

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
SANTA CRUZ

**INTERCULTURAL SOVEREIGNTY:
THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF INDIGENOUS SOCIAL MOVEMENTS**

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction
of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

POLITICS

with emphases in FEMINIST STUDIES
and LATIN AMERICAN AND LATINO STUDIES

by

Sandra Cristina Alvarez

December 2012

The Dissertation of Sandra Cristina
Alvarez is approved:

Professor Rosa-Linda Fregoso, Co-Chair

Professor Hector Perla Jr., Co-Chair

Professor Kent Eaton

Professor Angela Y. Davis

Tyrus Miller
Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies

Copyright © by
Sandra C. Alvarez
2012

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	v
Dedication and Acknowledgements	vii
Introduction.....	1
What do indigenous peoples confront when addressing questions of sovereignty?12	
Modernity and coloniality.....	24
Interculturality as decolonial option	34
Building intercultural sovereignty	37
Paradox of indigenous sovereignty.....	49
Interculturality as methodological/epistemic pproach.....	51
Overview.....	56
Chapter 1: De/colonizing Research	60
“Colonization in action in eastern Colombia”	66
Resistance: From silence to interculturality.....	80
Research and U’wa resistance: From objects to subjects of research.....	87
Circumstances of their relationship	93
Research crossing borders	102
Conclusion	107
Chapter 2: Theorizing Rights with Indigenous Peoples of the Americas Through the Practice of Education	110
Layers of human rights	115
Liberal humanist framings of human rights.....	116
Latin American tradition.....	119
Indigenous approaches to human rights.....	121
Intercultural resonances between north and south.....	125
Education as a building block of sovereignty: From the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples to daily practices	131
National context for ethnoeducation.....	136
Before the U’wa ethnoeducation project	139
“Wings to Fly”: Embodied decolonization through education.....	142
Kajkrasa Ruyina: Proyecto Etnoeducativo del Pueblo U’wa	148

Conclusion: Building sovereignty through education	152
Chapter 3: Acompañamiento	155
Campaigns and transnational advocacy networks	160
Accompaniment as intercultural strategy	166
The identity formation of the U'wa Defense Project and Mujer U'wa	171
The formation of the U'wa Defense Project	172
The formation of Mujer U'wa	179
Practices of acompañamiento	184
Conclusion: <i>Acompañamiento</i> from the past to the future	188
Conclusions.....	191
Appendix: List of Acronyms	201
Bibliography	202

Abstract

Intercultural Sovereignty: The Theory and Practice of Indigenous Movements

Sandra Cristina Alvarez

In 2006 the U'wa people of northeastern Colombia rejected the government's consultation process relative to the planned exploration and exploitation of petroleum located under U'wa ancestral lands because, in their view, the government had no right to the subsoil in the first place. The U'wa claimed sovereignty over the land and subsoil to reject the Colombian state's desire to exploit petroleum for profit. This raises an interesting paradox: how can an indigenous pueblo call for sovereignty from within the jurisdiction of a state? Beyond that, what are the stakes of indigenous sovereignty to global arrangements of power and resource distribution?

This dissertation examines U'wa efforts to resist cultural and physical extinction within a context of globalization and on-going civil conflict. What can we learn from this resistance—its persistence, its forms and methods, and its successes and failures? To both pose and answer this and related questions, I draw conceptual and analytical tools from the modernity/coloniality (M/C) research program to develop an intercultural approach that is grounded in the transnational networks that partner with the U'wa struggle. My multi-sited field research includes archival research and participation in organizing processes, interviews, and discussion groups.

I argue that intercultural sovereignty, a concept that builds on indigenous conceptualizations of sovereignty, helps make visible how marginalized and colonized peoples move beyond the traditional notion of sovereignty to build self-

determination. My research finds that the U'wa build intercultural sovereignty through their relationships of collaboration with outsiders, through the mobilization and redefinition of an international discourse of rights and in cross-border social movement partnerships.

This research contributes to academic and activist debates by adopting a decolonial approach that makes visible marginalized knowledges and practices in terms of sovereignty and human rights. Rather than engage a critique of sovereignty internal to Eurocentric modernity, I argue that it would be productive for Political Science to engage with indigenous concepts of sovereignty to address the history and consequences of colonialism and recognize different relations to land. Finally, the long-standing transnational partnerships engaged by the U'wa offer a different, complementary metric for measuring success in transnational advocacy networks.

Dedication and Acknowledgements

I dedicate this dissertation to the memories of the *luchadoras y luchadores* that have come before us. To my grandparents whose dreams of education have sustained me throughout a life of learning inside and outside of academia. To my parents who kept those dreams alive and taught me to work hard for what I believe in. To the U'wa whose daily struggles have much to teach and contribute towards conceptualizing a politics of life that recognizes our interconnections with each other and the earth. To Ingrid Washinawatok, Lahe'ena'e Gay, and Terence Freitas whose vision and lifework charted paths for many of us to follow. To Piedad Morales, whose laughter and poetry still rings in my ears. And to our future generations that need us to protect the earth for them, especially Noemi, Sofia, Daniel, Marcelo, Lucas, Andrés, Elizabeth, Rocío, Lucía, Juliana and in Colombia little Ingrid Washinawatok Tegria Cristancho.

Multiple people, institutions, and on-going conversations made this research possible. I first thank my committee co-chairs Rosa Linda Fregoso and Hector Perla for believing in my project and pushing me to make my writing legible to multiple audiences. Their respective work on human rights and social movements has greatly enriched my own. Kent Eaton helped me make clearer arguments and supported the interdisciplinary approach to my project. Angela Davis challenged me to be open to different possibilities without any guarantees and provided an amazing model of activist scholarship and mentorship. Thank you for offering a space for me to finish the last revisions on my dissertation. I'm thankful to the Latin American and Latina/o

Studies Department for pushing me to think outside of traditional disciplinary or regional boxes, and the Feminist Studies Department for providing the critical theories and tools to imagine different futures. I am grateful to the Politics Department, which first opened the door to my inquiries about how social forces produce political change. The Chicano/Latino Research Center, especially Gabriela Arredondo, El Centro-Chicano/Latino Resource Center and Rosie Cabrera, the Women's Center and the Lionel Cantú Center all created important spaces to build intellectual and activist community.

My research was also made possible through the generous funding of the Cota Robles Fellowship, the Politics Department, the Chicano/Latino Research Center, the Transnationalizing Gender Justice Dissertation Workshop, the University of California Human Rights Fellowship through the Human Rights Center at UC Berkeley, University of California Washington Center Fellowship, the Davis-Putter Scholarship for Activist Scholars, and finally multiple teaching assistantships and research assistantships.

I could not have endured without the sage advice of and venting sessions with my peers and friends on and off campus. In particular I thank Dawn Fraser, Leila Salazar, Courtney Rivard, Sara Benson, the Research Cluster for the Study of Women of Color in Collaboration and Conflict and the Feminists of Color Writing Collaborative, including Pascha Bueno-Hansen, Susy Zepeda, Roya Rastegar, Elisa Diana Huerta, Cindy Bello, Xochitl Chavez, Marianne Bueno, Karina Cervantes, Angelica Lopez, Ruth Kim, Jasmine Syedullah, the Colombia Region Research

Cluster especially Rose Cohen, Alan Ziegler, Jenny Escobar, and Claudia Lopez.

In Colombia, Patricia Adiola Bohorquez, Daris Cristancho, Berito Cobaria, Gilberto Cobaria, Clara Cecilia Velez Upegui, Susana Pimiento and many others supported my work, engaged my conversations and pushed me to think differently. In the US, my *hermanas* in Mujer U'wa—Ana Maria Murillo, Nefertiti Altan, Michelle Gutierrez, Susana Cáceres, Camille Chico—helped me maintain my commitment to a larger process than my own schooling and provided support by listening, laughing and dancing with me from the Bay Area to U'wa land. I give heartfelt thanks to Ali El Issa, John Livingstone, and Paul Haible for hours of conversation and coffee and the bridge they provided to Ingrid and Lahe's work and legacies. Thank you for trusting and participating in this process. For accompanying me on this path of transnational activism and relationship building, I thank John Lindsay-Poland, Susana Pimiento, Liza Smith, Kevin Koenig, Atossa Soltani, Andrew Miller, Andrew Fandino, Paul Paz y Miño and Leslie Wirpsa.

Finally, and though I know I have left out names that live in my heart, I want to thank my brother, Dr. Edwin Alvarez, my mother Gabriela Alvarez and father Reinaldo Alvarez for their unconditional love and support. The love of my life, Aurora Guerrero, has sustained and inspired me beyond words ever since I first met her on campus in 2005. For the love, energy and spiritual support of Carmen Quinteros, Tony Herebia and Patricia Ovando, I am eternally grateful. To the spirits that guide me and santos that walk with me, this work is a humble offering. May it open the door to many conversations and new possibilities.

Introduction

A video produced by the *Organización Nacional Indígena de Colombia* (ONIC) opens to the closed eyes of a man with long hair and dark skin. A heart monitor beeps in the background. The narrator begins: “They appeared more than 10,000 years ago. From a population of more than 20 million individuals, colonization reduced them to less than 2 million.” As the narrator speaks we see different parts of the man’s body: embroidered shirt and beaded necklace, long sleeves and colorful bracelets, long black hair tied in the back, his eyes closed. “They were confined to areas where the proportion of arable land does not ensure survival. In these same areas economic interests prevail over their lives.” A life-size model of an elephant behind the man comes in and out of focus. The man’s brow is furrowed, eyes still closed. He does not move. “In Colombia there are 102 indigenous pueblos.¹ Culture, language, and traditions disappear, victims of neglect, looting of their land, and forced displacement. In the next ten years, 25 indigenous pueblos of Colombia will disappear.” As this last warning trails off, the man opens his eyes. We then see

¹ Following Jackson (2007) and Wirpsa (2004: 141), I use Spanish word *pueblo* to denote both people and community. *Pueblo* is not just a plurality of individuals, but a people with their own customs, laws, and governing structures. Indigenous peoples (*pueblos*) have fought for the “s” at the end of the term so that their right to self-determination would be recognized at the international level (El Issa 2010; Smith 1999). Linda Smith explains, “‘Indigenous peoples’ is a relatively recent term which emerged in the 1970s out of the struggles primarily of the American Indian Movement (AIM), and the Canadian Indian Brotherhood. It is a term that internationalizes the experiences, the issues and the struggles of some of the world’s colonized peoples. The final ‘s’ in ‘indigenous peoples’ has been argued for quite vigorously by indigenous activists because of the right of peoples to self-determination. It is also used as a way of recognizing that there are real differences between different indigenous peoples” (Smith 1999: 7).

from his perspective; he is standing inside a glass case within a museum where curious families mill about. “It’s not too late.” The indigenous man looks around at his surroundings as the narrator concludes: “Let’s react.” The video fades to black and ends with the website address www.onic.com.co (ONIC 2010).²

According to the Colombian Constitutional Court’s 2009 ruling, *Auto 004*, the U’wa people of northeastern Colombia, along with 33 other indigenous pueblos, face physical and cultural extinction due to the on-going armed conflict and related displacement (Cepeda Espinosa 2009).³ The ONIC argues that all 102 indigenous peoples within the territorial jurisdiction of Colombia face extinction due in part to the armed conflict but also “poverty, discrimination, institutional neglect, and the imposition of a foreign development model that devastates their communities” (ONIC 2010: 10).

In the face of the U’wa’s potential extinction caused by the above mentioned problems and in the context of Colombia’s globalization and armed conflict, this dissertation seeks to understand: how do indigenous peoples redefine sovereignty to

² Aparecieron hace más de 10 mil años. Llegaron a ser más de 20 millones de individuos reducidos por la colonización a menos de 2 millones. Fueron confinado en zonas donde la proporción de tierra cultivable no asegura su supervivencia. En estas mismas zonas los intereses económicos prevalecen sobre sus vidas. En Colombia existen 102 pueblos indígenas. Cultura, lengua y tradición desaparecen, victimas del olvido, del saqueo y del desplazamiento forzado. En los próximos diez años, 25 pueblos indígenas desaparecerán del territorio colombiano. Aun no es demasiado tarde. Reaccionemos.

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tlwi0w2RMNU&feature=player_embedded

³ These include the Wiwa, Kankuamo, Arhuaco, Koqui, Wayúu, Embera-Katío, Embera-Dobidá, Embera-Chamí, Wounaan, Awá, Nasa, Pijao, Koreguaje, Kofán, Siona, Betoy, Sikuni, Nukak-Makú, Guayabero, U’wa, Chimila, Yukpa, Kuna, Eperara-Siapidaara, Guambiano, Zenú, Yanacona, Kokonuko, Totoró, Huitoto, Inga, Kamenzá, Kichwa, Kuiva (Cepeda Espinosa 2009: 25).

avoid physical and cultural extinction and build self-determination? The question leads to a theoretically interesting paradox: how does an indigenous *pueblo* build sovereignty within the jurisdiction of a modern state?

This dissertation argues that the U'wa pueblo of Colombia does this by deploying transnational strategies to create what I call intercultural sovereignty. Just as the video above is a call to interrupt discourses of dead (indigenous) history housed in museums, the U'wa struggle for sovereignty interrupts the western hegemonic approach that views states as the only entities with the capacity to exercise sovereignty. This dissertation shows how the U'wa engage in strategies to build intercultural sovereignty within the context of economic globalization, an ongoing civil war, and a state with a long tradition of promoting natural resource extraction to generate revenue. Intercultural sovereignty as practiced by indigenous peoples, not only advocates for a different understanding of sovereignty that does not presume sovereignty to be co-terminus with the nation-state, but also provides an alternative to the Eurocentric discourse on monolithic state sovereignty, which precludes pluri-national claims to shared sovereignty.

The term “interculturality” evokes a concept and political project advanced in Latin America by indigenous social movements in struggles for bilingual education in the 1980s and 1990s (Walsh 2000; Rojas 2004). Indigenous movements pushed for intercultural education as a political strategy that recognized the relationship between democracy, citizenship, and education (Rappaport 2005). Interculturality is based on an “other” logic that emerges from indigenous struggles to survive as distinct nations

through three centuries of colonization and genocide and two centuries of marginalization and assimilation by nation-states in the Americas. To survive these adverse circumstances, many indigenous peoples have adapted some aspects of the dominant society and reworked them under a different logic. In that sense interculturality describes a method of appropriating concepts across cultures (Rappaport 2005: 8). For example, in the ONIC video this meant staging it in a museum, a context more familiar to dominant society than to indigenous people. Second, interculturalism refers to a political perspective that imagines a functioning pluri-national state based on dialogue and coexistence. The indigenous man coming alive forces the viewer to imagine a different relationship to indigenous people, as intersubjective instead of objectifying. Finally, an intercultural approach also indicates relationships based on collaboration and engaged dialogue (Rappaport 2005: 8).

Moreover, this dissertation expands the IR conceptualization of state sovereignty to argue that indigenous peoples, in this case the U’wa, are building what I am calling intercultural sovereignty. This does not mean secession from the state, as IR and international law might expect when indigenous people demand sovereignty and self-determination. Instead, as the U’wa governing council (ASOUWA) frames it, “The government should recognize that we are people who are *part of* that word ‘State.’ It should respect our forms of life, our thinking, our laws of origin, and our elders. It should respect universal human rights and international treaties because we are people—we too feel” (ASOUWA 2002). Intercultural sovereignty differs from IR

theories of sovereignty because of its relational approach to authority and territory. In other words, rather than a one-way incorporation into established power hierarchies, using the logic of interculturality indigenous peoples seek a transformation of relations with the state and a recognition of their historical relations to territory.⁴

I open with this video for two reasons. First it communicates through the use of an intercultural strategy. By intercultural strategy I mean that the producers of the message attempt to engage viewers through the use of concepts familiar to the dominant society (Schiwy 2009; Rappaport 2005; Walsh 2009). It suggests a relational understanding of the condition facing indigenous people in Colombia today, an understanding which must come to terms with centuries of history that have resulted in the threat of extinction for indigenous *pueblos*. Interculturality calls for a concerted effort to examine the positions and worldviews of different located histories and thus points to attempts at decolonization. In the video, this engagement seeks to create a relational subjectivity, or intersubjectivity, to undermine the objectification of indigenous people. The “inter” in this term advances a relational understanding of indigenous people that serves as an alternative to the dominant narrative that relegates indigenous people to little more than historical artifacts or

⁴ Transculturation and syncretism are two related but different terms that discuss cultural mixing. Transculturation, a term coined by Fernando Ortiz (1940), refers to a new synthesis of two or more cultures as a result of colonialism. Syncretism also refers to a new synthesis from previously unrelated and seemingly contradictory religions, ideologies, or political systems. Interculturality is a term that emerges from indigenous and Afrodescendant movements in the Americas. It refers to the building of relationships of respect across difference, not necessarily creating a new cultural synthesis.

curiosities. If indigenous people no longer were to exist then there would be no need to remember or rectify the injustices from colonial times that continue today.

Second, the video highlights the ongoing devastation of colonization facing indigenous peoples in Colombia and throughout the Americas: extinction. Sovereignty, for indigenous peoples, means the ultimate right to exist as socially, culturally, economically, politically, and epistemologically distinct peoples in harmony with the earth and to make decisions that safeguard such an existence (Wiessner 2008). Thus, the opposite of sovereignty is extinction. Colonial and later state authorities have perpetuated both physical and cultural extinction in successive stages of national history through genocide, marginalization, and most recently assimilation under the banner of building the modern, sovereign Colombian nation. Today the dominant approach to sovereignty in International Relations (IR) understands it as absolute authority over a territory and has become interchangeable today with the State (Krasner 2001; Camilleri 1994; Jackson 1990). However, this dissertation argues that Indigenous peoples, as demonstrated by the U'wa case in Colombia, interrupt this western centered discourse by redefining and building sovereignty through daily practices and making claims through a transnational discourse of decolonial rights from within the confines of juridically sovereign states.

The ONIC, an organization composed of and representing 102 indigenous pueblos located within the borders of Colombia, produced this video for their anti-extinction campaign entitled "Sweet Words, Breath of Life: Campaign for the Survival of Indigenous Peoples at Risk of Extinction in Colombia" launched in 2010.

The ONIC's objective was to develop a visibility campaign about the "conditions of existence of the indigenous population" and policies to "protect and strengthen the integrity of the indigenous pueblos...to rethink processes of resistance" (ONIC 2010: 5). The campaign drew attention to 32 indigenous *pueblos* with populations of less than 500 people at risk of extinction (ONIC 2010: 7).⁵ This campaign came in the wake of the Colombian Constitutional Court's ruling, *Auto 004* of 2009. These two lists from the Colombian Constitutional Court and the ONIC only coincide in terms of two *pueblos*, the Nukak-Makú and Guayabero. In other words, together these two lists paint a bleak picture of the not-so-distant future with over sixty indigenous *pueblos* at risk of extinction.⁶

The Constitutional Court and the ONIC take different perspectives on the causes of potential extinction. According to the ruling, *Auto 004*, the Colombian Constitutional Court identifies the internal armed conflict as the cause of the potential cultural or physical extinction of these 34 indigenous *pueblos* (Cepeda Espinosa 2009: 2). The indigenous and social movements in Colombia—and their transnational partners—argue that the armed conflict cannot be extricated from the neoliberal economic development model promoted by the Colombian government. Indigenous organizing, especially since the 1970s and the rewriting of the Constitution in 1991,

⁵ These include *pueblos* with less than 100 people: Yamalero, Makaguaje, Pisamira, Tsirípu, Eduria (Taiwano), Plaroa, Wipijimi, Muinane, Yaruro, and Dujo; between 100 and 200: Judpa, Yauna, Bara, Ocaina, Yohop (Hupdu), Amorua, Chiricoa, Nonuya, Kawayari; between 200 and 500: Yuri, Matapi, Kacua, Achagua, Carijona, Tatuyo, Tariano, Yagua, Masiguaro, Nukak-Makú, Guayabero, Carapana, Bora (ONIC 2010: 60).

⁶ The ONIC recognize 102 pueblos while the Colombian government only recognizes 87 (ONIC 2010; DANE 2005).

facilitated indigenous and Afro-Colombian legal gains and recognition. According to a recent report from the Colombian Department of National Planning, 27.3 percent of national territory is covered by 735 *resguardos* where Colombia's indigenous pueblos hold collective land titles (DNP 2010: 16). If eighty percent of Colombia's natural resources are found on those lands (Rappaport 2005: 1), the question becomes: who has the right to make decisions about land and natural resources?

Dominant approaches within IR theory, and the Colombian government, would answer that state sovereignty gives state institutions the sole authority to make these decisions. The classical meaning of sovereignty is the supreme authority over a territory exercised by the state (Hinsley 1966; Krasner 2001). It is a concept foundational not just to IR theory and international law, but to modernity more broadly. However, state sovereignty emerged in Europe simultaneous with the colonization of what are today the Americas by the same European powers (Wallerstein 2004; Quijano 2000). An alternative perspective on sovereignty informed by the modernity/coloniality (M/C) research project would argue that because state sovereignty is intricately tied to colonialism and its legacies, particularly in the Américas, a shift of perspective is necessary to alter the terms of the discussion. This shift requires an embodied locus of enunciation instead of a disembodied theoretical approach to sovereignty (Escobar 2003: 62; Mignolo 2000: 13). An indigenous perspective on sovereignty would argue that indigenous peoples, as collectivities that predate the modern nation-states of the Americas, are sovereign and hold legitimate right to make decisions about the conditions that affect them. This

shift from viewing indigenous people as objects of study and universal (Eurocentric) understandings of sovereignty to contextualized loci of enunciation of particular actors is theorized by the modernity/coloniality research program, which provides a framework to interrupt Eurocentric discussions of modernity by revealing the legacies of colonization, or the coloniality of power. If European colonizers targeted indigenous peoples with the goal of extermination or assimilation and their lands for settlement or expropriation across centuries of colonial rule and subsequent nation-state governance, then Eurocentric notions of sovereignty could hardly address indigenous resistance and relationships to land and territory. In this case, the extinction of indigenous pueblos blamed on war and globalization is better understood in historical context as a product of the coloniality of power, given that both the economic system of capitalism and political system of the liberal state have sought the accumulation of land and resources in the centuries since colonization in the Americas began (Quijano 2000).

With this video the ONIC addresses a Colombian audience about the ongoing consequences of colonization for indigenous peoples: loss and looting of land, forced displacement, neglect, and extinction. The video, as a call to action for viewers, requires a collective effort or “reaction” to change the current course of events. The video connects Colombian society to the ongoing dispossession of indigenous peoples who, for many, are “out of sight and out of mind.” The closed eyes of the indigenous man represent the closed eyes of Colombians as they neglect or ignore the harsh reality of 500 years of interrelated processes that continue today. A key part of the

video's message is that there is nothing inevitable in the extinction of indigenous peoples in Colombia. The larger message works to interrupt a way of thinking, a linear narrative of modernity that relegates indigenous people to the past, preserved in a museum, and as lifeless as the extinct elephant standing behind him. Showing the indigenous person conscious and breathing by the end of the video reveals indigenous people, as agent—*alive*—and not just victim. By shifting to the perspective of the indigenous man looking out of the installation into the museum, it shifts the perspective from an disembodied voice speaking about an object, “indigenous man,” to a subject who museum patrons must recognize as living rather than dismiss as extinct.

U'wa ancestral lands lie across five different *departamentos* (on the eastern range of the Andes Mountains in northeastern Colombia and even reach into Venezuela. In the mid 1990s the U'wa nation, numbering between 5,000-10,000, announced plans to commit mass suicide if the Colombian government and Occidental Petroleum followed through with plans to explore for oil on their ancestral lands (Vidal 1997). Building on strategies developed across centuries of resistance to colonialism the U'wa have taken their struggle against Occidental Petroleum in the 1990s to multiple arenas with the ultimate goal of demanding recognition of their rights to ancestral lands. Sovereignty, for the U'wa, is signified by their relationship to land, which is “one of the fundamental values that identifies [the U'wa] vision of the world and the construction of a future” (ASOUWA 2009). In that relationship to land, the U'was see it as their responsibility to protect the earth: to be U'wa is to

“respect and protect Mother Earth as mandated by the Law of Origin. Following this law one lives as an U’wa, if it is not fulfilled, one ceases to be U’wa and becomes *Riowa* [non-U’wa]” (ASOUWA 2007: 30). In the long struggle against oil exploration on their ancestral lands, the U’wa consistently expressed this relationship to explain their rejection of national economic development plans.

The U’wa struggle parallels the ONIC’s campaign video in three related ways. First, the video connects the Colombian history of colonization to the present, just as the U’wa bring their oral traditions to bear on current disputes around the use of and control over their ancestral lands. Second, both the ONIC, through this video, and the U’wa mobilize discourses and concepts familiar to Colombian society and the political elite, specifically in terms of human rights and sovereignty. Lastly, both the ONIC and the U’wa actively seek out (non-indigenous) others to be part of a collective “reaction” to the injustices committed against indigenous peoples through various transnational strategies.

In the following sections I first explore the dominant historical development of the theory of sovereignty within IR, which is couched within Eurocentric perspectives on modernity that pay short shrift to the foundational role of colonialism as well as its aftermath. Dominant approaches in IR privilege the state, largely viewing colonialism as a problem of the past (Jackson 1990). But as scholars in the modernity/coloniality paradigm have documented, modern state political power, especially in Latin America, largely conserves the dynamics put in place during colonization. Anibal Quijano (Quijano 2000) refers to this as the coloniality of power.

To highlight how the logic of colonial relations persists and drives indigenous peoples to extinction I next turn to a modernity/coloniality framework. In doing so I ask, how might a decolonial approach interrupt the Eurocentric discourse on sovereignty and make visible the subalternized knowledges, epistemologies, and practices of marginalized peoples? Rather than assume that sovereignty is limited to states I ask how the U'wa define sovereignty for themselves, through what means and in relation to what entities. How does a decolonial approach to the study of sovereignty in the case of the U'wa examine the social and political histories of actors in relation to each other while paying particular attention to hierarchies of power? This research finds that the U'wa have made their case for intercultural sovereignty, which both demands recognition from the Colombian state and yet also recognizes state sovereignty, using mechanisms from colonial, national, and international laws. Through these mechanisms, U'wa leaders argue for their people's right to the soil and subsoil of their ancestral lands (ASOUWA 2006).

What do indigenous peoples confront when addressing questions of sovereignty?

The classical meaning of sovereignty derived from IR literatures defines sovereignty as the absolute authority over a demarcated territory. For example, F. H. Hinsley defined sovereignty as “the idea that there is a final and absolute political authority in the political community...*and no final and absolute authority exists elsewhere*” (Hinsley 1966: 26, emphasis original). This holds key implications for indigenous peoples given that states are the only entities imbued with the capacity for sovereignty, internally and externally, and in relation to other states. To date most

Political Science studies of indigenous peoples assume the framework of state sovereignty, and focus on their struggles for citizenship rights (Yashar 2005), human rights (Brysk 2000), constitutional rights (Van Cott 2000), and/or in relation to democracy and democratization (Van Cott 1994). These studies highlight questions of autonomy and identity but do not question state sovereignty. Studies on sovereignty likewise do not engage or recognize indigenous peoples as sovereign (Jackson 1990; Krasner 2001). The traditional definition of sovereignty leaves little room for a discussion of sovereignty for indigenous peoples that are not looking to form their own states, but instead are working to prevent their people's cultural and physical extinction. Moreover, this situation appears paradoxical as indigenous peoples make claims to sovereign rights within the territory of a particular nation-state and using the legal framework of that state government. To make sense of this apparent contradiction, I first examine the emergence of the classical definition of state sovereignty.

Sovereignty is a foundational concept for IR, particularly in relation to the consolidation of the nation-state in Europe (Jackson and Sorensen 2003). While the Eurocentric notion of sovereignty has spread throughout the world, the mobilizing vehicle for its dissemination, colonialism, is hardly addressed. Additionally, a review of the IR literature on sovereignty shows that the concepts (and institutions) of sovereignty are defined as coterminous with the state. In fact, many scholars use state sovereignty interchangeably with sovereignty in general (Skinner 2010; Camilleri 1994; Weber 1995). For example, sovereignty, according to Cynthia Weber (1995),

“describes states either individually or in a community. Thus sovereignty serves as a fundamental point of reference in international relations, a ground or essential modifier for the state.... Can one say anything about statehood without beginning by deciding what sovereignty means? When this question is considered in light of most of the literature in international relations, the answer appears to be probably not” (Weber 1995: 1). State sovereignty is conventionally defined as the exclusive authority over a particular territory, including the control of borders (Krasner 2001; Hinsley 1966). In theory, this implies a duality where externally, sovereign states are free from interference by other states. Internally, sovereign states hold authority within their territorial borders. Statehood is composed of territory, people, and a government (James 1999). Finally, IR’s central theme is the study of the international state system, whose building blocks are states (Krasner 2001: 230).

Contributing to debates on the salience of the state in a time of globalization, Stephen Krasner further identified multiple meanings of sovereignty, including domestic, Westphalian, and juridical (Krasner 2001: 230-233).⁷ Krasner explains that sovereignty refers to both practices and rules; thus these elements are not necessarily

⁷ One debate in the literature questions threats to state sovereignty, including globalization and human rights, as threats to state sovereignty (Strange 1997; Krasner 2001). While some see the death of the state as a result of these threats (Bartelson 2001), others argue that state sovereignty has historically adapted to globalizing forces (Krasner 2001; Sikkink 1993; Reus Smit 2001). Krasner argues against a common belief in the erosion of sovereignty due to globalization or “the combined onslaught of monetary unions, CNN, the Internet, and nongovernmental organizations.” Instead, he asserts, economic globalization will produce an alteration in the “scope of state authority rather than to generate some fundamentally new way to organize political life” (Krasner 2001: 20).

parts of a larger whole. Rather, each aspect of sovereignty may overlap or impact another, just as some may exist absent the others. Drawing upon Hobbes and Bodin, Krasner's definition of domestic sovereignty refers to the structures of authority within a territorial jurisdiction (Krasner 2001: 231). Westphalian or Vattellian sovereignty, the most commonly used meaning of sovereignty, is the rule of noninterference by outside powers in a nation-state's internal affairs. Finally, juridical sovereignty refers to legal aspects of recognizing independent states within an international system (Krasner 2001: 232). For an example of how these different aspects co-exist, a "failed" state (or quasi-state) may lack domestic sovereignty with high rates of impunity and violence due to conflict fueled by "drug wars," such as Colombia or Mexico, but still retain Westphalian and juridical sovereignty. The governments of those countries may lack control of large portions of national territory, but their borders are respected by other states and the state is recognized in international relations and institutions. The European Union provides an example of a group of states that have given up aspects of domestic sovereignty by enforcing their juridical sovereignty or the right to enter into contract with other states in that Union (Krasner 2001: 233).

Krasner's definition of domestic sovereignty implies the regulation of behavior within a territorial jurisdiction in terms of the structures of authority for governing as well as the military might to provide protection (Krasner 2001: 231-232, Jackson 1990). Krasner cites Jean Bodin and Hobbes, sixteenth and seventeenth century theorists of domestic sovereignty, who both wrote during a time of war and

unrest due to religious strife. As a result of this context, they favored a strong, centralized state (Krasner 2001: 231-232). The state referred to “a specific type of union or civil association, that of a *universitas* or community of people living subject to the sovereign authority of a recognized monarch or ruling group” (Skinner 2010: 27).

French political theorist Jean Bodin first articulated the theory that evolved into the concept of state sovereignty during the sixteenth century (Spruyt 1994; Camilleri 1994; Skinner 2010). Bodin favored the monarch as the sovereign, in which “all the people in generall, and in one bodie [swear] faithfull alleageance to one soveraigne monarch” (quoted in Skinner 2010: 29). Bodin defines sovereignty as “*Majestas est summa in cives ac subditos legibusque soluta potestas* (sovereignty is supreme power over citizens and subjugated peoples and is bound by no other law)” (James 1986: xi; Camilleri 1994).

Thomas Hobbes also theorized absolutist theories of the state. Hobbes believed that people surrender their rights to the Leviathan as the “Multitude united in one Person” (Camilleri 1994: 17), a “commonwealth,” “*civitas*” or “state” (Skinner 2010: 37). The state may be made up of any number of people but the sovereign was absolute, which was necessary to promote the common good. Hobbes’ justification for submitting to the sovereign is not because of divine law but because they are “authorised representatives” with the responsibility to “act at all times in such a way as ‘to procure the common interest’ by conducting their government in a manner ‘agreeable to Equity, and the Common Good’” (Skinner 2010: 35). In this Hobbesian

approach, the “common good” of sovereignty includes the use of state security for its “procurement”:

Sovereign states, at their most fundamental, must be equipped with “the sword of war” or “the right to arm”, and “the sword of justice” or “the right to punish”, as Hobbes (1993, pp. 176–7) puts it. He captured this responsibility in the following words: “Now, all the duties of rulers are contained in this one sentence, the safety of the people is the supreme law” (Hobbes, 1993, p. 258).... That proposition has not changed since the time of Hobbes, in spite of remarkable changes to states and societies in other respects.⁸ (Jackson 2007: 299)

Security is thus an important aspect of domestic sovereignty, but is most successful when the structures of authority also have legitimacy in the eyes of the people (Krasner 2001: 232).

Critics of the absolutist theory represented by Bodin and Hobbes advocated a populist theory of state sovereignty. While this line of thought agreed that the state refers to a type of civic union, it disagreed with the metaphor of the people as a body in need of the sovereign head. Instead they argued that the body politic, or the people, was the source of sovereignty. Their discussions were based not on monarchies but other polities “governed by legislative assemblies in which the people were represented according to different social ranks or ‘estates’” (Skinner 2010: 31). These examples were found in what is today known as Italy, Switzerland, and the Netherlands (United Provinces).

⁸ Jackson (1990) uses this aspect of sovereignty as one reason to explain how and why European forces colonized other regions of the world instead of respecting them as sovereign territories. For example, in the nineteenth century when rulers in Africa were unable to protect their people, they were likewise not recognized as sovereign states. Thus virtually the entire African continent was dominated and partitioned by European colonial powers and reduced to dependencies.

Seventeenth and eighteenth century writers John Locke and Jean-Jacques Rousseau theorized popular sovereignty. The social contract that Rousseau envisages is part of a “republican vision” (Prokhovnik 2008). Locke reinterpreted natural law “as a claim to innate, inalienable rights inherent in each individual” (Camilleri 1994: 17), which became associated with individual liberal rights. In opposition to Hobbes’ theory of the absolute sovereign, Locke insisted upon individual rights, such as property, that the sovereign could not violate. Individual rights, then, could not be violated by society or the state. Locke viewed the sovereign state as deriving legitimacy from the consent of individuals, to whom the state owed a responsibility of protecting and respecting individual rights (Camilleri 1994, Hinsley 1966). According to Hinsley (1966: 154) with Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s 1756 publication of *Social Contract*, Rousseau succeeded in defining the concept of popular sovereignty, which refers to the idea that the rule of law depends upon the consent or will of the people. Rousseau’s approach to sovereignty, inscribed in political doctrine as a result of the French and US Revolutions, has become hegemonic in IR (Hinsley 1966: 154).

In sum, domestic sovereignty refers to the internal capacity and legitimacy of authorities within a state. By internal capacity I mean the ability to provide for both the common good and for protection. Legitimacy refers to the trust citizens have in the government’s capacity to provide protection and other services. For example in contemporary Colombia, because the state has not succeeded in maintaining a monopoly on the use of violence or the provision of justice, the extent of domestic sovereignty is highly debatable. In the U’wa case the state has been unable to ensure

the safety and protection of the U'wa people who have historically endured state violence at the hands of religious figures (see chapter 1), military personnel, and illegal armed actors (Wirpsa 2004: 147, 267-273). Furthermore, as the U'wa have stated, their interests, well-being, and points of view also have been left out of consideration of state decision-making.

For Krasner, domestic sovereignty is defined by internal structures of authority and security. Westphalian sovereignty is defined by the recognition of authority over a state by other states that respect the principle of non-intervention (Krasner 2001: 232). This form of sovereignty represents a shift from religious to secular authority, the establishment of borders instead of overlapping relations of rule, and the principle of sovereignty as exclusionary and residing in nation-states. For IR scholars, the Peace of Westphalia marks a key moment in the linking of territory and political rule to the principle of non-intervention (Philpott 2000; Krasner 2005).⁹ Westphalia refers to a treaty signed in 1648 to end the Thirty Years' War, a war that devastated Europe during the last decades of the Protestant Reformation. Bodin and later Hobbes theorized about sovereignty in the context of the religious wars that pit Catholics against Protestants beginning in the early sixteenth century. The resulting doctrine of the divine right of kings was articulated to wrest power away from the Holy Roman Empire and to separate religious authorities from

⁹ Krasner argues against the conventional view that this aspect of sovereignty “did not actually receive explicit articulation until a century later, when the French-speaking Swiss jurist Emmerich de Vattel penned his 1758 work on *The Law of Nations, Or Principles of the Law of Nature Applied to the Conduct and Affairs of Nations and Sovereigns*” (Krasner 2005: 81). For this reason, in his 2005 article, he names this aspect of sovereignty “Westphalian-cum-Vattelien sovereignty” (Krasner 2005: 71).

political matters (Camilleri 1994, Philpott 2000). This signified the stripping away of overlapping relations of rule and the establishment of borders recognized by other sovereign authorities.

The problem with Westphalian sovereignty for Indigenous peoples is found in the doctrine of *uti possidetis*. Uti Possidetis, according to legal scholar Siegfried Wiessner “means one should leave the place as one received it” (Wiessner 2008: 1150). The doctrine set the precedent for the exclusionary logic of borders and the privileging of established authority that persists today. It was first implemented during the nineteenth century period of independence of Latin American states (Wiessner 2008: 1150).

The decolonizing processes of Asia and particularly Africa followed this precedent by maintaining the territorial boundaries set by European colonizers (Jackson 1990; Jackson 2007; Wiessner 2008: 1149-1152). Wiessner (2008) explains how this doctrine became a problem in the UN process of decolonization:

[T]he choice as to the political future of colonized peoples was not given to the individual peoples conquered, but to the inhabitants of territories colonized by European conquerors, within the boundaries of the lines of demarcation drawn by the colonizers. Thus the colonizers, by constituting the new country’s “people” under the new sovereign’s control continued to rule the colonized from their graves. (Wiessner 2008: 1150)

Consequently, Westphalian sovereignty set the stage for the division of territory into states where international borders, fixed by colonial powers, could only be changed with the consent of all states involved, thus reinforcing colonial dynamics established by European colonial powers.

The last dimension of sovereignty identified by Krasner is juridical sovereignty, which structures the relationships between states and international institutions. He argues juridical sovereignty means that “independent territorial entities merit recognition and with it such rights and privileges as membership in international organizations, possible access (if needed) to the resources of international financial institutions, the ability to sign contracts or treaties with other states and entities, and diplomatic immunity for their representatives” (Krasner 2005: 71). Krasner draws a parallel between this aspect of sovereignty within international law to the liberal theory of the state: states at the international level and individuals at the national level are “free and equal” (Krasner 2001: 233).

Robert Jackson, however, argues that states are not equal, signaling a problematic aspect of this type of sovereignty. His concept of “quasi-states” explores the distinction between negative and positive sovereignty and points to the latest stage of the “international dualism” that characterizes the “states-system” (Jackson 1990: 55). He builds on Dutch theorist Hugo Grotius who first conceived of this dualism to assert, “There is an outer circle that embraces all mankind, under natural law, and an inner circle, the *corpus Christianorum*, bound by the law of Christ” (Jackson 1990: 54). The second phase arose in the nineteenth century when European powers depended upon international law and particularly the concept of *terra nullius* (land belonging to no one) to justify occupation and colonial expansion and occupation of territories in Asia and Africa. It lasted until the early twentieth century. Jackson does not include North and South America or Russian Asia in the dualism between

European and non-European states. Instead he argues that the dualism is internal to those regions: “The same dualism existed in North and South America and Russian Asia, but it was internal rather than external colonialism and consequently was never subjected to eventual decolonization” (Jackson 1990: 55).

The last stage, represented by his notion of “quasi-states,” emerges through the decolonization of Africa and Asia in the period after World War II. Negative sovereignty refers to the “normative framework that upholds sovereign statehood in the Third World” (Jackson 1990: 1). In Krasner’s terms, this refers to Westphalian and juridical sovereignty (Jackson 1990: 27). Positive sovereignty, on the other hand, refers to that which “emerged in Europe along with the modern state and was expressed by Western imperialism and colonialism” (Jackson: 1990: 1). Positive sovereignty, or Krasner’s domestic sovereignty, refers to a sovereign government that “possesses the wherewithal to provide political goods for its citizens” (Krasner 2001: 29). Today’s quasi-states, holding negative (i.e. Westphalian and juridical) sovereignty, are primarily those in Africa and Asia that have acquired sovereignty through the principle of self-determination espoused after World War II, but may not hold a monopoly on the provision of justice or on the use of force. Jackson notes the United Nation’s 1960 *Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples* (Resolution 1514) which “proclaimed that ‘all peoples have the right to self-determination’ and ‘inadequacy of political, economic, social or educational preparedness should never serve as a pretext for delaying independence’” (Jackson 1990: 77). These states, according to Jackson, were largely not ready to

provide for the domestic needs of their populations in practice, even if they were newly respected as sovereign. Former colonial powers were then expected to aid in the development of these new sovereign entities.

Jackson's notion of quasi-states reveals two important perspectives in IR that center European history. First, the European state system is held as the model for all other political territories. Second, Jackson expresses a common view of the Americas as "an object of European conquest and *an extension of European sovereignty*" (Jackson 1990: 56, emphasis added).

