictates, the fact that indigenous rights are minimized (or violated) is a necessary sacrifice given the promise of modern development.

While the history of the Peru’s development agenda is beyond the scope of this article, it is important to mention that Garcia’s policies are not atypical. In fact, since the colonial period, the government has engaged in policies designed to develop the Amazon region at the expense of indigenous territorial claims and rights. This same logic facilitated the exploitation of natural resources, the disintegration of indigenous territorial spaces, and the marginalization and suppression of indigenous cultures. The earliest attempts at colonization in the Peruvian Amazon (1537), for example, were based on the extraction of gold and silver realized through the *encomienda*, a disguised slavery practice that promised Christian salvation in exchange for labor (Taylor, 1999). Perhaps the most notorious period in the region’s history was the rubber boom of the late 1800s and early 1900s, marking the beginnings of Peru as a “modern” independent republic (1821; see Drinot, 2000). It was also the period in which the most brutal practices were used to extract rubber, leaving an indelible colonial wound on indigenous peoples still evident today (see Hvalkof, 2000).

This never-ending attempt to “colonize” and develop the region was a consistent characteristic in Peru’s policy agenda throughout the modern era. This was manifest in the governments of Manuel Prado (1956-1962) and Fernando Belaúnde Terry (1962-1968 and 1975-1980). Belaúnde wrote a book titled “The Conquest of Peru by Peruvians,” which details his desires to conquer the region by building an intricate

system of highways to develop the region (Smith, 1982). Even the relatively progressive military government of Juan Velasco Alvarez (1968-1975), who passed the 1974 Law of Native Communities, at the time considered the most advanced in all of South America (Smith, 1982, p. 5), engaged in aggressive colonization policies, including oil development, that ended up further eroding the integrity of indigenous territorial spaces (Chirif & Garcia, 2007).

Modernity/Coloniality and Indigenous Viewpoints on Development

Thus far I have argued that M/C helps to identify the government's perspective on development as Eurocentric. Understanding development as Euro-centered suggests that it is possible to think about development not from the center, but from the fringes or borders of Eurocentric modernity. For Mignolo, it is important to underscore that this is a "privileged epistemological space" that has been conceived against a hegemonic mode that occupies the center of the modern imaginary that has suppressed or "subalternized Other imaginaries." Crucially, this space is not simply one of oppression, but a place to discover new ways of thinking and acting that might provide viable alternatives to Eurocentric modernity. In fact, for Mignolo, some of the most effective critiques of globalization today are articulated not by postmodern theories, but by the "emergence of forms of knowledge that have been subalternized during the last five hundred years under global designs . . ." (2000, p. 22).

It is important to stress that this conceptual space *is* modern. As Mignolo argues, it is impossible to separate the subaltern from the modern imaginary. This is notably distinct from the metanarratives (especially liberalism and socialism), which tend to place indigenous peoples in traditional or nonmodern categories. Modernization theory (Rostow), liberalism (and neoliberalism), socialism, and other "modern" perspectives emphasize the idea of stages of development as a path to becoming modern (see Escobar, 1995). Importantly, notions such as undeveloped apply not only to countries but also to peoples and regions. Against Garcia's description of indigenous peoples as primitive, backwards, and undeveloped, from this perspective, indigenous peoples, along with other subaltern subjects (Afro-Latinos, workers, etc.), are just as modern as Euro-centered Latin Americans in positions of power, yet they experience modernity from a different vantage point or a different epistemological locus.

Indigenous positions on development, for example, resonate with relatively mainstream or "modern" positions on the environment. In an "Open letter to President Garcia," AIDESEP mentions that 10% of the world's biodiversity and 30% of the world's fresh water is located in the Peruvian Amazon. Suggesting that it is President Garcia who is out of touch with modern thinking, they remark it is Garcia who is not connected to the latest information about climate change: "if there were an ecological catastrophe, only from Peru would it be possible to repopulate the planet" (AIDESEP, 2007). These types of statements from indigenous peoples are quite common. In a public pronouncement, 22 distinct women's indigenous groups state that "thanks to

our ancestral knowledge and our protection we have a territory that is called the lungs of the earth” (*Radio Voz de la Selva*, 2009b). According to Alberto Pizango, president of AIDESEP during the protests, state officials simply don’t understand that “we are the air conditioning of the world” (*Radio Voz de la Selva*, 2009a).

However, indigenous opposition to oil development also stems from the experience of being marginalized subjects of modern development. From the lens of M/C, this explains why indigenous peoples throughout the region are fierce advocates for the Achuar from the Corrientes region of Northern Peru, who, at the hands of the state oil company Petroperú and the multinational Occidental Petroleum, experienced over 30 years of environmental degradation (La Torre-Lopez, 1999). Pizango remarks that Amazonian peoples “will always” take the example of the Achuar, emphasizing how exploitation has caused children in the region to have lead and cadmium in their blood (AIDESEP, 2007). In a 2008 response to the entrance of Pacific Stratus Energy on indigenous land, a Matés leader commented that, in spite of company promises, the experience of 1974 reminds them that “various brothers died when the company came in” (Servindi, 2008b). Etched in the collective memories of indigenous peoples, these remarks are frequent throughout the region.

It is also important to underscore how President Garcia’s *perro del hortelano* discourse misrepresents indigenous perspectives on development. Garcia implies that environmental activists allied with indigenous causes are heavily influenced by socialist perspectives. He writes that the present-day environmentalists are in fact “yesterday’s communists,” who have changed their red shirts for green ones (Garcia, 2007). The notion that indigenous peoples are influenced by a Marxist-left is something that indigenous peoples themselves categorically reject. In response to Garcia’s claims, ex-AIDESEP president Gil Inoach-Shawit argues that indigenous notions of development are “not marked by Western philosophers.” In fact, he says, “for indigenous peoples scientific and utopian socialism do not exist,” pointing out that the proletariat’s claims are based on improving salaries and working conditions, not on securing territorial rights (Inoach-Shawit, 2009). As Inoach-Shawit claims, indigenous values revolve around the concept of territory.

For many indigenous peoples, “territory” is conceptualized differently from the Western notion of “land”: territory embodies a collective, spiritual, and sacred space, interdependent with nature. In a recent constitutional proposal, the four major Peruvian indigenous organizations provide further insights: “in this space we express our spirituality and cosmovision, music, dance, poetry, literature, . . . we recreate our richness and linguistic multiplicity” (AIDESEP et al., 2004). Responding to President Garcia’s insinuation that the Amazon region is unproductive, FENAMAD (The Native Federation of the Madre de Dios River and Tributaries) argues that these territories are the main source of indigenous existence, producing food, water, and medicine (Native Federation of the Madre de Dios [FENAMAD], 2008).

Of course, it would be inaccurate to reduce indigenous conceptualizations of territory to a purely natural space that should be cordoned off from all forms of development, which is precisely what the *perro del hortelano* discourse implies. For instance,

the abovementioned constitutional proposal emphasizes indigenous technological capabilities in regard to the use of soils, waters, and forests and indigenous understandings of the chemical-pharmaceutical properties of plants for development purposes. Rather than rejecting economic development, it highlights the importance of creating a state development fund for financial and administrative support, for promoting indigenous businesses enterprises, and for providing indigenous peoples greater access to markets (AIDSEP et al. 2004).

Directly responding to the *perro del hortelano* critique, Inoach-Shawit rejects the idea that the Amazon can be considered an unproductive space. He provides examples from the 1980s, where, with minimal state-level assistance, indigenous peoples were able to increase rice and corn yields up to 500%. Inoach-Shawit also cites other examples where, with the help of NGOs, indigenous forestry projects proved to be especially productive, expanding market access for indigenous products and reducing the incidence of illegal logging and, in some cases, organizing cooperatives in fish-farms, which has helped to reduce their dependence on extractive industries. As Inoach-Shawit explains, indigenous peoples have always been engaged in a wide variety of economically productive activities: “the indigenous population is not some *perro del hortelano*. They defend their territories like a businessman defends his economic assets” (Inoach Shawit, 2007).