As this discussion illustrates, sovereignty in the traditional IR conception is coterminous with statehood. The three aspects of sovereignty highlighted by Krasner—domestic, Westphalian, and juridical—provide markers for the terms of the debate on sovereignty and indigenous peoples. Despite Rousseau's notion of popular sovereignty within domestic sovereignty and because of the state-centered focus on Westphalian and juridical sovereignty, the way that IR defines sovereignty is insufficient for indigenous peoples. In sum, the traditional notions of sovereignty in IR have several interrelated problems. First, they are derived inductively from European history. Second, sovereignty as practiced in Europe is assumed to be universally applicable, and obscures alternative experiences of nation-state and sovereignty formation that were influenced by different processes, such as imperialism. Third, it cannot account for the fact that in Latin America nation-state building or the building of state sovereignty was the primary mechanism used to disenfranchise the indigenous peoples of the region.

While modernity and sovereignty are usually discussed in Western literatures apart from colonialism and its legacies, the concept of intercultural sovereignty requires these two concepts to be in conversation. Intercultural sovereignty is the response by indigenous people to build self-determination from within the prevailing nation-state and international political system while challenging the legacies of colonialism. As illustrated by the video used to open the chapter, intercultural sovereignty calls for a shift in perspective from the dominant, largely unquestioned location of western discourses on sovereignty to a perspective grounded in the histories of colonization of the Americas. This sheds light on the U'wa's historic relations with the Colombian state and society to make visible how they have sought to appropriate and redefine the concept of sovereignty to exert control over the territory, resources, and decision-making affecting their people and ancestral homelands.

Modernity and coloniality

In the previous section, what remained constant through the development of the theory of sovereignty is the emphasis on the singular authority over a bounded territory ascribed to sovereign states. The doctrine of *uti possidetis* ensured that even with decolonization the original boundaries set by colonial powers were respected, a principle enshrined in the UN Charter, Article 2. This illustrates the persistence of colonial logics of political control over land and subjects and remains problematic over time not only for minority rights, as recognized particularly in the aftermath of World War II, but especially so for indigenous peoples in the Americas and elsewhere

who were not viewed worthy of self-determination through state form. Indigenous peoples of the Americas were objectified first by colonial then by national authorities that developed mechanisms of power to incorporate indigenous populations into the nation-states that emerged with independence in the nineteenth century.

The modernity/coloniality research program offers an approach that accounts for how modernity is constituted by coloniality in order to make visible alternatives to prescriptions for political, social, and economic power based in European history. Eurocentric modernity involves hegemonic control over the spheres of knowledge, subjectivity, authority, and the economy. The assumed universality of western notions of sovereignty masks the Eurocentric approach to the study of sovereignty. Latin America and the historical realities of indigenous populations and rights struggles have much to contribute to these discussions. To deconstruct the Eurocentric bias of the mainstream perspective, we must recognize the role that colonialism and particularly the colonization of Latin America has played (and its legacies continue to play) in the consolidation of the modern/colonial world system. The modernity/coloniality research program offers a decolonial approach to think *from* the Americas instead of *about* Latin America as an object or an extension of Europe.

Decoloniality as an analytics approaches Latin America not merely as an object of study or to refer to a particular nationality but signals a contextualized *perspective*, what Escobar refers to as a locus of enunciation. As Arturo Escobar (2003) explains, “‘Latin America’ itself becomes a perspective that can be practiced in multiple areas, provided it is constituted from counterhegemonic elaborations that

challenge the very assumption of Latin America as an object of study constituted prior to and outside imperialist discourses that often construct it” (Escobar 2003: 69).¹⁰ A Latin American locus of enunciation takes into account and questions the production of knowledge from a perspective that takes into account the distortions produced in the past and present by the processes and logics of colonization. This locus of enunciation, Escobar emphasizes, “reveals and denounces the blindness of the narrative of modernity” that turns Latin America into an object of study (2003: 62). This object then receives theories based on different histories. The projects and social movements that arise from the experiences of local histories that differ from, yet are impacted by, the expansion of the “West” reveal the blindness of this narrative. Decoloniality offers an “other” way of thinking to expand Eurocentric narratives of modernity (Escobar 2003: 53). In other words, a Eurocentric approach to sovereignty can only see the authority (power) of the state, which is part of the colonial logic. However, approaching sovereignty from the locus of enunciation of the U’wa people signals a political history that cannot be subsumed as an additional category of citizen or individual. It must address historical relations between the U’wa, with their own political and cultural systems and beliefs, and the Colombian state. In what follows I review modernity and coloniality as a power structure to

¹⁰ ‘Latinoamérica’ en si misma deviene una perspectiva que puede ser practicada en múltiples espacios, con tal de que se constituya desde elaboraciones contrahegemónicas que desafíen el supuesto mismo de Latinoamérica como objeto de estudio constituido, *previo y afuera de* los discursos a menudo imperialistas que lo construyen.

better understand decoloniality as an analytics that reveals the possibilities of intercultural sovereignty.

Arturo Escobar lays out the main premises of European modernity in historical, sociological, cultural, and philosophical terms to establish what the modernity/coloniality group is working to interrupt (Escobar 2003: 55-56). Historically, modernity from a Eurocentric perspective originates in northern Europe (particularly England, France, and Germany) as a result of the Reformation, Enlightenment, and the French Revolution, processes that consolidated in the Industrial Revolution. In sociological terms, the accompanying institutions include the sovereign nation-state, the disconnection of social life from local contexts and time-space distancing. Culturally, modernity translated into the notion of individualism, an emphasis and reliance on experts and reason or rationality. Philosophically, modernity produced the notion of man as separate from divinity and nature and the idea of progress as linear (Dussel 2000).

Escobar (2003) argues that Eurocentric modernity is in fact a local history that has produced a global design. Eurocentric modernity co-exists with, yet attempts to subsume, other colonial modernities (Mignolo 2000). European modernity should be viewed as a local history, one contextualized in a particular place and time, whose frameworks for understanding economic and political relations today have become hegemonic, that is, a global design. The Argentinean philosopher Enrique Dussel (2000) distinguishes two views on modernity: one is provincial, Eurocentric, and understood as emancipatory. The other takes a larger perspective into account, a

global or world-view aligned to Immanuel Wallerstein's conceptualization of the modern world-system (Wallerstein 2004). Instead of a singular (north) European modernity, Dussel argues that Spain and Portugal played important roles in the construction of the first stage of modernity that produced the conditions of possibility for the second stage of modernity, which was dominated by England, France, and Germany.¹¹ Thus his thesis is that "Modernity really began in 1492" when Spain reached (what was to become) America and laid the groundwork for the Atlantic circuit that was to replace the Mediterranean trade circuit (Dussel 2000: 474, Escobar 2003, Mignolo 2000). If modernity began with Columbus' voyage across the Atlantic, then modernity and coloniality are mutually constitutive. Recognizing coloniality is key to undoing the erasure of the histories of peoples subjected to the political rule of European powers that claim sovereignty as emancipatory. Coloniality points to the violence and marginalization that enabled the economic and political world system that exists today. If there is only one story with regards to modernity or sovereignty, then other resistances and knowledges will continue to be erased. If we cannot think outside of state-centered sovereignty, then we cannot envision anything before states were constituted, nor can we account for the processes and violences that accompanied and enabled "independence" in the American context and decolonization in Africa and Asia.

¹¹ Wallerstein has been critiqued by other M/C scholars for leaving out the roles played by Spain and Portugal in the construction of the modern-world system. See Mignolo (2000).

According to Peruvian sociologist Aníbal Quijano (2000), colonization connected two mechanisms of power; one was the classification of peoples according to “race” and the other was the division and control of labor. The expansion of this colonization required “a Eurocentric perspective of knowledge, a theoretical perspective on the idea of race as a naturalization of colonial relations between Europeans and non-Europeans” (Quijano 2000: 534-5). Decoloniality as an analytics focuses on these three aspects of the coloniality of power: the logics of political and economic relations, the construction of subjectivity based on the idea of race, and Eurocentric knowledge production. If the key problem facing the U’wa in the struggle for sovereignty is a Eurocentric and state-centered interpretation of sovereignty, then decoloniality as an analytics interrupts this discourse and shifts the locus of enunciation to a people who have maintained autochthonous governing systems and adapted to new realities.

Colonialism established a system of political and economic control by a small European minority over peoples across the Americas.¹² Quijano argues that colonialism produced “an articulation of all historically known previous structures of control of labor, slavery, serfdom, small independent commodity production and

¹² Quijano explains in a footnote, “from 1492 to 1610, America was exclusively the time/space under Iberian (Hispanic Portuguese) colonial domination. This included, in the northern border, California, Texas, New Mexico, Florida (conquered in the nineteenth century by the United States), the Spanish-speaking Caribbean area, up to Cape Horn in the South—roughly, the time/space of today’s Latin America. The Eurocentered, capitalist, colonial/modern power emerged then and here. So though today America is a very heterogeneous world in terms of power and culture, and for descriptive purposes could be better referred to as the Americas, in regards to the history of the specific pattern of world power that is discussed here, “‘America’ still is the proper denomination.”

reciprocity, together around and upon the basis of capital and the world market” (Quijano 2000: 534). The coloniality of power is a structure of power based on the articulation of peoples into a global capitalist system, classified by race (Quijano 2007). The monetization of labor and the world market based on the extraction of precious metals from the Americas allowed for the control and concentration of commerce across wide networks (Quijano 2000). Thus, building on Raul Prebisch (Prebisch 1960) and dependency theory out of Latin America, the M/C group also emphasize that the control of labor according to race produced a geographic mapping across larger circuits that assigned particular roles for countries of the core and periphery in the global economy (Quijano 2000).

The invention of race justified the domination and repression of populations across the Americas and eventually Asia and Africa (Quijano 1995). From “pureza de sangre” tests that classified according to religion during the time of the Inquisition, classification of populations according to “biological” traits justified their subjugation in the Americas (Quijano 2000). Race, Quijano argues, was the codification of differences into values of superior and inferior and created the social identities that dictated social relations. “Indians” were reduced to serfs, “blacks” were owned as slaves, and “whites” received wages or were independent producers. The use of race to assign value to particular populations was not only important for the control of labor, but also in the production of knowledge and the subalternization of indigenous knowledges (Wynter 2003). In a manner analogous to the articulation of all forms of labor to the world-economy, European hegemony organized “one global cultural

order” (Quijano 2000: 540). Through the expropriation of useful indigenous knowledges, the suppression of languages and cultural systems and the assumption of European superiority over all other non-Europeans, this new order created intersubjective relations of domination. To maintain this domination, the colonized were further compelled to learn the dominant culture. Quijano named this rationale Eurocentrism (2000).

Eurocentrism is based on two founding myths of evolutionism and dualism. First, Europe is positioned as the culmination of a linear progression from the state of nature to the status of developed. Modernization theories, such as Rostow’s stages of growth, illustrate this aspect of Eurocentrism by implying that all countries should follow the five stages demonstrated by Europe (Rostow 1960). Similarly, in the production of knowledge, standards used to measure success and achievements are based on European models. Second, the differences between Europeans and non-Europeans are deemed natural and not attributed to Europe’s position of power (Quijano 2000: 535). This was demonstrated, as mentioned above, by debates on whether “Indians” had a soul or could think. If “Indians” were not viewed as human, the appropriation and plundering of the land and resources was justified. Europeans were unable or unwilling to consider Indians, and later blacks, as human. Instead they were viewed as subrational or non-human; for example Wynter cites Sepulveda’s analogy of the Indians to Spanish as monkeys to men (Wynter 2003: 264). With the advent of Cartesian dualisms, the split between subject and object marked man, ego cogito. As an individual, man was divorced from the natural and the spiritual realms.

According to Wynter, “the world of the laity, including that of the then ascendant modern European state, to escape their subordination to the world of the Church” humans had to be redescribed and man invented (Wynter 2003: 263). This humanist reinvention she described as “degodded” and Man became a political subject of the state. Wynter cites a fifteenth century treatise by Italian humanist Pico della Mirandola as rewriting the relationship between man and God: “It was the new premise that God had created the world/universe for mankind’s sake, as a premise that ensured that He would have had to make it according to rational, nonarbitrary rules that could be knowable by the beings that He had made it for” (Wynter 2003: 278). Wynter is unsettling the coloniality of being to discuss the displacement of the “Christian self” through the reinvention of the human as “ratiocentric subject” (Wynter 2003: 269).

This emergent humanistic way of thinking about Man supported the consolidation of the nation-state by disconnecting the logic of governance from the Church to the state. The development of academic disciplines further accompanied that consolidation as the late eighteenth century European university divided the production of knowledge into disciplines—political science, economics, and sociology—that accompanied the spheres of the state, the market and society respectively (Wallerstein 2004: 6). The divorce of man from the spiritual and natural worlds made the advance of the physical and biological sciences possible (Wynter 2003). Furthermore, this individualism and the focus on the individual as a political

subject of the state served to subalternize alternative knowledges and relationships between “individuals” and collectivities.

The concept of coloniality of power articulates the logic behind the interlocking relationships of labor, race and sex, justified through Eurocentric dualist notions of superiority and inferiority. Looking for the difference colonialism makes calls attention to the spaces that have been hidden by Eurocentric modernity and its discourses to work against colonization. Examining the colonial difference, which is “the space where the coloniality of power is enacted,” is to find “where the restitution of subaltern knowledge is taking place and where border thinking is emerging” (Mignolo 2000: ix). Walter Mignolo (Mignolo 2011) suggests decoloniality as an analytics for decentering Eurocentric modernity. According to Mignolo, decoloniality emerged as a critique of modernity from the Third World through an opening signaled by the 1955 Bandung conference of non-aligned countries, which showed that beyond capitalism and communism there existed the prospect of decolonization (Mignolo 2011: xi-xii, 52-62). This theoretical and epistemological shift in perspective espoused by the M/C research program makes visible subalternized epistemologies and knowledges and interrupts Eurocentric discourses on modernity and sovereignty that are dualistic and privilege hierarchical relations of power between subjects and objects.

To defy the dualist thinking that fractures our realities, a decolonial approach to sovereignty would not assume one universal meaning, based solely on European models. A decolonial approach to sovereignty examines the loci of enunciation of

related positions to take into account the colonality of power. In this case it would be the context and history from which the U'wa organize their futures in relation to the actors that impact their lives and livelihood, particularly the political and economic actors that want to exploit U'wa lands and resources under the banner of economic development. Decolonial options are epistemic and political projects that build “roads towards the future,” a world in which many worlds fit (Mignolo 2011: 217). A decolonial critique of sovereignty requires de-linking the concept from the linear, Eurocentric discourse on modernity prevalent in IR scholarship. In a world where many worlds fit, key concepts like sovereignty would be viewed as connectors instead of imbued with a singular universal definition based on the global designs based on local European histories.

Interculturality as decolonial option

What decolonial thinking, an “other” thinking, and border thinking all point to is a political project to transform ways of being and thinking such that a plurality of perspectives can coexist in relation to each other. One example of this transformative way of thinking is found in the organizing strategies engaged by indigenous peoples. In Latin America, the concept of interculturality emerges from social movements of indigenous and black peoples in processes of decolonization (Walsh 2006). While the practice of interculturality is borne from centuries of resisting colonial and state disciplining forces, the concept emerged in policy-making discourses in relation to ethnoeducation in the early 1980s (Walsh 2000; Castillo Guzman and Caicedo Ortiz 2008). Since then, interculturality has been incorporated into education policy across

the Andean region and other countries in Latin America as well as into constitutional reforms in Ecuador and Bolivia (Walsh 2009; Castillo Guzman and Caicedo Ortiz 2008).

Through respectful, horizontal dialogues and dwelling in distinct local histories, loci of enunciation can be communicated in order to project “roads to the future” (Mignolo 2011: xiii, 27). According to Catherine Walsh, “As concept and practice, process and project, interculturality signifies—in its most general form—the contact and exchange *between cultures* on equitable terms; under conditions of equality” (Walsh 2009: 41).¹³ Interculturality thus points to a different logic than one of inclusion or integration as signified by the concepts of multiculturalism or transculturation (Schiwy 2009). In Schiwy’s study of indigenous media production in the Andean region, she shows how the Indianization of media enacts an intercultural communication strategy that does not seek integration into hegemonic discourses. Instead, indigenous media producers “question the perspectives, genealogies, subjectivities, and technologies of representation that, since the time of conquest, have been privileged in a global epistemic geopolitics” (Schiwy 2009: 26-27). The logic of interculturality recognizes and respects difference, emphasizes collaboration and works towards decolonization by rejecting imposed discourses and “redefining where and how sustainable knowledge is produced” (Schiwy 2009: 27).

Interculturality also works through the transfer of concepts across cultures. In the case

¹³ Como concepto y práctica, proceso y proyecto, la interculturalidad significa—en su forma más general—el contacto e intercambio *entre culturas* en términos equitativos; en condiciones de igualdad.

of indigenous media, Schiwy examines how dominant modes of audiovisual production were appropriated and adapted to facilitate the creation of educational tools for decentralized intercultural communication (Schiwy 2009).

Intercultural strategies demand horizontal dialogue between people who should be equals. This entails the recognition or learning of different yet related localized histories within the context of modernity/coloniality. Indeed, the concept has been integrated into reformed or rewritten constitutions in the Andean region, particularly Bolivia and Ecuador, as a means towards the recognition of plurinational states (Walsh 2009). Interculturality thus grounds discussions about “diversity” or “multiculturalism” by demanding recognition of particular histories and their effects in the present. For indigenous peoples this means a recognition and respect for the historical relationship they hold to particular areas, which go beyond the history of the nation-state. The knowledge indigenous peoples hold in relation to the environment is invaluable in a time of environmental crisis and global climate change. Similar to the conditions of indigenous peoples in the United States and Canada, the process of decolonization in Latin America remains unfinished: while *criollos* won independence for the nation-states of the Americas, indigenous peoples remain “internally” colonized (Schiwy 2009, Jackson 1990). The U’wa face similar circumstances to many indigenous peoples in the Americas that today face the threat of natural resource development.

Resistance for the U’wa and other indigenous peoples has required organizing against the forces of the state and church whose assimilationist and evangelical

practices attempted to turn indigenous people into *campesinos*. Today multinational and national corporations have replaced the church by appropriating indigenous land for the extraction of resources. Examining their resistance through strategies to build intercultural sovereignty reveals the seeds of future decolonial possibilities. By examining indigenous struggles today, we can learn about how indigenous peoples have developed strategies across time. Contrary to popular attitudes that view indigenous peoples as backwards or stuck in the past, their organizing processes show how they have constantly adapted to new circumstances by engaging the political system that developed around them and appropriating concepts from the dominant society for their own survival. These processes are constructive and can show others a different logic and how to live in a world where intersubjective relationships at local, regional, national, inter, and transnational levels are unavoidable and increasingly necessary.

Building intercultural sovereignty

The framework of modernity/coloniality and the logic of interculturality allows for a change in the terms of debate on sovereignty by shifting the locus of enunciation (Escobar 2003). Where sovereignty in Western debates derives from Eurocentric and statist discourses, indigenous peoples, particularly in the post-World War II era, have appropriated the term to argue for rights to self-determination and autonomy (Barker 2005). The U'wa case contributes to a larger international indigenous discourse on sovereignty and decolonization that has manifested in the development of international institutions like the United Nations Permanent Forum on

Indigenous Issues and the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Ingrid Washinawatok El-Issa, chair of the United Nations Decade on Indigenous Peoples (1995-2004), summarized an indigenous definition of sovereignty:

Since the time that human beings offered thanks for the first sunrise, sovereignty has been an integral part of Indigenous peoples' daily existence. With the Original Instructions from the Creator, we realize our responsibilities. Those are the laws that lay the foundation for our society. These responsibilities are manifest through our ceremonies. Ceremonies are not just motions we go through. They are an active process that reaffirms our connection to the Creator and all of Creation. Sacred is not separate from responsibility and daily existence. From the mundane to the momentous, sovereignty is an integral part of the foundation that anchors our culture, society and organizational structures.... Sovereignty is not a right and responsibility reserved only for human beings. Sovereignty is an integral component within the rest of Creation and belongs to all the components of that Creation. We cannot forget that. (Washinawatok 1999: 23)

This intercultural approach to sovereignty represents an indigenous way of being in the world that does not line up with hegemonic definitions of dominion or authority or military power. Unlike Eurocentric discourses that view “man” as separate from nature, an indigenous perspective recognizes a relationship of universal kinship across time, space, and species (Barsh 1986). Washinawatok examines her lived educational experience to discuss how she began to draw a distinction between an imposed Eurocentric perspective on sovereignty and her own indigenous belief system:

My high school political science teacher, Mr. Shriver, used to drum into our heads that sovereignty is power. Although I could not articulate it at that time, I remember having this sense that sovereignty meant much more than just power. This sense became clear as I grew

older and heard the eloquence of folks like Matthew King at Greengrass Sundance or Philip Deere at the Youth and Elders Circles that he hosted. Further conversations with my Dad evolved into an even deeper understanding.¹⁴ What I have come to grasp is that sovereignty is alive and active. Yet it is quite common that in Native languages there is no original single word for sovereignty. That does not mean that the concept of sovereignty does not exist for Indigenous peoples. Actually it lives quite vividly among us. Indigenous peoples often find the English language grossly inadequate when it comes to translating native words (which often times incorporate whole concepts) into English. While sovereignty is alive and invested in the reality of every living thing for Native folks, Europeans relegated sovereignty to only one realm of life and existence: authority, supremacy and dominion. In the Indigenous realm, sovereignty encompasses responsibility, reciprocity, the land, life and much more. (Washinawatok 1999: 23)

This idea of intercultural sovereignty echoes with the logic named *sumak kawsay* in Quichua and *suma kamaña* in Aymara, which loosely translates to live in harmony with the earth, *Pachamama* (Mignolo 2011: 307). Employing this same logic, the U'wa echo these motives for refusing oil exploitation on their ancestral lands (ASOUWA 2002; ASOUWA 2009).

An intercultural approach to sovereignty underlines the historical relationships and relational reciprocity between different living beings. This is not reduced to humans within a predetermined bounded territory; instead it includes, Washinawatok explains, “land, life and much more” (1999: 23). This approach contributes to the de-linking of sovereignty from the linear narrative that emerges from a located history in Europe. By remembering the histories that interweave with the colonization of the

¹⁴ Ingrid Washinawatok’s father, James Washinawatok, was a key activist who fought for restoration of tribal sovereignty after the Menominee were terminated in the 1950s. Ingrid often cited the experience of learning from her parents’ participation in restoring tribal sovereignty. See Beck (2001).

Americas by colonial powers, sovereignty becomes a connector, as per Mignolo (2011: 230), one that requires a relational analysis of the different subjects involved. If interculturality is to be an effective political project and decolonial concept, naming loci of enunciation, engaging in dialogue and making a world where many worlds fit, are imperatives.

For centuries the U'wa have voiced their position in defense of their land and life to colonial and then Colombian government officials (Falchetti 2003). Since the 1990s U'wa leaders have extended these statements to others in addition to the state. More recently in 2009 U'wa leaders addressed the National Oil Company *Ecopetrol*, the National Army, the National Ombudsman (*Defensoría del Pueblo*), the Attorney General's Office and organizations supporting the campaign for the defense of U'wa territory. ASOUWA, the U'wa Association of Traditional Authorities and Tribal Councils, reiterated their position once again through a communiqué (ASOUWA 2009). Facing military, guerrilla, and Ecopetrol activities on their ancestral lands, U'wa declaration resonate with Krasner's (2001) notions of domestic, Westphalian, and juridical sovereignty in terms of U'wa lands:

We reject any intervention in the ancestral territory U'WA that threatens our culture. According to our cosmovision, territory is one of the fundamental values that identifies our vision of the world and the construction of a future. It is part of an integrated whole that gives us identity and is the basis for the enforcement of our special collective rights. Therefore, activities that since 1990 the company ECOPETROL performed in the village Cedeño violate our cultural rights by invading one of our sacred sites preventing the practice of our traditional ceremonies.

According to the Constitution and subsequent laws, the territory over which Aboriginal communities exercise sovereignty, includes the

territory delimited by the *resguardo* and the territories that, although not included within the reservation, have been in possession and cultural use by the respective indigenous community.

The territory where Ecopetrol currently operates exploration activities in the Gibraltar 3 Well is U'wa territory. It is a sacred site as a center of learning and knowledge of traditional medicine U'wa.

We oppose the limitation of movement that the security forces and the company have imposed on our community within U'wa traditional territory of which we own ancestrally. Also, we do not recognize the authority of any armed group because they interrupt the peace and our cosmovision. As U'wa people, we believe that in our territory and especially on sacred territory, guns contaminate with bad energy, leaving the energy of war, death, confrontation and evil. That harms our environment especially in times of cultural rituals of fasting that will begin on June 15.

We will continue to strengthen the campaign to defend the U'wa territory: "A culture with principles has no price" making visible our issues and establishing strategic alliances with various social actors at national and international levels. (ASOUWA 2009)

In this communiqué U'wa leaders unequivocally express their right to ancestral land vis-à-vis all armed actors, legal or illegal, including the security forces of the Colombian state. This position violates the Colombian state's domestic sovereignty by rejecting militarization of the land.

It simultaneously asserts U'wa sovereignty in terms that resonate with the classical IR definition of sovereignty by rejecting "any intervention in the ancestral territory." The U'wa strategize across the borders of the Colombian state's Westphalian sovereignty by seeking "alliances with various social actors at national and international levels" to amplify their claims for justice and to hold the state accountable to international processes. Central to their argument for sovereignty over their lands is the central relationship of their identity to their territory, which conflicts

with Colombian claims to sovereignty. The U'wa specifically reject the security of the Colombian state as something foreign to their territory that “contaminate(s) with bad energy, leaving the energy of war, death, confrontation and evil.”

The communiqué was written by the U'wa Association of Traditional Authorities and Tribal Councils (ASOUWA), which is composed of a committee elected by U'wa from the seventeen communities.¹⁵ Also referred to as the Cabildo Mayor, ASOUWA was consolidated as such in 1993, the same year they requested an expansion and unification of the lands to which they had gained titles over the previous twenty years. In 1999 the *Resguardo Unido* (or *Unico*) U'wa increased the parameters of titled land from 66,000 hectares to 222,000 by bringing together the existing *Reserva Indígena* Aguablanca – Tauretes (1979) and the Resguardo Cobaría – Tegria – Bocota – Rinconada (1987, (ASOUWA 2006)).¹⁶ ASOUWA defines resguardo as the “collective land property delivered by the national government to the

¹⁵ The 17 communities that are affiliated to ASOU'WA are located in the Colombian *departamentos* of Boyaca, Santander, and Norte de Santander. They each govern themselves through Cabildo Menores, which mirror the Cabildo Mayor, ASOU'WA. While Other U'wa communities are located further away in the departments of Arauca and Casanare. They organize collectively with ASCATIDAR, *Asociación de Cabildos y Autoridades Tradicionales del Departamento de Arauca*, which is composed of the Inga, Sikuani, Betoy, Hitnu and Macaguán peoples. For the purposes of this dissertation, I focus my research on ASOU'WA.

¹⁶ Wirpsa explains, “A *resguardo indígena* is a ‘legal and socio-political establishment’ corresponding to a demarcated plot of land over which an indigenous *pueblo* holds a formal land title and which is administered by a major council. The institution of the *resguardo* grants the *pueblo* rights to manage both the territory and the internal affairs of the community living inside it, according to the mandates of the community’s recognized governance structure, culture and traditions. A *reserva indígena*, meanwhile, is a ‘globe of untitled land’ occupied by one or various communities, whose boundaries have been delineated and assigned to the jurisdiction of the community, granting them rights to ‘use and usufruct with the exclusion of third parties.’ In this case, formal land titles rest with the State” (2004: 55).

indigenous communities as full recognition of the dominion the indigenous people have exerted on them from time immemorial” (ASOUWA 2006: 34). The institutions of resguardos and Cabildos, according to ASOUWA, were achieved by “the indigenous peoples’ struggles across time that have managed to maintain two institutions from the colonial period” (ASOUWA 2006: 34). These two colonial institutions continue to be organizing structures for indigenous pueblos to organize themselves. Indeed, the current phase of indigenous organizing in Colombia emerged through struggles for the recovery of ancestral lands beginning in the 1970s through these two institutions (Rathgeber 2004). While “resguardos” and “Cabildos” are colonial institutions, they have not replaced U’wa forms of governance. For example, the name of the association that represents the U’wa people: ASOUWA stands for the Association of U’wa Councils and Traditional Authorities. According to multiple conversations with U’wa Cabildo members and organizers, the elected representatives that hold the positions in the executive council (junta directiva) consult with the traditional authorities in decision-making processes that will impact the larger U’wa community. These elected representatives at different times have been removed from positions of leadership if decisions are made contrary to the principles of U’wa pueblo. Historically the U’wa spiritual leaders or “traditional authorities” are the principal leaders that provide guidance in the political and spiritual aspects of the U’wa people (Osborn 1982, 2009; Rochereau 1959; Cobarria 2005).

The 1991 Colombian Constitution coupled with the participation of indigenous peoples in commemorating 500 years of colonization in 1992 opened new

political spaces for the U'wa and others to make demands and claims on the state (Rathgeber 2004). The U'wa draw on Law 21 of 1991, which ratified International Labor Organization's Convention 169 Concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries, to bolster their argument to the Colombian state that projects such as oil drilling require prior consultation. The sticking point on this struggle, as seen throughout the 1990s and into the first decade of the century, hinges upon differing notions of sovereignty. The state views the final decision on development projects as pertaining to the state whereas the U'wa interpret Law 21 as granting the U'wa the right to veto (ASOUWA 2006: 17). To be clear, the state, while recognizing U'wa rights to particular lands as evidenced by the expansion of the *U'wa Resguardo Unido*, continues to view the subsoil as property of the state. U'wa leaders have found that while both the Colombian government and the oil company were interested in meeting the bureaucratic requirement for consultation, they were not serious about involving them in the decision-making process about whether or not to veto or approve the project (Fulmer 2009; Wirpsa 2004).

U'wa leaders chose the anniversary of Columbus' arrival in the western hemisphere, October 12, 2006, to present a multi-layered argument to the Colombian government to reject the prior consultation process in relation to oil exploration on their ancestral lands. This was presented by 500 U'was in a meeting with Ecopetrol and government representatives from multiple offices including the offices of the Vice President, Internal Affairs and Human Rights Ombudsman, the Ministry of the Interior and Justice and Ministry of the Environment (UDP/AW 2006). A press

release by the U'wa Defense Project (UDP) pitched the story to news outlets: “The U'wa Reject Consultation Process and Ecopetrol's Oil Project on Their Reserve in Colombia. Tribe Presents Historic Land Titles from the Spanish Crown Granting Legal Ownership Including Sub-surface Rights and Calls for Cancellation of Oil Project” (UDP/AW 2006). The title of this legal argument encapsulates their goal: “Historical, Constitutional, Legal, Economic, Social, Environmental and Cultural Foundations of ASOUWA Objections to the Reasoning of the National Government in Terms of the Oil Exploration and Production Project in U'wa Territory and to Solicit its Definitive Cancellation: No to Consultation” (ASOUWA 2006).¹⁷ As indicated by the title, the objective was to lay out their arguments against oil exploration on their land in legal and historical terms by drawing on colonial and Colombian law.¹⁸ The U'wa assert their right to ownership of the land and subsoil of their colonial reservation and the more recent extension of the *Resguardo Unido* U'wa established in 1999. It concludes with signatures from Cabildo Menor representatives, *autoridades tradicionales*,¹⁹ the Cabildo Mayor and legal counsel,

¹⁷ Fundamentos Históricos, Constitucionales, Legales, Económicos, Sociales, Ambientales y Culturales de la Asociación U'wa Para Objetar los Argumentos del Gobierno Nacional Frente al Proyecto de Exploración y Explotación Petrolera en Territorio U'wa, y Solicitar Su Cancelación Definitiva: No a la Consulta Previa.

¹⁸ Como prueba trasladada solicitamos al gobierno nacional pedir a estas dos instancias judiciales entregar en copia auténtica las sentencias referencias para que hagan parte del acervo probatorio que sustentan nuestra decisión y argumentación histórica y legal del derecho de propiedad absoluta del suelo y subsuelo inmersos en el área del resguardo colonial y el reciente.

¹⁹ *Autoridades Tradicionales*, usually elders, are political and spiritual leaders whose authority exceeds that of elected leaders. Decisions are made in communal spaces, either asambleas or congresos, where traditional authorities judge the work of elected

including an U'wa lawyer, to ratify the “sovereign decision of the U'wa Pueblo Soliciting the Cancellation of the Oil Project in U'wa Territory” (ASOUWA 2006: 36).²⁰

This document traces an argument plotting points through different moments in colonial and Colombian laws that support their position as sovereign and against the oil project, including those I have mentioned already, the 1991 Constitution and Law 21 of 1991. *Fundamentos* begins by citing a Papal Bull issued May 4, 1493, by Pope Alexander VI, which is viewed by many, this document suggests, “as the historic origin of Spanish dominion in its colonies in America” (ASOUWA 2006: 1). Against this common interpretation ASOUWA argues

the dominion bestowed by Alexander VI upon the Catholic Monarchy and its heirs cannot be understood as a particular dominion over the land, because, among other reasons, the Pope, who was not the owner of those lands, could hardly dispose of something which he did not hold. It is, therefore, a *political* dominion whose primary purpose was to facilitate the spread of Catholicism in the newly discovered American lands.²¹ (ASOUWA 2006: 1)

Furthermore, they assert, the actual origin of Spanish titling of lands in America related specifically to those from which the indigenous people fled or lands whose populations were extinguished and not to those lands the indigenous people conserved through resistance or distance from the Spanish (ASOUWA 2006: 1). The

leaders and others working on behalf of the U'wa in relation to Colombian institutions.

²⁰ Ratificación de la Decisión Soberana del Pueblo U'wa Solicitando Cancelación de Proyecto Petrolero en Territorio U'wa.

²¹ El dominio otorgado por Alejandro VI a los Reyes Católicos y a sus sucesores no puede entenderse como un dominio particular sobre la tierra, entre otras razones porque no siendo el Papa dueño de ellas mal podía disponer de algo que no tenía. Se trata, por tanto, de un dominio político cuyo fin principal era el de facilitar la propagación de la religión católica en las tierras americanas recién descubiertas.

U'wa argue that the “simple occupation” of the indigenous peoples on their lands is what grants them title to the land equal to “conquistador” claims made through the appropriation of lands by force (ASOUWA 2006: 1).

Throughout the document, the U'wa explain their perspective or locus of enunciation as original inhabitants of land now included within the territory of Colombia. They use laws interpreted through U'wa experience in order to register their right to making sovereign decisions. While the Colombian state mobilizes the dominant IR notion of sovereignty, claiming all rights to make decisions regarding land and resource development, the U'wa call on multiple entities to recognize their rights. For example, ASOUWA declares

The U'wa people with settlements in the *departamentos* of Casanare, Arauca, Boyaca, Santander and Norte de Santander issues a request, to national and international governments, national and international courts, national and international companies exploiting natural and non-renewable resources, for the absolute respect of the right of possession, ownership and control of our ancestral lands as reaffirmed by the Spanish Crown by royal decree of July 21, 1802, which occurred in Madrid (Spain), defined the limits of the indigenous resguardo of Tierradentro Tunebo Nation (U'wa Nation today), and recently the Resguardo Unido of the Indigenous U'wa extended by Resolution No. 056 of August 6, 1999 issued by the INCORA.²² (ASOUWA 2006: 32)

²² El Pueblo U'wa con asentamiento en los territorios de Casanare, Arauca, Boyaca, Santander y Norte de Santander solicita al: gobierno nacional e internacional, cortes nacionales e internacionales, empresas nacionales e internacionales explotadoras de los recursos naturales renovables y no renovables; el respeto absoluto del derecho de posesión, propiedad y dominio de nuestras tierras ancestrales tal como fue reafirmado por la Corona Española mediante la Cedula Real de 21 de Julio de 1802 dado en Madrid (España), en la cual se definió los límites del Resguardo Indígena de Tierradentro de la Nación Tuneba (hoy Nación U'wa), y recientemente el del Resguardo Indígena Unido U'wa ampliado mediante la Resolución No. 056 del 6 de agosto de 1999 expedida por el INCORA.

While they recognize the Colombian state, they highlight that Colombia won independence from the Spanish Crown eight years *after* the Spanish Crown recognized the U'wa Resguardo:

On 20 July 1810 we heard the *Grito de Independencia* for the Colombian state, but not for Aboriginal and natives of Colombia. Instead the resistance continues to maintain and solidify the political and legal ratification made by the Spanish crown in 1802 when the Indigenous delimited the Resguardo of Tierradentro Tuneba Nation, which positively reaffirms the legitimacy and justice in relation to our ancestral lands. In 1810 Colombia became independent from Spanish rule, historically an event taking place after ours. Due to this, all political, administrative, and judicial institutions contained in the constitutions and laws of the republic built from 1810 to 2006 should have no effect on the right of possession and property that assists us on our ancestral lands as is stated in Article 332 of the Constitution which states: “Article 332. The state owns the subsoil and non-renewable natural resources, *without prejudice to the rights acquired and perfected under prior laws.*” (ASOUWA 2006: 33)²³

The 1802 delimitation of the *Resguardo Tierradentro Tuneba* Nation, Article 332 of the 1991 Colombian Constitution and the 1887 Law 153 from the Colombian Civil Code together provide a legal framework through which ASOUWA justify their rights to ancestral lands. Law 153 from 1887, which justifies ownership through

²³ El 20 de Julio de 1810 se dio el Grito de Independencia para el Estado Colombiano, pero para los aborígenes y naturales de Colombia no, porque continua la Resistencia por mantener la ratificación política y legal hecha por la corona española en 1802 cuando delimito el resguardo Indígena de Tierradentro de la Nación Tuneba en la cual reafirma positivamente la legitimidad y justicia que nos asiste sobre nuestras tierras ancestrales. En 1810 Colombia se independizo del yugo español, hecho histórico posterior a la nuestra, luego todas las instituciones políticas, administrativas y judiciales contenidos en las constituciones y en las leyes de la republica edificadas desde 1810 al 2006 en nada debe afectar el derecho de posesión y propiedad que nos asiste sobre nuestras tierras ancestrales tal como esta consignado en el articulo 332 de la Constitución Nacional que establece: Artículo 332. El Estado es propietario del subsuelo y de los recursos naturales no renovables, *sin perjuicio de los derechos adquiridos y perfeccionados con arreglo a las leyes preexistentes.*

occupation and possession, and Article 332 of the 1991 Constitution are interpreted as recognizing the pre-existing rights that the U'wa claim (ASOUWA 2006: 20).

Paradox of indigenous sovereignty

U'wa claims for sovereignty are paradoxical from the dominant IR perspective in that they are calling for sovereignty from within the jurisdiction of a state. However, U'wa claims, I argue, are for intercultural sovereignty, which is not the same as state sovereignty from an IR perspective but expands the notion to apply to an indigenous pueblo organized under a non-state formation. The U'wa are not asking to be included simply as citizens within a multicultural state. Nonetheless, they recognize themselves as part of the state and demand respect for the difference that their identity as indigenous implies. This subjectivity reframes discussions on sovereignty by transforming the terms of the discussion. With their legal arguments the U'wa show that their rights date from before the establishment of Colombia as an independent state, effectively decentering the state. The recognition they demand includes respect for their language, customs, and land use and respect for decision-making in these areas within their territorial jurisdiction. This form of sovereignty enacted and claimed by the U'wa is tied to the international discourse that indigenous peoples are developing through international institutions such as the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues and recently approved through the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Intercultural sovereignty, then, is a sovereignty enforced through holding states and societies accountable to national and international norms. Unlike state sovereignty that is exclusionary,

hierarchical, and enforced through the use of arms, intercultural sovereignty is relational and horizontal and is enacted through dialogue and collaboration and in resistance to the logic of coloniality.

As in the past (see chapter 1), U'wa leaders articulate their vision through intercultural means. They have appropriated concepts from the Colombian state, the Constitution, other national laws and international human rights discourses to define their vision of sovereignty (Rappaport 2005). This vision of sovereignty points to an intercultural logic. In this case they define their territory as that land which has “been in possession and cultural use” by their community. By this measure, their territory extends beyond the boundaries of the state-approved *Resguardo Unido U'wa* and includes the site currently operated by Ecopetrol. This conflict over land underlies all fronts of the U'wa struggle. To contend with the challenges wrought by this conflict, they have armed themselves with colonial land titles and reached out across borders to claim international human rights by holding the Colombian government to their word, represented by signing on to international agreements like ILO Convention 169.

U'wa resistance to physical and cultural extinction manifests in strategies to build intercultural sovereignty. Interculturality presupposes a negotiated political process, which requires the ability to translate across cultures. At its most basic level, intercultural sovereignty requires the mutual recognition of intertwined histories. In the U'wa case, the U'wa recognize the Colombian state and demand recognition of their worldview and ways of life in relation to land and Mother Earth, which includes

the subsoil. The U'wa interpret and explain their relationship to their ancestral lands in terms of their own mythology at the same time that they use colonial and Colombian laws to justify their rights to the land and subsoil.

Intercultural sovereignty disrupts the linear, Eurocentric narrative on state sovereignty by naming loci of enunciation with related history and context. Intercultural strategies involve the practice of building dialogue and respect across cultures for “other” perspectives. Such strategies require a horizontal engagement between different cultural systems instead of dichotomous, hierarchical relations. It does not imply a “literal” translation of concepts but entails the ability to engage the political work necessary to recognize different—yet related—perspectives.

Interculturality as methodological/epistemic approach

To theorize *from* Latin America requires the specificity of time and place to theorize not just about but *with* subalternized others. The M/C group stress “other” ways of thinking, not as one more or additional way of thinking but an “other” way of thought, other knowledges in the spirit of the World Social Forum and the saying “Another world is possible” (Escobar 2003: 52). Walter D. Mignolo proposes “an ‘other thought’ to avoid the modern trap of putting every thing in one temporal line, in one highway that is already being patrolled and guarded by gate-keepers making sure that ‘other thoughts’ do not cross the borders” (Mignolo 2007: 156). Intercultural sovereignty is one such “other” thought. By thinking from Latin America the focus is on subalternized knowledges and local histories. According to Mignolo, “‘an other thinking’ is based on the spatial confrontations between different concepts of

history...[and] is possible when different local histories and their particular power relations are taken into consideration” (Mignolo 2000: 67).

Walter Mignolo refers to this as border thinking, a concept aligned with W.E.B Du Bois’s concept of double consciousness and Gloria Anzaldúa’s (Anzaldúa 1987) “new mestiza consciousness.” Border thinking bridges dichotomies by thinking from a double perspective and enacting a double critique. Similarly, in terms of decolonial feminism, Lugones (2010) explains, “the emphasis is on maintaining multiplicity at the point of reduction.” This calls for coalitional efforts, which Lugones finds in the work of feminists of color (Sandoval 2000), and requires a dwelling in resistance with specific attention to the day to day interweavings of social relations or the “intimate everyday resistant interactions to the colonial difference” (Lugones 2010: 743).²⁴

To avoid the pitfalls of western research on Indigenous peoples that have served to extract knowledge or apply theoretical frameworks inconsistent with the histories and practices of indigenous peoples (Smith 1999), this dissertation engages activist research as part of the decolonial option (Mignolo 2011). As such, it represents a step in an on-going process of intercultural collaboration and organizing that began for me in 1999 when I attended a rally in front of the San Francisco

²⁴ I echo Lugones’ use of the term dwell to signify an effort to learn in relation rather than to read, examine, or analyze an object. Lugones argues that for decolonial feminists “the task begins by her seeing the colonial difference, emphatically resisting her epistemological habit of erasing it. Seeing it, she sees the world anew.... The reading moves against the social-scientific objectifying reading, attempting rather to understand subjects.... [T]he histories of resistance at the colonial difference are where we need to dwell, learning about each other” (Lugones 2010: 753).

Colombian Consulate. Charles Hale defines activist research as “a method through which we affirm a political alignment with an organized group of people in struggle and allow dialogue with them to shape each phase of the processes” (Hale 2006: 97). Rappaport suggests as much through her own work with the *Consejo Regional Indígena del Cauca* (Regional Indigenous Council of the Cauca) in southwestern Colombia (2005). Activist research premised in collaboration is key to an intercultural approach. To this end, the mixed methodology adopted in this dissertation is multi-sited and dialogical in nature, guided by an ethos of listening and speaking with differently situated actors. A key aspect of its dialogical nature is the on-going need to translate my side of the conversation in conversation with the U’wa.

To examine intercultural sovereignty from the perspective of Indigenous peoples, as Washinawatok and the U’wa have suggested, the research process is undergirded by the principle of relational accountability or reciprocity. Similarly, Indigenous scholar Shawn Wilson understands research as ceremony, by which he means that research is a process of bringing relationships closer together (Wilson 2008):

The space and therefore the relationship between people or between people and their environment is seen as sacred.... By reducing the space between things, we are strengthening the relationship that they share. And this bringing things together so that they share the same space is what ceremony is about. This is why research itself is a sacred ceremony within an Indigenous research paradigm, as it is all about building relationships and bridging this sacred space. (Wilson 2008: 87)

In Rappaport’s terms, it requires collaboration instead of traditional, uni-directional ethnographic techniques that often served to re-inscribe powered hierarchies (2005).

Thus the dialogues in which I have engaged for this research require accountability on my part. By accountability I mean that the research I have engaged has a purpose beyond the search for knowledge. By naming my own relational accountability I also make visible my own positioning.

As an activist researcher, I entered the research through direct participation and responsibility in cross border partner organizations, Mujer U'wa (MU) and the UDP. My participation with these organizations, which dates back to 2003 with UDP and 2006 with MU, not only facilitated access to organizational archives and a historical understanding of relations between U'wa leaders and US-based allies, but also provided collective spaces for the analysis of findings and support for the continuity of relationships over the course of research and writing.

A research trip to the east coast (January–April 2010) coincided with an invitation from the Smithsonian's National Museum of the American Indian for two U'wa representatives to visit their DC, Maryland, and New York facilities. I coordinated with UDP and accompanied the U'wa President and International Liaison to these meetings, serving additionally as interpreter. In DC and New York I participated in organizing strategy sessions and community events. During the four-month stay on the east coast, I carried out interviews with long-time U'wa supporters and solidarity activists, former UDP worker/activists, and family members and colleagues of two of the slain US activists. The relationship I have developed over the course of the last nine years with Ali El-Issa, husband of Ingrid Washinawatok, provided much insight into her work and access to archives housed at the Flying

Eagle Woman Fund in New York. John Livingstone, Lahe'ena'e Gay's partner, provided access to Gay's video, text, and photographic archives.

During my research trip to Colombia (June–August 2010) I interviewed and engaged with long-time human rights activists allied with the U'wa including key representatives from CENSAT Agua Viva, Fundación Hemera, Siempre Viva, and ONIC representatives. The ONIC, a partner of the U'wa since the 1980s, provided access to their archives related to the U'wa struggle relative to the government and the campaign against Occidental Petroleum. With support from the University of California Human Rights Center, I traveled twice to the U'wa resguardo where I conducted semi-structured interviews with ten U'wa women and participated in two community meetings—one with women from the northern region and the other with women and men from Boyacá. The purpose of two separate trips to the resguardo was to prepare for the delegation of MU activists that took place in August. During this delegation we (the MU activists) observed as U'wa women reported on and debated the needs related to the renewed plan to organize women's committees. Additionally, we each presented on topics requested by U'wa women and based on our own organizing experiences. I presented part of my dissertation research as it pertained to the background and legacies of Washinawatok and Gay.²⁵

²⁵ To continue a transnational conversation across indigenous pueblos and the Colombian diaspora, Mujer U'wa shared a short video I produced to highlight aspects of our delegation to the U'wa resguardo. It was shown in May 2011 at the annual memorial and celebration of Ingrid Washinawatok's life, which takes place during the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues.

Overview

To answer the question of how the U'wa build and thereby redefine sovereignty, I look at three different sites: a century of academic research; indigenous human rights discourses and organizing; and crossborder relationships between the U'wa and different kinds of collectives: ASOUWA, MU (a transborder community organizing project between U'wa women and US-based Latina and indigenous solidarity activists), and the UDP (an indigenous and environmental rights nongovernmental organization). Each chapter examines different but related intercultural processes towards the project of building sovereignty. By centering the U'wa and the multiple dimensions of their colonial difference, the chapters collectively and individually chart future possibilities by examining the lived practices of building sovereignty in the past and present (Smith 2008; Pratt 2007). The dissertation proceeds as follows. In the introductory chapter, I outline the stakes in research on indigenous peoples, namely extinction, and how the U'wa are shifting the terms of the debate on sovereignty by confronting the coloniality of power through interculturality.

Chapter 1, "De/colonizing Research," extends a conventional literature review, moving from charting debates to considering the relation of researchers to the practices of colonization and decolonization in the particular case of the U'wa. In this case, examining key researcher/U'wa relationships reveals intercultural engagements between researchers and U'wa leaders who were recognized as agents and not just objects of research. U'wa leaders have mobilized research about them to support their

struggles relative to the state, furthering their objectives of building sovereignty. Researchers have uncovered evidence that support U'wa claims to their ancestral territory. They have also brought to light strategies engaged during colonial times in which the U'wa utilize concepts from dominant society to demand respect for their lands. Furthermore, this chapter also represents a step towards fulfilling one of my commitments during this research process: to help rebuild U'wa archives.

Chapter 2, "Theorizing Rights with Indigenous Peoples of the Americas Through the Practice of Education," dwells on how U'wa approaches to human rights, particularly in terms of education, contribute to and participate in a larger international discourse on indigenous rights. The U'wa struggle is directly related to two indigenous activists and intellectuals Ingrid Washinawatok El-Issa (Menominee) and Lahe'ena'e Gay (Kanaka Maoli) who shared similar visions on sovereignty and human rights. What emerges is a consensus on the interpretation of the human right to education through a generational approach, which requires educational systems that engage multiple generations and the interconnectedness of life, the environment and spirituality. This discourse, embedded in the educational project of the U'wa pueblo, demonstrates the construction of sovereignty.

In the third chapter, "*Acompañamiento*: Redefining Transnational 'Success,'" I develop the concept of *acompañamiento* as a specific intercultural strategy engaged by crossborder, grassroots activists, and allies. This is a reflection on the formation and interaction of solidarity efforts engaged in with U'wa leaders by the UDP based now at Amazon Watch, and MU, a transborder collective with leadership shared

between an U'wa woman and a US-based indigenous Colombian woman. This term shifts our understanding of transnational social movements by recognizing the importance of long-term relationship building to our understanding of movement success. These practices of relationship building demonstrate how the U'wa reach outside of the state to construct alternatives to the state-centered meanings of sovereignty. These efforts enact a cross-border diplomacy where outside intervention is sought to legitimize and support their on-going struggle for sovereignty, challenging the borders of Westphalian sovereignty. Thus the U'wa emphasize respect for borders established through their own particular history and not just state history.

Intercultural sovereignty from an indigenous perspective takes on the meanings of sovereignty identified by Krasner (2001) in terms of domestic, Westphalian and juridical sovereignty but from a different perspective, one that takes the coloniality of power into account. First, for the U'wa to claim sovereignty does not equate to secession from the state, as IR and international law might expect when indigenous people demand their sovereignty and self-determination. Instead, as the U'wa governing council (ASOUWA) frames it, "The government should recognize that we are people who are *part of* that word 'State.' It should respect our forms of life, our thinking, our laws of origin and of our elders. It should respect universal human rights and international treaties because we are people—we too feel" (ASOUWA 2002). Intercultural sovereignty differs from IR theories of sovereignty because of its relational approach to authority and territory. In other words, rather

than a one-way incorporation into established power hierarchies, using the logic of interculturality indigenous peoples seek a transformation of relations with the state and a recognition of their historical relations to territory.

Chapter 1 shows how U'wa leaders moved from silence to intercultural strategies in the production of knowledge to negotiate collaboration from outsiders in matters pertaining to land rights. Chapter 2 demonstrates how U'wa leaders contribute to international indigenous human rights discourses through the practices of domestic sovereignty in terms of education. By drawing on the international system of human rights, the U'wa challenge the Colombian state's juridical sovereignty as they demand and enact their own. Chapter 3 demonstrates how the U'wa violate the Colombian state's Westphalian sovereignty by inviting outside actors into their territory in their struggle against the state. Finally, to conclude I assess the logic of intercultural sovereignty by weaving together the insights from the body of the dissertation. I reframe the dissertation's research question to: What is the future of indigenous struggles in Colombia and the Americas? A serious engagement by state authorities with the U'wa's relational and decolonial notion of intercultural sovereignty, that depends not on the force of arms to enforce sovereignty but the force of their own history in relation to dominant society, could set a precedent and effect a wide-ranging impact on marginalized peoples' struggles over land in many parts of the world.

Chapter 1: De/colonizing Research

From the vantage point of the colonized, a position from which I write, and choose to privilege, the term “research” is inextricably linked to European imperialism and colonialism. The word itself, “research”, is probably one of the dirtiest words in the indigenous world’s vocabulary. When mentioned in many indigenous contexts, it stirs up silence, it conjures up bad memories, it raises a smile that is knowing and distrustful. (Smith 1999: 1)

In *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* Linda T.

Smith argues that for indigenous peoples research is a “dirty” word whose history is “inextricably” tied to colonization and imperialism (Smith 1999: 1). Research, or the production of knowledge, is constituted by “systems for organizing, classifying, and storing new knowledge, and for theorizing the meanings of such discoveries” (Smith 1999: 60). Europe is regarded as the culmination of a linear progression from the state of nature to the status of developed. From that core idea, all else is categorized hierarchically in terms of race and gender. Indigenous knowledges were simultaneously appropriated through colonization and subjugated through religious conversion and forced education. Smith argues that the disciplines of Anthropology and Geography took responsibility for defining the other and providing the means to imperialist appropriation respectively (Smith 1999: 66-67). Despite this dark history Smith views research as a “significant site of struggle between the interests and ways of knowing of the West and the interests and ways of resisting of the Other” (Smith 1999: 2). As a site of struggle, what can the production of knowledge about the U’wa tell us about their strategies of resistance to physical and cultural extinction and for sovereignty? And what can I as a non-U’wa scholar do with this research history?

I approach these questions as an activist scholar rooted in the Colombian diaspora, human rights, environmental, and indigenous rights networks, and particularly in organizations. Thirteen years ago I was introduced to the U'wa struggle against Occidental Petroleum at a demonstration in front of the Colombian Consulate in San Francisco around the same time as the tragic deaths of Ingrid Washinawatok El-Issa, Lahe'ena'e Gay, and Terence Freitas. Soon after, as the director of a human rights education and action program focused on Colombia at an allied San Francisco-based organization, Global Exchange, I was invited to join the U'wa Defense Working Group in 2000. The goal was to strengthen policy work (to cut military aid to Colombia embodied within Plan Colombia) and anti-corporate work engaged by the environmentalist organizations partnered with the U'wa (UDP, Rainforest Action Network, Amazon Watch, and Project Underground). I left Global Exchange the day before I began my tenure with the UDP in 2003 when Ana Maria Murillo invited me to join the advisory committee of the UDP, a small organization (discussed in chapter 3) also based in San Francisco. And in 2006 I supported the construction of the US-based side of MU. As I transitioned from activist to activist-researcher, the questions that my larger research project addresses emerged from conversations engaged over years of activist collaboration, particularly in relation to U'wa leaders.

The idea for gathering this research and producing an annotated bibliography of academic texts grew out of a conversation on potential avenues of useful research with U'wa leaders in New York in 2009 and 2010. Both Cristancho (2009) and

Gilberto Cobaria (2010) expressed disdain for research that focused on U'wa people as victims and stressed the importance of research that will make suggestions for the future based on U'wa contributions developed through their political work. In addition to expanding upon a literature review, this chapter represents my effort to understand the historical production of knowledge about the U'wa and to decolonize it by examining the context in which researchers engaged the U'wa and tracing U'wa resistance. The bibliography privileges literatures available in US libraries from a range of disciplines that span nearly a hundred years.

This review of the available literature paints a picture of the varied interests behind research on the U'wa, subsequently how they have been studied and how researchers have engaged their pueblo. My goals for this aspect of my research project in which I compiled the last hundred years of academic research on the U'wa were two fold: First, to establish collaboration by making an offering in my transition to researcher. Second, to chart the trends in research on the U'wa and unearth the intercultural relationships and strategies embedded within this collection of research. Thus, this chapter also represents one aspect of a dialogical process that emerges from multiple years of collaboration with the U'wa through my participation in US-based partner organizations.²⁶ Reflecting on the lack of reciprocity on the part of documentarians, writers, and researchers, we concluded that an important task would be to compile and annotate a bibliography of the research available on the U'wa so that it could be made available for U'wa students in their own *Centro Educativo*. By

²⁶See chapter 3 for a discussion of the work of these partner or *acompañante* organizations.

offering this archive, I hope to avoid repeating the colonial practice of a one-way extraction of information about the U'wa as objects of study by sharing what I found with them. The longterm activists, many of whom may not have time or access to engage in reviewing this literature, is an additional audience for this particular chapter.

From this *recorrido* through the literatures a long history of intercultural relationships marked by resistance emerges. We can trace through relationships signaled by the authors' ethnographic narratives and citational practices, in which I include acknowledgements, a genealogy of the contact zone to consider the people, forces and discourses that impact and in turn are impacted by the U'wa. This genealogy of researchers can also prove to be useful for the U'wa in current and future battles as they strategize how to rebuild the coalitions that supported them at the height of their struggle against Occidental Petroleum and the Colombian government.

Through this process I found that academic knowledge production on the U'wa is no exception to the critiques made by Smith: as an instrument of colonization, research has served to facilitate access to land and resources (Rocheraux 1919; Stoddart 1959), for assimilation through language (Headland 1979, 1979; Marquez 1970) or to save fragments of a quickly decaying and soon-to-be extinct world, i.e. for the sake of scholarly knowledge (Stoddart 1962). However, academic research has also been used to make visible subalternized knowledges that support claims to land and cultural identity (Osborn 1982, 1985; Falchetti 2003) and to make

visible alternatives to corporate globalization (Wirpsa 2004; Rodriguez-Garavito and Arenas 2005). Both U'wa leaders and scholars since the 1970s have turned to intercultural collaboration to initiate and mobilize research that supports U'wa claims in struggles with the state, furthering their objectives of taking back control over the decision-making processes affecting their ancestral lands, resources, and people. It is this process of adaptation and dialogue through which they build intercultural sovereignty.

Interculturality emerged in the twentieth century Latin America as both practice and discourse. It manifested in the decolonial social movements of indigenous and black peoples (Walsh 2006) and in policy discourses in relation to ethnoeducation in the 1980s (Walsh 2000; Castillo Guzman and Caicedo Ortiz 2008). In this chapter I am using the concept of interculturality in two ways. First it refers to the deployment of dominant concepts by the U'wa in their struggle to assert their sovereignty. Second, it points to the use of sustained dialogue to establish non-hierarchical relationships. Thus, intercultural relationships demonstrate intersubjective relationships of mutual respect. These two aspects are mutually reinforcing and manifest in the later literature by noncolonialist scholars that reflect on their relationships to the U'wa or develop research from the U'was locus of enunciation. If interculturality is to be an effective political project and decolonial concept, naming loci of enunciation, engaging in dialogue and making a world where many worlds fit, are imperatives.

A review of the last century of research on the U'wa tells a story about the relationship of research and de/colonization in Colombia through three themes that overlap chronologically. The first section focuses on colonialist research conducted or sponsored by religious figures. Though this kind of research, which treats U'wa individuals or collectively simply as objects, continues to a lesser degree today,²⁷ I focus on the writings from 1914 to the 1960s when it was most prevalent. In this section I first examine anthropological research and language studies, which reveals the relationship between religion and the state in the colonization and assimilation of U'wa people and their ancestral lands into national systems. Next I trace U'wa resistance to these colonial processes within the colonialist research. In the second section I focus on research since the 1970s that coincides with the emergence of U'wa and other Colombian indigenous social movements. It corresponds to a shift in anthropological approaches to research with indigenous peoples that center the agency of research subjects. This era opens up new relationships between researchers and the U'wa as I demonstrate through a focus on British anthropologist Ann Osborn, Colombian anthropologist Helena Pradilla, and Colombian historian Ana Maria Falchetti.

The final section examines the research from the 1990s to today, a period that corresponds to the increased recognition of indigenous rights and the national and international emergence of the struggle against Occidental Petroleum. The U'wa

²⁷ See (Arias Valencia 2008; Mora Torres et al. 2007).

actively continued to work interculturally with allies, this time crossing international borders in their struggle to gain recognition and legitimacy beyond the state.

“Colonization in action in eastern Colombia”

As an instrument or mechanism of colonization, research on indigenous people in general, and the U’wa in particular, has served to extract information to define and construct the Other (Rochereau 1914), to facilitate access to land and resources (Rocheraux 1919) for assimilation and evangelization (Headland 1979; Headland and Headland 1971; Marquez 1970), or to save fragments of a quickly decaying and soon-to-be extinct world (i.e. for the sake of scholarly knowledge, Stoddart and Trubshaw 1962). A review of the literature shows how the state and religion have worked together intimately to support and produce research within the context of colonization of U’wa land and society.

With the economic and security support of the Colombian state Catholic missionaries were responsible for re-organizing the settlement of U’wa lands and colonization of the U’wa language beginning in the early twentieth century (Stoddart and Trubshaw 1962). The appropriation of U’wa land was facilitated first by the availability of U’wa lands during certain months of the year. Over the course of four seasons, the U’wa live in three different temperate zones, following the movement of the sun. Missionaries, and later “*colonos*,”²⁸ mystified by this movement took up

²⁸ *Colono* is a commonly used term to describe small farmers who venture into previously uncultivated rural areas. The *colonos* of this period were *campesinos* displaced by violence in other areas of the country or in search of land to eke out a subsistence living. U’wa call them the sons of Cristobal Colono.

residence in “abandoned” U’wa parcels. In this way, missionaries of the twentieth century took the place of *encomenderos* in early centuries of colonization by usurping U’wa land and forcing adults and children to work for—and be schooled by—the Catholic Church.

The first to establish a mission in U’wa ancestral lands in the twentieth century was Father Henri Rochereau in 1910. In one of his earliest articles on the Tunebo (U’wa) Henri Rochereau explained that the Colombian government charged him and an “observation” team with the task of exploring the region of the upper Arauca River basin (also known as the Sarare region, Rochereau 1919: 513).²⁹ The maps furnished by the government were, in Rochereau’s words, “completely false,” compelling them to develop a more accurate cartography, which suggests that very little was known about the region (Rochereau 1919: 513). While the government said nothing of the indigenous population of the region, Rochereau and fellow observers took it upon themselves to also study the tribes found within the region (Rochereau 1919: 513). Rochereau’s study and later ones also provide highly descriptive documentations through participant observation of the geographic location and aspects of “material culture” such as dress, physical appearance, and housing structures (Chaves 1964; Headland 1973; Marquez 1979).³⁰

²⁹ Marquez comments on how this trip introduced Rochereau to the Unkasía community. He spent most of his time with the Tamarana, Unkasia, and Tegria communities (Marquez 1980: 537).

³⁰ Another set of articles by Rochereau that I was unable to access is cited in the *Revista de Misiones* (Berichá 1992).

Later described as the missionary responsible for “reviving” colonization and establishing the series of missions (Stoddart and Trubshaw 1962: 48), Rochereau became a central figure in the twentieth century colonization of the U’wa. In building the different “mission stations,” Henry Rochereau built the infrastructure that facilitated further colonization and research in the region over the following decades. In addition to publishing his own anthropological work (Rochereau 1914; Rocheraux 1919; Rochereau 1961), linguistic analysis and translation of Spanish religious texts into “Tunebo” (Rochereau 1959), he built the religious educational system and laid the institutional and anthropological foundation for future researchers, like Stoddart and Trubshaw (Stoddart 1959, 1962; Stoddart and Trubshaw 1962), Alvaro Chaves (1964) and later Marquez (1979). A prolific writer over a period of nearly fifty years, his work was foundational for later researchers as evidenced through the bibliographies and acknowledgements of virtually all the following Colombian and foreign researchers who published through the 1980s.

The next major research program on the U’wa began in 1959 when Stoddart and Trubshaw formed part of a seven-member “Cambridge Colombia Expedition.” The research expedition was conceived as a series of geological, geographical and glaciological studies around Sierra Nevada de Cocuy of the eastern range of the Colombian Andes—the U’wa’s homeland (Stoddart 1959). In his own estimation it was the “first geographical study of the Tunebo Indians” (1959: 3). From this four month study, Stoddart produced a 1959 report titled “UUA: Observations on the Tunebo Indians in Eastern Colombia” (1959), the aforementioned “Colonization in

Action in Eastern Colombia” (Stoddart and Trubshaw 1962) and “Myth and Ceremonial Among the Tunebo Indians of Eastern Colombia” (Stoddart 1962) published in an American Folklore journal. Hosted by the missionaries and sponsored by government and corporate entities, their research assumes a linear process of colonization with the eventual disappearance of the tribe (Stoddart and Trubshaw 1962: 52). According to the report, missionaries outnumbered individual U’wa leaders as key sources of information. To supplement “personal observation” they interviewed twelve individuals: three U’was, four missionaries, four settlers, and a “muleteer” (Stoddart 1959:5).³¹

Stoddart and Trubshaw explained the three factors that contributed to the colonization of the land and minds of the U’wa: the Catholic Church, the “availability” of land, and the construction of a road through U’wa ancestral lands to connect the northern part of the country with the eastern plains. The Church’s efforts, carried out by missionary priests and nuns, were sponsored by the state (Stoddart and Trubshaw 1962: 48-49). According to Stoddart and Trubshaw, the missionaries transformed the economy and sought to restructure the U’wa relationship with the land as they took over the region. They forced marriages and parceled out small individual lots on or near Church lands to disrupt the seasonal migrations, practices of communal ownership and to inculcate the Catholic religion and values into new

³¹ In another example of colonialist, extractive research, simultaneous to the Cambridge Colombia Expedition, the Catholic missionaries at San Luis del Chuscal facilitated the retrieval of blood samples for a series of studies that analyzed the properties of U’wa blood and genetic make-up (Arends 1961; Layrisse, Layrisse, and Wilbert 1963).

generations. The Church instituted an educational system to change ways of thinking and communicating. They also changed the economy of the region by concentrating land and crops into “plantation conditions.” Stoddart and Trubshaw describe the chronology of missionary efforts at colonization:

The technique was to build a chapel and schoolroom, teach Indian children, and employ them to grow crops of maize, plantains and sugar-cane, and to look after mission cattle. The methods used aroused considerable opposition, and as a result the Bócota station had to be abandoned in 1957. Meanwhile a new station had been established (1953) at San Luis del Chuscal, [which]...has become the centre of a new plan of mission campaign. A large school for Tunebo children has been established, and it is hoped to marry boys and girls within the mission and settle them on the fertile river terraces close by. This scheme was begun, and the first Christian Tunebo farm occupied, in 1959. Though the mission buildings are only half completed, ten acres are already under cultivation, for maize, yuca, plantains and sugar-cane. The cane is made into panela [coarse brick sugar] at the mission. Plantains and bananas are grown on the lowest terraces of the Rio Cobaría under plantation conditions, and an experimental plot with intercropping of bananas and plantains with coffee and cacao has been begun. A major feature of the Chuscal economy is the herd of zebu and crossed zebu cattle...pigs, and poultry. (Stoddart and Trubshaw 1962: 49)

Through this passage we see the Church’s role in assimilating U’wa children through the imposition of religion and western education and adults through integration into an economy based on cattle and other foreign agricultural practices.

In addition to the aforementioned invasion of U’wa ancestral territory by the Catholic Church, the eruption of political violence in the late 1940s pushed *campesinos* into U’wa territory (Stoddart 1962, Chaves 1964). The creation of the *Instituto Colombiano de la Reforma Agraria* (INCORA) in the early 1960s encouraged *campesino* colonization through the provision of loan credits for cattle,

land titles, the construction of schools and health posts (IDEADE 1997). By Colombian law, “a colonist may claim ownership of any land on which he has settled, irrespective of the indigenous tribal claims” (Stoddart 1959: 16). This governmental institution also built a road through U’wa territory to connect Pamplona and Arauca, paving the way for the founding of the towns of San Bernardo, Samoré, Cubará, and Saravena. Two of these towns, Samoré and Cubará, are currently located along the perimeter of the government-recognized *Resguardo Unido U’wa*. In sum, during this period of the twentieth century the collaboration between Church, state, and corporate interests in gaining knowledge about the area was instrumental during in providing the infrastructure for the settlement of the U’wa region (Rochereau 1919, Stoddart and Trubshaw 1959, Pradilla and Salazar 1978).

Stoddart and Trubshaw acknowledge the support of missionaries Father Rochereau and Monseñor Garcia in addition to a long list of other sponsors including Shell International Petroleum Company, Mount Everest Foundation, *Empresa Colombiana de Turismo*, and national Colombian geography and anthropology institutes (Stoddart 1959:3).³² Stoddart and Trubshaw conclude that “in twenty years a

³² “It is, however, only proper to record here our thanks to the Mount Everest Foundation, the Shell International Petroleum Company, the Pilgrim Trust, the Royal Geographical Society, B.P. Trading Limited, the Frederick Soddy Trust, and all those who gave generous financial help, and to the firms who helped us with supplies of equipment. The *Empresa Colombiano de Turismo* S.A., the Pacific Steam Navigation Company, and Avianca all helped with transport. We are also grateful to Professor R. C. Crist, Professor J.A. Steers, Sr., James Wordie, Mr. L.P. Kirwan of the Royal Geographical Society, Dr. G. Reichel-Dolmatoff of the *Instituto Colombiano de Antropologia*, Dr. L. Ortiz of the *Museo Nacional* in Bogota, Dr. Benjamin Villegas Robledo of the Instituto Geográfico ‘Agustin Codazzi’, Mr. G. F. de Sausmarez and Mr. I. Peter Allnutt of the British Council in Bogota, His Excellency The British

fourth stage is already in sight, when the distinct tribal groups will have disappeared, absorbed by the *mestizos* or transmuted in the Christianized mission farms, and occupied in clearing the rain-forest for maize and plantains and coffee” (Stoddart and Trubshaw 1962: 52). The funders and sponsors of this research would likely welcome such a conclusion: oil and tourism companies joined with the state and missionary figures to survey and map lands soon to become free of its human inhabitants through assimilation. The research these funders supported predicted that it would take twenty years for the U’wa to be completely assimilated at which time their lands would be opened for capitalist development based on agricultural production and mineral extraction. These predictions proved false.

The religious colonization of the U’wa created an infrastructure to educate and assimilate U’was. Given the scholars that acknowledge the Catholic missionaries, particularly Rochereau, it also made research possible by giving access and support to medical researchers, geographers, and other anthropologists (Stoddart 1959; Arends 1961; Stoddart 1962; Stoddart and Trubshaw 1962; Layrisse, Layrisse, and Wilbert 1963; Chaves 1964). My survey of 130 texts published on the U’wa between 1914 and 2010 revealed that the majority of linguistic and anthropological studies published up to the 1970s and into the 1980s resulted from collaborations between the Colombian State and the Catholic Church or Protestant missionaries.³³ Of these, I

Ambassador in Bogota and His Excellency The Colombian Ambassador in London, Father H.J. Rochereau, Monsenor E. Garcia and the missionaries at San Luis de Chuscal, and all those who helped the Expedition with advice and assistance, especially regarding the work of the Indian party” (Stoddart 1959: 3).

³³ In 1888 the Colombian government contracted the Catholic Church through the

focus on the most prolific missionary anthropologists, Catholics Father Rochereau (Rochereau 1914, 1919, 1927, 1959, 1961, 1964),³⁴ Sister Maria Helena Marquez, Marquez 1970, 1975, 1976, 1979, 1981, 1983, 1988), and US Protestants Paul and Edna Headland (SIL 1966, 1976; 1976/1990{Headland, 1976 #64} Headland 1977, 1979, 1979, 1980, 1982, 1997; Headland and Headland 1966, 1966, 1971, 1971, 1971, 1972, 1972, 1972, 1976, 1976, 1985, 1985, 1987; Headland and Osborn 1974; Headland 1994; Headland 1973, 1973, 1986, 1997; Headland and Headland 1972; Headland and Levinsohn 1977). They all studied the U'wa language and “culture” for the translation of religious texts for catechism and to provide missionaries with tools for evangelization.

Sister Helena Marquez lived among the U'wa people in the communities of Aguablanca, Cobaría and Tegría for twenty years between 1952 and 1980 (Marquez 1980). Her work, she explains, facilitates the work of anthropologists, missionaries and the state:

It is left to us, the missionaries, a delicate task, after a profound learning of the indigenous culture: to discover in that culture all the richness of values adequate for the planting of the seeds of the Word,

Vatican to educate indigenous peoples in Colombia with the objective of integrating them into the “civilized world” (Rojas Curieux 1999: 46). This agreement was renewed in 1973. The Summer Institute for Linguistics signed a contract with Colombian President Alberto Lleras Camargo in 1962, which remained active until 2002 (SIL 2012). Protestant Missionaries Paul and Edna Headland from the Summer Institute for Linguistics, published in collaboration with an agency of the *Ministerio de Gobierno*, which today would be known as the Ministry of the Interior, in particular the General Directorate of Integration and Community Development, Operations Division of Indigenous Affairs (*Dirección General de Integración y Desarrollo de la Comunidad, División Operativa de Asuntos Indígenas*).

³⁴ One set of texts I have yet to locate were reports published in the *Revista de Misiones*, which figured prominently in the bibliographies of the Colombian scholars.

in Jesus' example, who took from paganism the symbols and converted them into signs. He transformed a culture without having lacked respect for that culture.

The motivation that has made me take on this new work has been the desire to offer Missionaries, Anthropologists and government personnel in charge of the promotion and evangelization of these indigenous people, some tools that will permit them to know the reasons for (U'wa) attitudes, behavior that at times disconcert us, to derive from there the principal conclusions and politics with respect to the work with them.... (Marquez 1983)

Marquez sees her project primarily as part of the evangelizing mission of her church, but her words reveal a dual purpose of supporting government personnel in their colonial designs for the U'wa and their lands.

Sister Marquez thus made her mark in two ways: first through publications of translated religious texts in U'wa, and second through ethnographic representations of U'wa life and cosmivision. In 1970 she published the first catechism lesson in the Aguablanca dialect of the U'wa language (Marquez 1970: 1). She followed it with a translation of the Gospel of Mark that totaled over 450 pages (Marquez 1975, 1980). Her published studies from 1979, 1981, and 1983 delved deeper into U'wa spiritual beliefs. In Marquez's 1979 text simply titled *Los Tunebo*, she outlines the difficulties researchers face in learning about U'wa spirituality:

1. The prohibition to make known to the whites their rites and beliefs.
2. This knowledge is confined to a few people (karekas in general). The majority of the natives know little Spanish, many of whom barely know a few words and construct phrases with difficulty.
3. Severe problems of transport: intransitable trails closed by the rugged terrain and rivers swollen most of the year. The danger of poisonous snakes abound in the region. Difficulty in obtaining basic necessities such as food. (Marquez 1979)

Marquez was able to overcome these difficulties in acquiring U'wa knowledge and information as evidenced in an introduction to her *Catequismo Básico* published in 1970. In this book's foreword Padre Francisco Arango explained that Marquez achieved the translation of text into the U'wa language "aided by the young Tuneba indian, Esperanza Aguablanca, who went to Medellín with her mother Judith, to support such a noble undertaking. . . . [T]raditionally the tunebos have been selfish in teaching their language, but not Esperanza or Judith, who have lived at the Mission for sixteen years and consider themselves true spiritual daughters of the Mission" (Marquez 1970: 4-5). Thus missionary Sister Maria Elena Marquez overcame this obstacle of guarded silence—or "selfishness" according to Padre Arango—through the "support" of two informants who depended upon the mission for their survival: Judith (Surábara), a monolingual U'wa mother and U'wa spiritual authority (kareka), and Esperanza (Berichá) Aguablanca, her bilingual daughter.³⁵ For example, the Gospel According to Mark was translated into the U'wa language in Medellín from 1971 to 1973 with Judith and Esperanza's help as informants (Berichá and Romero Moreno 2000; Aguablanca 1992). Esperanza, or Berichá as she calls herself, taught

³⁵ Sister Maria Elena and Berichá played pivotal roles in each other's lives. While Berichá played the role of informant and translator for the Missionary Sister, she was also able to study and eventually became a teacher in the indigenous schools of Cobaria, Aguablanca, and el Tablon and at the missionary school at El Chuscal. She studied anthropology at the Instituto Misionero Javeriano de Yarumal (Aguablanca 2000) and wrote "Actividades para realizacion de los viajes astrales/Activities for the realization of astral journeys," (Berichá 1991), "*Tengo los pies en la cabeza/My feet are in my mind*" (1992) and a chapter with Maria Eugenia Romero Moreno on the "Uwa (Tunebo)" for the *Geografía Humana de Colombia Region Orinoquia/Human Geography of Colombia Orinoco Region* (Aguablanca and Romero Moreno 2000).

the missionaries her language (Marquez 1970:1) and provided them with access to sacred information through her ability to communicate and understand her mother, Surábara, a “spiritual authority.” Berichá and her mother went to live at the mission after Surábara was widowed and could not provide for herself and her daughter who was born with no legs. The missionaries took them in, put Judith to work on Church-occupied lands, and made “Esperancita” “useful” by educating her and initiating her career as teacher (Aguablanca 1992; Berichá and Romero Moreno 2000).³⁶

Marquez followed in the footsteps of Rochereau in her commitment to learning the U’wa language and beliefs to further the goals of proselytizing and sharing the Word. The missionary-based educational system provided the infrastructure for colonialism as a way to teach religion and Spanish as well as to reconfigure settlement patterns and economic activities. The missions not only took in abandoned children and single mothers, like Esperanza and her mother Judith, they went even further by taking away children from their families with the help of the police (Pradilla and Salazar 1978).

US Protestant missionaries Paul and Edna Headland present another example of missionaries collaborating with the Colombian government, but this time with international backing. They were sponsored by the “faith-based” nongovernmental

³⁶ In “Esperanza,” the missionaries found a symbolic justification for their work. Born with a birth defect, according to U’wa “tradition” Berichá wouldn’t have been allowed to live. Birth defects had been interpreted as the punishment for altering the equilibrium that the U’wa are responsible for in nature (Berichá 1992). Her parents had already decided to not comply with the practice of sacrificing their baby for the good of the *pueblo*. However, after her father died unexpectedly, Judith, or Suraburá, was unable to care for the growing child and meet the demands of living off of the land.

organization Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL), known at that time as Wycliffe Bible Translators (WBT) to funders and supporters in the United States (Benthall 1982).³⁷ Between 1964 and 1986 they split their time between Loma Linda, Colombia, and the U'wa communities of Cobaría and Tegría (Headland 1997). “During those years, when the U'wa would leave as part of a seasonal migration to their settlements in the lower mountainside, [Paula and Edna Headland] would frequently bring some of them to live at the Center for the Summer Institute of Linguistics [in Loma Linda, Colombia]” (Headland, E. 1997: 1). With U'wa “help” the Headlands published at least thirty texts over three decades between 1966 and 1997 in the areas of linguistics, literacy education, anthropology, and the translation of religious texts into “Tunebo.”³⁸ Through the Indigenous Affairs Operative Division of the Directorate of Integration and Community Development, the Colombian government's Interior Ministry (*Ministerio de Gobierno*) co-published multiple literacy (1966a, 1966b, 1972a, 1972b, 1972c, 1976a, 1977a, 1979, 1979, 1979),

³⁷ William Cameron Townsend with L.L. Legters founded the Summer Institute of Linguistics in 1934. Shortly thereafter he began Camp Wycliffe to train linguists and translators (WGA 2012). “Their original plan had been to train translators who would serve under other established missionary societies. But by the early 1940s, friends of the work strongly recommended the formation of a society specifically focused on Bible translation” (WGA 2012). The Wycliffe Bible Translators (WBT), named after the first man to translate the Bible into English, was born (Stoll 1982). Until 1991 SIL and WBT were two sides of the same coin; they shared members and a board.

³⁸ For example they thank “the people of Cobaría who were so patient and persistent in helping us both in language study and in our everyday life in a primitive village. Jose Ignacio Afanador was especially helpful in introducing us to the language slowly and thoroughly. Felipe Cobaría was diligent in seeing that we spoke correctly. Our other two main informants were Alvaro Cobaría and Manuel Suarez” (Headland 1973), Buswara Cobaría, Jose Ignacio Afanador, and the late Alvaro Cobaría (Headland and Levinsohn 1977) as well as Leonel Cobaría and Pablo Cobaría (Headland 1986).

anthropological (1973a, 1974, 1976) and linguistic texts (1973b, 1976b, 1977b, 1980, 1986, 1994, 1997a, 1997b).

These Protestant missionaries, like the Catholics, worked closely with the Colombian government to carry out their research activities but depended also upon other funding sources to complete their mission, specifically a sister relationship with the WBT. While governments of Latin America, Africa, and Asia apparently contracted with SIL for its research and educational work in developing writing systems for previously unwritten languages, supporters in the US funded the work through the Wycliffe Bible Translators. The funders were evangelical Protestants motivated by the work of translating the bible to other languages (Benthall 1982):1). The SIL/WBT representatives were trained in linguistics and expected to spend fifteen years studying a language, developing a grammar, starting an educational program, and translating portions of the bible. As cited above, the Colombian government's Directorate of Integration and Community Development supported the publication of two thirds of the Headlands' publications. The eight publications that translated portions of the bible were published either by United Bible Societies or WBT through the firm Editorial Townsend located in Loma Linda, Colombia, the headquarters of the SIL (Headland and Headland 1971, 1971, 1971; Headland and Headland 1972; Headland and Headland 1976; SIL 1976/1990; Headland 1979, 1982; Headland and Headland 1985, 1985).³⁹ In short, the SIL tapped into evangelical

³⁹ These last texts are not part of the bibliography provided on SIL's website (SIL 2012), reflecting the refashioning of the two groups into separate entities in 1991 (Wycliffe Global Alliance 2012). The Summer Institute for Linguistics renamed itself

Christian funds to carry out missionary activities and research in conjunction with State objectives to “integrate” communities. Thus, SIL/WBT used the work of anthropology to do the work of the state and religion.