The M/C lens, in summary, offers a complex understanding of indigenous perspectives on development: Indigenous peoples from the Peruvian Amazon do not reject development, rather they seek to forge an alternative development project that is based on indigenous conceptualizations of territory. The *perro del hortelano* discourse frames indigenous peoples as romantically yearning for a natural relationship to land, requiring a hands-off approach to development. In lieu of indigenous cosmovision, it is easy to see how one might confuse this with a certain type of environmental protectionism that is antidevelopment. However, indigenous peoples recognize and embrace the importance of development, albeit from a different perspective and epistemological locus.

Final Comments (and a Gesture Toward Decoloniality)

The main objective of this article has been to examine the conflict between indigenous peoples and the Peruvian government over natural resource development (especially hydrocarbon development) in the Peruvian Amazon. This particular conflict ended tragically as 33 Peruvians lost their lives. Given the ever-increasing scarcity of resources, conflicts between governments and indigenous peoples are inevitable as national development interests collide with the rights of indigenous peoples to protect their environments and utilize resources in accordance with their own cultural values. In this case, despite the obvious tragedy of Bagua, the protest movement successfully pressured the government into repealing four of the most controversial decrees (1015, 1073, 1090, 1064). And, more significant, in August of 2011, the Peruvian Congress

approved the *Law of the Rights to Prior Consultation for Indigenous and Original Peoples as recognized by ILO 169*. Congress had originally passed the law in May of 2010, but President García refused to sign it. However, Peru's newly elected president, Ollanta Humala signed the law, fulfilling a campaign promise (Servindi, 2011).

The success of the indigenous movement from the Peruvian Amazon to impact public policy is noteworthy, especially considering that indigenous people from the region represent only about 1% of the entire Peruvian population. In this case, part of this success was no doubt due to the support from a multitude of groups and organizations throughout Peru. Labor organizations, student groups, antiglobalization protestors, human rights advocates, and Catholic bishops all advocated strongly in favor of indigenous demands. The protests were even supported by several members of Congress and from governmental organizations such as the Public Ombudsman's Office. According to indigenous rights lawyer Vladimir Pinto, 2009 will be remembered as a critical juncture in the Peruvian indigenous movement: "Never, as in this past year, has so much public consciousness been generated around the existence of an indigenous Peru" (Pinto-Lopez, 2009).

The relative success of these protests, however, should be tempered with a certain caution. While the newly passed consultation law does represent a step toward greater indigenous participation in the formulation and implementation of development projects, the law does not grant indigenous peoples the political power to significantly alter development projects on indigenous spaces. In fact, one of the reasons that García opposed signing the new law was that he felt that it gave the impression to indigenous peoples that they have "special" rights that supersede national rights to develop the region. Here García is not wrong as the law explicitly states that the final decision over the approval of legislative or administrative measures corresponds to the "competent state entity" (Article 15). In other words, it is quite conceivable that even with the passage of this new law the government could, if it deemed necessary, pass legislative and administrative measures—and legislative decrees—that undermine indigenous territorial rights. In 2010, Peruvian Anthropologist Alberto Chirif expressed this sentiment: "As good as the proposal for a consultation law might be, if there is no political will it is worthless" (Chirif, 2010, p. 8).

This begs the question, then, how to create public policies that respect indigenous rights to territorial and cultural integrity? Informed by the M/C lens, to answer this question, I suggest a gesturing toward a decolonization of public policies. Drawing from the insights of this article, a decolonization of Peru's natural resource policy regime would require a reform of public policy at two levels: (a) The state must recognize that its policies and institutions are conceived around a Eurocentric logic that has excluded and marginalized indigenous peoples from the making and implementation of natural resources policies that directly affect indigenous livelihoods; (b) Indigenous participation in development project should be rethought to include indigenous conceptualizations of development and modernity. This requires political, economic, and epistemic participation in development.