In sum, language and ethnographic studies by Catholic and Protestant missionaries, which support colonial objectives, dominate the literature from 1914 through the 1970s. During this time the state supported the research and “educational” activities of both Catholic and Protestant missionaries as well as other researchers to speed up assimilation of the “Tunebo” Indians and the access of their land and resources into the coffers of the nation-state. Both Catholic and Protestant missionaries published biblical texts translated into U’wa dialects. Rochereau (1959) and Marquez (1970) published catechism lessons while the Headlands produce primers on the U’wa language (multiple texts published between 1966 and 1979). Eventually, according to U’wa political representatives, both Catholic and Protestant missionaries were made to leave by U’wa authorities (Cobaria 2010; Cobaría 2010; ASOUWA 2007). The studies by missionaries, in addition to the anthropological and geographical studies produced during this time, look at the U’wa as an object of research to be measured, described, and controlled or interpreted through recognizable thought systems (Arends 1961; Stoddart 1959, 1962; Stoddart and Trubshaw 1962; Chaves 1964). As with other research in Anthropology from the

as SIL International and the Wycliffe Bible Translators changed its name to Wycliffe Global Alliance and moved their headquarters from Dallas, Texas (where SIL is located) to Singapore (Wycliffe Global Alliance 2012).

period, these studies lack attention to U'wa agency and fail to demonstrate any concern for accountability from the researchers towards the subjects they research.

Resistance: From silence to interculturality

In the following section I provide a different reading of the key authors noted above to uncover the resistance with which the researchers were met. This serves to recognize the U'wa people not only as victims of colonization, but also as agents in the struggle against assimilation. When read critically the academic and anthropological renderings of the U'wa enable us to see the ways in which the U'wa resisted religious colonization in order to keep their ancestral beliefs and knowledge alive. Reading against the grain, this section identifies two U'wa strategies of resistance: silence and interculturality. Early researchers were met with silence in regards to information about their most sacred beliefs, rituals, practices, and narratives with non-U'wa. It is a recurring theme brought up by multiple scholars who studied the U'wa during this time period. We also can glean traces of U'wa resistance through the use of dominant symbolic systems. U'wa leaders were those fluent in U'wa and Spanish that argued their cases by drawing analogies to Catholic value systems.

Resistance to Religious Colonization

In Rochereau's writing, we see traces of resistance particularly in relation to religion or mythology. In an early article published in French, Rochereau (1919) writes on religion:

We do not know many things from their religious ideas because they guard silence on this topic. We do not know if it is that they have had an unfortunate experience. A jaguar was killing domestic animals every night. We went to stay the night with a group of 4 or 5 families of tunebos to trap the animal. After a long stake-out (*acecho*) that certainly caused us much fatigue, we were able to see how they woke up in the morning. Upon waking, they would pray sitting up, opening their arms on high and looking to the heavens.⁴⁰ (Rochereau 1919: 522)

U'wa attempts to “guard silence” illustrate resistance to this missionary investigator.

Of the U'wa's religious life Rochereau was only able to ascertain that they engage in a morning prayer “sitting up...and looking to the heavens” and this observation he attained after he had been living in the area for nearly ten years (Stoddart 1959).

Similarly, in a later text Rochereau complained in a section titled “Superstitions”:

“Data about religion, witchcraft, curandero practices, etc., is extremely difficult to get anything out of the Tunebos... We exhibit here what we have gotten out *with much difficulty*” (1961: 42, emphasis added).

The U'was' guarded silence can be similarly traced in later research published in the 1960s. Despite witnessing some native ceremonies, Stoddart is still able to claim the U'wa have “no organized religious life” (Stoddart 1962: 147). Likewise, anthropologist Alvaro Chaves explains “We could not obtain any mythical narrative

⁴⁰ “No sabemos muchas cosas de sus ideas religiosas porque ellos guardan mucho silencio acerca de este tema. No sabemos si es que han tenido una experiencia infortunada. Un jaguar mataba animales domésticos cada noche. Nos fuimos a quedar la noche con un grupo de tunebos de 4 o 5 familias para atrapar el animal. Después de un largo acecho que por cierto nos causo gran fatiga, nosotros pudimos ver como se despertaban por la mañana. Al despertarse, hacían cierta oración sentados, abriendo los brazos en alto y mirando hacia el cielo” (Rocheraux 1919, translation to Spanish from French by Reinaldo Alvarez).

(*relato*) from the indigenous people” aside from one short “myth” regarding a sacred site (Chaves 1964: 31).⁴¹ He further expounds,

The information relative to their [U’wa] material culture was obviously better captured given our use of observation. The areas of magic, religion and life cycle were barely outlined (in his study), due to the natural reserve of the informants on these themes, a reserve that could only be overcome through a long-standing time of living with them” (Chaves 1964: 5).⁴²

Similarly, missionary Sister Elena Marquez identifies the main obstacle to her investigation of the Tunebo cosmovision as the prohibition of sharing U’wa rituals and beliefs with white people (Marquez 1979). From these examples we see that the U’wa were extremely reluctant to teach *blancos* about their sacred knowledges.⁴³

Just as the U’wa engaged strategies beyond silence to resist the religious colonization of their lands, researchers tried other strategies to obtain the information they desired. In a 1961 article Rochereau admits that to record sacred chants he had to resort to tricking a spiritual leader. He explains:

[the] biggest disgrace for a Kareka is that the white people learn his songs/chants. To copy them surreptitiously (*al vuelo*), hidden

⁴¹ “Ningún relato mítico pudimos obtener de los indígenas.”

⁴² “Lo relativo a cultural material fue obviamente mejor captado, por depender en su mayor parte de la observación. Los campos de magia, religión y ciclo vital apenas pudieron esbozarse, debido a la natural reserva de los informantes sobre el tema, reserva que solo puede superarse mediante una convivencia duradera.”

⁴³ This silence was not absolute. Rochereau’s (1959) “Colección de textos en Tegría,” includes over a hundred pages of religious curriculum translated to U’wa and the myths and chants of the *Uerjayas* or spiritual leaders/elders into Spanish. This text was dedicated to “the memory of the Indian Pablo de Tarso, son of a Tegría chief, who died with admirable Christian sentiments in the flower of his age. *This youth knew how to ignore the threats and ostracism from his own kind*, and put his intelligence and the richness of his heart at the service of the Mission, *giving us the secret of his language that nobody of his race had wanted to reveal to us*” (my emphasis, Rochereau 1959:10).” In Rochereau’s portrayal, this exceptional young man faced considerable opposition to his collaboration with the Mission.

behind a cloth, we charged a Missionary Sister to excite the pride (*amor propio*) of the Kareka Higinio, conveniently softening him with a good ration of *majule*, and to tell him that he was no Kareka and did not know how to sing/chant. Higinio was worked up (*se le calentó*) and sang thinking he was alone with her, but so lightly that our transcription resulted quite deficient. Nonetheless, we have been able to translate a section.⁴⁴ (1961: 47)

Once this leader discovered that Rochereau had the recordings, Higinio, “in complete despair, fled the house, running aimlessly, he disappeared into the countryside and nothing was heard from him again” (1961: 47).

Alternatively, the U’wa also practiced resistance by learning the religious ways and language of the colonizers and missionaries.⁴⁵ Much of the scholarship noted above also recorded the U’wa’s use of this information and language skills to oppose the missionaries and their aims. For example, Stoddart (1959) reports:

[T]he practical results of the missionary activity had been almost negligible. The missionaries admitted that most of the Indians only consented to baptism to learn something of the white man’s ways, and some of their most violent opponents, such as the *kareka* Paulina of Bócota, are in fact baptized persons. (27)

Moreover, Chaves and Rochereau misinterpreted the U’wa knowledge and use of the “white man’s ways.” Chaves cites Rochereau’s study to explain the origin of the “Tunebo” religion, which he claims is based on “creator gods, totemism and Christian

⁴⁴ “La mayor desgracia para un Kareka es que los blancos conozcan esos cantos. Para copiarlos al vuelo, ocultos detrás de un cuero, encargamos a una Hermana Misionera que excitara el amor propio del Kareka Higinio, convenientemente ablandado con una buena ración de *majule*, y le dijera que no era Kareka ninguno y que no sabía cantar. Higinio se le calentó y cantó creyéndose sólo con ella, pero tan ligero que nuestra transcripción resultó bastante deficiente. Sin embargo se ha podido traducirlos en parte” (47).

⁴⁵ Colombian historian Ana Maria Falchetti (2003) more recently traced U’wa use of Christian symbolism to compare and explain their own practices and ways of life. I return to this below.

influences” (1964: 25). The Christian influences described by Rochereau are manifest in “their desire to imitate the Christian culture (*culto*), and the facility with which the *kareka* declares himself *cura*/priest (perhaps the first word (*kareka*) is a Tunebo deformation of the second (*cura*)), and how they name their adolescent initiation ceremonies as baptism” (Rochereau 1961: 45).⁴⁶ Additionally, Chaves describes how Sísera, U’wa careca,⁴⁷ lived in Pamplona under the protection of Bishop Rafael Afanador y Cadena. This Bishop was responsible for the decrees issued in 1924 that called for the naming of a Diocese “Junta” of Missions who was charged with colonization and evangelization in the Sarare region. After several years in Pamplona Sísera returned to his land and gave himself the name of “José Ignacio Afanador y Cadena.” According to Chaves, “his long stay among the white people, his knowledge of Spanish and adopting the Bishop’s name gave him the necessary prestige to be elected chief. His predecessor, deceased, studied to become a priest, at the Seminary of Pamplona, but he preferred to return to his mountains and rule his tribe” (Chaves 1964: 26).⁴⁸ Both Rochereau and Chaves might seem to suggest that U’wa leaders became those able to adopt syncretic practices or who became

⁴⁶ “Su deseo de imitar el culto cristiano, y la facilidad con que el *kareka* se declara *cura* (quizas la primera palabra sea una deformacion Tuneba de la segunda), y como califican de bautismo sus ceremonias de iniciacion de la adolescencia.” See also Chaves (1964: 26).

⁴⁷ *Kareka/careca* is an U’wa authority figure and spiritual leader, also referred to as shaman.

⁴⁸ Rochereau cites another example: “A young Tunebo was picked up by Monseñor Arbelaez and with the desire to enter the Seminary, he carried out his studies. He requested permission after many years to visit his family and just like that he left his holy robe for the loincloth of his ancestors and became a *Kareka*! They called him *Padre Arbelaez*!” (Rochereau 1961: 40).

transcultured, practicing a hybrid of Catholic and U'wa spirituality. However, later researchers demonstrate how the U'wa deployed language colonial authorities would understand in order to argue for maintaining their ways of life.

For example, Ana Maria Falchetti, a Colombian historian and anthropologist to whom I return below, showed through archival evidence that the U'wa learned the Christian religion in order to relate or draw parallels between their important rituals and those of the Christian tradition. This was a strategy taken up by the U'wa since “colonial” times (Falchetti 2003, 2007). Chaves himself gives more detail on how the U'wa carried out this strategy. U'wa children are “allowed” to go to school to avoid a permanent removal from the family. However the children are cleansed upon returning from school to mark the difference between the two worlds and to avoid the contamination of the U'wa world by the western world:

It is admirable the way that the tunebos conserve their beliefs, traditions and customs. In a passive way they have tenaciously opposed the introduction of new systems and ways of living, accepting only that which do not influence the spiritual terrain. They let their children go to school because they know if they do not they will be sent to the Mission and with this they will lose direct contact with the familial group, but every day, when those boys and girls return home, they must give themselves a purifying bath in the stream, before entering the household. And while the parents permit that their children learn beliefs and customs of the whites, they fight tenaciously to inculcate in them their own beliefs and to make them participate in all their ceremonies. (Chaves 1964: 27)

Chaves describes as “passive” the “tenacious” opposition demonstrated by the U'wa. However, this strategy is best understood as an early attempt to build intercultural sovereignty by a population being colonized by a materially more powerful group. The U'wa participate in colonized spaces and accept “only that which do not

influence the spiritual domain” in order to “conserve their beliefs, traditions and customs.” Part of this strategy is learning to live in two worlds and mark the border between them both through cleansing rituals in order to maintain sovereignty over specific aspects of their lives. From the above excerpts we see the U’wa are strategic about their interactions and communications with religious authorities. They adopt some concepts from the Catholic religion to explain their own. Rochereau and Chaves misinterpreted this to mean the U’wa adopted/absorbed the Christian meanings of these terms—like baptism and priest, but as will be made clear below through Falchetti’s work, this was actually their mobilization of an intercultural strategy using Christian words and concepts as tools in their fight to keep control over their own ways of life and religiosity—a process that I call building intercultural sovereignty.

In addition to what Chaves calls a “passive way” (of resistance, 1964: 39), the U’wa engaged in *active* resistance:

Tunebo resentment at the missionaries’ confiscation of their *rubrizas*⁴⁹ and interference with their dance festivals (they attempted to substitute a new Christian text for the old Tunebo beliefs) broke out in an armed attack on the mission at Bócota by several Tunebos with machetes, and the resident missionary was obliged to seek military help from the Mayor of Guicán. (Stoddart 1959: 27)

In 1959 Stoddart gave details to what he addressed as simply “considerable opposition” that resulted in the abandonment of the Bócota station in 1957 (1962). Despite Stoddart’s characterization of “passive resistance” and inevitable *mestizaje* the U’wa displayed agency in opposing the desire of researchers to study their sacred knowledge, establish missions in particular localities and colonize their minds by

⁴⁹ A spiritual implement utilized by U’wa spiritual authorities.

imposing foreign beliefs upon them. While the U'wa recognize the inevitable proximity and interaction with colonial society, in terms of education, language, and religious practice, they are protective of their knowledge. And yet they engage with them consciously to acquire the ways of the “Liwoa” or white people. However, because of the colonization of U'wa ancestral lands by *campesinos*—promoted by the state and the church during the 1960s and 1970s— the U'wa developed new mechanisms for dealing with the changes based on these established strategies of resistance.

Research and U'wa resistance: From objects to subjects of research

About a century ago Father Rochereau inaugurated what one academic calls the “modern” colonization of the U'wa people in 1910 (Stoddart 1959: 26). Based on the “pioneering” work of Rochereau the first part of this chapter discusses how missionaries, both Catholic and Protestant, did the work of the state to incorporate the U'wa people and their land into the nation-state of Colombia. While these fifty years of research demonstrate a colonialist model of research, a close reading of the ethnographic data documented in these publications shows U'wa resistance and agency in the face of this colonization. The following section continues on the theme of resistance to highlight different approaches emerging in secular anthropology to research the U'wa. Instead of a positivistic, objectivist approach to research recent researchers, without religious affiliations, demonstrate a respect for the U'wa by grounding their work in the U'was' own cosmovision. In this sense, the U'wa shifted from objects of research to subjects of research that are intimately connected in

partnership with their investigators. This shift in research from the 1970s to today coincides both with the emergence of U'wa and other Colombian indigenous social movements as well as the evolution of anthropological paradigms to center the agency of research subjects. This research differs from earlier research as we begin to see a shift in how scholars engage with the U'wa. Anthropologists Helena Pradilla (Pradilla and Salazar 1978; Pradilla 1983), Ann Osborn (Osborn 1982, 1985; Wilson 2008; Osborn 2009 [1995]) and historian Ana Maria Falchetti (Falchetti 2003; Falchetti de Saenz 2007), the most prominent of these scholars, document the historical colonization and marginalization of the U'wa within the context of understanding from an U'wa perspective or locus of enunciation. These relationships thus demonstrate aspects of an intercultural logic in three related ways. First, the scholars seek to understand from an U'wa point of view, or locus of enunciation, instead of imposing a Eurocentric framework. Second, the relationship between Ann Osborn and U'wa leaders demonstrates a reciprocal, horizontal exchange where the U'wa agree to teach her about their cosmovision in exchange for her help in navigating Colombian government agencies. Finally, the U'wa later use these same studies to legitimate their claims for ancestral lands.

In the 1970s and 1980s, anthropological researchers took a different approach to working with the U'wa, a result of U'wa conditions as well as the orientations of these new researchers. Whereas earlier authors adopted colonial motives for studying the U'wa and their language, by the 1970s secular anthropologists began to recognize the U'wa as subjects of research and not merely objects and to prioritize the

viewpoints of the U'wa instead of merely interpreting the observed lives of the U'wa people through a Western lens. James Clifford and George Marcus (1986) discuss this shift in terms of ethnography in *Writing Culture*. Following the processes of decolonization in the post-war period, critiques of ethnographic practices provoked a “crisis in anthropology” in which ethnography was no longer believed to contain transparent, authoritative truths (Clifford and Marcus 1986: 10). By the 1960s and 1970s “different rules of the game for ethnography” began to emerge where indigenous peoples began to impose restrictions and conditions on research. Clifford and Marcus assert that only a rigorous partiality is possible when contingencies of language, power and history are recognized in the production of knowledge. Ann Osborn, engaging in research with the U'wa in the 1970s, embodies this shift.

If in the early part of the century Father Henri Rochereau set the tone for research on the U'wa, this section focuses on the work of Ann Osborn who provides a different path for researchers to follow. Hailed as the most well known contemporary scholar of the U'wa people (Vasco Uribe 1994),⁵⁰ Ann Osborn's research reflected debates in anthropology about the relationship between researchers and their subjects. Of the major scholars who have written about the U'wa, Osborn is among the first to reflect upon her relationship to the U'wa and the reciprocity it required (Osborn 2009

⁵⁰ This is also corroborated by the number of authors—academic, activist and journalist—that build upon or cite Osborn (Aguablanca 1992; Falchetti de Saenz 1997; Aguablanca and Romero Moreno 2000; Vidal 1997; Serje 2003; Rodriguez-Garavito and Arenas 2005). Additionally Berichá/Esperanza Aguablanca (1992) and Ana Maria Falchetti (2003) dedicate their works to her.

[1995]).⁵¹ Her research aims to understand cultural meanings through the U'wa's own point of view. This approach facilitated dialogues for the purpose of mutual understanding between herself and U'wa spiritual leaders. It also led to the production of work that the U'wa could use in substantiating their arguments for sovereignty. Osborn's experience with the U'wa shows how their spiritual/political leaders set the terms of relationships with outsiders to forge their own intercultural sovereignty (relationships) and to put their priorities of the struggle over land first.

Osborn's research makes two kinds of contributions, one academic and the other political. Her dissertation research, under the auspices of the University of Oxford in Anthropology, recorded, transcribed, and translated U'wa chanted myths to better understand their material relationships with the land they inhabited. To counterbalance and complement the prevailing wisdom at the time of her study, Osborn showed the spiritual dimension that motivated U'wa material practices. John (1956) named the Andean indigenous practice of seasonal migration up and down the mountainside as "vertical agriculture." Osborn argued that the U'wa not only fulfilled the material needs of their populations by cultivating at different altitudes, but that their seasonal migrations played an important role in their cosmology as evidenced in their chants and mythologies. In other words, her dissertation research concluded, "mythology is just as essential for survival as, for instance, agriculture and that it

⁵¹ Osborn's 1982 doctoral thesis, "Mythology and Social Structure Among the U'wa," was translated to Spanish in 1995 as *Las Cuatro Estaciones: Mitología y Estructura Social Entre Los U'wa* (Osborn 1995). This Spanish version was translated and re-published as *The Four Seasons of the U'wa: A Chibcha Ritual Ecology in the Colombian Andes* (2009).

should therefore be considered as a necessary condition of both cultural and physical existence" (Osborn 2009: 89).

On the Eastern slopes of the Andes the U'wa live at different altitudes depending on the season. The movement of the sun, its equinox and solstices, mark the seasons and determine what social or agricultural activity the U'wa must perform. Where the Catholic Church and *campesinos* took advantage of their seasonal migration, this movement and the associated rituals and chants are a responsibility the U'wa enact to maintain equilibrium between upper and lower worlds. The work the U'wa do to maintain this equilibrium is not nationalistic or limited to benefit of the U'wa people. U'wa elders explain that they chant for the whole world; without chanting the "world would fall down" (Osborn 2009: xxiii).⁵² Osborn begins with mythology and its performance "because this is undoubtedly the way in which the U'wa perceive their myths; the myth creates a reality which did not exist before. In this society, myth and ritual reconcile and balance the material and non-material world, not only with each other but within themselves" (Osborn 2009: xxiii).

She found a people accustomed to ritual and ceremony; the U'wa demonstrated great respect for the sacred relationship with their environment, which is explained in their oral tradition or "chanted myths" in detail. The relationship between the U'wa and their environment serves to show that there exists no separation between their sacred and daily lives. Osborn argued against the then-

⁵² For example, in the U'wa cosmology, the oil found under the earth's surface is in fact the blood of Mother Earth. Bleeding the earth by cutting her veins and letting the blood-oil flow affects everyone.

dominant view on Andean research represented by the work of John Murra (1956). Murra wrote about a similar cyclical way of life practiced by other Andean communities, but in his writings he merely describes *what* these communities do but does not stop to consider *why* they follow these cycles. As a student of the *wedhaiya* (principal chanters), Osborn was given entry into ancient texts that shed light on U'wa holistic approaches to ecology and the work required to maintain equilibrium in nature in particular places. Her research thus brings together anthropology, archaeology, and oral traditions to understand the U'wa on their own terms.

Osborn's political contribution lies in the charting of a map using references from U'wa oral tradition that trace their ancestral lands, particularly through the chanted myth examined in *El Vuelo de las Tijeretas* (Osborn 1985). Osborn's method combined different types of evidence with the objective of locating the U'wa in the past. Her starting point was the chanted myth which follows the flight of the *tijereta*, or kite-tailed swallow, that stops at different points that mark U'wa ancestral lands. Through her work with elders she was able to deduce the locations named in the chanted myth. In these locations she gathered material evidence, particularly pottery shards, that showed where U'wa people had lived. By supplementing an anthropological study with archaeological evidence, Osborn provides the material evidence useful for U'wa claims to land (Osborn 1979). This interdisciplinary study encouraged archaeologists to consider other evidence to supplement the pieces of material culture they extract from the ground. Indeed, when the U'wa's struggle to defend their land from oil drilling erupted on the international stage in the late 1990s,

two key investigative pieces used Osborn's work to explain the U'wa's plight and reasons for protecting the land (Vidal 1997; Project Underground 1998).

Circumstances of their relationship

In contrast to the scholars referenced above, Osborn was introduced to the U'wa by a white *campesino* who had established a trade relationship with the U'wa. Osborn, accompanied by the *campesino*, traveled an old U'wa route into their community instead of approaching through the missionary-pioneered route. He was able to vouch for Osborn given his seven-year acquaintance with the researcher (Osborne 2009:1). She relates the conditions they expected from her to carry out her study:

On arrival I explained that I had come to learn how the Kubaruwa lived and thought, and declared what I, as an ethnographer, hoped to do. They, for their part, declared that they had no intention of becoming my informants! Nevertheless, an agreement was eventually reached with the Bita Wedhaiya of the Aya, in conclave with several of the principal chanters, which explicitly excluded money payment and was conditional upon my ability to learn: they were sure that no one not born an U'wa could understand or learn their culture. When they suggested that I help them with their problems with the Whites instead of studying with them, my answer was unequivocal and logical to the Bita Wedhaiya⁵³; it was that I could not help them if I did not know and understand them and what was important to them. I added that I could not help people who did not help themselves. I was permitted to stay with them on probation for one month. (Osborn 2009: 2)

This reciprocal approach produced a dialogical relationship that was key to building understanding of U'wa perspectives on history and their role in the world. Osborn's

⁵³ Osborn explains the "term for principal shaman or master shaman is *Bitá Wedhaiya* (another meaning of which is wise elder); for shaman the term is *Kareka*" (2009: 2).

relationship with the *Bita Wedhaiya* (also written as *wedhaiya* or *werjaya*) of Kubaruwa (Cobaría) “was not finally cemented until they were able to evaluate [her] in relations of interaction with other people of White culture, in this case the Protestants of the American Summer Institute of Linguistics, the Colombian Catholic missionaries and White settlers” (Osborn 2009: 2). Osborn didn’t impose her presence as others had done; the *Bita Wedhaiya* set the circumstances for her entry: it was “conditional upon [her] ability to learn.” Her learning, in turn, was necessary for her to be able to assist them in their “problems with Whites.”

After watching Osborn’s progress after a year of study the *Bita Wedhaiya* gained confidence in her and began to explain their problems. Osborn responded by offering ways she could support their efforts to resolve land issues:

The possibility of a reserve was discussed and I offered to accompany two Spanish-speaking men to Bogotá, so that they might learn about the ways of government officials and legal possibilities of protecting themselves against the encroachments of White settlers and missionaries. From then on, different pairs of Spanish-speaking Kubaruwa would travel with me to Bogota and stay at my flat, so that I could show them the way around the different Ministries, introduce them, and explain to them the spoken and written information they received. Very soon they were able to make their own way to government offices and to present and argue their case alone, something the U’wa have been doing at least since about 1650 (Rivero 1956: 148). The U’wa (Kubaruwa, Kaibaka and Tagrinuwa clans)⁵⁴ obtained legal rights to their land in 1974, and these were ratified in 1976. (Osborn 2009: 7)

If she wanted to study them Osborn had to also help the *Bita Wedhaiya* in their work to defend their land. She did this by helping leaders navigate government bureaucracies in the capital, Bogotá. Roberto Cobaría, past president of the U’wa

⁵⁴ Cobaría, Bócota, Tegria.

governing council, corroborated this reciprocal exchange when he recounted his first trips as a young man to Bogotá in the company of Ann Osborn and other U'wa leaders: "I got experience traveling with Ann Osborn to Bogotá.... At first I was scared to talk at the different public ministries.... I learned a lot. Every week we would go to government agencies. There should be letters that showed our opposition to the bi-national highway" (Cobaría 2010).⁵⁵ These first trips took place in the 1970s. Since then Roberto "Berito" Cobaría, elected as international liaison, utilized those early experiences in multiple government offices, as well as in the multiple countries and international institutions he has travelled to, as the highest profile U'wa leader to have travelled the world (Miller 2010). It is within that space of dialogue with U'wa liaisons and under their guidance that relationships were fostered to contribute to practices of building intercultural sovereignty.

Unlike earlier scholars who provided no evidence of sustained dialogue with research subjects or interest in their point of view, Osborn returned after finishing her research and writing to discuss her findings with the U'wa, make corrections and receive permission to publish the texts (Osborn 2009: 9). Instead of basing her accounts solely on her own observations, or that of other visitors, she was taken on as student by the *wedhaiya*, which meant that she learned in dialogue with the elders, the spiritual authorities. She demonstrated an approach that "took the view of the people" to explain material aspects of their culture "to document what the people actually

⁵⁵ Agarré experiencia yendo con Ann Osborn a Bogotá.... Tenia miedo hablar en ministerios públicos... Aprendí mucho. Cada ocho días íbamos a la gobernación. Debe haber carta (por oponernos a) la carretera binacional.

thought about what they were doing” (Osborn 2009: 212). U’wa leaders, in a 1996 statement authored by Werjayas, Cabildos, Cabildo Mayor, and the Equipo de Etnoeducación, cited Ann Osborn as an important scholar of the U’wa people: “Ann Osborn has been one of the key scholars of the U’wa culture. Her investigations went to levels very difficult to access by any other scientist of our times. She brings together work from over a decade during which time she was guided by the most respected *werjayas* that have existed” (Werjayas 1996).⁵⁶ Osborn also expressed admiration for the U’wa: “No one could help but be impressed by the Kubaruwa—their all-night chanting and rituals, the way they very carefully plan everything they do and consistently work to time schedules, their frequent changes of residence up and down the mountainside, and their preoccupation with the preservation of their land and customs. I also very soon became aware that I was living in a society which was accustomed to study and whose chamans were accomplished teachers—some of whom were to become my teachers” (Osborn 2009: 4).

Helena Pradilla, a student of anthropology at the Universidad Nacional in Bogotá, developed a line of study that parallels Osborn’s approach in its respect for the U’wa point of view. Like Osborn, Pradilla’s studies attempt to understand common anthropological questions through a lens informed by U’wa thought. This led Pradilla to interpret the availability and use of traditional medicines and food sources through the origin myths shared by U’wa spiritual leaders (Pradilla and

⁵⁶ Ann Osborn ha sido una de las principales estudiosas de la cultura U’wa, sus investigaciones, que llegaron a niveles difícilmente alcanzables por cualquier otro científico de nuestros días, resumen una labor de mas de una década, tiempo durante el cual fue guiada por uno de los mayores *werjayas* que han existido.

Espinoza 1982; Pradilla and Salazar 1978). Pradilla began her research in 1976 and published “Tunebia Infiel: La Persecución Religiosa a los Tunebos” (Pradilla and Salazar 1978). This study gathered an extensive bibliography to examine the process of religious colonization and document both missionary perspectives on the U’wa and U’wa perspectives on the missionaries. She concludes that methods of colonization have not changed substantially since the sixteenth century. Likewise, she reveals that the U’wa have also demonstrated resistance since that same time period (Pradilla and Salazar 1978). While she notes that Protestant missionaries did not employ the same violent tactics of kidnapping women and children as the Catholics did, they similarly sought to colonize the souls of the U’wa people by replacing their systems of religious and spiritual thought with Christian narratives. Religion, in other words, served as the spearhead that opened U’wa territory and the people for colonization of land and soul. Her prescription for the situation facing the U’wa was to advocate for an education that respected their language and culture and a politics that respected U’wa authorities:

The alternative offered to the Indigenous people has been *mestizaje* (cultural mixing) and the destruction of the community. The defenLa alternativa ofrecida a los Indígenas ha sido el mestizaje y la destrucción de la comunidad. La defensa de la sociedad Indígena incluye en primera instancia el respeto y reconocimiento a la autoridad tradicional. Habida cuenta del papel nocivo de la colonización religiosa; a la par que la salida de las misiones cualquiera sea su filiación eclesiástica, se impone la necesidad de una educación laica por parte del estado, que tenga en cuenta las exigencias sociales particulares de la comunidad. (Pradilla and Salazar 1978)

Though the term “intercultural education” had not yet gained currency in the late 1970s when this was published, Pradilla suggests the significance of an appropriate

U'wa education in terms of language and “religion” or U'wa systems of thought. Together with her other studies Pradilla argues from the U'wa perspective on historical relations with the state and colonial/religious authorities to advocate for the U'wa right to make decisions about education and political authority. She further addressed the threat posed by illegal interests in uranium and emerald mining on the existing U'wa reserve as well as indiscriminate lumber extraction (Pradilla and Salazar 1978). These concerns all point to questions of U'wa sovereignty: political authority, the right to decide how natural resources are utilized and an appropriate education. It also shows how researchers were no longer only concerned with representing the U'wa as objects.

Ana Maria Falchetti, a student, an assistant, and finally a good friend of Ann Osborn's, spent seven years working in the national archives (*Archivo General de la Nación*) tracing the documentation of U'wa efforts to protect their land during the colonial period (Falchetti 2010). Similar to how Osborn brings together archaeological evidence with oral traditions to locate the U'wa in a particular geohistorical location, Falchetti uses oral traditions to better understand and trace indigenous strategies of resistance found in a repository of colonial documents housed in the *Archivo Nacional de la Nación* (Falchetti 2003; Falchetti de Saenz 2007). She argues:

Only the study of documentary sources and particular mythologies can gradually lead to understanding indigenous strategies and the dynamics of their perception of history. It is therefore essential to unite history and anthropology, an articulation whose importance has been highlighted in studies of anthropology in Latin America for several decades (Falchetti 2005: 45).

Falchetti draws from the oral traditions documented by Osborn (Osborn 1979, 1982, 1985, 1988), Pradilla (Pradilla and Salazar 1978; Pradilla and Espinoza 1982; Pradilla 1983), Marquez (Marquez 1980), and Salazar and Sarmiento Salazar and Sarmiento (Salazar and Sarmiento 1985) to interpret historical documents from colonial archives. Falchetti's work in the archives reveals documentation of resistance to and interaction with the colonial government, missionary and even *encomendero* reports on the U'wa from as early as the 16th century (2003). Her collection of documents from the National Archives is a significant effort to reinscribe the history between the U'wa and colonial rule over the centuries. Similar to the resistance hinted at in Stoddart and Trubshaw (1962) and Chaves (1964) cited above, Falchetti explains how the U'wa studied the ways, thinking, and religion of those in power to translate the U'wa way of thinking, their *pensamiento histórico*, in ways legible to colonial and state authorities.

Falchetti's investigations in the *Archivo General de la Nación* uncovered multiple communications between indigenous U'wa leaders and Spanish authorities written in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, with the majority written in the second half of the eighteenth century, when the U'wa experienced a more intense loss of land (Falchetti 2003: 163). In her work she elucidates the strategies the U'wa used to argue for their rights to land by citing 18th century documents written by U'wa "mediators" in Spanish (2003, 2005). Falchetti cites how the U'wa would draw parallels between their own rituals and deities with Catholic ones (2003, 2007: 56-7). The U'wa developed this intercultural strategy of becoming versed in another culture

in order to explain or relate one's own, over the course of centuries and they continue to use it through today.

Her findings trace U'wa attempts to build intercultural sovereignty to this time period and illustrate the intercultural strategies that they used. By actively learning the language and religion of the Spanish colonial authorities, the U'wa leaders argued that their religious practices were equivalent to particular Catholic rituals and that their differences should be respected. These leaders managed two systems of thought: "they defended their ancestral right over lands but tried to unite it with Spanish laws and regulatory land policy imposed by the Spanish" (Falchetti 2003: 47).

The key document Falchetti draws upon to build her argument is a letter written by U'wa leaders in the eighteenth century that explains their mythology as evidence of their right to their ancestral territories. This particular mythical account tells their origin story and includes Capitán Berrío, remembered today as a deity who according to their oral tradition had distributed lands to the U'wa. Falchetti traces this figure to a Spanish *encomendero* and captain, Martín de Mendoza de la Hoz y Berrío who protected them from the abuses of outsiders and provided documents from Spanish authorities recognizing their *resguardos* a century earlier (Falchetti 2003: 13).

Ann Osborn and Ana Maria Falchetti demonstrate a dynamic approach to research that begins with a deep respect for the U'wa point of view and belief system. Both authors orient themselves first by engaging U'wa oral histories to interpret

historical documents, events, and geographical locations.⁵⁷ In Osborn's case, she was taken on as an apprentice to learn the language and life of the U'wa. Only after developing a relationship and trust with them was she allowed to record, translate, and share the U'wa chanted myths (2009), which she used to locate the U'wa temporally and geographically on the contemporary map of the region (1982, 1985). Falchetti (2003, 2005) builds on the oral traditions documented by Osborn and others (Pradilla 1983; Marquez 1983; Salazar and Sarmiento 1985) to better understand U'wa communications with colonial authorities that she unearths from the colonial archives. These authors demonstrate that instead of being mere victims of colonization the U'wa consciously adapted to changing circumstances to survive and construct sovereignty. Falchetti (2003) demonstrates the U'wa use of intercultural strategies with colonial officials to argue for their rights to land. Osborn's research provides a model of a reciprocal research where she exchanged her knowledge of government agencies in the struggle for land rights for the right to learn the U'wa cosmovision. Falchetti, Osborn, and Pradilla all engage a shift in anthropology that begins with the locus of enunciation of their research subjects as one which has something to offer larger society. It helps us understand what intercultural sovereignty would mean for the U'wa when their role of defenders of the earth is

⁵⁷ Unlike Osborn, Falchetti has not involved herself directly in the current struggle for land rights. However, after publishing *La Búsqueda Del Equilibrio: Los Uwa y la Defensa de su Territorio Sagrado en Tiempos Coloniales* (2003) through the National History Library and Colombian Academy of History, her latest publication, *El Legado Milenario de los Uwas: La Sabiduría Ancestral de un Pueblo Indígena* (2007) was published through the national public library, *La Biblioteca Luis Angel Arango*, for the purpose of sharing lessons from the U'wa perception of history and resistance to colonization with a broader audience.

taken into account. Finally, this research, locating the U'wa in the past in relation to their ancestral lands, can and is being utilized to legitimate their claims for sovereignty over their land.

Research crossing borders

The U'wa's centuries-long fight to demand respect for their ancestral lands and capacity for adapting to changing circumstances manifested in the 1980s through their consolidation of organizing efforts into *cabildos*. Berichá (given the name Esperanza Aguablanca by missionaries), the first U'wa to publish a book, documented part of this process, including her role in related political workshops and literacy campaigns (1992). Berichá had been former assistant and informant to the aforementioned author Sister Marquez. Josefina Perdomo Rivera, a nurse and university professor, provides another account of this process (Perdomo Rivera 2001). In the 1990s the U'wa's continued organizing led to unifying different land holdings (reservas and resguardos) into the *Resguardo Unido U'wa* (unified U'wa reservation), and to confronting the government through national legal arenas to stop the planned oil exploration on their land. If in the 1980s research on the U'wa continued its focus in the areas of cultural and linguistic anthropology and was almost entirely published within Colombia,⁵⁸ research in the 1990s began to diversify largely due to the new “colonial” threat, Occidental Petroleum Company. A partnership between the

⁵⁸ Including Pradilla and Espinoza (1982), Marquez (1980, 1983, 1988), Osborn (1982, 1985, 1988, 1989), Pradilla (1983), Salazar y Sarmiento (1985), Headland, E. (1982), Headland, P. (1986). The exceptions to anthropological texts published in Spanish are Osborn (1989) and Headland (1986), published in English, and religious translations Headland and Headland (1985) and (1987).

corporation and the state replaced the collaboration between the church (or religion) and the state. Beginning in the 1990s research on the U'wa diversified from its origins in anthropology and linguistics to cover a range of disciplines including health, literature, legal studies, law and society, political science and philosophy. This shift is partially explained by the period after Colombia adopted a new constitution that finally recognized the country as pluri-ethnic and the International Labor Organization's Convention 169 that calls for free, prior, and informed consent in the development of their ancestral lands.

The U'wa's political and legal struggle against oil exploration erupted in the 1990s after Occidental Petroleum and other oil companies purchased exploration rights on ancestral U'wa lands. At the same time indigenous rights were recognized in new ways after the Colombian government ratified International Labor Organization Convention 169 in 1989 and adopted a new constitution in 1991 (Roldan Ortega 2004).⁵⁹ Facing these new circumstances, the U'wa once again appealed to governmental authorities using their intercultural strategies developed across centuries of using Spanish language and law to argue their position. With requests falling on deaf ears, the U'wa grabbed the attention of worldwide media in 1995 when leaders threatened to re-enact a moment of their history under colonization: collective suicide. According to a 1997 report in the *Guardian* (London):

[F]or the U'wa, any incursion on to their territory would be devastating, and their response is categorical: if and when Shell and [Occidental Petroleum]

⁵⁹ Colombia rewrote its constitution through a national constituent assembly with indigenous representation that included new legal protections and avenues for both indigenous and afrocolombian people (Roldan 2004).

move in to their mountains, the tribal leaders say that many U'wa will throw themselves off a high cliff called The Cliff of Death in an act of mass ritual suicide. For the U'wa, this would be a positive act—better to die with both dignity and culture intact, they say, than to see their world torn apart. Mass ritual suicide is part of the U'wa culture. The tribe's oral history recounts how in the 16th century one large U'wa community, in retreat from the Spaniards, came to The Cliff Of Death. All U'wa territory is considered sacred, but there are some areas, the cliff included, where no one may go. U'wa history relates that, faced with being forced to move on to this forbidden land, the tribe put their children in clay pots and cast them off the cliff before leaping backwards after them. The chiefs are said to have gone last. If the U'wa carry out their threat, they will go back to The Cliff Of Death. (Vidal 1997)

Using their oral tradition, the U'wa's message aimed to make clear the stakes in this kind of "development." The threat garnered international media attention which helped publicize the U'wa struggle against the new colonizer with indigenous, environmental rights, and globalization activists across the Americas and Europe (Reinsborough 2009; James 2009; Wirpsa 1997).

Jennifer Evans (1997) published the first academic article in a legal journal in the United States, *Colorado Journal of International Environmental Law and Policy*, which examines the multiple actors embroiled in the dispute over oil development: the Colombian state, Occidental Petroleum, and the U'wa. In their legal attempts to stop seismic testing, contradictory rulings from the Constitutional Court and the *Consejo de Estado* eventually pushed the U'wa to seek support outside national boundaries (Evans 1997: 132). After exhausting the national legal system, the U'wa turned to the OAS and environmental groups in the United States to generate support for their rights to decide what happens on their land. The Colombian state also did the same by formally requesting and receiving mediation from the Organization of American States' Unit (OAS) for Promotion of Democracy, and the Program on

Nonviolent Sanctions and Cultural Survival at Harvard's Center for International Affairs (Evans 1997: 133-4). Again, the U'wa explain their opposition to oil extraction based on their mythical perception of history. In fact, it was Berito Cobaría—the young U'wa who had traveled with Osborn to Bogotá in the 1970s—who first travelled to the United States to meet directly with Occidental Petroleum shareholders and executives in 1997. He explained their rejection of the oil-drilling project: “You must understand ... that to drill for oil is an extremely sensitive matter for us. We would be selling the blood of Mother Earth. We cannot do it.... We want to know if [Occidental] will respect our law. If there is no solution, we have a history of suicide” (Evans 1997: 133).

Shortly after Evans published in the *Colorado Journal of International Environmental Law and Policy* (1997), Project Underground, a California-based environmental rights organization, published a report to inform activists about a new campaign in support of the U'wa struggle against Occidental Petroleum titled “Blood of Our Mother: The U'wa People, Occidental Petroleum and the Colombian Oil Industry” (1998). Terence Freitas, as one of the main researchers responsible for the report and lead organizer of the U'wa Defense Working Group, traveled multiple times to U'wa territory and Bogotá to conduct research about the struggle and the potential implications of oil development in the area (Project Underground 1998: inside cover). Thus by the end of the 1990s as the U'wa took their case to national courts and eventually the international arena, research focused on the U'wa shifted from the study of their language and cultural traditions to the struggle against oil and

resource extraction in the context of legal frameworks (Evans 1997; Gibson 2000; Wagner 2000; Culler 2001; Arenas 2001; Perafán Simmonds and Azcárate García 2002; Godshall 2003; Fulmer 2009; Houghton 2008; Uribe Botero 2003), social movements and the environment (Project Underground 1998; Serje 2003; Wirpsa 2004; Uribe Botero 2005; Rodriguez-Garavito and Arenas 2005; Janes Eller 2007; Arenas 2007; Lee 2008, 2010).

Unlike preceding work on the U'wa, this research demonstrates a common starting point in that their authors write about the U'wa not as victims or objects of research but as subjects with rights. The majority of these studies utilize a human rights discourse or legal framework to examine the conflict and its impacts. For example, Martin Wagner, a lawyer and adjunct professor at Golden Gate University of Law, published an article in *Hastings International & Comparative Law Review* reviewing the norms that could be “valuable in the defense of indigenous peoples and the environment, whether in domestic courts, international tribunals, or as a basis for shaping public opinion” (Wagner 2000: 494). He enumerated specific norms in international law relevant to indigenous peoples affected by natural resource extraction, including the right to a healthy environment, indigenous rights, procedural rights (*consulta* or free, prior and informed consent), and other land issues (Wagner 2000). As a lawyer with *Earth Justice* Wagner represented the U'wa in their case presented to the Inter-American Human Rights Commission (Wagner 2010). By publishing his analysis of the norms relevant to the U'wa case Wagner raised

awareness of the U'wa case to a broader intellectual community.⁶⁰ In broadening the applicability of his research to other indigenous communities that face similar circumstances, it further reflects U'wa thinking—their struggle is not a selfish one but related to other indigenous peoples and the earth as a whole.

In Colombia the research at the turn of the century and into the first decade examined the intersection of international and national legal frameworks within the national arena (Sánchez 2001; Arenas 2001). While US-based legal scholarship largely focused on international norms (Wagner 2000, Culler 2001, Godshall 2003, Miranda 2006, Fulmer 2009), Luis Carlos Arenas and Leslie Wirpsa (discussed more extensively in chapter 3) adopt a transnational perspective to examine multiple levels of legal and political analysis at the intersections of law and society. They both include the transnational social movement that formed as part of the U'wa effort to oust Occidental Petroleum from their lands in their research (Wirpsa 2004, Rodriguez-Garavito & Arenas 2005, Arenas 2007). Unlike much of the other legally-based research these authors draw on both Colombian and US-based research.

Conclusion

Setting the groundwork for the following chapters, this chapter traces how over time the U'wa resisted religious and academic modalities of colonization, first through silence then through intercultural strategies to safeguard their own cosmology

⁶⁰ Similarly, Lauren Godshall (2003) investigates international norms related to indigenous intellectual property. Like Wagner (2000), Godshall is consciously contributing to the struggle in support of the U'wa as a law student and volunteer with U'wa Defense Project coordinator, Elizabeth Martin (Martin 2010).

and themselves as a distinct people with the right to exist. The interdisciplinary collection of Western knowledge production that I have gathered on the U'wa spans nearly a hundred years and opens a window onto the role of research in colonization and decolonization. The above literature review points to the varied interests behind research on the U'wa over this period and how researchers have engaged their pueblo. Conversely, it also looks at how the U'wa responded to researchers and colonization by negotiating access to knowledge (using silence or intercultural strategies) and defining perspectives from their historical location and understanding of the universe.

Tracing the production of knowledge about the U'wa reveals that they have employed intercultural strategies of resistance since colonial times, as evidenced by Falchetti's work in the archives where she used U'wa documented oral traditions to interpret the logic of letters sent to colonial authorities. They exhibited an intercultural strategy of explaining their interests and positions through concepts that dominant society would understand (i.e. Catholic religious symbols and rituals). Interculturality includes the negotiation of different cultural logics and allows space for the recognition of colonization's legacies.

Despite the cruel methods used by missionaries and governmental authorities to colonize the U'wa during the early 20th century, the use of intercultural strategies has been and remains a key strategy for U'wa survival. While maintaining their own identity, they learned the ways, language, and religion of colonial society to survive colonial and "post"colonial threats by demanding their rights through concepts provided by dominant society. They have extended this practice of building from two

perspectives to argue their position by partnering with scholars in relations of reciprocity and horizontal dialogue. It is this process of adaptation and strategic deployment of colonial concepts and intercultural partnerships that have helped the U'wa build intercultural sovereignty.

Chapter 2: Theorizing Rights with Indigenous Peoples of the Americas Through the Practice of Education

In late 1998 Roberto “Berito” Cobaría, then-U’wa president, met several prominent indigenous rights advocates and non-governmental organization (NGO) leaders at an international gathering, the State of the World Forum in San Francisco, California (Freitas 1998). Terence Freitas, a Californian environmental and indigenous rights activist, served as a bridge between the U’wa representative and other indigenous leaders as well as the forum (Feingold 1999). After invitations and plans for a larger delegation of North American and Pacific Islander activists and elders, only Freitas and two others were able to make the February 1999 trip to U’wa ancestral lands (El Issa 2010). Their goal was to build a partnership that could support the well-being of the U’wa pueblo with particular focus of working together on an educational program that fit the needs of the U’wa *pueblo*. Instead of an assimilationist state or proselytizing Catholic educational system, the U’wa envisioned and were already working towards an education that valued and respected their language, oral traditions, and relations with the earth. At the tail end of the two-week visit to U’wa territory, Ingrid Washinawatok El-Issa (Menominee), Lahe’ena’e Gay (Hawaiian) and Terence Freitas were abducted and killed by so-called left-wing guerrillas after visiting U’wa ancestral lands.

Each of these activists were embedded in larger communities that cross multiple borders and share a common discourse with the U’wa. Freitas had travelled five times to U’wa territory in his role as key transnational ally and supporter of the

U'wa struggle against oil exploration by Los Angeles-based Occidental Petroleum. His efforts had focused on supporting the *Cabildo Mayor* in building legal and political support in defense of U'wa lands and life from the oil industry. But in this visit with two Native American women, their focus was on education and health, not oil (El Issa 2010). Ingrid Washinwatok, as the Director of the Fund for the Four Directions, focused on nurturing the lifeways and languages of indigenous communities. Washinawatok was dedicated to the internal strengthening of indigenous communities and advocacy of sovereignty rights through the smallest, everyday practices to the international arenas of the United Nations. Lahe'ena'e Gay, a photojournalist, historian, and founder of the Pacific Cultural Conservancy Institute, had developed an ethnoeducation model for indigenous peoples in Panamá and was eager to support U'wa efforts at developing their own educational system. In other words, they all shared the common belief that without the education of future generations, there would be no people or land to defend. The internal strengthening of the *pueblo* was as necessary for survival as political recognition of their land base and sovereignty in relation to it.

Multiple theories have arisen to try to answer why these three were killed by a group that purports to be anti-capitalist and against the state (Henaos Ospina 2002), but none have been able to explain the motive behind the deaths of these three rights activists. Instead of dwelling on their deaths, however, this chapter explores what the intersection of their trajectories as individuals whose communities share a common discourse with the U'wa represents. The U'wa redefine education in terms of human

rights and sovereignty in ways that resonate with broader indigenous rights discourse at the international and transnational levels. Engagements between the U'wa and other indigenous peoples—transnational relations—bypassed the state to connect the U'wa to their indigenous counterparts across the Americas and the Pacific. This intercultural engagement between different indigenous communities represents/illustrates the past, present, and future of indigenous modes of resistance and organizing. More precisely, the way indigenous people organize—with each other, across borders, with other communities—represents an intercultural strategy aimed at building sovereignty across generations through a shared discourse. The discourse is decolonial in that it works to heal from centuries of colonization by ensuring their future. Reflecting upon this event within the larger context of international and transnational indigenous rights struggles shows us that individuals can be killed, but not an idea.

In this way Washinawatok, Gay, and Freitas still accompany the U'wa; it is a spiritual accompaniment that lives through relationships established before and after (in memory of) their tragic deaths in 1999. In describing Washinawatok at a yearly memorial that takes place in her honor during the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, Jose Barreiro expressed the scope of Washinawatok's legacy:

Ingrid was really the symbol of the emergence that we have seen of international indigenous peoples. We were saying earlier today in another meeting that for 500 years, at least in the Americas, the idea of indigenous people was that they were either obstacles to progress, people to be destroyed, [to eliminate by] genocide. Or the other side, which was the position of Las Casas back in the early part of the conquest: they're victims, people who could be, who could be human beings, who could be Christianized. So for 500 years we've had this idea of genocide or human rights victims. And it's true

that the second position was the better one. But since 1977—and I salute Oren Lyons here and the ones who pushed that work from the beginning—the indigenous people did not just represent themselves as victims. These days we're representing an idea. An idea that's better than the idea that's prevalent today because we're representing the human community, so it's an idea that's being presented. It's not just a complaint. It's an idea. And that's what I remember most of Ingrid. She knew the idea. (Mercado 2004)

The idea that brought the U'wa together with Freitas, Washinawatok, and Gay was not a simple understanding of human rights for individuals envisioned by dominant liberal frameworks. Rather the idea was shaped through decades of organizing for the recognition of collective rights for indigenous peoples as part of a struggle for sovereignty and self-determination. This research on indigenous conceptualizations of rights I hope will also provide an opening for activists based in nongovernmental and solidarity organizations to reflect on the potential of intercultural strategies and the urgency of decolonial understandings of rights. These rights strategies were paths towards sovereignty.

I contextualize the U'wa struggle within a larger hemispheric effort at building indigenous rights from the smallest daily practices to international instruments like the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. To this end, the questions I seek to answer: How are indigenous discourses of rights put into practice to build sovereignty? How do indigenous peoples contribute to human rights debates and practices? This chapter examines the theory and practice of indigenous conceptualizations of human rights through the lens of education. I show how the U'wa have mobilized a decolonial discourse of human rights using the framework of intercultural education to build sovereignty. Next I examine indigenous

conceptualizations of rights. I argue that this decolonial approach challenges dominant liberal and Latin American traditions of human rights. I then turn to the U'wa educational project to show how it 1) connects the U'wa to local, regional, and international/transnational indigenous struggles, 2) reproduces their worldview and cultural practices, 3) transforms relations with the state. Thus, this chapter explains how indigenous peoples build sovereignty through the daily practices of education, where education is understood as a fundamental component of human rights struggles.

Dwelling in indigenous histories of resistance calls for attention to the smallest actions or daily practices of resistance embedded within layered histories. Ingrid Washinawatok reminded us, “It starts small. We can be up there lobbying Congress. Yes, we could be doing that. But in order to see the change and how things are going, it really has to start small. The smallest is all over the place” (Washinawatok-El Issa 1993). To see the smallest actions means to read multiple histories in a particular location, to de-center Western, Eurocentric thinking, and to privilege alternative knowledge production. This approach takes into account the present history or aftermath of five hundred years of colonization echoed in “new” waves of neo-colonization to examine resistance to the interlocking systems of oppression that impact the meanings and practices of human rights activism.

In this way I contextualize the U'wa struggle within a larger hemispheric effort to build indigenous sovereignty through human rights. Rights are enacted through the smallest daily practices and inscribed within international instruments

like the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. To chart the construction of rights and sovereignty, I follow Maria Lugones suggestion to take a “pedestrian view—the perspective from inside the midst of people, from inside the layers of relations and institutions and practices” (Lugones 2003: 5). The layers of history that impact U’wa relationships to land lie within discourses of rights that include the dominant liberal rights tradition, Latin American tradition, and indigenous conceptualizations. While the U’wa have made use of legal strategies at the national and international levels (Wirpsa 2004, Rodriguez-Garavito and Arenas 2005), I locate this pedestrian view in the smallest acts and daily practices of education.

Layers of human rights

Eurocentric liberal human rights frameworks and the Latin American tradition are limited in their ability to comprehend subjects such as the U’wa. Liberalism’s individual fails to recognize the collective indigenous subject in relation to land. Based in the notion of god-given rights of natural law, Latin American/Spanish legal thought does not recognize indigenous cosmovisions which provide a different relationship between “humans” and land. In natural law and the Latin American tradition, the human has dominion over the environment. In comparison, humans, from an U’wa perspective, are only a part of nature. The indigenous approach to human rights is more closely aligned with the way the U’wa interpret human rights.

I weave together these parallel conversations and activisms across the Americas to articulate an indigenous conceptualization of human rights. This conceptualization manifests in the U’wa’s daily practices of living and organizing and

is inscribed within international institutions such as the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues and in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples ratified in 2007. This conceptualization hinges upon intergenerational and rooted efforts that are manifestations of the concept of universal kinship and the global indigenous paradigm. Centering the earth and environment in relation to the collective subject of human rights, indigenous conceptualizations provide a decolonial approach to claims made in legal, political, and social spaces. This approach reframes humans in relation to their environment. As a child of Mother Earth, humans have a responsibility to nurture and defend the earth. But this defense is not only for indigenous peoples at this moment in time. Instead U'wa and other indigenous peoples bring awareness of relations across time, both to the ancestors that remain in spirit form and the children of the future that provide the roots through which the *pueblo* will continue to grow and live.

Liberal humanist framings of human rights

Narratives on human rights most commonly trace their conceptual origins to eighteenth century Enlightenment thought embodied within the American (US) Declaration of Independence and Bill of Rights and the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen (Brysk and Shafir 2004; Balfour and Cadava 2004; Forsythe 1998; Hernandez-Truyol 2002). Rhoda Howard-Hassman and Jack Donnelly (1996) expand upon these basic elements by connecting rights to corresponding subjects and the political context in which these subjects are embedded:

Human rights are morally prior to and superior to society and the state, and under the control of individuals, who hold them and exercise them against the state in extreme cases. This reflects not only the equality of all individuals but also their autonomy, their right to have and pursue interests and goals different from those of the state or its rulers. In the areas and endeavors protected by human rights, the individual is “king”—or rather as equal and autonomous person entitled to equal concern and respect. (Howard-Hassman and Donnelly 1996: 406-7)

Howard-Hassman and Donnelly (1996) both point to the notion of the individual as bearer of human rights, which is at the core of the dominant liberal perspective through which human rights are interpreted in scholarship and advocacy. This liberal discourse assumed particular meanings of “human” and “rights” as well as a particular subject of such rights.

Enlightenment thought and the French Revolution succeeded in articulating the concept of rights in relation to national sovereignty. As the quote above suggests, sovereignty, no longer residing in the monarchy, was to reside in the people and particularly the individual. The philosophy of Enlightenment thinkers, like Hobbes and Locke, are implicit within Howard and Donnelly’s definition above. For example, as a basis of their assertion that “[h]uman rights are morally prior to and superior to society and the state,” Locke writes, natural rights “belong to individuals as individuals in the state of nature and [are] therefore prior to entry into society” (quoted in Hall 1986: 42). Similarly, the individual as “king” held sovereignty before the state. This idea, based on the “state of nature” erases historical specificities of relationships between people and the development of societies and denies the social nature of “individuals.”

This helps to explain the “negative” rights of this tradition and their correspondence to the idea of “negative freedom” or that the private sphere surrounding individuals that neither other individuals nor the state should enter without consent (Shapiro 1986). If negative rights refers to the rights to a number of actions free of interference from the state (e.g. freedom of association, of religion, of speech), “positive” rights points to the responsibility of the state in fulfilling particular rights (e.g. education, housing, or work). Stuart Hall elaborates on the idea of privacy within liberalism that “first privileged private man in ‘his’ individual private space, made the domestic sphere, with its specific sexual divisions, into a symbol of ‘his’ sovereignty and constructed it as a form of private property” (Hall 1986: 36). Translated into the twentieth century drafting of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights (UDHR), Article 12 states: “No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home, or correspondence, nor to attacks upon his honour and reputation. Everyone has the right to the protection of the law against such interference or attacks.”⁶¹ This public-private divide represented a challenge to the existent power relations at the time of the US and French Revolutions. As Stammers elaborates,

The notion that sovereignty derived from the people challenged the divine right of kings. The right of resistance or rebellion was predicated on the notion that government was legitimate only insofar as it served the interests of the people. The idea of individuals having rights challenged the idea that individuals only had duties to their masters and betters. The claim of a right to

⁶¹ Universal Declaration of Human Rights: <http://www.unhchr.ch/udhr/lang/eng.htm>. I highlight the gendered pronoun in the article just as Hall signals the same sexed subject of liberalism.

private property challenged the prevailing belief that all property was ultimately vested in the crown. (Stammers 1993: 73)

While this was revolutionary for some *in particular geopolitical spaces and time*, the reality that it was not, in fact, a *universal* humanism as liberals would argue, is important to underscore. We need only remember the reliance on ownership of property, the existence of chattel slavery, and the exclusion of women when considering who was allowed to partake in this recognition of rights vis-à-vis states. In other words, while a universal subject was understood as human, in reality this abstract, timeless subject was a propertied, white male who owned the civil and political rights to be let alone in *his* private affairs.

Further, liberalism assumed state responsibility for protecting human rights, insofar as a subject is only recognized in relation to this state. This state-centric perspective led Hannah Arendt in *The Origins of Totalitarianism* to criticize the “perplexities of the rights of man” which make national or citizenship rights necessary for the recognition of human rights (Arendt 1968: 287). Liberal frameworks focus exclusively on state responsibility without questioning the legitimacy of the state, effectively erasing other important histories and ways of knowing.

Latin American tradition

Liberal interpretations of human rights ignore colonial histories and legacies, instead focusing on the isolated individual. The Latin American tradition of human rights contemplated the individual as well but in terms of a larger collective or

community. Bartolomé de Las Casas and Francisco de Vitoria of the School of Salamanca first applied a natural rights doctrine to a concrete situation in response to the brutality of the conquest of the Americas (Tierney 1997; Carrozza 2003; Glendon 2003). Natural rights are god-given and exist prior to the state. Using this framework, Las Casas recognized “Indians” as human, individually and within a collective, with their own internal political and religious systems. Carozza identifies an important feature central to Latin American human rights traditions in Las Casas’ writing, the “Aristotelian-Thomist understanding of the natural sociability of human person” (Carozza 2003: 295). In this sense, community constitutes the means by which individual freedom is realized and authorized through commonly held beliefs and practices. His conception of human rights “integrates the recognition of individual rights with social or collective ones, and...perceive[s] the Indians both as individuals and also as peoples, as communities” (Carozza 2003: 295). This illustrates a different conceptualization of human rights: the subject of human rights as a collective subject with duties and obligations to the collective.

The region’s more expansive understanding of human rights includes economic and social rights in addition to the civil and political rights emphasized in liberal frameworks. This understanding was expressed through Constitutions and later, influenced debates that ultimately led to the inclusion of human rights at the 1945 conference and founding of the United Nations and also provided models for the UDHR (Carozza 2003: 284-289).

Indigenous approaches to human rights

Beyond the rights of the individual or the collective subject, indigenous frameworks recognize the earth as central to the concept of human rights. The attention to the living whole infuses the material world, “human” and “non-human,” with a spirituality that dominant thinking relegates to the category of religion. Indigenous peoples manifest this framework in holistic strategies for living; all practices must be aligned with the earth. In Bolivia and Ecuador, for example, movements have achieved the recognition of the rights of the earth or nature (Vidal 2011; Acosta 2010). Rights of the earth and indigenous rights under this logic stand to put a brake on rampant development projects as indigenous peoples and the earth are viewed as subjects of law instead of objects. Instead of considering only the most immediate violation of rights, it would necessitate a shift in the temporal perspective on human rights dwelling in time to assess the outcome of legal disputes or to recognize rightful relations and sovereignty over land. Under this logic, the U’wa implement the right to education as a key strategy in the U’wa struggle for sovereignty, which I elaborate in the section to follow.

Indigenous organizing of the 1960s and 1970s led to what Native American historian Susan Miller calls the development of a global indigenous paradigm, which disrupts liberal and Latin American frameworks (Miller 2008). Miller explains, “The key distinguishing assumption of the Indigenous paradigm is that the cosmos is a living being and that the cosmos and all its parts have consciousness” (Miller 2008: 10). Walter Mignolo (2011: 307) highlights the corresponding Quichua concept of

sumak kawasy (or *suma kamaña* in Aymara), which can be translated to “live in harmony with Pachamama.” More specifically he cites Simon Yampara, an Aymara sociologist who argues that *sumak kamaña* means “to live in harmony, in the complementation of the diverse worlds of the eco-biotic natural community.” This resonates with U’wa visions of human rights as Daris Cristancho, U’wa organizer and intellectual, explained

Human rights are not only about defending or respecting the life of just one person. It is about respecting the life of the lagoon, the life of the trees, the life of the mountains, the life of all those things that are with us that we cannot see but give us life. It is about how to respect all of that because in all of nature is found what gives life to human beings. So if we begin to violate those rights that are foundational to nature and everything around us like our cosmovisión, then we are attacking the lives of people, of entire populations, of our people. That is the starting point for our vision of respecting international humanitarian law and human rights. It is the cosmovisión of the U’wa people and that is why it has been said that those attacks, like the attacks on petroleum, are attacks on the spiritual life of the U’wa people. The result of those attacks is to be left without our connection to life.⁶² (Cristancho 2009)

For the U’wa and other indigenous peoples, an attack on nature (*la naturaleza*, or *pachamama*) is an attack on the spiritual life of the U’wa people. Likewise, Miller argues “[t]he rights violated in such cases are not only the prior collective rights and

⁶² Los derechos humanos no solo se trata de defender o respetarle la vida a una persona se trata el de respetar la vida de la laguna la vida de los árboles la vida de las montañas de toda un símbolo de cosas que están con nosotros y que nosotros no lo podemos ver. Es como respetar todo eso. por que en todo lo que esta en la parte natural es lo que le da la vida al ser humano. Entonces si nosotros empezamos a violar todas estos derechos que están allí fundamentado en la naturaleza y en todo lo que nos rodea como la cosmovisión y la visión. entonces estamos ya atentando con la vida de las personas de la población de la comunidad. entonces desde allí parte la visión de respetar en si el derecho internacional humanitario. ese es la cosmovisión del pueblo U’wa. Porque nosotros sentimos y por eso fue que, se dijo, va a atentar y se esta atentando contra el petróleo es estar atentando contra la vida espiritual del pueblo U’wa y si esto pasa prácticamente los U’was nos quedamos sin esa conexión.

human rights of the people on the land but also the rights of spirits and the right of the land to hold and nurture her human communities according to her natural preferences” (Miller 2008: 10-11). For the U’wa, the earth is mother and gives life. Therefore the danger of these attacks affects people beyond the U’wa: “If oil is taken from the earth, our mother, she will dry out and will not produce what we humans need to live. If we do not take care of the earth, then the earth cannot continue to sustain us” (Cobaría 2005). According to Cobaría, the many natural disasters we have seen in recent years give credence to this argument (Cobaría 2005). Consider Berito Cobaría’s testimony in 1997 before an environmental conference in Colombia:

Each time that a species is extinguished, mankind comes closer to his own extinction, each time an indigenous people becomes extinct, one more member of the great human family leaves forever on a journey with no return. Each extinct species is a great wound for life. Man will reduce life, and survival will begin...perhaps before greed takes root in him he will be able to see the wonder of the world and the greatness of the universe that extends beyond the diameter of a coin. (Cobaría 1997)

The U’wa further recognize their responsibility to maintain a balance with the earth for everyone, regardless of nation-state boundaries, because there is only one Mother Earth. An U’wa *Bita weidhaiya* (*autoridad tradicional* or spiritual elder) explained the significance of their yearly fasting and rituals: “If we did not chant, the world would wear out...it would come down...we chant for the Whites as well, so that they can continue living in their world” (Osborn 2009: 4). If the U’wa were to cease to exist, their chanting would end and would create further imbalances in the responsibility that peoples have with the earth. Thus, when the U’wa fight to stop oil drilling on their land and defend the earth, they do not do this for themselves only.

This is a manifestation of U'wa adhering to a common indigenous interpretation of universal kinship.

Lahe'ena'e Gay, the founder of the Pacific Cultural Conservancy Institute (PCCI) whose mission was to stop the extinction of indigenous peoples of the Pacific Rim, echoed this sentiment in an address to the United Nations Fifth Commission on Sustainable Development in 1997:

Indigenous peoples know that, as they disappear from the planet, the integrity of the world and the human species as a whole weakens. They fight for the preservation of their ecosystems, knowledge and very existence, not for themselves alone, but for the health and well being of all the world's people. (Gay 1999)

The global indigenous paradigm echoes within the discourses of indigenous peoples across the Americas, including Daris Cristancho (U'wa), Berito Cobarria (U'wa), Ingrid Washinawatok (Menominee) and Lahe'ena'e Gay (Hawaiian). They were connected first by shared contexts of struggle: resistance to extinction and colonization. Recognizing each other as relatives was a manifestation of the concept of universal kinship. Earlier relationships across networks north and south, indigenous and environmentally-focused, opened an intersecting space that move new strands of the movement together.

With a shared discourse of rights based in an indigenous paradigm, this discourse interrupts liberal individualist notions of rights by recognizing the link between the individual and collectivity (Holder and Corntassel 2002: 149). Russell Barsh (1986) distills the global indigenous paradigm into the indigenous concept of universal kinship, which recognizes relations across time, space, and species. These

relations correspond to spiritual, political, and ecological dimensions (Barsh 1986: 187). The land connects ancestors to the unborn, across time; an “individual” within a family is connected to all living things. This stands in stark contrast to industrialized societies: “Everything is either living or non-living, and all decisions are made for the living” (Barsh 1986: 187). Robbing the future for today and denying the impacts of today’s decisions on tomorrow disrespects the complex web of kinship that connects our lives in the material-spiritual world. Paula Gunn Allen articulated this framework through language:

In English, one can divide the universe into two parts: the natural and the supernatural. Humanity has no real part in either, being neither animal nor spirit—that is, the supernatural is discussed as though it were apart from people, and the natural as though people were apart from it. This necessarily forces English-speaking people into a position of alienation from the world they live in. Such isolation is entirely foreign to American Indian thought. At base, every story, every song, every ceremony tells the Indian that each creature is part of a living whole and that all parts of that whole are related to one another by virtue of their participation in the whole of being. (Gunn Allen 1986/1997: 60)

The attention to the living whole infuses the material world, “human” and “non-human,” with a spirituality that dominant thinking relegates to the category of religion. For indigenous peoples that recognize and organize through this framework, this approach manifests in holistic strategies for living; all practices must be aligned with the earth.

Intercultural resonances between north and south

Lahe’ena’e Gay’s work at the PCCI serves as an excellent example of such a holistic approach to resisting extinction. It was the resonance between the political

projects represented by Gay, Washinawatok, and Cobaría at their first meeting at the State of the World Forum in 1998 that initiated a transnational relationship that continues today through different organizations such as the Flying Eagle Woman Fund and MU. The Pacific Cultural Conservancy Institute was on the verge of launching an educational project for Panama's indigenous peoples that was to serve as a potential model for work with the U'wa in Colombia. Their mission statement explains, "PCCI's projects deal directly with the long-term preservation and restoration of endangered human populations and their respective ecosystems. Therefore, not one aspect of the challenge, but the entire cultural spectrum of environment, social, economic, and education, are addressed" (PCCI 1998). Concretely, the PCCI, under Gay's leadership, developed a model for educational projects that recognized the integration of the multiple aspects of a pueblo's lives and ecosystems (PCCI 1999). Planned for 1999-2004 in partnership with the Panamanian Ministry of Education, the Panama project envisioned a campus that would include "living educational tools," such as gardens, living species protected areas, hydrology (water sources) and indigenous history by supporting teaching by the elders.⁶³ Instead of concentrating the imposition of knowledge from outside the community, this

⁶³ The curriculum for the gardens was to include the subjects of Botany, Health, Medicine, Discipline, Organizational Skills, Soil Management, Food Production, and Caretaking. Natural areas were to house endangered living species providing a work space in their geographical area to make possible the long-term preservation of the species. This living tool would include a curriculum that covers Zoology, Species Protection, Animal Husbandry, Communications, Caretaking, and Culture. Hydrology would follow a curriculum based in Ecosystem Management, Water Purity/Chemistry, Water Engineering, Agricultural Relationships, and Community Health. Lastly, the work with the elders would cover Literature, Tradition/Culture, History, and Community Structure (PCCI 1999: 5-6).

project leaned heavily on the indigenous people's rooted knowledges in terms of their environment, medicines, and lifeways. It also accounted for intergenerational approaches to education.

Ingrid Washinawatok El-Issa favored this approach not only conceptually but directly as well. Internal documents shared by Gay with Terence Freitas after the October 1998 meeting at the State of the World Forum show Washinawatok's support and integration with the PCCI (PCCI nd). In a response to questions about core values and strategic direction for the PCCI made to board members, staff, and advisors, Washinawatok encouraged further grounding the structure of the organization in an indigenous model, such as that envisioned by PCCI education projects. This included a "circle of elders to provide spiritual guidance and to advise on traditional values and customs" and a "council or circle of youth to provide input as to their special needs in making the traditional values of their culture work for them and their children in the modern world. They would also be crucial to the successful passing on of their cultural heritage to their contemporaries and future generations" (PCCI nd).⁶⁴

Intergenerational and rooted efforts like these are manifestations of the concept of universal kinship and the global indigenous paradigm. Another way to express this indigenous conceptualization is through the Haudenosaunee concept of seventh generation rights, which speaks to the aspect of time. Ingrid Washinawatok articulated this idea as a standard, "seventh generation," by which to measure the

⁶⁴ Documents related to the PCCI and Lahe'ena'e Gay were accessed through the personal archives of Gay's partner, John Livingstone, and the organizational archives for the UDP housed at Amazon Watch. Ali El-Issa provided access to Ingrid Washinawatok's archives housed at the Flying Eagle Woman Fund.

potential benefits of different projects and practices for a better world. Speaking as the board chair of the Native Americans in Philanthropy, she stated,

those of us living now were our ancestors' seventh generation. As it was then, we put ourselves second in deference for our seventh generation. The work we do in the foundations or funds where we are employed or whose board seats we occupy, makes the principle of the seventh generation a paramount standard (Ingrid Washinawatok quoted in Runningwater 1999: 43).

One related fund, on whose board Washinawatok sat, historicized this concept: "Our organization derives its name [Seventh Generation Fund for Indigenous Development] from a precept of the Great Law of Peace of the Haudenosaunee [Six Nations Iroquois Confederacy] which mandates that chiefs consider the impact of their decisions on the seventh generation yet to come" (Seventh Generation Fund 2012). In her multiple roles as activist, educator, philanthropist, and rights advocate she enacted a politic based on this precept. Education is the key method to ensure the survival of generations as opposed to their extinction or assimilation. For example as co-founder of the Indigenous Women's Network, Washinawatok cooperated in a collective effort to build a space for reflection, education, and capacity building for intergenerational indigenous women. In the Network's magazine, *Indigenous Woman*, Washinawatok wrote a regular column "Auntie Ing's Tips: On Parenting" in addition to essays on Rigoberta Menchu's Nobel Peace Prize, indigenous conceptualizations of sovereignty and interviews with indigenous cultural producers. Her parenting tips considered that responsibility within an intergeneration framework:

Our kids are constantly learning. (We still continue to learn). The elders say even they continue to learn. You continue to learn and balance yourself until you die. Everything our kids encounter is new and something to master, whether it is how to walk across the room without spilling their juice, riding a

two wheeler or, the ceremonial songs. They are seeing, grasping, and trying to make sense and logic out of the world around them. This is something that has gone on for every generation. I remember my parents talking about the things they had learned growing up that were different from us growing up just due to new inventions. But the point is that we all go through making sense out of our world. Those that were brought up in Boarding Schools have to almost learn certain things all over again, like re-parent ourselves from scratch because there are areas that we were left all alone on. (Washinawatok 1991: 35)

Learning across generations, respecting those generations, was a central theme of Washinawatok's praxis. This attention to the historical meaning of everyday practices—in child-rearing, for example—mobilized her activism at all levels, including in work connected to the United Nations. She is remembered on the front page of the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues' website, with her photo and a caption reading, "The ancestors are alive and their vision lives through us" (UNPFII 2011). She was similarly remembered at the signing of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in September 2007 (Oldham and Frank 2008).

Just as Washinawatok worked in multiple spaces, Lahe'ena'e Gay enacted this philosophy in a diversity of forums. In 1998, Gay addressed corporate leaders at a conference on "Social Sustainability" at the Hewlett Packard Laboratory. Corporations, Gay argued, can make decisions about natural resource exploitation that can promote social sustainability, which happens "when we care about the other living extension of our own identity" (Gay 1998). She presented the earth and all of its beings as part of one system, one tree. In this system, when one part of it is

weakened or attacked, impacted by development that takes away what they need to exist, the entire system suffers. Furthermore, impacts are felt across time:

We've heard today from some of our speakers the term "seven generations" but what does that mean to you? To indigenous populations seventh generation planning is, in essence, a corporate process. Seventh generational planning is something that you can learn. It is something that you can apply in your corporation. It's something that you can apply in your departments that will dramatically improve the output of everything that you're talking about here. (Gay 1998)

Thinking about seven generations in terms of resource extraction would change the way investments in extraction were made. Gay's attempt to integrate an indigenous perspective of social relationality and interdependence challenges corporate executives who claim to be interested in "social sustainability" ways to manifest this discourse.

Daris Cristancho shows how respect for previous and future generations resonates with *U'wa pensamiento*. She points out the shared struggle across indigenous peoples of Latin America and the United States who "are all fighting to keep [their] culture, thinking (*pensamiento*), the ideals of the ancestors, grandparents, and are also defending the right to life, the right to dignity, the right to territory."⁶⁵ In a 2005 interview Cristancho describes how she learned from her indigenous counterparts

⁶⁵ Y lo otro que quiero decir y recalcar mucho es que en cuanto a lo que vemos que estamos haciendo en conjunto es que tanto los pueblos Indígenas de toda Latinoamérica y también de aquí de EEUU también estamos luchando es por mantener nuestra cultura, nuestro pensamiento, nuestro ideal de nuestros ancestros, de nuestros abuelos y que todos estamos defendiendo también, el derecho a la vida, el derecho a la dignidad, el derecho a tener un territorio.

In New York I talked to fellow indigenous women (*compañeras indígenas*) and they were sharing with me the struggles they've had to confront here in the United States. It was very similar to ours. I talked with her and asked about their thinking (*pensamiento*), spirituality, how they used to live, their language. She told me about all of the injustices they had lived through. Beyond those injustices, here (in the US) indigenous communities are also not valued for what they are: ancestors. (Cristancho 2005)

By acknowledging indigenous peoples as ancestors within particular nation-state boundaries, Cristancho, calls for a generational perspective on today's human rights. The idea of indigenous people as living ancestors speaks to the indigenous concept of universal kinship, specifically in recognition of relationships across time and in relation to space.

Education as a building block of sovereignty: From the United Nations

Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples to daily practices

After briefly considering the inscription of a global indigenous paradigm within the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), I examine U'wa histories of resistance through education. An appropriate education that follows indigenous cosmovisions is both a tool and a manifestation of a people's belief system. As a tool it facilitates the transmission of important histories and visions for the future that would otherwise be overridden by dominant societal understandings of the world. As a manifestation of U'wa cultural principles, control over the administration, pedagogy, infrastructure, and methodology of the education will ensure that the U'wa will not become culturally extinct. The U'wa anchor their education project in their own historical traditions, perspectives, and communications systems. This has been achieved through organizing processes taking place across

local, national, regional, and international levels. The education of future generations, which has been inscribed within the UNDRIP, is a means towards building sovereignty. It is the idea that brought Washinawatok and Gay together with the U'wa. Both the current U'wa education projects and past resistance strategies demonstrate the importance of this organizing and its potential for the successful exercise of Indigenous understandings of human rights.

International and transnational organizing across (what became) the Americas crystallized in the 1960s and 1970s with indigenous peoples developing collective efforts and networks in struggles for land rights and sovereignty (Warren and Jackson 2002; Washinawatok 1998; Anaya 2006). This organizing culminated in the ratification of the UNDRIP in 2007. The UNDRIP was signed thirty years after the first time indigenous peoples addressed the United Nations at the 1977 conference in Geneva on “Discrimination Against the Indigenous Populations of the Americas,” organized by the nongovernmental organizations of the United Nations (Washinawatok 1998: 41). Earlier efforts by indigenous peoples at the League of Nations in 1923 were rebuffed when Cayuga chief, Deskaheh, was denied access to address the assembly about Canada’s coercion of the Haudenosaunee. At the 1977 conference, Oren Lyons of the Onondaga illustrated the perspective shared by the 165 delegates present from North, South and Central America:

I do not see a delegation for the four-footed. I see no seat for the eagles. We forget and we consider ourselves superior, but we are after all a mere part of the Creation. And we must continue to understand where we are. And we stand between the mountain and the ant, somewhere and only there, as part and parcel of the Creation (Washinawatok 1998: 44).

The conference and the following 1981 International Non-governmental Organizations Conference on Indigenous People and the Land led to the establishment of the Working Group on Indigenous Populations (WGIP) in 1982, which was comprised of experts and instead of state delegates (Washinawatok 1998: 43). At this second conference, Phillip Deere, chair of the Indigenous Philosophy and Land Commission, concluded in his report: “From the Indian way of viewing things, humanity is an integral part of nature—a prolongation of the Universe, according to its own laws and organizing itself in a collective and communal form” (Washinawatok 1998: 45). This organizing momentum, which depended upon the involvement of indigenous peoples from across the Americas, continued to grow through the WGIP. According to S. James Anaya (Anaya 2009), the WGIP “broke new ground” in the United Nations by opening sessions directly to indigenous peoples and organizations, circumventing the formal process of accreditation normally required for participation (Anaya 2009: 17).⁶⁶

In 1993 the WGIP finalized the first draft of the UNDRIP.⁶⁷ However, due to resistance from state delegates it would take fourteen more years before the UNDRIP

⁶⁶ According to Washinawatok (1998: 47), under the Commission on Human Rights and the Sub-Commission on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, the Working Group “is open to all representatives of indigenous peoples and their communities and organizations.... Representatives without NGO affiliation or official status are encouraged to speak, to submit statements about their peoples’ concerns, and to suggest changes in the draft declaration” (Washinawatok 47-48).

⁶⁷ In the same year discussions also began on what would eventually become the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UNPFII). Established in 2000 by the Economic and Social Council, the first UNPFII session was held in 2002. Washinawatok also details how “native NGOs and activists have worked to include indigenous peoples on the agenda of special U.N. activities” such as the Conference

would be approved by the UN General Assembly. In 2007, after more than twenty years of drafting and debate, the UNDRIP was ratified with only four states voting against it: the United States, Canada, New Zealand, and Australia. Eleven states abstained. Colombia was the only state south of the US border to abstain, a position reversed in 2009 (Anaya 2009: 57-58). Upon welcoming the adoption of the UNDRIP, Les Malezer, Chair of the Global Indigenous Peoples' Caucus stated:

The Declaration [UNDRIP] does not represent solely the viewpoint of the United Nations, nor does it represent solely the viewpoint of the Indigenous Peoples. It is a Declaration which combines our views and interests and which sets the framework for the future. It is a tool for peace and justice, based upon mutual recognition and mutual respect. (Oldham and Frank 2008: 5)

While the UNDRIP does not have the force of law, it marks the first time indigenous peoples were recognized as peoples, rather than “populations” or simply “people” (Oldham and Frank 2008: 6). It thus affirmed rights that already existed but had been denied to indigenous peoples (Anaya 2009: 58-59). According to Anaya the purpose of the Declaration is “to remedy the historical denial of the right of self-determination and related human rights so that indigenous peoples may overcome systemic disadvantage and achieve a position of equality vis-à-vis heretofore dominant sectors” (Anaya 2009: 59). This aspect of self-determination proved to be one of the most contentious aspects of the UNDRIP, delaying its ratification. African states in particular sought to delay a vote until a caveat was added to Article 46 that the UNDRIP not be “construed as authorizing or encouraging any action which would

on Environment and Development, the International Year of the World's Indigenous People (1993) and the International Decade of the World's Indigenous People (1995-2004)(Washinawatok 1998: 51-57).

dismember or impair totally, or in part, the territorial integrity or political unity of sovereign and independent States” (quoted in Anaya 2009: 57). Anaya argues that indigenous peoples’ organizing has contributed newer approaches to this concept of self-determination in recognizing “the freedom of individuals and groups to form associations and to collectively pursue their own destinies under conditions of equality within the framework of the states within which they live” (Anaya 2006: 117). This approach taken by indigenous peoples today through the human rights system, which in my view encapsulates the notion of intercultural sovereignty, recognizes simultaneously the right to exist and be different and the interdependencies and connections that indigenous people have developed across the centuries and decades of contact with dominant societies. In other words, for the most part indigenous people look not to secede from states in pursuance of their sovereignty or self-determination but the right to make decisions about their conditions of living.

The UNDRIP thus lays the groundwork and thinking behind the decolonization of indigenous peoples lands and lives, which takes into account the concept of universal kinship. In particular, indigenous education policies, I argue, point to the daily practices that manifest this approach to decoloniality and self-determination. In what follows of this section, I trace how a decolonial approach was codified in the declaration. By decolonial I mean that the particular histories of indigenous peoples are taken into account and attempts are made to mitigate the historical conditions and injustices as a result of colonization. Indigenous peoples

engage the key strategy of education to uphold these responsibilities. Throughout the UNDRIP, several articles point to this ideal. For example, Article 13 states “Indigenous peoples have the right to revitalize, use, develop and transmit to future generations their histories, languages, oral traditions, philosophies, writing systems and literatures, and to designate and retain their own names for communities, places and persons” (UN General Assembly 2007). Article 25 maintains “Indigenous peoples have the right to maintain and strengthen their distinctive spiritual relationship with their traditionally owned or otherwise occupied and used lands, territories, waters and coastal seas and other resources and to *uphold their responsibilities to future generations in this regard.*” Article 14 declares that “Indigenous peoples have the right to establish and control their educational systems and institutions providing education in their own languages, in a manner appropriate to their cultural methods of teaching and learning.”