The first level (a recognition of Eurocentric bias) suggests that the left/right political spectrum (socialism vs. neoliberalism) that often defines conflicts between indigenous peoples and national governments is somewhat limited. In this case, President Garcia's policies fit clearly within the neoliberal model that do explain many Latin American development policies (Menem, Uribe, Carlos Andres Perez, Fujimori, etc.). However, both left and right leaning governments engage in extractive development projects that challenge indigenous territorial and cultural claims. Left leaning governments in Venezuela, Brazil, and Ecuador, for example, are still drilling for oil in the Amazon region and, quite possibly, still violating indigenous territorial claims. This does not imply that neoliberal governments and left-leaning governments are the same, but does recognize that, theoretically, both are inspired by Eurocentric values.

The second level (greater participation in development projects) suggests that indigenous conceptualizations and epistemological considerations should be considered in the formulation and implementation of development projects. Here, Robert Guimaraes, the former ex-vice president of AIDSESP, sheds light on what this might look like from the perspective of indigenous peoples. Guimaraes argues that if indigenous peoples' conceptualizations of territory were incorporated into natural resource policy, indigenous peoples would have rights over the air, soil and subsoil, which would then force the state to negotiate with indigenous communities as equals. This would not prevent all oil development, says Guimaraes, but it would make it more difficult for companies to violate indigenous rights. The real problem, says Guimaraes, is that by maintaining the ownership of the subsoil the state can effectively maintain economic and political control over indigenous territorial spaces (R. Guimaraes, personal interview, January 2008). In my view, Guimaraes's comments reflect the government's logic of coloniality that, since the first colonial encounters with indigenous peoples, has led to a willingness to violate indigenous territorial rights in the name of modern development. Moving toward decoloniality would necessarily require that the state, as Guimaraes suggests, give indigenous peoples a greater economic, political, and epistemic role in the making of Peru's development policies.

- a. "formal jobs for Peruvians . . ."
- b. "the *minifundista* model without technology . . ."
- c. "it is shameful that Chile exports . . ."
- d. "[by] virtue of that right they freely determine . . ." (p. 4)
- e. "the object of the process of public . . ." (p. 16)
- f. "if there were an ecological . . ."
- g. "for indigenous peoples . . ."
- h. "in this space we express . . ." (p. 15)
- i. "the indigenous population . . ."
- j. "Never, as in this past year . . ."

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Notes

1. This video spot can be accessed at www.youtube.com/watch?v=JDVGw4pbHEk.
2. Gerardo Réénique (2009) come to a similar conclusion, albeit for slightly different reasons, arguing that AIDSEP represents “another modernity (p. 130).
3. Many observers agreed that the FTA was a pretext to implement a legal structure that would significantly change the development model in the Amazon region (Bandarián-Gomez, 2008).
4. Since the time of this writing, indigenous protests of oil development, including recent oil spills, continues especially against Tailsman Energy Company on the Morana River and against Pluspetrol on Marañón River (Go to <http://amazonwatch.org/news>).
5. For the most recent compilation of this group’s work see *Cultural Studies*, 21(2-3), March/May, 2007.

References

- Aquino, M. (2009, May 15). Peru protests over Amazon development intensify. *Reuters*. Retrieved from <http://www.reuters.com/article/2009/05/15/peru-energy-protests-idUSN1529149520090515>
- Barandiarán-Gomez, A. (2008). *Camisea y el fantasma de una política de hidrocarburos en el Perú* [Camisea and the phantom of the hydrocarbons policy in Peru]. Lima, Peru: Lima DAR (Derecho, Ambiente y Recursos Naturales).
- C169 Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention. (1989). *Convention concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries*. Geneva, Switzerland: International Labour Organization.
- Chirif, A. (2010, July 3). Perú: Las observaciones del Ejecutivo: El derecho de consulta versus el autoritarismo [Peru: Observations of the executive: The right of consultation versus authoritarianism]. *Servindi*. Retrieved from <http://www.servindi.org/actualidad/27886>
- Chirif, A., & García Hierro, P. (2007). *Marcando Territorio: Progresos y Limitaciones de la Titulación de Territorios en la Amazona* [Marking Territory: Progress and Limitations of the degree of territory in the Amazon] Copenhagen, Denmark: IWGIA (International Working Group on Indigenous Affairs).
- Declaran estado de emergencia en distritos amazónicos por violencia [Declare state of emergency in Amazonian districts for violence]. (2009, May 9). *El Comercio*. Retrieved from HYPERLINK “<http://elcomercio.pe/noticia/284325/gobierno-declaro-estado-emergencia-varios-distritos-amazonicos-actos-violencia>.” <http://elcomercio.pe/noticia/284325/gobierno-declaro-estado-emergencia-varios-distritos-amazonicos-actos-violencia>

- Drinot, P. (2000). Peru, 1884-1930: A beggar sitting on a bench of gold. In E. Cárdenas, J. A. Ocampo & R. Thorp (Eds.), *An economic history of twentieth-century Latin America* (New York, NY: Palgrave).
- Dussel, E. (2002). World-system and "trans"-modernity. *Nepantla: Views from the South*, 3(2).
- Escobar, A. (1995). *Encountering development : the making and unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Escobar, A. (2004). Beyond the Third World: imperial globality, global coloniality and anti-globalisation social movements. *Third World Quarterly*, 25(1), 207-230.
- Escobar, A. (2007). Worlds and knowledges otherwise—The Latin American modernity/coloniality research program. *Cultural Studies*, 21, 179-210.
- Finer, M., & Orta-Martinez, M. (2010a). A second hydrocarbon boom threatens the Peruvian Amazon: Trends, projections, and policy implications. *Environmental Research Letters*, 5(1), 1-10.
- Finer, M., & Orta-Martinez, M. (2010b). Oil frontiers and indigenous resistance in the Peruvian Amazon. *Ecological Economics*, 70, 207-218.
- Garcia, A. (2007, October 28). El síndrome del perro del hortelano [The dog in the manger syndrome. Trade.]. *el Comercio*. Retrieved from http://elcomercio.pe/edicionimpresa/html/2007-10-28/el_sindrome_del_perro_del_hort.html
- Greenspan, E. (2006). *Strategies for improving government consultations with indigenous peoples in the Peruvian Amazon* (Unpublished master's thesis). John F. Kennedy School of Government Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.
- Harvey, D. (1989). *The condition of postmodernity: An enquiry into the origins of cultural change*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Huancas, M. (2009, August 9). Reporte de la Defensoría del Pueblo: El temor al daño ambiental genera gran parte de los conflictos sociales Defensoría del Pueblo [Report of the Ombudsman's Office: The fear of environmental damage generated much of the Ombudsman's social conflicts]. *el Comercio*.
- Hughes, N. (2010). Indigenous protest in Peru: The "Orchard Dog" bites back. *Social Movement Studies*, 9(1), 85-90.
- Hvalkof, S. (2000). Outrage in rubber and oil: Extractivism, indigenous peoples, and justice in the Upper Amazon. In C. Zerner (Ed.), *People, plants, and justice: The politics of nature conservation* (pp. 83-116). New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Inoach-Shawit, G. (2007, December 18). Peru: La diferencia entre el perro del hortelano y el perro del monte [Peru: The difference between the dog and the dog in the manger of the mountain.]. *Servindi*. Retrieved from <http://www.servindi.org/actualidad/3087> & <http://www.servindi.org/actualidad/opinion/14884>
- Inoach-Shawit, G. (2009, August 1). Peru: El camino del movimiento indígena. Hacia donde caminar y que caminos evitar [Peru: The road to indigenous movement: Where to walk and what roads to avoid.]. *Servindi*.
- Interethnic Association of Development of the Peruvian Amazon, Confederation of Amazonian Nationalities of Peru, Confederation of Farmers of Peru, and National Agrarian Confederation. (2004). *Ante la comision especial: Ley 28150, sobre comunidades campesinas y nativas, propuesta de las organizaciones de pueblos originarios y de comunidades campesinas*