National context for ethnoeducation

Interculturality as a process and political project began to emerge through indigenous organizing for bilingual education in Perú, Ecuador and Bolivia in the 1970s (De la Cadena 2008: 265). For example in Perú, from the struggle for bilingual education, interculturality has come to signify “*un diálogo entre culturas,*” a dialogue among cultures (de la Cadena 2008: 265). The struggle becomes over the kind of dialogue between cultures that ensues. For the indigenous movements making demands on the state to be recognized as peoples with different cosmovisions and approaches to land and territory, dialogue, in this sense, works to interrupt

homogenizing discourses of national histories that exclude or relegate indigenous peoples to the past. Instead with interculturality indigenous social movements aim to transform relations with the state, beginning with education and other public policies.

The U'was' *Kajkrasa Ruyina* ethnoeducation project provides the framework for enacting decolonial understandings of rights through the daily practices of education. It represents a manifestation of a regional approach to education that centers the principle and process of interculturality. Gains from this struggle over education manifest in Colombian legislation beginning in the late 1970s in response to indigenous organizing for the right to a bilingual and appropriate education (Castillo Guzman and Caicedo Ortiz 2008: 20-22). Decree 1142 of 1978 recognized the rights of ethnic groups to design and implement their own educational curriculum as well as the right to choose their own teachers (Castillo Guzman and Caicedo Ortiz 2008: 19-20). In 1986 the Ministry of Education established the National Program for Ethnoeducation, which came to define ethnoeducation as

an on-going social process, immersed in the community's own culture (*cultura propia*). The process consists of the acquisition of knowledge and values and the development of skills and abilities according to the needs, interests and aspirations of the community to enable it to participate fully in the cultural maintenance of the ethnic group.⁶⁸ (Ministry of Education, 1987, p. 51 quoted in Castillo Guzman and Castro Caicedo 2008: 23)

The 1991 Colombian Constitution further institutionalized the recognition of previously erased and marginalized communities. First, the Constitution ended the

⁶⁸ Un proceso social permanente, inmerso en la cultura propia, que consiste en la adquisición de conocimientos y valores, y en el desarrollo de habilidades y destrezas, de acuerdo con las necesidades, intereses y aspiraciones de la comunidad, que la capacitan para participar plenamente en el control cultural del grupo étnico.

historical relationship between the Church and the education of Indigenous peoples. Next it also identified the pedagogical implications of the ethnic and cultural diversity of the nation (Artunduaga 1997: 38). According to Manuel Artunduaga, the Training Coordinator for Community Education of the Ministry of the Environment, this ethnic diversity required (and requires) an intercultural education:

By intercultural it is meant not only in terms of the culturally distinct peoples, but also for the Colombian national society, which has the responsibility and the right to know, value and enrich our culture through a respectful dialogue of knowledges and expertise that are articulated and complement each other.⁶⁹ (Artunduaga 1997: 38)

Artunduaga articulates interculturality as interactive and reciprocal. In theory, interculturality in education, as in democracy, would mean a dialogue between different knowledges with respect for differences. This implies an exchange of knowledges rather than a one-way imposition of knowledge or a hierarchical inequality. The U'wa educational project emerges in the spaces created by social movements demanding an appropriate education. Thus, built upon principles that resonate with the UNDRIP, the U'wa project is a product not just of U'wa organizing, but also national and regional movements, first for education and later for a plurinational state.

⁶⁹ Intercultural no solamente para los pueblos culturalmente diferenciados, sino tambien para la sociedad nacional colombiana, que tiene el deber y el derecho de conocer, valorar y enriquecer nuestra cultura a partir de un dialogo respetuoso de saberes y conocimientos que se articulen y complementen mutuamente.

Before the U'wa ethnoeducation project

As noted in chapter 1, for U'wa traditional authorities, some U'wa attendance in missionary schools was viewed as unavoidable at times and necessary at others. Since the colonial period, U'wa leaders managed two systems of thought; “they defended their ancestral right over lands but tried to frame it within Spanish laws and regulatory land policy imposed by the Spanish” (Falchetti 2003: 47). In the eighteenth century a Spanish Jesuit missionary Juan Rivero complained about the U'wa capacity to speak, which shows how the U'wa used Spanish to argue against Catholic treatment:

These brutes consider themselves to have great intellect, and even more intellect than the whites; they say that when God created the world and divided his gifts among all the peoples, he gave riches to the whites, a priest to the *Girara* who had great need of him to flog them, and intellect to the Tunebo (U'wa). This great intellect has been and is the greatest cross borne by those who deal with them, because, holding themselves to be so intelligent and being great talkers, they make the head ache with gossip of every possible kind. There are one or two of their principal men who understand something of Spanish, and whom they call speakers, whom they regard as oracles and archives of wisdom; when the Provincial goes to visit them he needs to equip himself with the patience to suffer their nonsense for hours on end, because as soon as they find out that the Provincial has arrived, the speaker sets off immediately to fulfill his obligation; he is followed by the whole population, the chief men go into the Padre's house, the common folk and the women crowd around the windows, all hushed and very attentive to what their speaker says. He launches into his speech which is basically a matter of censuring the whites, making a thousand complaints against their cows because they are eating their maize; then denouncing their cacique, and complaining about their priest because he flogs them so much, and in the end the whole diatribe consists in saying there is no need of a priest, because they are good Indians and it is enough for them to have a mayor. This and much other foolishness they pester the Padre for several hours, until with good reason he gives in to their roughness and coarseness, giving them hope that everything will be settled. (Rivero 1956 quoted and translated in Osborn 2009: 3)

U'wa "speakers" were respected for their ability to translate their complaints and needs to the Catholics that supervised the colonization process, putting to use the education they had been forced to receive. Many witnessed the efforts of these "speakers" or "talkers" who had learned Spanish and Catholic rituals to translate their complaints and demands to the Provincial authority. This demonstrates that the U'wa have long viewed learning and knowledge of the dominant language as a necessary intercultural tool to be able to explain their positions across cultures.

U'wa resistance to and strategies for using the dominant educational systems developed in response to government-sponsored missionary and anthropological efforts of the twentieth century. In addition to missionary efforts to "civilize" indigenous populations, educational systems were further institutionalized alongside the opening of roads into U'wa lands in the early 1940s (Rochereau 1959, Stoddart 1959). The first documented kidnappings of U'wa children to attend school took place in 1944 (Pradilla 1978). In the fifties from the epicenter of missionary operations in San Luis del Chuscal, the Catholic missionaries expanded its system of education for the U'wa.⁷⁰ In the 1960s, 1970s and into the 1980s children were removed from their family nucleus to attend missionary schools (ASOUWA 2007: 14).

One of those children was Roberto "Berito" Cobaría (Cobaría 2010). He corroborates what Pradilla (1978) and Berichá (2002, 2010) also document. In Berito Cobaría's case, he was forced by police to attend boarding school as a child. After

⁷⁰ Schools were constructed in Bócota, Rabaría, Tegría, el Zulia, Cobaría, Tauretes, Cascajal y Segovia (Pradilla and Espinoza 1982: 10).

successfully evading them for some time, the religious authorities made a compromise with his family who chose him to attend school instead of sending his sister.⁷¹ Berito, as he is known across the United States, Europe, and the Andean region, illustrates perfectly a 21st century version of the U'wa speaker or oracle decried by 18th century missionary noted above, Juan Rivero. Berito is one of the “principal men who understand something of Spanish” mentioned by Rivero above who has become an interlocutor for the U'wa people in multiple spaces (Osborn 2009: 3).⁷² For example, in 1997 he was the first to travel to the United States and

⁷¹ One Archbishop testified to taking small children over a period of twenty years: “The [Colombian government’s] Indigenous Affairs Division knows my proceedings in reference to the removal of small girls and boys. For twenty years and again today, I decry the angst provoked in me by these Tunebos [U’was] that would hide them from me and would not let me talk with them, not even for baptisms. I made a contract with them as follows: when you let a Tunebo die without notifying me, you must hand over a girl or boy to educate them for two years. They agreed to this. Because some did not fulfill this contact, at the end of ten years, the Cobarías handed over: Graciela, Cecilia, Beritá and Abata. Under the same reasoning I took Kuitama and Rusokoma, daughters of the U’wa chief, José Ignacio Afanador (Sísira). Six, according to the contract. From the Bókota clan, I only took Flor, Luis Educarado’s sister, one of which accompanies me. From the Tegrías, I only took Francisco” (from testimony provided to the Inspector General’s Office” (Procurador General de la Nación) by Archbishop Abraham Builes in Pradilla 1978: 38-39). “La División de Asuntos Indígenas sabe mi proceder referente a la quitada de niños y niñas pequeños. Hace 20 años y ahora lo denunció nuevamente, me daba angustia ver que a los mismos moribundos tunebos (U’was) me los escondían y no me dejaban hablar con ellos por si querían bautizarse. Con ellos hice un contrato así: Cuando ustedes me dejen morir un tunebo sin llamarme, me entregan un niño o niña para educarlo dos años. Ellos dijeron que sí. Como algunos no cumplieron, en término de 10 años los Cobarías me entregaron a: Graciela, Cecilia, Beritá y Abata. Yo quité a juro por la misma razón a Kuitama y a Rusokoma hijas del jefe de los Cobaría, José Ignacio Afanador (Sísira). Seis, según el contrato. A los bókota no les quité sino a Flor, hermana de Luis Educarado, uno de los que me acompaña. A los Tegrías no les quité sino a Francisco.”

⁷² In 2010 Berito Cobaría, elected as the international liaison for the U'wa, and Gilberto Cobaría, the elected President of ASOUWA traveled to the US to meet with

specifically Occidental Petroleum's headquarters. He has shared stories about confronting guerrillas from the *Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia* (FARC) after the kidnapping and subsequent killing of Washinawatok, Gay, and Freitas as well as getting assaulted by paramilitary thugs. He is certainly the most well known of U'wa leaders. But Berito also used his forced education to become a translator and connector between U'wa society, Colombian, and international societies. Berito is not the only U'wa who learned to use an imposed language and legal system while maintaining a grounding in the U'wa people's cosmovision.

“Wings to Fly”: Embodied decolonization through education

Berichá, the young U'wa who served as informant and translator for anthropologist and nun Marquez (discussed in chapter 1), has played a similar role to Berito. Her story sheds light on the embodied aspect of the transition of U'wa education from colonial to decolonial (Berichá 1992). Berichá, re-named Esperanza by Marquez, was educated by the missionary nun-teachers.⁷³ Her education at the Mission eventually provided a path for Berichá to become an educator herself.

Beginning in the mid-1960s, Berichá taught math, (Spanish) reading and writing skills, the Catholic religion, and tailoring. In schools run by the Catholic missionaries

old US-based allies. While in the US, Amazon Watch published a profile of Berito's leadership beginning with his first visit to the US in 1997. They also document a statement from a representative of the Organizacion Nacional Indigena de Colombia: “According to Luis Fernando Arias, General Secretary of the ONIC: ‘Berito taught Colombia's indigenous people and the world the importance of the globalization of resistance, how to defend the beloved earth, and how to fight against climate change’” (Miller 2010).

⁷³ For a short essay on Berichá's evolution to Esperanza Aguablanca from the perspective of Sister Marquez, see (Marquez 1976).

Berichá taught both U'wa and *colono* (white *campesino*) girls and young women whose attendance was enforced by the Police Inspector (Berichá 1992: 22).

In 1992 Berichá became the first U'wa to publish an autobiographical memoir that documents her own story in the context of a larger collective (Berichá 1992).⁷⁴ She documents U'wa-missionary relations, U'wa organizing processes, and U'wa ways of understanding transmitted through oral knowledge by her mother, *un autoridad tradicional*. In this capacity she also taught the U'wa language to the missionary nuns and helped develop a book on U'wa grammar and a translation to U'wa of the Book of Saint Mark (Marquez 1975). She taught both U'wa and *colono* (white *campesino*) girls and young women whose attendance was enforced by the Police Inspector (Berichá 1992: 22). Her work as a teacher exposed her not only to the traditional authorities of the different U'wa communities, but also to Colombian government representatives, different Catholic and Protestant missionaries, as well as other academics and individuals outside of U'wa territory.

Berichá recounts the experience of coming to political consciousness in 1976 during a workshop organized by Jesuit priests geared towards nearby campesinos. She writes,

I attended a course that gave me the right to think, to express myself, to make decisions. We had the right to speak and to organize whatever we wished. I also learned that with those rights came responsibilities with respect to myself and others around me. I saw in the attitudes of those around me an equality among everyone. So I began to reflect and ask myself: "why didn't the nuns teach this to us?" I thought and thought

⁷⁴ There are many layers of significance to the timing and publication of the book. Published in 1992 when indigenous peoples across the Americas re-appropriated the celebrations of "discovery," it was funded by Occidental Petroleum.

about this until it dawned on me that the nuns did not want us U'wa to learn these things. It did not benefit them that the U'wa would have “wings to fly”.⁷⁵ (Berichá 1992: 26)

Berichá took a course with two other U'was that was not intended for her as an indigenous woman and transforms this new perspective into a useful one for her people. Reflecting upon the paternalism of the missionaries, the three U'was, including Berichá, consequently organized a consciousness-raising seminar for other U'wa people which resulted in OTUN, *Organización Tunebo*. With her education and ability to translate and interpret, Berichá established relationships across communities and took part in organizing and advocating for the needs of her people. Her trajectory through the missionary educational system—first as student, then informant, and later teacher—provided the exposure to other ways of thinking that resulted in her rethinking her own role in education. It proved to be the catalyst for her return to collective organizing through an U'wa cosmovision while taking advantage of the available recognized political spaces (Cabildos).

During the 1980s the U'wa “in light of immense need for a direct channel of communication with the Colombian government to achieve recognition of their rights that until that moment had been denied” followed the lead of other indigenous

⁷⁵ Yo podía asistir a un curso en el que se le daba a la persona el derecho de pensar, de expresarse, y de tomar decisiones; teníamos el derecho de hablar y de organizar cualquier cosa que uno quisiera. También aprendí que frente a esos derechos hay unos deberes que cumplir y unas responsabilidades para consigo mismo y para con las demás personas. Yo veía en las actitudes de los compañeros una igualdad entre todos. Entonces comencé a reflexionar: “¿Por qué las monjitas no nos enseñaban esas cosas?” comencé a “echar cabeza” y se me vino a la mente que las hermanitas no querían que nosotros U'wa, aprendiéramos esas cosas pues no les convenía que “U'wa tuviera alitas para volar.”

pueblos that were recuperating lands by organizing Cabildos according to Law 89 of 1890 of Colombia's Indigenous legislation (Berichá 1992: 37-38). According to Berichá this form of government was foreign to the U'wa and served to disarticulate U'wa culture. Nonetheless it was necessary in order to be recognized by the Colombian government so that their needs in relation to health, land, and education could be met. Utilizing her experience and education under the missionaries and her subsequent consciousness of the relations of paternalism and colonialism enforced by the Catholics, Berichá emerged as a leader in this process by teaching law to U'wa leaders and elders with respect to the constitution and responsibilities of *cabildos*, Colombian law and indigenous rights (Berichá 2010).

U'wa leaders confronted a minefield in their pursuit of sovereignty and land tenure. The struggle for education occurred within a context of *campesino* colonization, guerrilla group movement, large landowner and local politician interference and appropriation of U'wa lands. But just as the U'wa persisted in the colonial period, using Spanish laws to translate and argue for the needs of their people, they continued this resistance through the emerging Cabildo structures in the 1980s. The Colombian state recognized *Cabildos* as the legal representation of indigenous pueblos through an 1890 law. Through Cabildos, the U'wa were able to establish relationships with local, regional, national, and international indigenous and popular movements. These structures also changed the U'wa's relationship to the government:

The U'wa had started to manage themselves and to communicate directly with the government. The first petitions related to the

problems of land invasion by *colonos*. First they requested the “*saneamiento*” of the Tegria, Bocota, Cobaría and Rotarbaría lands; indigenous health promoters, and respect for their culture in addition to an education adequate for their needs and free of all type of imposition.⁷⁶ (Berichá 1992: 42)

Land, health, and education were the top priorities of the Cabildos that consolidated in the 1980s. Through the cabildos, the U’wa demanded that their education rights be respected. In 1984 Berichá organized a letter to the *Seminario Nacional de Etnoeducación* signed by Cabildo members and *Karekas* (traditional authorities). In the letter the U’wa representatives enumerated thirteen points related to education, presenting the problems they faced and demanding information on existing resources and plans for educational projects related to their people (Representantes de las comunidades Tunebas 1984). In particular, the U’wa representatives demanded the rights accorded them under Decree 1142 of 1978: “that indigenous teachers chosen by the *Karekas* and Cabildos be appointed, that educational programs be adjusted to fit the needs and culture of our community, that we be allowed real participation in these programs, that the history of our pueblo be taught, and that our traditional authorities, *Caciques*, *Karekas* and Cabildo be respected” (Representantes de las comunidades Tunebas 1984). They further decried the fact that 90 percent of U’wa students were

⁷⁶ Los U’wa habían comenzado a dirigirse y a comunicarse directamente con el Gobierno, y sus primeras peticiones fueron relacionadas con los problemas de las tierras invadidas por los colonizadores. Primero pidieron el saneamiento de las tierras de Bókota, Tegría, Cobaría y Rotarbaría; promotores de salud indígenas, y respeto por su cultura, además de solicitar que la educación se adecuara a las condiciones del medio y se liberara de todo tipo de imposición (Berichá 1992: 42). *Saneamiento* refers to a process where the government buys out parcels of land “owned” by *campesinos* or other landowners on land within the U’wa *Reserva Indígena de Aguablanca—Tauretes* (established in 1979) and the *Resguardo de Cobaría—Tegría—Bócota—Rinconada* (established 1987; ASOU’WA 2006: 21).

taught in schools run by Catholic missionaries and only 10 percent were taught in state schools.

Berichá's trajectory shows how education plays a role in colonization and decolonization. Her role in translating Catholic religious texts into U'wa and serving as translator/informant for anthropologist missionary Marquez illuminates the way that she was complicit in colonization. However, her text demonstrates how through her missionary education and position as teacher in various U'wa communities provided access to other U'wa leaders and non-U'wa allies to work towards their own definitions of self-government, education, and therefore sovereignty.

Daris Cristancho represents the generation of school teacher/community organizers that emerged in the 1980s during the consolidation of U'wa cabildos. She benefited from Berichá's generation that took the education they had gained to put it towards community organizing and serving as intermediary between the formalities of the Colombian state and the formalities of the *autoridades tradicionales*. With Cristancho, as with Berichá, we see how educational activities become the site in which rights are envisioned and enacted. Early leaders may have used Spanish to serve as intermediaries between the U'wa *pueblo* and the Colombian government, such as Berito. However new generations, building on earlier leaders work, become additional mediators with the state.

Organizing by the age of fifteen during the process of establishing *Cabildos*, Cristancho became a teacher in the nineties as an outcome of an U'wa Congreso in 1990 (Cristancho 2010). During this decade her job as a teacher placed her in

different locations in the region, which exposed her to the conditions that result from lack of access to land in multiple communities, including neighboring indigenous peoples distinct from the U'wa. She and her husband, who was a cabildo member in the nineties, were involved in the land recuperation processes of different Cabildos. As a key organizer during mass mobilizations against Occidental Petroleum, including a six-month sit-in in the late 1990s and early 2000s, she worked closely with US-based Freitas, Washinawatok, and Gay, as noted earlier. Cristancho continues Berichá's example of building from the experience gained through education and teaching towards participation in self-governance and demanding rights or otherwise hold the Colombian state accountable to laws that would benefit the U'wa if implemented.⁷⁷

Kajkrasa Ruyina: Proyecto Etnoeducativo del Pueblo U'wa

On December 29, 1998, the Fifth U'wa Congress with participation from the 17 communities of the *Resguardo Unido U'wa* “proposed to reject the national education system and close down all government schools located on reservation lands” (Gay 1999). The U'wa expelled the missionary educational system from the *Resguardo U'wa*, which took effect with Law 715 of 2001 (ASOUWA 2007: 24). Between 2005 and 2008 the Ministry of Education implemented a collaborative effort with ASOUWA to produce an ethnoeducation project named *Kajkrasa Ruyina* –

⁷⁷ Current president Gilberto Cobaría provides one more trajectory of a teacher who has come to work for the intercultural sovereignty of the U'wa. Beginning in 1996 in his earlier capacity as Director of Ethnoeducation, Cobaría has led the effort to implement the U'wa ethnoeducation project based on U'wa indigenous criteria (Cobaría 2010).

Guardianes de la Madre Tierra – El Planeta Azul (Cobaria 2010). The starting point for this project according to the ASOUWA is that “education in indigenous communities cannot be delegated or transferred, it is experiential, human, natural, practical, ensuring respect for Mother Earth, human rights, to the word, tolerance and hospitality” (ASOUWA 2007: 30).

The legal definition of ethnoeducation is outlined law 115 of 1994:

The education of ethnic groups will be oriented by the principles and objectives of education established by the present law and will take into account, in addition, the criteria of *integrity, interculturality, linguistic diversity, community participation, flexibility and progressiveness*. It will aim to strengthen the processes of identity, knowledge, socialization, protection and proper use of nature, systems and practices of community organization, use of local languages, teacher training and research in all areas of culture.⁷⁸ (ASOUWA 2007: 30)

In the *Kajkrasa Ruyina*, the U’wa interpret these criteria according to their own logic. For example, “Integrity, which signifies a union between each person with Mother Nature; she is a living superior being and the heart of the fabric of life” (ASOUWA 2007: 30). This criteria is manifested in U’wa efforts to protect the land, restore recognition of their rights to ancestral lands and refusal to negotiate the selling of oil manifest this principle. For the U’wa, oil is the blood of the earth. Though the U’wa

⁷⁸ Ley 115 de 1994 (Titulo 3, Capitulo III), referente a la *Educacion para Grupos Etnicos*, en el Articulo 56, *Principios y Fines*, dice: “La educación de los grupos étnicos estará orientada por los principios y fines de la educación establecidos en la presente Ley y tendrá en cuenta además los criterios de integralidad, interculturalidad, diversidad lingüística, participación comunitaria, flexibilidad y progresividad. Tendrá como finalidad afianzar los procesos de identidad, conocimiento, socialización, protección y uso adecuado de la naturaleza, sistemas y prácticas comunitarias de organización, uso de las lenguas vernáculas, formación de docentes e investigaciones en todos los ámbitos de la cultura.”

suffer from malnutrition and other health issues, they are not willing to compromise their responsibility to defending the earth to gain from selling off the oil found in the subsoil of their ancestral lands. This respect for the earth as central to their existence is vital to their cosmovision. “The U’wa culture revolves around the cosmovision, that is the legacy of knowledges of the ancestors that have been transmitted from generation to generation through the spoken word and song (chant)...the core of our culture is where the principle actors of our own education (*educación propia*) are nature, community and *autoridades tradicionales*” (ASOUWA 2007: 42).

In other words, within the ethnoeducation project, education, and the production of knowledge take place in relation to multiple spaces and times to show the integral connection with the earth. Gilberto Cobaria explained, “Spirituality is worked at night with the children. The academic aspect is worked on in the morning hours. Weaving, artisanry, and agriculture are worked in the afternoon. The social and community aspect is worked on Saturdays and Sundays. That is how we organize our education” (Cobaria 2010).⁷⁹ For younger generations to be able to learn this integral approach to education and land and their relationship to it remains central. This echoes the UNDRIP outlined above but stands in contrast to the UDHR. The UDHR establishes the right to own property, a conceptualization of land that ignores responsibility to the Mother Earth and instead objectifies relations with nature.

⁷⁹ “La parte espiritual se trabaja en las noches con los niños. La parte académica se trabaja en horas de la mañana. La parte artesanal, la parte agrícola se trabaja en horas de la tarde. La parte social y la parte comunitaria se trabaja sábados domingos. Esa es la parte educativa.”

A second example of how the U'wa define the criteria of interculturality within the conceptualization of education states:

Interculturality refers to assigning importance to communal gatherings with traditional authorities where ideas, teachings and visions are exchanged. In interaction with the larger society, it refers to the appropriation of knowledge useful for teaching practices. With other peoples or ethnic groups, interculturality manifests in the exchange of knowledge about organizing, ideological, political, cultural and environmental processes. (ASOUWA 2007: 31)

This conceptualization of interculturality specifies the need to learn within one's own culture following the guidance and emphasizing interaction with the larger community. They further distinguish interculturality in relations with the larger Colombian society and in terms of other peoples or ethnic groups. Because of a clear understanding of different ways of thinking and the need to mediate between the two, they resolve the tension between outside learning and community priorities by strict expectations of students that go on to higher education students; they are to return regularly for participation in community ceremonies and cleansings or *purificaciones*.⁸⁰ This process of managing two different ways of thinking is a strategy that is centuries old.

These concepts of integrity and interculturality in terms of education illuminate the manner in which the U'wa enact the notion of universal kinship, which

⁸⁰ Over the years that I most closely worked with the U'wa Defense Project, 2003–2006, one aspect of the programmatic work was fundraising to support students chosen by ASOUWA that went on to higher education in Economy, Social Work, and Medicine. Part of the student's responsibility was to return regularly to the U'wa *resguardo* to participate in fasting rituals of purification. U'wa representatives that travelled outside of U'wa lands also were responsible for fasting and cleansing with the help of *autoridades tradicionales* from their respective community.

is codified in the UNDRIP. Universal kinship, according to Russell Barsh (1986) recognizes relations across time (generations), space, and species, which corresponds to the interrelatedness of spiritual, political, and ecological dimensions of everyday life (Barsh 1986: 187).

The U'wa ethnoeducation project aims to ensure a strong basis in terms of U'wa identity or culture before learning the ways of the "outside" or *riowa* world. This includes achieving an agreement with the state that recognizes an U'wa child's right to be educated at home in their communities until the age of seven so that their identity as U'wa will be rooted in them before exposure to Western education (Cobaria 2010). The U'wa education project differs radically from the imposed western educational system that took children away from their family and environment. Instead U'wa educators and political leaders recognize the role of mothers, fathers, grandparents, *autoridades tradicionales*, and the environment as sources of knowledge.

Conclusion: Building sovereignty through education

The *riowa* (white people) has not wanted to understand that if we lose our ties to our Mother Earth, time will be lost with her (the spirit of our ancestors, our present, our future). (Cobaria 1997)

The U'wa efforts towards education show us how education is more than a second generation right, which sometimes is regarded of less importance than civil or political rights. Instead education is central to the enactment of intercultural sovereignty, which operates on a different logic than liberal, Eurocentric frameworks allow. This logic can be summed up in terms of universal kinship. U'wa education

embodies a logic of recognizing the inter-relations between different time, species, and spaces. Intercultural sovereignty recognizes relations with others but looks to build relationships of respect, not hierarchy.

Through interweaving indigenous intellectual thought and institutionalized indigenous discourse, we find that the U'wa people's educational program manifests a decolonial understanding of human rights. Over centuries the U'wa have resisted the colonization of mind and body. Only recently, within the context of a national movement for indigenous rights and an appropriate education, have they achieved a formal process of developing an education plan that is grounded in their thought and culture. Their struggle against religious missionary educators and the imposed system recognized the importance of language and cultural practices for their future as a people.

The tension between indigenous perspectives and the state, with regard to intercultural education in particular and intercultural relations in general, mirrors the tension between indigenous perspectives and liberal framings of human rights. The U'wa, and other indigenous peoples in the region, struggle against the dominant tendency to include difference without transforming ways of thinking, which is the difference between multiculturalism and interculturality. If larger society heeded the lessons that intercultural education should be teaching, the priority of the individual would give way to an intersubjective, collective approach. The earth would be respected for the source of life that it is and decisions would be made considering the impacts on future generations, an intergenerational approach to human rights.

Chapter 3: Acompañamiento

In 2002 Occidental Petroleum withdrew from its oil-drilling project in northeastern Colombia and returned the related license to the Colombian government (ASOUWA 2002; Efe 2002). The U'wa people and their allies across the Americas and Europe celebrated the success of a decade-long transnational campaign to force Occidental Petroleum off U'wa lands (Reinsborough 2004; Soltani and Koenig 2004). Occidental Petroleum's departure, however, did not mark the end of the threat to the U'wa's territorial sovereignty and well-being, instead the Colombian state oil company Ecopetrol took over the oil concession. Moreover, soon after this important success, with the shared target of US-based Occidental Petroleum out of the picture, the U'wa struggle seemingly dropped off of international and Colombian activists' radar screens. Without a US target, the U'wa received less visibility, attention, and support from transnational actors than before, rendering them more vulnerable in relation to the state and its oil company. In a 2010 visit to the United States, Gilberto Cobaría, President of ASOUWA the recognized U'wa governing council, explained that current threats to their land and life have actually increased (Cobaría 2010). Today they face not only threats from oil exploitation projects, but also from the construction of gas pipelines, coal mining, and possibly a binational thoroughfare through U'wa sacred sites, as well as plans for "eco-tourism" in a national park that overlaps with their territory. This raises a paradox: Can Occidental Petroleum's withdrawal be considered a success, when it also led to the demobilization of the U'wa's transnational advocacy network, leaving them more vulnerable to violations

of their sovereignty by domestic actors, such as the Colombian state-owned oil company Eco-petrol? Or did the loss of an external target expose the limits of campaign-based metrics of success often used by scholars to judge the effectiveness of TANs?

An analysis of campaign success is a dominant approach to consider this question on the effectiveness of TANs (Keck and Sikkink 1998). This is appropriate to measure the results of particular collaborations. However, I argue that a more holistic approach considers the effectiveness of TANs where an examination of the relationships that result from (or provide the impetus for future campaigns) and the processes or practices engaged in collaboration complements a focus on campaigns. In other words, in addition to analyzing campaign results, the quality of relationships and the processes/practices to build them paint a fuller picture of impacts and effectiveness of TANs.⁸¹

Given the reality of the conditions of survival for the U'wa, an intercultural approach that takes into account the coloniality of power would orient an inquiry from the U'wa's perspective. Thus, we must first understand their motivation or goal behind partnering with transnational allies. We find that for the U'wa, the campaign against Occidental Petroleum was simply one manifestation of their ongoing struggle to build intercultural sovereignty. In a legal document that articulates all the justifications for their objection to oil development on their land, ASOUWA (2006)

⁸¹ My thinking on these three elements of success—results, relationships, and processes—is indebted to a workshop on facilitative leadership in which I participated in the late 1990s. See www.interactioninstitute.org.

utilizes colonial and national law to demand respect for their sovereignty over ancestral lands from multiple entities, including national and international courts, companies and governments:

The U'wa people with settlements in the *departamentos* of Casanare, Arauca, Boyaca, Santander and Norte de Santander issues a request, to national and international governments, national and international courts, national and international companies exploiting natural and non-renewable resources, for the absolute respect of the right of possession, ownership and control of our ancestral lands as reaffirmed by the Spanish Crown by royal decree of July 21, 1802, which occurred in Madrid (Spain), defined the limits of the indigenous resguardo of Tierradentro Tunebo Nation (U'wa Nation today), and recently the *Resguardo Unido* of the Indigenous U'wa extended by Resolution No. 056 of August 6, 1999 issued by the INCORA.⁸² (ASOUWA 2006: 32)

An earlier communiqué written by ASOUWA in the wake of Occidental's announced withdrawal states the U'wa vision clearly. When the U'wa succeeded in their transnational campaign against Occidental Petroleum in 2002, they thanked their allies, those who had passed away during the struggle, and restated their demands for the future. The U'wa communiqué stated:

We want to remind our friends and brothers and sisters around the world that our fight continues, that the government should return lands that they took through violence, cancel all oil, mining, and environmental projects...hand over the...cost of land titling for the *Resguardo Unido U'wa*, and compensate us for the death of our children and leaders, compensate the families of the three supporters

⁸² El Pueblo U'wa con asentamiento en los territorios de Casanare, Arauca, Boyaca, Santander y Norte de Santander solicita al: gobierno nacional e internacional, cortes nacionales e internacionales, empresas nacionales e internacionales explotadoras de los recursos naturales renovables y no renovables; el respeto absoluto del derecho de posesión, propiedad y dominio de nuestras tierras ancestrales tal como fue reafirmado por la Corona Española mediante la Cedula Real de 21 de Julio de 1802 dado en Madrid (España), en la cual se definió los límites del Resguardo Indígena de Tierradentro de la Nación Tuneba (hoy Nación U'wa), y recientemente el del Resguardo Indígena Unido U'wa ampliado mediante la Resolución No. 056 del 6 de agosto de 1999 expedida por el INCORA.

of indigenous rights who gave their lives to defend our legitimate rights, and the social sectors for their human, moral and economic losses. The U'wa will show the government that we are dignified and fair, that we are not asking for anything that isn't ours, that Mother Earth and her children are sacred. Brothers and sisters of the world, the U'wa will continue defending Mother Earth. We invite you to continue accompanying us. Thank you for believing in us. (ASOUWA 2002)

Through this communiqué U'wa leaders ask for continued accompaniment in their fight to defend Mother Earth. This is an important aspect of the U'wa fight for intercultural sovereignty as it motivates and gives meaning to their political struggles. This points to an U'wa conceptualization of sovereignty, which is comparable to what Russell Barsh (1986) and Holder and Corntassel (2002) have called universal kinship. Universal kinship, according to Russell Barsh recognizes relations across time, space, and species, which correspond to spiritual, political, and ecological dimensions (Barsh 1986: 187). The U'wa recognized the relationships they share with those whose lives were lost and the local social sectors that supported their campaign at the same time as they reiterated their responsibility to defend the sacredness of the earth.

The intercultural sovereignty that the U'wa envision includes their responsibility to defend the earth and relationships across multiple differences. This vision of universal kinship utilizes a different logic than conventional sovereignty from the perspective of the state. For the state, sovereignty is absolute control over land, subsoil, resources, and people within its territorial jurisdiction. The state does not share sovereignty. However, in the U'wa's conception of intercultural sovereignty they argue that:

The government should recognize that we are people who are part of that word "State." It should respect our forms of life, our thinking, our laws of

origin and of our elders. It should respect universal human rights and international treaties because we are people—we too feel. (ASOUWA 2002)

Thus, the U'wa concept of intercultural sovereignty does not seek secession from the nation-state, but demands respect for their life practices as equally valid yet distinct from that of Westernized Colombian society. In sum, it is based on a pluri-ethnic or pluri-national vision of the Colombian nation that includes ecological lessons for those disconnected from the cycles of the earth. It further seeks recognition of their sovereignty not only from the Colombian state but the larger international community.

In this chapter, I argue that the U'wa build intercultural sovereignty through *acompañamiento* (accompaniment), a transnational strategy engaged by the U'wa with crossborder grassroots activists and allies, whom they invite to join their struggle. The U'wa reach outside of the Colombian nation-state to gain international allies who help legitimize the U'wa's position by working to shame, pressure, and/or convince the government to concede rights of self-determination to the U'wa within their homeland. *Acompañamiento* results from successful collaborations (campaigns) and long-term relationship building that focuses on legitimizing and contributing to an U'wa conceptualization of intercultural sovereignty.

I suggest that when studying TANs, analyzing campaigns' ability to achieve their goals are important indicators of success and effectiveness. However, this must be complemented with an additional focus on the human relations (social capital) that are built through this process—how dense they are (actors cooperate at multiple levels to impact various targets) and how durable they are (whether or not they are

short-term or on-going). Consequently, relations of *acompañamiento* can provide a lens into the strength, density, and durability of transnational networks, which offers an additional way to assess the effectiveness of TANs beyond campaigns' ability to achieve their immediate goals. Instead, it shifts our focus onto the practice and degree to which social movement actors are capable of building relationships across borders and time, which strengthen the social capital of marginalized communities particularly with more materially and politically powerful allies.

The remainder of the chapter proceeds as follows. First, I review the dominant model frequently used in the study of crossborder collective action. I then build upon a current transborder human rights practice known as protective accompaniment (Brock 2007; Koopman 2011) to focus on *acompañamiento* as a strategy engaged by marginalized peoples to build intercultural sovereignty. Finally I analyze the practices of two related organizations that have maintained key partnerships with the U'wa regardless of the status of campaigns: the UDP and MU. This chapter thus makes visible organizing processes to complement a focus on campaigns as a metric of social movement success.

Campaigns and transnational advocacy networks

Keck and Sikkink's (1998) *Activists Without Borders* provided scholars in IR a groundbreaking framework through which to assess social movements and activism across international borders such as the U'wa's struggle. TANs include "those relevant actors working internationally on an issue, who are bound together by shared values, a common discourse, and dense exchanges of information and services"

(Keck and Sikkink 1998: 2).⁸³ By highlighting TANs Keck and Sikkink focus on nonstate actors that impact national and international politics across borders. In naming these networks as new actors in transnational politics, Keck and Sikkink aim to decenter the state as the key actor in international and comparative politics, allowing the interaction between agency and structure to be explored. The authors point to the growth of international NGOs over the last four decades as an indicator of the increasing importance of TANs in transnational politics.

For Keck and Sikkink, the campaigns that NGOs run serve as windows into the functioning of TANs. Campaigns are defined as “sets of strategically linked activities in which members of a diffuse principled network...develop explicit, visible ties and mutually recognized roles in pursuit of a common goal (and generally against a common target)” (Keck and Sikkink 1998: 6). Relations among the actors in a network, the resources they contribute, and the goals jointly established are visible through this campaign “window.”

The literature on transnational mobilizing in support of the U’wa has examined the campaign results of the TANs against Occidental Petroleum Corporation. These studies largely focused on the successful legal and policy changes won by the U’wa at national and international levels when legal and political actions were taken simultaneously (Wirpsa 2004, Rodriguez-Garavito & Arenas 2005, Arenas 2007). Extending Keck and Sikkink’s analysis to the U’wa struggle, these

⁸³Precursors to the contemporary transnational advocacy networks Keck and Sikkink research include transnational movements for the abolition of slavery, the international suffrage movement, and the campaign by missionaries to eradicate footbinding in China and female circumcision in Kenya.

authors underscore the openings created by processes of globalization for actors with shared goals and values to connect across various spatial scales despite multiple differences. For example, Leslie Wirpsa illustrates the shared values with a story about an U'wa leader's visit to Los Angeles in 2000 when Berito Cobaría, an U'wa spokesperson and spiritual authority, addressed activists who were supporting the fight against Occidental:

He waved his hand to signal inclusively to the individuals present, and explained that all of them—and other people working in solidarity with the U'wa struggle, even some US congresspersons—lived their lives in harmony with and obeying the laws of the U'wa god, Sira. The Occidental executives and certain members of the Colombian and US governments, however, he insisted, walked to the tune and dictates of another god, which he called the god of the yellow planet. (Wirpsa 2004: 327)

Wirpsa builds on Keck and Sikkink's notion of TANs to discuss hegemonic and counter-hegemonic regime networks where each regime is a confluence of multiple networks (2004: 138).⁸⁴ For Wirpsa, regime networks incorporate linkages that traverse multiple levels of analysis—local, national, international, transnational—and includes the state as an arena of struggle. Wirpsa's study examined the hegemonic oil-led, neoliberal market integration regime network and the counter-hegemonic regime network grounded in indigenous rights, which included environmental, civil, and political rights and anti-globalization movements. Her definition of success, then, is framed by the ability of weak actors to utilize openings created by globalization

⁸⁴ Wirpsa builds on Stephen Krasner's 1982 definition of regime ("a pattern of 'norms, rules and principles around which actors expectations converge'") as well as Oran Young's (1991) definition ("sets of rules, decision-making procedures, and/or programs that give rise to social practices, assign roles to the participants in these practices and govern their interactions"; Wirpsa 2004:10).

and international law. The U'wa were successful because they used new national and international laws in multiple arenas in their campaign against Occidental (Wirpsa 2004). Wirpsa notes the withdrawal of Occidental in 2002 coincided with an increase in militarization of the region due to the appropriation by the US Congress of \$98million for the protection of a pipeline that “runs through an edge of U'wa territory” (Wirpsa 2004: 311). Thus she qualifies the meaning of success:

Thus, as the U'wa case dramatically illustrates, while resistances, solidarity and the operations of regime networks can open opportunity structures for those with lesser power and enhance democratization, there are dangers associated with this increased participation and movement strength. When “success” from these spaces is significant, it tweaks the control panels of important powerful groups; this may lead to greater conflict, violence, and repression, as well as closures of democratic spaces, especially during periods of contestation. Yet there is movement forward. In the *longe duree*, the U'wa and other indigenous groups possess starkly different possibilities than those of their counterparts historically contesting resource extraction or territorial dispossession. (Wirpsa 2004: 319)

Wirpsa's work deftly weaves a narrative of multiple actors in disparate locations to map out the hegemonic and counter-hegemonic regime networks (Wirpsa 2004: 81-82). But her focus on the opportunity structures of these networks in conflict with each other *leaves aside the question of the connections between actors in the networks*, the human relationships that sustain long-term and long-distance crossborder collaboration.

Colombian scholars Cesar Rodriguez-Garavito and Luis Carlos Arenas (2005; 243) also utilize Keck and Sikkink's approach to analyze the “potential and limitations of transnational political mobilization in support of indigenous rights.”

Like Wirpsa, the legal or policy changes wrought by the transnational mobilization of

multiple sectors are most clearly delineated in their research. Recognizing that there “is no single indicator of success or failure,” Garavito-Rodriguez and Arenas (2005: 260) utilize Keck and Sikkink’s five-fold criteria to assess the transnational coalition’s campaign. Keck and Sikkink determined that the conditions under which networks have influence are in: 1) issues creation, 2) “influence on discursive positions of states and international organizations,” 3) change in institutional procedures, 4) policy change in governments or international organizations, and finally 5) influence on state practices (1998: 25). Rodriguez-Garavito and Arenas conclude:

The U’wa campaign has been largely successful insofar as it has managed to (1) create the issue of indigenous rights vis-à-vis resource extraction in Colombia, and raise international awareness about similar conflicts elsewhere, (2) influence the discourses of target actors (Oxy [Occidental Petroleum] and the Colombian government), (3) have an impact on institutional procedures, (4) bring about (temporary) policy changes in target actors, and (5) influence target actors’ behavior (as shown by Oxy’s withdrawal). (2005: 260-261)

These five criteria focus on discursive, policy, and behavioral changes in terms of target actors, which as Wirpsa states is “movement forward.” However, neither of these two studies considers the goal of sovereignty that motivates the U’wa struggle in the first place. The U’wa, as stated in the communiqué noted above, recognize that defending Mother Earth was a continuing struggle which required “permanent” on-going accompaniment.

Within a year of Occidental’s withdrawal, Ecopetrol, the state-owned oil company, took up Occidental Petroleum’s objective, resuming seismic prospecting (Rodriguez-Garavito and Arenas 2005: 259). Rodriguez-Garavito and Arenas surmise

that the response to U'wa "repeated 'urgent calls' to 'resume international solidarity' ... has not been nearly as enthusiastic as during the first phase of the campaign [which] bears witness to the premature demobilizing effect of Oxy's withdrawal" (2005: 259). They argue that differing perspectives on time frames and targets on the part of the U'wa and transnational NGOs led to waning support for the U'wa (Garavito-Rodriguez and Arenas 2005: 261). The reasons for this, according to these authors, are both cultural and organizational. NGOs dependent upon scarce funding face a context conducive to short-term projects. With Occidental out of the picture and urgency around the U'wa case minimized, transnational NGOs were pressed to find other similar campaigns to support elsewhere. But for the U'wa, the struggle for sovereignty was not achieved when they forced the withdrawal of Occidental Petroleum. In fact, they argue that from the beginning transnational NGOs organizing this campaign identified different goals and targets. In the end, US-based organizations beat their target—Occidental Petroleum—and achieved their aims—their ouster from U'wa land. On the contrary, the U'wa who have lived in resistance against colonizing forces for centuries, knew that fight against Occidental Petroleum was just one of the most recent phases in their struggle against extinction.

What this assessment of the demobilization of the transnational network exemplifies is the focus on visible campaigns to measure a network's effectiveness. Campaigns are certainly key for crossborder organizing, especially to focus efforts on specific targets, and their policies or behavior. However, transnational mobilization is not as simple as responding to communiqués or sharing values but requires both a

catalyst and sustained commitment and engagement. A successful boomerang pattern of transnational activism (Keck and Sikkink 1998) or signal flare strategy (Perla 2008) can lead to the *acompañamiento* of the marginalized by differentially-resourced members of the network, but the latter requires sustained engagement over time.

In the U'wa case, *acompañamiento* is not the call itself, but rather can be the result of a successful call (boomerang pattern or signal flare strategy), usually made by personal testimonios – whether in-country delegation or while activists are on tour in the United States. U'wa leaders expressed as much in their communiqué following the announcement of Occidental Petroleum's withdrawal as they invited others to “continue accompanying” them. *Acompañamiento* is not the strategy that builds strong core relationships, but rather the outcome or result of strong/durable relationships. The practices that can lead to building trust and legitimacy and include on-going communications through speaking tours and country visits, as demonstrated by the UDP and MU activists.

Accompaniment as intercultural strategy

In the U'wa case accompaniment for intercultural sovereignty aims to transform relations of power relative to the state by building networks of support that legitimate and increase their capacity for self-determination. This engagement creates a relational subjectivity, or intersubjectivity, that undermines the objectification of indigenous people that results from the coloniality of power. These relationships allow the U'wa to become more effective at challenging the historical legacies of colonization, or coloniality of power that erases them from the present. These

relationships depend upon mutual understanding, particularly in regions of conflict. Through respectful, horizontal dialogues, local histories can be communicated in order to project roads to the future (Mignolo 2011: xiii, 27). The “inter” in this term advances a relational understanding of indigenous people that serves as an alternative to the dominant narrative that relegates indigenous people to little more than victims.

Feminist geographer Sara Koopman (2011) and former Peace Brigades accompanier Lizzie Brock (2007) have examined the strategy of “protective accompaniment” in crossborder relationships between Colombian and outside organizations. Koopman describes protective accompaniment as a strategy to “make space for peace.” This strategy “puts bodies that are less at risk next to bodies that are under threat, as a sort of “unarmed bodyguard” and “relies on networks with the ability to pressure chains of political and military influence in other spaces/times, which raises the stakes of an attack” (Koopman 2011: 278).⁸⁵ The volunteers who accompany communities or human rights defenders follow strict protocols delineated in agreements that are negotiated between the partnering groups. The accompaniment of an organization or community often translates into spending hours and even days with organizational representatives and leaders in their offices, during travel across

⁸⁵Koopman traces accompaniment to Gandhian practices in India and between blacks and whites during the civil rights movement in the US (Koopman 2011: 278). In Latin America the nongovernmental organization, Peace Brigades International (PBI), was the first to initiate an accompaniment project in Guatemala in 1983. Eleven years later their project broke ground in Colombia (Brock 2007: 325). Colombia is now the country with the largest number of international groups that practice protective accompaniment. Accompaniment projects have also been organized in other countries including Sri Lanka, the Philippines (Mindanao), Palestine, Mexico, Nepal, Iraq (Kurdistan), Sudan, El Salvador, Indonesia, Guatemala, and First Nations territory in Canada (Lindsay-Poland 2012; Koopman 2011).

town, across the country or internationally in some cases. This physical presence of international observers is reinforced with political pressure activated through established relationships with government and military officials and diplomatic pressure through various embassies.

Lizzie Brock draws her analysis of protective accompaniment from four years (1999-2003) of activities in Colombia with Peace Brigades International (PBI, Brock 2007: 326). PBI, a nongovernmental organization promoting nonviolence and human rights, aims to “make space for peace” through three methods: informational accompaniment, political lobbying and physical accompaniment (PBI 2012).

International protective accompaniment entails

the physical accompaniment by international personnel of activists, organizations, or communities who are threatened with politically motivated attacks.... This accompaniment service has three simultaneous and mutually reinforcing impacts. First, the international presence protects threatened activists by raising the stakes of any attacks against them. Secondly, it encourages civil society activism by allowing threatened organizations more space and confidence to operate and by building links of solidarity with the international community. And, thirdly, it strengthens the international movement for peace and human rights by giving accompaniment volunteers a powerful first-hand experience, which becomes a sustained source of inspiration to themselves and others upon their return to their home country. (Brock 2007: 331)

Brock discusses protective accompaniment as an example of humanitarian diplomacy.

In this context, “the role of humanitarian actors is to save lives and ameliorate suffering” (Smith 2007: 36). Humanitarian diplomacy utilizes the art of negotiation, use of information, and is based on relevant laws or conventions (Smith 2007: 40).

This take on humanitarian diplomacy and protective accompaniment provides

immediate assistance in areas of conflict, expanding the political space of maneuvering for accompanied organizations and activists.

The Fellowship of Reconciliation (FOR), also attuned to this discourse of civilian diplomacy, through their “Colombia Peace Presence” project accompanies the Peace Community of San José de Apartadó (SJA). Fifteen years ago, this community organized collectively as a Peace Community, taking a nonviolent stand in a conflict zone. The community agreed to live by key principles: the participation in collective work, a refusal of participating directly or indirectly in the armed conflict (i.e. through using weapons or facilitating communication or information to any of the actors in the conflict), and the rejection of impunity and injustice.⁸⁶

According to FOR,

Human rights accompaniment refers to unarmed international presence for the protection of communities and civil society organizations in areas of violence and conflict threatened as a result of their human rights and peace-building work. The practice has been tested on the ground in many regions of the world, from the Americas to Asia to Africa, led by organizations whose mission statements express commitments to the goals and processes of nonviolent resistance, participatory democracy, and peace-building. (FOR 2011)

As explicated by Koopman and Brock and demonstrated by PBI and FOR, protective accompaniment refers to a mode of international solidarity in conflict zones that depends upon the maintenance of physical presence, sharing of information, and pressure on government and security forces. By “raising the stakes of an attack” through visible international presence, these organizations endeavor to hold

⁸⁶ I draw these points from large signs the community placed on the perimeters of the community, which I photographed during a solidarity visit in 2001.

governments and security forces accountable to their official positions on human rights. The strategy of protective accompaniment implies a long-term commitment that exceed short term campaign time frames in recognition of an on-going conflict with a long history, and hinges upon a negotiated agreement between the international accompanying organization and a Colombian human rights organization or community targeted in the conflict.

Thus protective accompaniment centers the state and its representatives through its focus on holding the state and military accountable for human rights abuses. *Acompañamiento*, as I use it here, goes beyond the state. While campaigns provide objective goals to measure success or assess effectiveness of these networks, the focus on policy changes brought about by campaigns tends to highlight only one dimension of the impacts produced by crossborder networked allies while ignoring other processes and relationships (the subjective, human element). Networks do not suddenly emerge based on shared interests, nor is the continued mobilization of transnational efforts a “call and response” to communiqués. The focus on campaigns, with visible manifestations of transnational coordination in the form of protests combined with attention to material or political advances made by social movements, helps us understand short-term gains made in alliance across borders. But given the long-term impacts and struggles produced by colonization and neoliberal globalization, campaigns are not the only way to gauge the effectiveness of cross border alliances.

For a fuller account of success I argue that we must study the cohesiveness and durability of transnational networks by looking at the partnerships and sustained relationships that become the motors of these transnational networks. Protective accompaniment gets us part of the way there in that it implies a longer-term view of transnational partnership than a campaign. This practice includes the principle of non-intervention (PBI 2012), which limits the kind of work the accompanying organization can carry out to pressure state actors to uphold the human rights agreements they have ratified. In other words, organizations that provide protective accompaniment do not participate in internal organizing processes of their accompanied organizations or communities. Their physical presence and communication with government and military officials raise the profiles of accompanied groups so that they can carry out the work in accordance with their internal law, but with less fear of persecution. In a nation-state at war, organizations and communities that invite accompaniers from abroad interrupt traditional state sovereignty by going beyond the state to seek their own protection.

The identity formation of the U'wa Defense Project and Mujer U'wa

To examine the intercultural strategy of accompaniment within the transnational network in support of the U'wa, I center the partnerships between U'wa leaders and two US-based organizing projects: the UDP and MU. These two organizations, which resulted from the first visit of an U'wa leader to the United States in 1997, represent relationships that have been sustained since that time and beyond the anti-Occidental Petroleum campaign. Below I consider first the identity

formations of UDP and MU. Next I examine practices of coalition-building between MU, U'wa women and ASOUWA. Finally, I conclude with a redefinition of success through the work of acompañamiento. This complements the work of Rodríguez-Garavito and Arenas (2005) that focused on strategies related to campaigns, which helped us understand the short-term gains in expelling Occidental Petroleum.

The formation of the U'wa Defense Project

When the U'wa Defense Project relocated its fiscal sponsorship from the Pacha Mama Alliance to Amazon Watch in 2006, organizational representatives signed a memorandum of understanding between the two organizations to document and agree upon the identity of UDP and expectations from the merger. It begins:

U'wa Defense Project (UDP) is a “child of the U'wa people.” The organization was founded by a call from the U'wa to Terence Freitas that resulted in the creation of UDP. It is central to the organization that the U'wa remain active partners in program strategy and related decision-making. (UDP-AW 2006)

UDP's identity was directly related to the U'wa people and further tied to them by the tragedy of losing Freitas in 1999. Several years later when US-based UDP advisors traveled with MU on a delegation to meet with the U'wa on their ancestral lands, Berito Cobarria spoke on the basis of his extensive experience working with to a large gathering of women and Cabildo members:

Where was UDP born? UDP was born here (on U'wa lands). It was born in El Chuscal first.⁸⁷ Next we had to go to California, Los Angeles, San Francisco,

⁸⁷ El Chuscal was the center of Catholic Missionary operations that now serves as the principal meeting space for U'wa decision-making assemblies for issues affecting the seventeen communities represented by ASOUWA.

to plant it. We also connected (*integramos*) New York and Washington....
From the United States we went to many capitals. (Cobaría 2010)

For the U'wa and for UDP, the relationship between the organization and the pueblo is a living one, akin to a familial relationship. The UDP identifies and is identified by U'wa leaders in a relational and intersubjective way. According to Cobaría, UDP was born on U'wa land and had to be planted in California and brought New York and Washington on board. On the first visit of an U'wa representative to the United States in 1997, Cobaría met Terence Freitas. In full dialogue with the U'wa traditional authorities, UDP developed its mission as a project to support the U'wa in their struggle for sovereignty. It carried out its mission within a larger network of environmental and indigenous rights activists. For example, it was the Amazon Alliance and Melina Selverston-Scher who had arranged the visit to the United States for Cobaría (Wirpsa 2004: 202).⁸⁸

The U'wa Defense Project shows how this accompaniment organization is simultaneously made up of particular individuals and all their networked relations. Terence Freitas spearheaded the formation of the U'wa Defense Project and the U'wa Defense Working Group, a coalition of activist organizations at the forefront of US based organizing against Occidental Petroleum. Between 1997 and 1999 Freitas was the principal communicator between U'wa leaders and US organizations traveling

⁸⁸ This was confirmed by Selverston-Scher on the University of California Campus on September 20, 2012, when Café Revolución was re-named the Terry Freitas Café in honor of his legacy and thanks to an endowment gifted by Freitas' grandmother to UCSC (Blumenthal 2012; White 2012). The Amazon Alliance was a large coalition of indigenous rights organizations and indigenous associations. This alliance in turn was a part of a larger network, Friends of the Earth Network, whose coordination was based in Ecuador.

five times to the territory (UDP 2005; Wirpsa 2004: 202). The strategies to fight Occidental and the Colombian state were developed in dialogue with U'wa leaders and traditional authorities. Rodriguez-Garavito and Arenas (2005: 254) and Wirpsa (2004: 202) cite the work of the organizations in the U'wa Defense Working Group as key to coordinating the US side of the campaign against Occidental Petroleum. These were legal and political strategies to defend their land, obtain collective titles to their lands and stop oil mining.

However, Freitas heard something else in the call for solidarity from the U'wa that has not received much attention: All of the external, oppositional organizing—i.e. against the Colombian government and transnational corporation—depended upon the internal strength of the community (UDP 2005). The internal strength of the community was limited and diminished by colonization in terms of health problems and disconnection from their land and spirituality. In dialogue about community needs, Freitas sought to distinguish UDP as an organization focused on community development in addition to legal support, advocacy, and research (UDP 2005), as inscribed within the UDP mission statement in 2001:

In full consultation with the U'wa Traditional Authorities, U'wa Defense Project (UDP) provides legal, community development, advocacy, and research support to the Colombian indigenous U'wa people as they strive for self-determination over their lives and culture through defense of their ancestral territory and environment, bringing their knowledge about ecological and people-centered development into the global debate (UDP Mission Statement).

This orientation differed from the rest of the U'wa Defense Working Group (UDWG) that was composed of campaign-based organizations (UDP 2005). The three main

organizations that led the organizing within the U'wa Defense Working Group were the Rainforest Action Network (RAN), Amazon Watch (AW), and Project Underground (Koenig 2005).⁸⁹ UDP distinguished itself as an *acompañante* organization by actively and consistently complementing campaign strategies with support for community development. Further they recognized most specifically the importance of consulting with U'wa Traditional Authorities and not just the Colombian government-recognized ASOUWA.

A key part of the strategy developed by UDP and U'wa leaders for community development was education (a strategy with a long history, see chapter 1 and 2). In 1999 UDP sought funding to begin a series of higher education scholarships to build capacity in emerging U'wa leaders (UDP 2005). With this sentiment Freitas facilitated a connection with indigenous leaders based in the United States from organizations that focused on ethnoeducation as a path towards sovereignty and autonomy (PCCI 1998; FEWF nd). At the State of the World Forum in late 1998, Washinawatok and Gay met Cobaria and Freitas. With an introduction and mediation by Freitas, Cobaria invited them to U'wa territory and within four months they went. The magazine *Indigenous Woman* published by the Indigenous Women's Network explained in an issue dedicated to Washinawatok, former co-chair of the network,

⁸⁹ Evidence that the UDP distinguished itself from these campaign-focused organizations can be found in the steep decline in activity for RAN, PU, and AW after the withdrawal of Occidental Petroleum. Amazon Watch, however, did maintain a relationship with U'wa leaders through participation in the UDP advisory committee (Koenig 2005) and later took on the UDP into its organizational structure.

Terry—who had acted as the central liaison between the Traditional U'wa Authority and the coalition known as the U'wa Defense Working Group in North America for nearly two years—was introducing the others to the U'wa for the purposes of a cultural preservation program based on models developed by the Pacific Cultural Conservancy International which Lahe directed. This was taking the solidarity campaign to another stage of exploring community-based development alternatives as a means to bolster the resistance to [Occidental Petroleum's] proposal to drill for oil. Ingrid, with years of indigenous rights work behind her, was there to share experience and insight as well connections to resources in North America. (For the Workbook: The Case of the U'wa vs OXY 1999)

Freitas facilitated a new intercultural partnership between U'wa leaders and North American Indigenous rights advocates. Going outside of the state, the U'wa were looking to partner with Washinawatok's and Gay's organizations to implement education systems that respected and cultivated their own worldview and spirituality. This effort to connect with other indigenous peoples demonstrates an intercultural strategy of decentering the state. This way of understanding interculturality is through inter-indigenous relationships (Schiwy 2009).

As noted in chapter 2, Washinawatok's other roles illustrate again the networks that intersect through people. She was not only the Executive Director of the Fund for the Four Directions, a philanthropic organization that funded ethno-education and health projects for indigenous peoples, she was also the Chair of NGO Committee for the Decade of Indigenous Peoples and heavily involved in efforts at the United Nations to codify rights for indigenous peoples into international law.⁹⁰

⁹⁰ Kearns (2009) writes “Among other accomplishments, Ingrid was a wife and mother, and the chair of the NGO Committee on the United Nations International

Gay, Founder of the Pacific Cultural Conservancy International (PCCI), was dedicated to long-term projects developed in collaboration with indigenous communities to resist physical and cultural extinction. Gay went to discuss plans for an ethnoeducation project based on a five-year project PCCI had embarked upon with Indigenous peoples in Panama.⁹¹ Washinawatok and Gay manifested through their lives' work a definition of sovereignty that resonated with the U'wa's own vision and understanding. While the physical lives of these three activists and advocates were cut short, their work continued through the organizations they began and the collectives they were part of.

In this case, Washinawatok and Gay utilized the structure of a foundation to support the practices that make up cultural sovereignty, namely health and education, services usually provided by state agencies. They all agreed that language and the preservation of cultural practices was a way to build sovereignty. These details signal

Decade of the World's Indigenous Peoples, delegate for the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, NGO representative in consultative status to the UN for the International Indian Treaty Council and a member of the Working Group on Indigenous Populations. Ingrid also served as the executive director of the Fund of the Four Directions, chair of Native Americans in Philanthropy, co-chair of the Indigenous Women's Network, and as a board member of the American Indian Community House, the Sister Fund, the National Network of Grantmakers, and was on the selection committee for the Letelier Moffit Human Rights Award." She was also a boardmember at the Seventh Generation for Indian Development, an Indigenous non-profit organization that provided a grant to Mujer U'wa for the year 2010 (Murillo 2011).

⁹¹ Amazon Watch holds early U'wa Defense Project archives that include Freitas' file on the work of the PCCI, Gay's organization. These included PCCI's mission and vision statement, a cornerstone document that identified PCCI's organizational vision through the voices of board and advisory board members, proposals, legal documents certifying crossborder contracts and collaborations and finally, a draft proposal to develop and implement a project with the U'wa similar to the work with Panamanian indigenous peoples.

the multiple networks that intersect with the U'wa struggle and which contribute to building sovereignty. Each of these organizations and networks also represent future possibilities. Through these crossborder networks that build campaigns against state and corporate targets or develop programs to strengthen communities and indigenous and marginalized peoples and others that share their values build their own sovereignty, challenge the Colombian states domestic, juridical and Westphalian dimensions of sovereignty.

The U'wa Defense Project and MU emerged from this political project. From 2004 to 2006, UDP supported the internal organizing processes of the U'wa including providing resources to support transportation and logistics for workshops that took place in each of the seventeen U'wa communities (UDP/ASOUWA 2005). In the United States the small organization, run by two staff and an advisory board, engaged in a strategic planning process with the goal of defining priorities, planning objectives, and exploring institutional arrangements for a sustainable and effective future (U'wa Defense Project 2005).

When UDP merged with Amazon Watch, the community development and women-centered aspect of the work spun off into a new organization, *Mujer U'wa: Iniciativa de Mujeres Defensoras de la Cultura*. Institutionally, the U'wa Defense Project has an identity rooted in Freitas' organizing networks. Freitas, though relatively young at the time, had experience working with multiple communities including Native American groups (Feingold 1999; UDP 2005). He participated in a network of organizations mobilized by the Amazon Alliance, another network of

indigenous rights groups, North and South, who were part of the Friends of the Earth Network, headquartered in Ecuador.⁹²

The formation of Mujer U'wa

In the United States, the solidarity work of fundraising and women's leadership development took the name of *Mujer U'wa: Iniciativa de Mujeres Defensoras de la Cultura* and continued the crossborder solidarity work of community building envisioned by Freitas, Gay, and Washinawatok. Where UDP was established to be a partnership with the Cabildo Mayor and framed as a familial relation, “*un hijo de los U'wa*,” Mujer U'wa (MU) attempted to hold the partnership within its infrastructure with leadership shared between two co-directors: seasoned U'wa organizer and teacher, Daris Cristancho and former UDP Executive Director, Ana Maria Murillo. The US side of MU is rooted in relationships built through Ana Maria Murillo, the former Executive Director of UDP (2001-2006), including relationships with family members and close colleagues of Washinawatok and Gay who continue to organize for indigenous sovereignty. Initially the crossborder project was formalized in the United States as a fiscally sponsored project of Moving Beyond Productions, a cultural arts organization based in San Francisco. In 2009 MU shifted

⁹² The Ecuadoran group *Acción Ecológica* was the first transborder activists to support the U'wa when representatives of this organization went to support the U'wa's *Foro por la Vida* in Cubará, Boyacá in 1996. This meeting was the beginning of a key relationship that facilitated the coalescing of a transnational social movement joining activists, organizations, political parties, and other concerned people across the United States, Europe, and Latin America.

institutional affiliation after Cristancho's visit to the United States⁹³ to the Peace Development Fund (PDF), a foundation aligned with the principles of interculturality in terms of building mutual respect and reciprocity with partners (Peace Development Fund n.d.). This new fiscal sponsor, PDF, is led by several of Washinawatok's close colleagues and her husband, Ali El-Issa.

MU thus drew upon some of the same networks that supported the U'wa and the UDP. While certainly aligned with the underlying principles of accompaniment, in particular a focus on the importance of long-term organizing processes, MU differentiated itself from UDP in its institutional organization. Instead of fulltime activists or its own institutionalized non-profit, MU in the United States depends upon the volunteer work of multiple politically-identified women of color who each bring different skills, resources, and networks to the work, eschewing the nonprofit model of establishing full-time positions or office space (Mujer U'wa 2010). MU also dispelled other myths about NGO cooperation. One young U'wa woman was surprised to find that after years of communicating with Nefertiti Altan, an activist with MU and lead trainer and educator for the Oakland-based School of Unity and Liberation, she was actually not blond and blue-eyed because she was from the United States (Mujer U'wa 2010). The story of each delegation participant opened the possibility to discuss multiple struggles. Collectively MU was composed of women

⁹³ The Ingrid Washinawatok El-Issa Flying Eagle Woman Fund for Peace, Justice, and Sovereignty—the organization established to continue and remember Washinawatok's legacy—invited Cristancho to the tenth annual celebration of Washinawatok's life to recognize her history of activism. This visit marked Cristancho's return to New York five years after her first visit with Washinawatok's community.

born from Central American (Guatemala, El Salvador), Colombian immigrant and indigenous parents (Nasa), or native to the US southwest (Diné). Collectively the women could sympathize with the roles colonization, the US government, and US corporations play in the political destinies of the countries and peoples of the Americas (Mujer U'wa 2010; Chico 2011).

The formation of MU illustrates the challenge in confronting the patriarchy learned through colonization (Lugones 2007), which manifested in the closing of political spaces and higher education scholarship opportunities for women.⁹⁴ The 2004 murder of a young U'wa health promoter, Yamilé Esther García Uncasia, by a Marxist guerrilla group (ELN, Ejército Nacional de Liberación), sparked an outcry that called attention to the role of women in U'wa political processes and the particular threats women face by virtue of their gender (ASOUWA 2004).

With the blessing of the traditional authorities, UDP began a women's program to develop leadership skills and to address other community needs related to nutrition and clothing (Mujer U'wa 2010). At this time, UDP's liaison, confirmed by the U'wa and the Cabildo Mayor, was Daris Cristancho, an U'wa teacher fluent in two U'wa dialects and Spanish and a key organizer of the street mobilizations against Occidental Petroleum in 2000 (Cristancho 2010). She began her activism twenty years earlier within the process of tribal council formations that took place in the 1980s (Cristancho 2010). As a teacher who taught at various educational centers

⁹⁴ One U'wa woman interviewed explained that the small amount of funds that *cabildo menores* have for higher education like law or medicine, is virtually never spent on girls. The fear is that an U'wa woman would be impregnated by a non-U'wa, which would result in an extinction of the U'wa (Alba 2010).

serving U'wa children, she was experienced the living conditions facing various U'wa communities. She further experienced other indigenous struggles and women's organizing through the national indigenous organization, la *Organizacion Nacional Indigena de Colombia* (ONIC) and later through the U.N. Permanent Forum.⁹⁵ However, when a new slate of leaders were voted into ASOUWA in 2006, priorities changed and program plans were renegotiated between ASOUWA and UDP. Despite the need for what UDP calls community development projects (health, food sovereignty, clothing) and the active participation of women in them, the new ASOUWA administration chose to cut the women's program. According to U'wa teacher, Dora, women are always being pushed out of larger organizing processes (Dora 2010). Further evidence of this is the lack of women leaders in public political spaces.

Before this however, as UDP changed institutional homes, shifted and integrated new personnel, as mentioned above, the U'wa also had a change in leadership of ASOUWA with the 2006 elections.⁹⁶ Berito Cobaría was voted out as was any interest in programs beyond legal and campaign strategies. UDP's mandate,

⁹⁵ She was also one of the last people to see Freitas, Washinawatok, and Gay in her role as a host to their delegation in 1999. When the UN Permanent Forum announced Indigenous Women as its theme for that year's meetings, the momentum and relationships already established led to an invitation for Daris Cristancho to attend and participate in the yearly memorial established for Washinawatok by her husband, Ali El Issa, and Washinawatok's colleagues from the Forum. This invitation facilitated the speaking tour organized around her visit and provided a space for Ana Maria Murillo and Daris Cristancho to bridge the collective wound caused by the tragic killing of Washinawatok. During this visit, the first of an U'wa woman to the US, Cristancho met and spent time with Gay and Washinawatok's spouses as well as Freitas' mother (Cristancho 2004; U'wa Defense Project 2004).

⁹⁶ Elections for the seats on the Cabildo Mayor come up every four years.

which did not change with the transition to AW, remained tied to supporting the strategic vision of the U'wa government. Thus, the women's program, no longer a priority, left the tribal government's and UDP's agendas. The women, however, had just received a seed grant from the San Francisco-based international foundation, the Global Fund for Women, and were not willing to let go of the organizing that had been taking place. Instead, the work spun off under a different name. Key U'wa women organizers in Colombia emerged from historical organizing processes related to health and education (Profe 2010, Dora 2010, Cristancho 2010). The exposure to community problems by virtue of teaching in multiple locations led many women to devise collective efforts to confront community-wide problems. Historical practices called "*convites*" were remembered and replicated through the food security project where women collectively plant and harvest, many times alongside U'wa schoolchildren and U'wa *casas de saber* (Mari 2010; Profe 2010). Cristancho and other women leaders, principally U'wa teachers, mothers and students, identified projects to be undertaken. These included a sewing cooperative (funded by the Global Fund for Women), a planting cooperative for food security, leadership development workshops, and a pharmacy with special attention to the needs of women and children (Mujer U'wa 2010). Money raised through small grants and grassroots fundraising strategies supported the development of leaders to participate in all aspects of tribal political life, not just internally but externally as well (Murillo 2010, Mujer U'wa 2010). While efforts such as a sewing cooperative may hardly seem decolonial, it provided a space for women to gather and discuss common concerns to overcome

alienation and to provide a political space for women. It further provided much needed clothing for children and for the women themselves. These small daily acts of building self-sufficiency in collaboration with others, *acompañadas*, are a key aspect of intercultural sovereignty. The accompaniment from the US-side of *Mujer U'wa* is precisely a walking beside, engaging in dialogue and respecting the locus of enunciation of the U'wa women.

Practices of acompañamiento

The intercultural strategy of acompañamiento provides the long-term relationship building that allows for humanitarian diplomacy (Minear and Smith 2007). Delegations and speaking tours are two practices engaged by accompaniment and solidarity organizations to build relationships across borders. Speaking tours refer to a visit to the United States by an indigenous leader with an agenda to publicize their situation, meet potential allies, and strategize on collaborative actions. Solidarity networks across the Americas use delegations to develop relations across differences. Delegations are organized groups of people who travel to a particular place and whose interaction implies an articulation of multiple networks with specific purposes.⁹⁷ Participants are potential or current activists situated within organized or organizing collectivities.

⁹⁷ Witness for Peace (WFP) is a key example of an accompaniment organization that has used delegations as an organizing tool. Within the community of organizations that works for human rights in Colombia through US policy activism, WFP is likely responsible for organizing the most delegations in Colombia for US activists since Congress passed Plan Colombia in 2000.⁹⁷ Witness for Peace claims to have taken over 10,000 people from the US on “short term transformative delegations” to Latin

In 2010 a delegation followed the path set forth by Freitas, Washinawatok and Gay, when MU activists collaborated with the tribal council to plan the first visit of US-based solidarity activists since 1999.⁹⁸ This effort to organize a delegation of the US-based members of MU to the U'wa *resguardo* joined forces with an organizing process that was already underway (ASOUWA 2010). In a letter sent to the 17 *Cabildo Menores*, the President of ASOUWA invited five women from each community to a meeting: “The objective of the meeting is to coordinate with women and transnational NGOs for the future creation of U'wa women's committees” (ASOUWA 2010).⁹⁹ U'wa women organizers eager to use public political spaces to build and include women's participation invited their US-based counterparts—the solidarity activists that made up the US side of the Mujer U'wa collective—to create a space of dialogue, share stories and meet each other (Cristancho 2010; Murillo 2010). The tribal government voted into office at the end of 2009 included within its action plan and mandate for the 2010-2014 period the development of a committee structure that would formalize women's organizing processes as part of a larger mission and vision to defend U'wa land and life, “la parte territorial y la parte

America and the Caribbean. These delegations document “the human costs of unfair trade and military policy” and learn about “grassroots organizing, policy advocacy, international peacemaking, conflict mediation and group process, cross-cultural sensitivity (and) diplomacy” (Witness for Peace 2010).

⁹⁸ Murillo, as the key representative of UDP from 2001-2006 traveled to Colombia up to twice a year to meet in the capital city of Bogotá with U'wa leaders and U'wa scholarship recipients to evaluate past activities and consider future planning. Only once during that time did she travel into the U'wa *resguardo* to participate in a large community *asamblea*, tracing some of Freitas, Washinawatok and Gay's steps (Murillo 2005).

⁹⁹ “El objetivo de la reunión es coordinar con mujeres y ONG transnacionales para la future creación del comité de mujeres U'WAS.”

cultural” (Cobaría 2010). The delegation of 2010 was conceived in support of this process. ASOUWA issued an invitation to each of the 17 community *cabildos* asking for five women representatives to travel to Cubará to move forward on the process of developing women’s committees and to connect to the visiting activists from the US side of MU (ASOUWA 2010). By visiting the US embassy in Colombia in advance of travel to the region and meeting with the Mayor of Cubará on the border of the *Resguardo Unido U’wa* before leaving, delegation members engaged in the more traditional practices of protective accompaniment (Brock 2007). And by holding the new ASOUWA administration to the “action plan” described by President Gilberto Cobaría during a visit to the United States—which included a proposal for the creation of Women’s Committees in each of the communities—MU activists strategized ways to counter the de-prioritization of women’s issues from the previous administration.¹⁰⁰

The delegation resulted from earlier organizing and built upon a series of relationships initiated by the three assassinated activists and explicitly remembered their legacies during the visit. First, the literal retracing of their steps required a security analysis to avoid the same fate of their predecessors. This involved leaning on UDP at Amazon Watch’s expertise to develop communication and action plans in

¹⁰⁰ Adiel Bohorquez, a human rights lawyer and long-term *acompañante* of the U’wa struggle recounted how people active in networks on indigenous and human rights in Colombia would half-jokingly question the existence of U’wa women given that U’wa men were the only U’wa representatives that travelled to the majority of national indigenous gatherings (Bohorquez 2010).

case of emergencies (Mujer U'wa 2010).¹⁰¹ In addition to providing the delegation a GPS locator that could communicate exact location and establishing a security protocol, Amazon Watch encouraged the aforementioned meeting with the US Embassy in Colombia to raise awareness of US citizen travel to the region and to demonstrate to US officials that the U'wa continue to be accompanied by US based NGOs.

Second, while the 2010 delegation participants were differently situated than Gay and Washinawatok, the vision with which the two delegations approached the work was the same. Where Washinawatok and Gay were the heads of a foundation and a nongovernmental organization respectively, positions achieved through a lifetime of grassroots work, the delegation of US-based women were grassroots activists themselves on related issues and were committed to using their relative positions of privilege to raise funds for projects that impacted the daily lives of the U'wa women. Delegation members included the lead organizer from the School of Unity and Liberation, a photojournalist active in San Francisco-based immigrant and community organizations, human rights activists experienced in fundraising, Latin American solidarity and human rights efforts, a Colombian lawyer and long-time U'wa *acompañante*. One delegate explained the attempt to exchange information:

We talked about indigenous communities in the US, they told us what their *cultura* meant to them. We discussed our experiences organizing around health rights, and discussed their health conditions today and

¹⁰¹ Amazon Watch works with and accompanies indigenous communities in Peru and Ecuador which requires travel to remote areas under dispute for control. In partnership with Mujer U'wa, they brought their experience and communication tools to bear on this delegation .

they showed us the pharmacy they have struggled to build to provide Western and traditional medicines to U'was who wouldn't be able to afford the local pharmacies' inflated prices. We talked about human rights and women's rights and they voted on how to proceed with the implementation of an action plan that had brought the current political leadership into office (the women's committees)" (Mujer U'wa 2010).

The *acompañamiento* of U'wa and US-based indigenous and Latina women opened the space to exchange experiences and build mutual understanding. This intercultural exchange contributes towards the building of sovereignty by finding alternative support to carry out their own organizing processes.

Conclusion: *Acompañamiento* from the past to the future

Crossborder efforts initiated in 1997—and nearly crushed by the unexpected and tragic deaths of international activists Freitas, Washinawatok and Gay in 1999—continued in the community building and leadership development activities of UDP. The shape of organizing structures served to respond to the needs of the particular struggle, instead of fitting aspects of the struggle into short-term NGO campaigns. In this case, MU emerged to support the internal needs of the community and UDP merged into Amazon Watch to access a different set of organizing skills. While both are important, the more visible campaign wins can render invisible the organizing processes necessary to implement successful campaigns and build sovereignty over the long term.

There are multiple layers of *acompañamiento* that need to be acknowledged. The three US based activists left multiple networks behind which the U'wa can still approach. This is a manifestation of the spiritual accompaniment that continues after

their deaths. Grounding this chapter in an exploration of *acompañamiento* as success brings into focus the stakes in organizing across different kinds of borders for marginalized communities like the U'wa. Beyond the success of the campaign against Occidental Petroleum, the U'wa struggle is successful because a significant portion of the U'wa people continue to practice their ancestral ways within a context of war, colonization and a capitalist economy dependent upon natural resources.

The relationships among ASOUWA, UDP, and MU rely upon coalition-building and collaboration and show how *acompañamiento* is based on working across/through differences in search of complementarity. Relationships between people are essential components to understanding social movements. We extend ourselves across differences by building on our connections and working through the rest. The concept of *acompañamiento* recognizes the time inherent in building and maintaining relationships towards a political project of sovereignty over land.¹⁰² It is premised on an exchange of resources between and among peoples whose different histories are precisely what make the exchanges rich. In sum, results relative to targeted policies or behavior are an important indicator of success, but crossborder relationships should also be considered; they point to possible alternative futures and require in-depth contextualization.

¹⁰²Cherrie Moraga (1988) calls this bridge work. In the introduction to *Esta Puente, Mi Espalda*, Moraga explains Gloria Anzaldúa's perspective on the border between the United States and Latin America as "*una herida abierta*" or an open wound: "When we extend ourselves like a bridge between our differences, this idea maintains the promise to heal the wounds caused by centuries of separation" ("*Cuando nos extendemos como puente entre las diferencias nuestras, esta expresión mantiene la promesa de aliviar las heridas causadas por los siglos de nuestra separación,*" Moraga 1988: 6).

Shortly after Freitas, Washinawatok, and Gay's bodies were found in Venezuela, Freitas' mother, Julie Freitas, wrote "I have learned from the U'wa elders that my son Terence sent his spirit to them in a dream this week. In this dream, Terence gave the elders a snail shell, which to the U'wa symbolizes peace and problem solving" (March 1999, quoted in Wirpsa 2004: 208 and Soltani and Murillo 2009: 1). The U'wa have explained that not only did they call Terence Freitas, founder of the UDP, to work with them but that he, Washinawatok, and Gay continue to support them from the spirit world after losing their lives on ancestral lands. In a 2009 publication to remember Terence Freitas on the tenth anniversary of their tragic deaths, the U'wa women's group explained: "their spirits still live in our sacred lands and live in the hearts of each and every one of us" (Soltani and Murillo 2009: 5; Kearns 2009). The Cabildo Mayor affirmed "Their shadows still walk with us, accompanying us along the path of resistance" (Kearns 2009).¹⁰³

¹⁰³ These letters marking the tenth anniversary of the loss of Freitas, Washinawatok, and Gay were published in *Indian Country Today*, now known as *This Week from Indian Country Today Media Network*.

Conclusions

The U'wa have fought against oil development since the early 1990s but their struggle for land rights goes back much further. Since colonial times the U'wa have addressed governing authorities to argue for their rights to land (Falchetti 2003). On October 12th 2006, 500 U'wa people from the *Resguardo Unido U'wa* met with government representatives to reject a consultation process in relation to oil exploration and exploitation on their ancestral lands. The U'wa lawyer, Ebaristo Tegria, presented a set of documents that justified their objection to oil drilling on their land, giving legal justifications based on colonial-era land titles and Colombian national laws. The U'wa refused to engage the consultation process, or *consulta previa*, because, in their view, the government had no right to the subsoil in the first place. One piece of evidence they highlighted was an 1802 title from Spain recognizing their *resguardo* 8 years before Colombia would become independent. In brief, the U'wa claimed sovereignty over the land and subsoil to reject the Colombian state's desire to exploit petroleum for profit. This raises an interesting paradox: how can an indigenous pueblo call for sovereignty from within the jurisdiction of a state?

Before I draw some conclusions from my research to answer this question, I briefly discuss my relationship to the U'wa through U.S. based organizations, which strongly orients my research efforts. Next, I will discuss the dominant International Relations approach to sovereignty. Finally, I'll return to the question of sovereignty through the lens of decoloniality. I argue that intercultural sovereignty, a concept that builds on indigenous conceptualizations of sovereignty, helps make visible how

marginalized and colonized peoples move beyond the traditional notion of sovereignty to build self-determination. My research finds that the U'wa build intercultural sovereignty through their relationships of collaboration with outsiders, through the mobilization and redefinition of an international discourse of rights and in cross-border social movement partnerships.

In Colombia indigenous pueblos hold collective titles over a quarter of the country, primarily, of course in rural resource-rich areas. In 2009 the Colombian Constitutional Court ruled that 34 of 87 indigenous pueblos were under threat of extinction due to displacement and the armed conflict. The U'wa was one of those. In 2010, the ONIC, the National Indigenous Organization of Colombia, the principle organization that represents and organizes on behalf of the indigenous peoples of Colombia, launched an anti-extinction campaign. While the ONIC argues that all 102 indigenous pueblos are under threat of extinction for reasons beyond the armed conflict, this campaign warns that 32 *pueblos* are at risk of extinction because their populations number less than 500. These two lists from the Constitutional Court and the ONIC only overlap in terms of 2 pueblos. That makes 64 of 102 pueblos that are under threat of extinction.