- e indígenas* [Before the special committee: Law 28150 on rural and native communities, proposal for indigenous peoples' organizations and rural and indigenous communities]. Lima, Peru: Author.
- Interethnic Association of Development of the Peruvian Amazon. (2007, November 13). Peru: Carta de AIDESEP al Presidente Alan García [Peru: Letter to President Alan García AIDESEP]. *Servindi*. Retrieved from <http://www.servindi.org/actualidad/3116>
- Interethnic Association of Development of the Peruvian Amazon. (2008). *Pronunciamiento May 15* [Statement May 15]. Retrieved from <http://www.aidesep.org.pe/index.php?codnota=18>
- Interethnic Association of Development of the Peruvian Amazon. (2009a, March 12). *Comunidades Kichwas y Secoyas defenderán su territorio y no permitirán el ingreso de la empresa brasileña Petrobras*. [Kichwa and Secoya communities defend their territory and will not allow the entry of the Brazilian company Petrobras]. Retrieved from <http://www.aidesep.org.pe/index.php?codnota=570>
- Interethnic Association of Development of the Peruvian Amazon. (2009b, April 10). *Ucayali, Selva Central y pueblo Matsés decidieron unirse a la lucha de la Amazonía peruana* [Ucayali, Selva Central and Matsés people decided to join the struggle of the Peruvian Amazon]. Retrieved from <http://www.aidesep.org.pe/index.php?codnota=622>
- Interethnic Association of Development of the Peruvian Amazon. (2009c). *Pueblos nomatsiguenga y asháninkas rechazan a Pluspetrol* [People reject asháninkas Nomatsiguenga and Pluspetrol]. Retrieved from <http://www.aidesep.org.pe/index.php?id=6>
- Kimerling, J. (1991). *Amazon crude*. New York, NY: Natural Resources Defense Council.
- La Torre Lopez, L. (1999). *All we want is to live in peace: Lessons learned from oil operations in indigenous territories of the Peruvian Amazon*. Lima, Peru: Lima International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Racimos de Ungurahui Working Group.
- Manacés-Valverde, J., & Gómez-Calleja, C. (2010). *Informe en Minoría de la Comisión Especial para Investigar y Analizar los Sucesos de Bagua* [Minority report of the Special Commission to Investigate and analyze the events of Bagua]. Retrieved from http://www.idl.org.pe/webpanel/informes/180411file_informeminoria.pdf
- Merino, B. (2010). *Discurso de la Doctora Beatriz Merino, defensora del pueblo, ante la comisión que investiga los sucesos ocurridos en las provincias de Bagua y Utcubamba, nombrado por el Congreso de la República* [Speech of Dr. Beatriz Merino, the Ombudsman, before the commission investigating the sucesors occurred in the provinces of Bagua and Utcubamba, appointed by the Congress]. Retrieved from http://indigenouseoplesissues.com/attachments/3672_Defensoria_Inf_Bagua_19.01.2010.pdf
- Mignolo, W. (2000). *Local histories/global designs: Coloniality, subaltern knowledges, and border thinking*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Mignolo, W. D. (2005). *The idea of Latin America*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Mignolo, W. D. (2007a). Delinking—The rhetoric of modernity, the logic of coloniality and the grammar of de-coloniality. *Cultural Studies*, 21, 449-514.
- Ministry of Energy and Mines. (2008). *Las actividades de hidrocarburos, la participación ciudadana y los instrumentos de gestión ambiental* [Hydrocarbon activities, public participation and environmental management tools]. Iquitos, Peru: The General Office of Social Management.

- Native Federation of the Madre de Dios. (2008, December 11). El verdadero "perro del horrelano" es el gobierno aprista afirma FENAMAD [The real "dog in the manger" is the APRA government says FENAMAD]. *Servindi*. Retrieved from <http://www.servindi.org/actualidad/2853>
- Perez-Maura, R. (2008). El Rey hizo muy bien en la cumbre; habría que poner orden [The King did very well at the summit; would have to bring order] [Electronic Version]. *ABC.es*. Retrieved from <http://www.abc.es/hemeroteca/historico-20-01-2008/abc/Internacional>
- Pinto-López, V. (2009). *El derercho a la consulta previa libre e informada a los pueblos indígenas en el Perú: Programa de Defensa de Derechos Indígenas*. [The right to free and informed prior consultation to the indigenous people in Peru: Defense program for indigenous rights].
- Radio La Voz de la Selva. (2009a, April 22). Pizango: Los indígenas solo piden respeto [Pizango: Indians only demand respect]. *Voz de la Selva 93.9 fm*. Retrieved from <http://www.cnr.org.pe/aa/vselva/ninterna.html?x=6644> & <http://radiolvs.cnr.org.pe/ninterna.html?x=6638>
- Radio La Voz de la Selva. (2009b, April 22). Apoyo a la lucha de los pueblos amazónicos [Support the struggle of the peoples of the Amazon]. *La Voz de la Selva 93.9 fm*. Retrieved from <http://www.cnr.org.pe/aa/vselva/ninterna.html?x=6644> & <http://radiolvs.cnr.org.pe/ninterna.html?x=6638>
- Rénique, G. (2009). Law of the Jungle in Peru: Indigenous Amazonian Uprising against Neoliberalism. *Socialism and Democracy*, 23, 117-135.
- Sawyer, S. (2004). *Crude chronicles: Indigenous politics, multinational oil, and neoliberalism in Ecuador*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Servindi. (2006, September 5). Perú: "No más concesiones petroleras en comunidades indígenas" demanda pueblo Achuar [Peru: "No more oil concessions in indigenous communities" Achuar people demand]. *Servindi*. Retrieved from <http://www.servindi.org/actualidad/1072>
- Servindi. (2007a, May 15). Perú: Congreso indígena denuncia usurpación de tierras en selva central [Peru: Indigenous Congress denounces land grab in central jungle.]. *Servindi*. Retrieved from <http://www.servindi.org/actualidad/2031>
- Servindi. (2007b, June 8). Perú: Pueblos Indígenas de selva central rechazan agresiva política de concesiones sobre territorios indígenas [Peru: Indigenous peoples reject central jungle aggressive policy of concessions on indigenous lands.]. *Servindi*. Retrieved from <http://www.servindi.org/actualidad/2097>
- Servindi. (2008a, April 29). Perú: Amazónicos del norte denuncian contaminación, rechazan concesiones petroleras y exigen respeto a sus derechos [Peru: Amazonian north denounce pollution, reject oil concessions and demand respect for their rights]. *Servindi*. Retrieved from <http://www.servindi.org/actualidad/3946>
- Servindi. (2008b, December 12). Peru: Gobierno concesionó lotes petroleros en el pueblos Matsés [Peru: Government leased out oil blocks in the peoples Matsés]. *Servindi*.
- Servindi. (2009a). Perú: FORMABIAP y ORKIWAN rechazan "acciones divisionistas" de petrolera Perenco [Peru: FORMABIAP and ORKIWAN reject "divisive measures" of Perenco oil]. *Servindi*. Retrieved from <http://www.servindi.org/actualidad/6056>

- Servindi. (2009b). Perú: Amazónicos continúan la lucha por defensa de sus derechos territoriales [Peru: Amazon continues the struggle to defend their land rights]. *Servindi*. Retrieved from <http://www.servindi.org/actualidad/10404>
- Servindi. (2011). Perú: “Presidente cumple su promesa y proluga Ley de Consulta Previa a pueblos indígenas” [Peru: “President keeps his promise and proluga Act prior consultation with indigenous peoples”]. *Servindi*. Retrieved from <http://www.servindi.org/actualidad/50733>
- Smith, R. C. (1982). *The dialectics of domination in Peru: Native communities and the myth of vast Amazonian emptiness*. Cambridge, MA: Cultural Survival.
- Taylor, A. C. (1999). Amazonian Western Margins (1500s-1800s). In F. Salomon & S. B. Schwartz (Eds.), *The Cambridge history of the native peoples of the Americas; Vol. 3: South America* (pp. 2 v). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- UN General Assembly. (2007, October 2). *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* (Resolution/adopted by the General Assembly, A/RES/61/295). New York, NY: Author.
- Wolf, E. R. (1997). *Europe and the people without history*. Berkeley: University of California Press. (Original work published 1982)

Bio

George Stetson is a visiting professor of Public Policy and Administration at Boise State University. His research focuses on natural resource development and environmental politics in Latin America and the developing world. He is currently working on a comparative project that examines environmental conflict and governance arrangements between marginalized actors, government officials, and private interests over natural resource development.