But that is not how I learned about the U'wa. I was introduced to the U'wa struggle in 1999 when I attended a demonstration in San Francisco in front of the Colombian Consulate targeting both the Colombian state and Occidental Petroleum, a Los Angeles-based company that sought to exploit the oil reserves located under U'wa ancestral lands. A year later in 2000 I was invited to join the coalition, the

U'wa Defense Working Group, that put on that demonstration, because I was heading up a human rights program at a San Francisco-based organization that focused on U.S. policy with Colombia. Little did I know how long this relationship would last. In fact, I had no intention of doing my research on the U'wa until it became apparent that what I had learned through my activism was not something I could find in the literature on social movements, on sovereignty or human rights. And I also began to see examples of how I could approach the process as an activist scholar such that the process of research could potentially be useful for the U'wa and for discussion with others in related transnational networks.

What, then, can we learn from this resistance—its persistence, its forms and methods, and its successes and failures? Within the context of Colombia where according to the Constitutional Court the U'wa face extinction—how does an indigenous pueblo build sovereignty within the jurisdiction of a modern nation-state? Beyond that, what are the stakes of indigenous sovereignty to global arrangements of power and resource distribution?

Through this line of questioning I aim to examine how social forces create political change. To do this I develop a decolonial lens. That is, if coloniality refers to the structures of power that remain after the official systems of colonial rule gave way to independent nation-states, decoloniality suggests a shift in logic, from Eurocentric to one situated in the knowledge and experiences of those continually marginalized by the logics of coloniality. Interculturality as a decolonial option emerged in twentieth century Latin America as both practice and discourse, manifesting in the

decolonial social movements of indigenous and black peoples that demanded respect for their culture and lives and in policy discourses in relation to ethnoeducation in the 1980s (Walsh 2000, Castillo Guzman and Caicedo Ortiz 2008).

By interculturality I mean the negotiation of different cultural logics in the process of decolonization and building sovereignty. Interculturality proposes a mutual respect across difference without hierarchies. As a generative concept, interculturality is used in three key ways for this research project. First it refers to the deployment of dominant concepts by marginalized people. Second, it explains the U'wa's use of sustained dialogue to establish non-hierarchical relationships. Finally, this project enacts an intercultural approach. By this I mean that rather than approach research with the U'wa as a one-way process of extracting information for the sake of knowledge, I directly asked the U'wa leadership how this project could be mutually beneficial to them so that I could center their needs in all aspects of my research and writing.

Interculturality also draws attention to this dissertation's methodological contribution. My research questions emerged from my interaction over several years with transnational networks in support of the U'wa, indigenous rights more broadly and human rights in Colombia. My shift from activist to activist scholar challenged me to devise a research plan open enough to negotiate research objectives with U'wa counterparts and focused enough to contribute to academic debates. This research thus embodies a dialogue where the dissertation is one part of the process. The

process continues as I make my analysis available to U'wa leaders and teachers for feedback and insight.

Grounded in the transnational network in support of the U'wa, this research contributes to academic *and* activist debates by adopting a decolonial approach, which makes visible how marginalized people move beyond the traditional notion of sovereignty to build self-determination. Rather than engage an internal critique of sovereignty—internal to Eurocentric modernity—I argue that it would be productive for Political Science to engage with indigenous concepts of sovereignty to address the history and consequences of colonialism and recognize deep relations to land

To date most Political Science studies of indigenous peoples movements focus on struggles for citizenship rights (Yashar 2005), human rights (Brysk 2000), constitutional rights (Van Cott 2000), and their relationship to democracy and democratization (Van Cott 1994). These studies highlight questions of autonomy and citizenship but take for granted the stability of state sovereignty, even if weakened in some sense. While dominant debates on sovereignty question how globalization and human rights impact the nature of state sovereignty, they nonetheless still center the state and frequently refuse to engage or recognize indigenous peoples as sovereign (Jackson 1990; Krasner 2001).

Sovereignty from this perspective derives from modern, European ideas: sovereignty recognizes the supreme authority of the state over a territorial jurisdiction. This includes the right to non-intervention by other states (Westphalian sovereignty), the authority to protect and organize the population (domestic

sovereignty), and the legal right of recognition at the international level (i.e. among other states). This dominant approach to sovereignty not only favors the model of the historical development of the European nation-state but it also leaves no space for collectivities that are non-state formations, like indigenous peoples. The traditional definition of sovereignty—which is embodied in state governments like Colombia’s and the United States—leaves little room for a discussion of sovereignty for indigenous peoples.

By analyzing sovereignty through the concept of interculturality, I take a decolonial approach that privileges the perspective of the marginalized. This simultaneously critiques monological, Eurocentric knowledges and provides an alternative logic by illuminating the on-going processes of resistance deployed by the U’wa and other indigenous peoples. Through this unique theoretical lens it becomes clear, as I stated earlier, that the U’wa build intercultural sovereignty through their relationships of collaboration with outsiders, through the mobilization and redefinition of an international discourse of rights and in cross-border social movement partnerships. Therefore, my dissertation develops the following key theoretical contributions, intercultural sovereignty, human rights, and *acompañamiento* in order to make this critical intervention.

Intercultural sovereignty.

The U’wa’s notion of intercultural sovereignty takes into account interdependence with the earth and of her creation, including the *Riowá*, or outsiders. They do not seek to withdraw or secede from the state; instead they seek reciprocal

respect for their own history, *cosmovision*, and decision-making processes in response to their recognition of the Colombian state's sovereignty. Theirs is not an exclusive sovereignty that seeks to separate but instead recognizes interconnections.

Approaching the concept of sovereignty through decoloniality thus highlights indigenous conceptualizations of sovereignty, the central premise of which is universal kinship, which recognizes relationships across space, time, and species (Barsh 1986). Interculturality signals these interconnections and aligns with other indigenous concepts such as the Quichua *sumak kawsay*, Aymara *suma kamaña* (Mignolo 2011: 306-307) or Seven Generations, “a precept of the Great Law of Peace of the Haudenosaunee (Six Nations Iroquois Confederacy) which mandates that chiefs consider the impact of their decisions on the seventh generation yet to come” (Seventh Generation Fund for Indigenous development 2012). As Ingrid Washinawatok explained, “While sovereignty is alive and invested in the reality of every living thing for Native folks, Europeans relegated sovereignty to only one realm of life and existence: authority, supremacy and dominion. In the Indigenous realm, sovereignty encompasses responsibility, reciprocity, the land, life and much more.”

Human rights

U'wa leaders contribute to and participate in larger international indigenous rights discourses through the practice and theory of education. Their educational curriculum shows a process of building sovereignty through the daily practices of education, which, for the U'wa are not limited to the classroom. Through their

educational curriculum, the U'wa emphasize their relationships to the earth. For example, the name of their ethnoeducational project states their role as earth's stewards quite succinctly: "*Kajkrasa Ruyina: Guardianes de la Madre Tierra—El Planeta Azul/Guardians of Mother Earth—the Blue Planet*" (ASOUWA 2007).

For the U'wa and other indigenous peoples education is fundamental to building their own sovereignty by designing appropriate systems of knowledge production that can produce their own visions of the future by teaching their own histories and relations. They have fought for these rights at multiple levels through and against state sovereignty, using the Colombian legal system and seeking support for their vision inside and outside of Colombian borders. By drawing on the international system of human rights, the U'wa challenge the Colombian state's juridical sovereignty as they demand and enact their own.

Acompañamiento and success in transnational networks

Through intercultural collaborations between U'wa leaders and cross-border allies the U'wa challenge the Colombian state's Westphalian sovereignty by inviting outside actors to intervene and support their struggles within the domestic jurisdiction of Colombia. *Acompañamiento* signals intercultural relationships that offer legitimacy and recognition to the U'wa that effectively decenter the state by focusing on the U'wa's own history. The concept further embodies the indigenous notion of universal kinship that recognizes relations across time, space, and species by learning from history in the process of planning for the future.

These strategies mirror the three aspects of the dominant notion of sovereignty. By engaging in intercultural relationships with organizations and allies across borders, the U'wa challenge Colombia's Westphalian sovereignty, which calls for nonintervention by foreign states. Relations of acompañamiento might provide material resources, but more importantly they provide political resources and legitimacy over time. The U'wa challenged Colombian domestic sovereignty by organizing in Cabildos and securing land titles to 14 percent of their ancestral lands. Under these governance structures, the Cabildo and U'wa educators demanded the withdrawal of the Church from the education of their children and developed their own intercultural curriculum with support from the Ministry of Education. Finally, U'wa strategies challenge Colombia's juridical sovereignty by connecting to and participating in an evolving international system of human rights to challenge the states actions within the larger society of states.

In sum, the U'wa's relational notion of intercultural sovereignty depends not on the force of arms but the force of their own history in relation to dominant society and international discourses of rights. Governments in the Andean region as well as some in Central America, are recognizing the concept of interculturality, even if its implementation is difficult. The recognition of intercultural sovereignty requires a transformation in the relationship between indigenous peoples and states; from one laden with asymmetrical power relations to relations of mutual respect. The U'wa's response to the challenges they have faced helps to shift the terms of the debate on sovereignty and provides an example to discuss and learn from for indigenous and

other marginalized peoples worldwide. Learning from the dynamic movements for indigenous rights across the globe and the alternatives to destructive modes of economic development they offer only becomes more important as we continue to experience the effects of global warming and climate change because we have ignored our responsibility to Mother Earth for too long.

In the near future, I hope to produce a few different iterations of this research to directly engage the different conversations and relationships that enriched this research project. I will translate the dissertation to Spanish so that I can share it with U'wa leaders, teachers and Colombian allies for feedback and discussion and produce a report in English for the U'wa Defense Project at Amazon Watch and Mujer U'wa. I am also excited to share this work with the family members of Ingrid Washinawatok El-Issa, Lahe'ena'e Gay and Terence Freitas who have illuminated my path of transnational activism. A second project will undertake a comparative study of *acompañamiento*/transnational partnerships with churches and other organizations in the U.S. with *campesino*, Afro-Colombian, church and other indigenous pueblos. My third project on the horizon comes out of my participation in the Colombia Region Research Cluster, which recently organized a roundtable at the Latin American Studies Association titled Diasporic Conversations in Academia and Activism. We look forward to publishing an anthology to continue the conversation.

Appendix: List of Acronyms

ASOUWA U'wa Association of Traditional Authorities and Tribal Councils
AW Amazon Watch
FOR Fellowship of Reconciliation
IR International Relations
M/C modernity/coloniality
MU Mujer U'wa
NGOs non-governmental organization
OAS Organization of American States'
ONIC Organización Nacional Indígena de Colombia
PBI Peace Brigades International
PCCI Pacific Cultural Conservancy Institute
PDF Peace Development Fund
SIL Summer Institute of Linguistics
SJA San José de Apartadó
TANs transnational advocacy networks
UDHR Universal Declaration on Human Rights
UDP U'wa Defense Project
UNDRIP United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples
WBT Wycliffe Bible Translators
WGIP Working Group on Indigenous Populations

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Interviews

* denotes pseudonym

Alba*. 2010. Interview. Cubará, Colombia, August 10.

Arias, Luis Fernando. 2010. Entrevista con Luis Fernando Arias, Secretario General de la Organización Nacional Indígena de Colombia. Edited by L. F. Lopez: Radio Nderland Internacional.

Avirama, Jesus. 2010. Interview. New York, January 17.

Benthall, Jonfaathan. 1982. The Summer Institute of Linguistics: Interview with William R. Merrifield. *RAIN: Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland* (53):1-5.

Berichá. 2010. Interview. Cubará, Colombia, June 7.

Bohorquez, Adiola Patricia. 2010. Interview. Bogotá, Colombia, July 21.

———. 2010. Interview. Cubará, Colombia, August 11.

Chico, Camille. 2011. Interview. Berkeley, July 11.

Cobaría, Roberto “Berito” Afanador. 2010. Interview. Washington, DC, April 10.

———. 2010. Interview. Berkeley, CA, September 24.

Cristancho, Daris. 2004. Interview by Tara Carr, US Office on Colombia. Washington, DC, May 13.

———. 2004. Long Beach, May 18.

———. 2004. *Liquid Gold*. Long Beach: http://diversity-radio.net/reasonswhy/Liquid_Gold__Oil-.

———. 2005. Pueblo U’wa and U’wa Defense Project. In *Partnering for Peace*. Chicago, IL: Fellowship of Reconciliation and Groundswell Productions.

———. 2009. Interview. New York, NY, May 9.

———. 2010. Interview. Cubará, Colombia, June 7.

Dora*. 2010. Interview. Laguna, Colombia, June 6.

El Issa, Ali. 2007. *Real Faces: Ali El-Issa*.
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_wadbdd9KbY.

El Issa, Ali. 2010. Interview. New York, NY, February 25.

Espinell, Cristina. 2010. Interview. Washington, DC, January 24.

- Ewen, Alex. 2010. Interview. New York, NY, February 25.
- Falchetti, Ana Maria. 2010. Interview. Bogotá, August 9.
- James, Carwil. 2009. Interview. Berkeley, September 30.
- Koenig, Kevin. 2005. Interview. San Francisco, July 16.
- Lina*. 2010. Interview. Fátima, Colombia, June 7.
- Lindsay-Poland, John. 2012. Personal communication. Oakland, January 16.
- Mari*. 2010. Interview. Fátima, Colombia, June 6.
- Martin, Elizabeth. 2010. Interview. New York, February 22.
- Murillo, Ana Maria. 2009. Interview. New York, NY, September 30.
- . 2010. Interview. Berkeley, September 30.
- . 2011. Interview. Berkeley, March 3.
- Reinsborough, Patrick. 2009. Interview. San Francisco, September 30.
- Vélez Upegui, Clara Cecilia. 2010. Interview. Medellín, Colombia, August 2.
- Wagner, Martin. 2010. Personal Communication. Santa Cruz, CA, September 22.
- Washinawatok, Ingrid. 1993. Interview by Mab Segrest.
- Williams, Agnes. 1999. An Interview with Ingrid: Health Solutions for Sustainable Communities Gathering 1997. *Indigenous Woman*. Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada: Indigenous Women's Network.

Other Primary Documents

- 3 Kidnapped U.S. Activists Found Dead; Colombian Rebels Blamed. 1999. *Chicago Tribune*, March 6.
- Acosta, Alberto. 2010. Hacia la Declaración Universal de los Derechos de la Naturaleza. *America Latina en Movimiento*, <http://alainet.org/active/37414>.
- Aguablanca, Esperanza (Berichá). 1992. Tengo Los Pies en la Cabeza. *Publicación digital en la página web de la Biblioteca Luis Ángel Arango del Banco de la República*.
- Aguablanca, Esperanza (Berichá), and María Eugenia Romero Moreno. 2000. U'WA (TUNEBO). *Geografía humana de Colombia región de la Orinoquía* 2 (3).
- Altan, Nefertiti. 2010. *Review Day 2*. Fatima. Video clip.
- Alvarez, Sandra. 2010. Transcript La Laguna Meeting with U'wa women and ASOUWA. Resguardo Unido U'wa, Colombia.
- Arends, Tulio. 1961. Absence of Abnormal Hæmoglobins in Colombian Tunebo Indians. *Nature* 190:93-94.

- Arias Valencia, Maria Mercedes. 2008. Calendario reproductivo en mujeres indígenas U'wa (Tunebo) de Boyacá, Colombia. In *XVI Encontro Nacional de Estudos Populacionais, ABEP*. Caxambú—MG—Brasil.
- Artunduaga, Luis Alberto. 1997. La etnoeducacion: una dimension de trabajo para la educacion en comunidades indigenas de Colombia. *Revista Iberoamericana de Educación* 13:35-45.
- ASCOIN. 1976. Katxa-ta. Bogotá: ASCOIN—Asociación Colombiana Indigenista.
- ASOUWA, Asociacion De Autoridades Tradicionales y Cabildos U'wa. 2002. Statement to the National and International Public on the Withdrawal of Oxy from U'wa Sacred Territory Kera Chikara. Save Our Earth.
- . 2004. Comunicado: La Guerrilla del ELN Asesina Mujer Indigena U'wa. Cubará.
- . 2006. Fundamentos históricos, constitucionales, legales, económicos, sociales, ambientales y culturales de la Asociación U'wa para objetar los argumentos del gobierno nacional frente al proyecto de exploración y explotación petrolera en territorio U'wa, y solicitar su cancelación definitiva: No a la consulta previa. Cubará, Boyacá: ASOUWA.
- . 2007. Proyecto Etnoeducativo Del Pueblo Indigena U'wa Del Resguardo Unido, *Kajkrasa Ruyina: Guardianes de la Madre Tierra el Planeta Azul*. Republica de Colombia: Ministerio de Educacion Nacional
- . 2009. Reunión Vereda Cedeño, territorio ancestral U'wa: Documento entregado por la ASOUWA a las fuerzas militares que operan en la zona y la empresa estatal de petróleos ECOPETROL. Cubará.
- . 2010. Invitation to Cabildos. Cubará, 2 August.
- Blumenthal, Chancellor. 2012. Remembering Terry. In *Chancellor Blumenthal*. Santa Cruz, CA.
- Centro de Produccion de Television. 1997. *U'wa: El pueblo de Sira*. Colombia: Universidad Autonoma de Bucaramanga.
- Cepeda Espinosa, Magistrado Manuel José 2009. AUTO N° 004 de 2009. Edited by C. C. S. S. d. Revisión. Bogotá, DC: República de Colombia.
- Chaves, A. 1964. *Reseña etnográfica de los Cobarías*. Vol. 3. Pamplona, Colombia: Casa Colonial.
- . 2005. Pueblo U'wa and U'wa Defense Project. In *Partnering for Peace*. Chicago, IL: Fellowship of Reconciliation and Groundswell Productions.
- Cobaría, Buswara, Paul Headland, and Edna Headland. 1976. Texto tunebo: La historia de Utacayá. In *Folclor indígena de Colombia Tomo 2*. Bogotá: Ministerio de Gobierno and Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.

- Cobaria, Gilberto. 2010. Presentation on Education at the Flying Eagle Woman Fund. New York, April 6.
- . 2010. Presentation to NGO allies at Washington Office on Latin America. Washington, D.C., April 8.
- . 2010. ASOUWA and Mujer U'wa Meeting Transcripts. Cubará, Colombia, Aug 12.
- Cobaría, Roberto Afanador "Berito". 1997. Message from the U'wa People to the World. Letter from the U'wa to Colombian Citizens. Guaduas, Colombia: National Forum on the Environment.
- . 2010. Meeting Transcripts, at La Laguna, *Resguardo Unido*, Colombia, June 6.
- Congreso de Colombia. 1890. Ley 089 de 1890. Bogotá, Colombia.
- Cristancho, Daris. 2004. Address at Ingrid Washinawatok El-Issa Memorial. New York, NY, May 18.
- DANE. 2005. La visibilización estadística de los grupos étnicos colombianos. Bogota: Departamento Administrativo Nacional de Estadística.
- Davies, Dorothy. 1999. Ingrid at Home. *Indigenous Woman*, 11-12.
- Dittrick, Paula. 2002. A Reporter's Grain of Salt. *Oil & Gas Journal*: 17.
- DNP, Departamento Nacional de Planeación. 2010. Aspectos básicos grupo étnico indígenas. Bogotá: Departamento Nacional de Planeación—Dirección de Desarrollo Territorial Sostenible—Subdirección de Ordenamiento y Desarrollo Territorial.
- Duenas-Barajas, E. 1993. Human Retroviruses in Amerindians of Colombia: High Prevalence of Human T Cell Lymphotropic Virus Type II Infection Among the Tunebo Indians. *The American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene* 49 (6): 657-63.
- Editors. 2008. "Federal Indictment Welcome on Murders of Ingrid and Companions," indiancountrytoday.com, [accessed July 8 2009, no longer available but still cited on indiancountrytodaymedianetwork.com].
- Gore Urged to Divest of Oil Stock. 2000. indiancountrytoday.com, July 12 [cited July 8 2009].
- Efe. 2002. Occidental Deja Tierra de los U'wa. *El Tiempo*.
- El Issa, Ali. 1999. Statement on Ingrid's Death: Cathedral of St. John the Divine, May 22, 1999. *Indigenous Woman*, 3-4.
- Feingold, Danny. 1999. Portrait of the Activist as a Young Man: The Passionate Life and Tragic Death of Terence Freitas. *L.A. Weekly*.

- FEWF. nd. *The Ingrid Washinawatok El-Issa Flying Eagle Woman Fund for Peace, Justice, and Sovereignty*. New York. <http://www.flyingeaglewomanfund.org>
- FOR, Fellowship of Reconciliation. 2011. Call for Submissions: Human Rights Accompaniment issue of Fellowship magazine. Edited by E. Vesely-Flad: Fellowship Magazine.
- For the Workbook: The Case of the U'wa vs. OXY. 1999. *Indigenous Woman*, 3 (1):5-6.
- Freitas, Terence. 1998. Resumen del viaje de Berito Kuwaru'wa [Roberto Cobaría] a Estado del Mundo.
- Frichner, Tonya Gonnella. 1999. Foreword: Flying Eagle Woman. *New York City Law Review* 3:39-40.
- Gay, Lahe'ena'e. 1990. *Pohaku: From Where We Came*.
- . 1991. Sacred Stones of Hawaii. *Archeology* 44 (4):40-45.
- . 1998. *Social Sustainability*. Hewlett Packard Laboratories. Lecture.
- . 1999. Of Stories with Uncertain Endings. *United Nations Chronicle XXXVI* (3):39.
- . 1999. PCCI Educational Program Draft-Proposal: Indigenous U'wa Communities of Colombia. Pacific Cultural Conservancy International.
- . n.d. Lecture at Bishop Museum. Edited by C. Skinner. Hawai'i: Hawaiian Airlines.
- Gay, Lahe'ena'e Lepeke Hart. 1996. Ancestral Voices.
- Gómez, Piedad. 1988. Ann Osborn: Una antropóloga peculiar. *Revista de Antropología IV* (2):197-199.
- Headland, Edna. 1976. Distribución de información en Tunebo. In *Estudios Chibchas I: Serie Sintáctica Tunebo Ica*, edited by S. H. Levinsohn. Bogotá: Ministerio de Gobierno y Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- . 1977. Introducción al Tunebo: 11 Lecciones Con el Propósito de ayudar a aquellos que puedan estar interesados en empezar a aprender este idioma. edited by M. d. G. Instituto Lingüístico de Verano, República de Colombia. Bogota.
- . 1979. Rio cu tanro = Vamos a leer en español : cartilla tuneba 3 : transición del tunebo al español para los que ya saben leer en tunebo. Bogotá, Colombia.
- . 1979. *Chauwa: cartilla tuneba 2: lecturas tunebas para leer después de la cartilla tuneba y antes de la cartilla de transición al español*, Summer Institute of Linguistics y Ministerio de Gobierno Dirección General de Integración y Desarrollo de la Comunidad, División Operativa de Asuntos Indígenas. Loma Linda, Colombia: Townsend.

- . 1980. Forma, posición y uso de fórmulas citativas en tunebo. In *Artículos en Lingüística y Campos Afines*, edited by O. Trujillo R.
- . 1982. *Chiwara resta: El paludismo en tunebo*. Loma Linda, Colombia: Editorial Townsend.
- . 1997. *Diccionario bilingüe: Uw cuwa (Tunebo)—Español, Español—Uw Cuwa (Tunebo) con una gramática uw cuwa (tuneba)*. Edited by Instituto Lingüístico de Verano. Bogotá: Editorial Buena Semilla.
- Headland, Edna Romaine. 1994. *Diccionario bilingüe tunebo-español, español-tunebo con una breve gramática tuneba.*, Interdisciplinary Studies, University of Texas, Arlington.
- Headland, Edna, and Paul Headland. 1966. *Tunebo cartilla 4*: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- . 1966. *Tunebo cartilla 2, Ministerio de Gobierno*: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- . 1971. *Jesús chinir sícora yénro : La muerte y resurrección de Jesucristo : San Marcos 14. 43-16. 15 para acompañar discos 5 y 6, Wycliffe Bible Translators*. Loma Linda: Editorial Townsend.
- . 1971. *Wacja yacutro: El hijo prodigo: San Lucas 15. 11-24 también veanse disco 4B, Wycliffe Bible Translators*. Loma Linda: Editorial Townsend.
- . 1971. *Jesúsat uwa cuitara wacaro: Los Milagros de Jesucristo para acompañar discos 1-4, United Bible Societies*. Loma Linda: Townsend.
- . 1972. *Ira riquinro = Va a sembrar la comida: cartilla segunda en tunebo*. Bogotá, Colombia.
- . 1972. *Susbura: La gallina: Cartilla primera en tunebo*. 2nd ed. Bogotá: Ministerio de Gobierno.
- . 1972. *Ubaja túwinro: Va a hacer una casa: Cartilla tercera en tunebo, Ministerio de Gobierno*.
- . 1976. Fonología del tunebo. In *Sistemas fonológicos de idiomas colombianos*. Bogotá: Ministerio de Gobierno y Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- . 1976. *Jesús chiwat chihotá ehcuro: Los hechos de los apóstoles, United Bible Societies*. Lima Linda, Colombia: Townsend.
- . 1985. *Siran ayro urá chi bin chihotá: Selección de salmos y proverbios en tunebo, United Bible Societies*. Loma Linda, Colombia: Townsend.
- . 1985. *Israel cárinro, sir chihotá ehcúquinro: Reyes y profetas, un resumen de 2 Samuel—Malaquías, United Bible Societies*. Loma Linda, Colombia: Townsend.
- . 1987. *Sir chihotá: El Nuevo Testamento de nuestro Señor Jesucristo en el*

- idioma tunebo. Sociedad bíblica internacional.* New Brunswick, NJ, Colombia.
- Headland, Edna, and Ann Osborn. 1974. Las condiciones de vida de los Tunebo: Medio ambiente, alimentación y salud. In *Informe al Instituto Colombiano de Antropología*.
- Headland, Paul. 1973. Tunebo. In *Aspectos de la cultura material de grupos étnicos de Colombia I*, edited by S. Schauer and e. al. Bogotá: Ministerio de Gobierno and Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- . 1973. The Grammar of Tunebo. In *Language Data, Amerindian Series*. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- . 1986. Social Rank and Tunebo requests. In *Pragmatics in non-Western perspective*, edited by G. Huttar and K. Gregerson. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics and the University of Texas at Arlington.
- . 1997. Words that Get People to Do Things: Translating Imperative Meanings. In *Notes on Translation*: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Headland, Paul, and Edna Headland. 1972. *Chihotá ay bi Márcosat ehcujacro: el Evangelio según San Marcos en tunebo*, United Bible Societies. Loma Linda, Colombia: Townsend.
- Headland, Paul, and Stephen H. Levinsohn. 1977. Prominence and Cohesion in Tunebo Discourse. In *Discourse Grammar: Studies in Indigenous Languages of Colombia, Panama, and Ecuador Part 2*, edited by R. E. Longacre and F. Woods. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Helios. 2007. *U'WA—The Last Guardians of the World*.
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hAckZV912Ac>
- Henao Ospina, Evelio. 2002. *Asesinados por error? El caso de los indigenistas estadounidenses*. Bogotá: Intermedio Editores.
- Hvalkof, Soren, and Peter Aaby, eds. 1981. *Is God an American? An Anthropological Perspective on the Summer Institute of Linguistics, Survival International*. Copenhagen & London: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs & Survival International.
- IDEADE. 1997. Participación del Pueblo U'wa en el Manejo, Recuperación y Conservación del Área del Parque Nacional Natural El Cocuy que se Superpone con el Territorio Indígena U'wa. Santafé de Bogotá D.C.: Universidad Javeriana - Instituto de Estudios Ambientales Para el Desarrollo—IDEADE.
- IDEAM. 1995-99. Region de los U'wa. In *Ministerio del Medio Ambiente*, Edited by O. E. y. Culturas: Instituto de Hidrología, Meteorología y Estudios Ambientales.

- INCODER. 2007. Saneamiento Resguardo. Bogotá: INCODER.
- International, SIL. 2012. *What Is SIL International?* 2012 [accessed March 16 2012].
- International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA). 2007. Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples <http://www.iwgia.org/sw248.asp>.
- Journeyman Productions. *U'wa Oil Resistance—Colombia*: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RD7NbXMR6gI&feature=fvw>.
- Katz, Jane. 1995. The Power Comes from Within: Ingrid Washinawatok, Menominee. In *Messengers of the Wind: Native American Women Tell Their Life Stories*, edited by J. Katz. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Kearns, Rick. 2009. *From Colombia, Grateful U'was Remember Ingrid Washinawatok El-Issa* (April 10). indiancountrytoday.com [accessed July 8 2009].
- Kubota, Gary. 2000. Amnesty International slams Clinton aid plan. *Honolulu Star Bulletin*, <http://archives.starbulletin.com/2000/03/04/news/story3.html>.
- Kubota, Gary T. 2000. One year later, a Hawaii woman's loved ones still seek her killers. They want answers to her ... Death in Colombia. *Honolulu Star Bulletin*, <http://archives.starbulletin.com/2000/03/04/news/story3.html>.
- LaDuke, Winona. 1999. Ingrid: Ogitchidaakwe Mikwendaagozid, A Warrior Woman Remembered. *Indigenous Woman*, 7-10.
- Layrisse, M., Z. Layrisse, and J. Wilbert. 1963. Blood group antigen studies of four Chibchan tribes. *American Anthropologist*:36-55.
- Lyons, Oren. 2006. Racism, Native American Human Rights and the United Nations. In *Onondaga Land Rights & Our Common Future*: Onondaga Nation Communications Office.
- Macdonald, Theodore, James Anaya, and Yadira Soto. 1998. The Samore Case: Observations and Recommendations. Washington: Organization of American States, Harvard University.
- Mahoney, Liam, and Luis Enrique Eguren. 1997. *Unarmed Bodyguards: International Accompaniment for the Protection of Human Rights*: Kumarian Press.
- Marquez, M.E. 1970. *Catecismo básico: en lengua indígena tuneba aguablanca español para ser usado en el Sarare, Prefectura de Arauca*. Medellín, Colombia: Talleres Tipográficos de la Editorial Salesiana.
- . 1975. *El evangelio de Marcos en lengua tuneba*. Medellín: Universidad Católica Andrés Bello, Ediciones "Mysterium".
- . 1976. Personajes indígenas: Una tribu y una figura Bericha o... Esperanza Aguablanca. *Katxa-Ta* 1 (Julio-Septiembre): 27-28.

- . 1979. *Los Tunebo*. Medellín, Colombia: Editorial Copymundo.
- . 1980. *Los indios tunebos y su cosmogonía*. Caracas: Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas de Venezuela.
- . 1983. *Trascendencia ideológica de los tunebo*. Medellín: Editorial Copimundo.
- Marquez, M.E., J Olza Zubiri, and Berichá. 1988. *Gramática de la lengua tuneba: Morfosintaxis del cobaría*: Universidad Católica del Tachira.
- Mercado, Claudia. 2004. Ingrid Washinawatok El-Issa Memorial (video footage). New York.
- Miller, Andrew. 2010. Profile in Courage: Berito Cobaría. In *News*: www.amazonwatch.com.
- Ministerio de Educación. 2001. Etnoeducación una política para la diversidad. *Al Tablero*.
- Mora Torres, Elizabeth, Haymeth Cecilia Páez Molina, Wellington Quiñónez Daza, and Miguel Leonardo López M. 2007. Mujer, Salud, y Tradición en los U'wa de Colombia y Cuestiones de Género en las Comunidades Indígenas. *Feminismo/s*:49-68.
- Moraga, Cherríe. 2000. Out of Our Revolutionary Minds Toward a Pedagogy of Revolt. In *Loving in the War Years: Lo que nunca pasó por sus labios*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Motta Marroquín, Jesús Alberto. 2000. *Ibita U'wa*. Santa Fé de Bogotá: Universidad Distrital Francisco José de Caldas, Centro de Investigaciones y Desarrollo Científico.
- Mujer U'wa. 2009. "We Women Are the Defenders of our Culture: A Message from the U'wa Women Accompanying Our Riowa Relatives. In *Celebrating the Life of Terence Unity Freitas: May 27, 1974–March 4, 1999*, edited by A. Soltani and A. M. Murillo. California.
- . 2010. Report Back from Delegation. San Francisco.
- . 2010. Grant Report to Global Fund for Women. Cubará, Colombia and San Francisco, CA.
- . 2010. Notes: Security Planning Meeting with Amazon Watch. Berkeley.
- Murillo, Ana Maria. 2005. Letter from the Field: A Trip to the Heartland of the U'wa Struggle. San Francisco: U'w Defense Project.
- Noticias Caracol. 2012. A empujones, indígenas sacan a militares de Toribío. *Noticias Caracol*, July 17.
- Oxy Claims Guerrilla Threats Behind Local Tribe's Opposition to its Colombian Exploration Project. 1997. *Oil & Gas Journal*.

- ONIC, Organización Nacional Indígena de Colombia. 2010. Video Promocional Campaña Palabra Dulce, Aire de Vida para la Pervivencia de los Pueblos Indígenas de Colombia en Riesgo de Extinción.
- . 2010. Campaña internacional para la pervivencia de los pueblos indígenas en riesgo de extinción en Colombia.
- Osborn, Ann. 1979. *La cerámica de los tunebos: Un estudio etnológico*. Bogotá: Fundación de Investigaciones Arqueológicas Nacionales, Banco de la República.
- . 1982. Mythology and social structure among U'Wa of Colombia. University of Oxford
- . 1985. *El vuelo de las tijeretas*. Vol. Publicación de la Fundación de Investigaciones Arqueológicas Nacionales; no.28. Bogotá: Fundación de Investigaciones Arqueológicas Nacionales, Banco de la República.
- . 1988. El multiculturalismo en los Andes Orientales. *Revista Colombiana de Antropología* 4 (2):23-42.
- . 1989. Multiculturalism in the eastern Andes. In *Archaeological Approaches to Cultural Identity*, edited by S. Shennan. London & New York: Routledge.
- . 1990. COMER Y SER COMIDO: Los animales en la tradición Oral U'WA (Tunebo). *Publicación digital en la página web de la Biblioteca Luis Ángel Arango del Banco de la República*.
- . 1995. *Las cuatro estaciones, mitología y estructura social entre los U'wa*. Bogotá: Banco de la República / Museo del Oro.
- . 2009 [1995]. *The Four Seasons of the U'wa: A Chibcha Ritual Ecology in the Colombian Andes*. Translated by L. Mowat. Wantage: Sean Kingston Publishing.
- PBI, Peace Brigades International. 2012. www.peacebrigades.org
- PCCI, Pacific Cultural Conservancy International. 1998. Mission and Vision Statement.
- . 1998. PCCI Mission Statement and Educational Program Description.
- . 1999. Traditional Education Program for Indigenous Communities of Panama.
- . nd. Summary of Input by Board Members, Advisors and Staff Regarding THE CORNERSTONE of the Conservancy.
- Peace Development Fund. n.d. <http://www.peacedevelopmentfund.org/>.
- Perdomo Rivera, Josefina. 2001. Yo Patrón! Pautas Metodológicas en la Resolución de Conflictos en Medio del Conflicto. In *V Congreso de Enfermeras Javerianas*. Bogotá: Revista de Enfermería.

- Potential Oil Industry Flashpoint Centers on OXY's Colombian Rainforest Wildcat. 1999. *Oil & Gas Journal*.
- Pourier, Lori Lea (Oglala Lakota). 1999. She Holds the People in Her Heart. *Indigenous Woman*, 17-18.
- Prada, Hilda Susana. 2007. *Barkuanjaro: Un Camino Desconocido*. Colombia: Universidad de Pamplona.
- Pradilla, Helena. 1979. Y nos han de Conquistar de Nuevo. Trabajo de Campo, Antropología, Universidad Nacional, Bogotá.
- . 1983. Los Tunebo a través de su historia de origen, Departamento de Antropología, Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Bogotá.
- Pradilla, Helena, and Amparo Espinoza. 1982. Los Tunebo: Adaptacion al medio ambiente y salud. Trabajo de Campo, Antropologia, Universidad Nacional, Bogotá.
- Pradilla, Helena, and Francisco J. Salazar. 1978. Tunebia infiel: La persecución religiosa a los Tunebos. Bogotá: Universidad Nacional—Facultad de Ciencias Humans.
- Project Underground. 1998. Blood of Our Mother: The U'wa People, Occidental Petroleum and the Colombian Oil Industry. Berkeley: Project Underground.
- Rainforest Action Network. 2001. *In Defense of Sacred Lands: The Uwa People's Struggle* (January). Wellness Goods, January [accessed October 27 2009]. <http://www.wellnessgoods.com/Defensesacredlands.asp>.
- Reinsborough, Patrick. 2002. Victory for the U'wa. *Earth First! Journal*. <http://www.earthfirstjournal.org/article.php?id=130>.
- . 2004. How The U'wa and People's Globalization Beat Big Oil. In *Globalize Liberation: How to Uproot the System and Build a Better World*, edited by D. Solnit. San Francisco: City Lights Books.
- Reuters. 2000. U.S. Gives Colombian Rebels Ultimatum: Three Americans' Killers Must be Brought to Justice Before a Stateside Visit. <http://archives.starbulletin.com/2000/03/04/news/story3.html>.
- Revista de Misiones. Revista de misiones. Obras misionales pontificias de la comisión episcopal de misiones de los misioneros de yarumal, de los misioneros de la consolata y de las misioneras de Santa Teresita, Bogotá (REV-0983).
- Rivet, Paul. 1924. Le langue Tunebo. *Journal de la Societe des Americanistes* xvi:19-92.
- Rivet, P, and Oppenheimer. 1943. La lengua Tunebo. In *Revista del Instituto Etnológico Nacional*. Bogotá.

- Roberts, Charlie. 2002. U'wa Versus La Oxy: Voracious Multinations and Indigenous Rights. *Covert Action Quarterly* (72):40-44.
- Rocheraux, Henri. 1919. Les Indiens Tunebos et Pedrazas. *Journal de la Societe des Americanistes* 11 (1):513-524.
- Rochereau, Henri. 1914. Lenguaje Tunebo. *Boletín de la Sociedad de Ciencias Naturales, Bogotá*. 2 (6).
- . 1959. Colección de textos Tegrías. In *Revista Colombiana de Antropología*. Bogotá.
- . 1961. Los tunebos. Grupo unkasia. *Revista Colombiana de Antropología* X:37-119.
- Runningwater, N. Bird. 1999. The Gift of Giving: Ingrid and Philanthropy. *Native Americas: Akwekon's Journal of Indigenous Issues* Summer: 43.
- Salazar, Francisco Javier, and María Ofelia Sarmiento. 1985. Etnohistoria y etnografía U'wa: El control ecológico vertical, nexos entre su pasado y su presente, Antropología, Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Bogotá.
- Seventh Generation Fund for Indian Development. 2012. *About Us* [accessed Sept 20 2012]. http://www.7genfund.org/about_us.php.
- SIL, Summer Institute of Linguistics. 1966. *Tusina el marrano: cartilla quinta en tunebo*.
- . 1976. Carit tan sinro. edited by M. d. Gobierno. Bogotá: SIL.
- . 1976/1990. Uwat carit tan sinro (Cartilla uwa; tuneba). Bogotá, Colombia: Editorial Townsend.
- . 2012. SIL's work in Colombia. <http://www.sil.org/americas/colombia/sil.asp?Lang=eng>.
- . 2012. Order of Democracy Award. <http://www.sil.org/americas/colombia/orden.asp?Lang=eng>.
- . 2012. SIL's work in Colombia. <http://www.sil.org/americas/colombia/sil.asp?Lang=eng>.
- Soltani, Atossa, and Kevin Koenig. 2004. U'wa Overcome Oxy: How a Small Colombian Indigenous Group and Global Solidarity Movement Defeated an Oil Giant, and the Struggle Ahead. *Multinational Monitor* 25 (1/2):9.
- Soltani, Atossa, and Ana Maria Murillo, eds. 2009. *Celebrating the Life of Terence Unity Freitas: May 27, 1974—March 4, 1999*. Edited by I. Nagara. California.
- Staff. 1995. Cubará, Pueblo frontera de Boyacá. *El Tiempo*, Mar 24.
- Staff Reports. 2002. *Colombian Natives Celebrate OXY Retreat*. indiancountrytoday.com [accessed July 8 2009].

- Staff Reports. 2009. *Colombian Rebel Wanted in the Murder of Ingrid Washinawatok to Face Charges in U.S.* indiancountrytoday.com, Sept 10 [accessed July 8 2009].
- Stoddart, D. R. 1959. Uua: Observations of the Tunebo Indians of Eastern Colombia. Cambridge: The Cambridge Colombian Expedition.
- . 1962. Myth and Ceremonial Among the Tunebo Indians of Eastern Colombia. *American Folklore Society* 75 (296): 147-152.
- Stoddart, D. R., and J. D. Trubshaw. 1962. Colonization in Action in Eastern Colombia. *Geography* 47 (1): 47-53.
- Stoll, David. 1982. The Summer Institute of Linguistics and Indigenous Movements. *Latin American Perspectives: Minorities in the Americas* 9 (2): 84-99.
- Trudell, John. 1999. RE: FARC (Fascist Armed Reactionary Criminality). *Indigenous Woman*, 19.
- UDP, U'wa Defense Project. 2004. Report on U'wa Defense Project's Speaking Tour
- . 2005. Letter to Planning Committee. *Strategic Planning Documents*.
- . 2005. Internal Memo on Initiation of Project. San Francisco, 24 August.
- UDP, U'wa Defense Project. 2005. U'wa Defense Project Memo on Initiation of Project. San Francisco, 24 August.
- UDP/ASOUWA. 2005. Informe final del trabajo realizado con el Pueblo U'wa y la UDP EE.UU. (Enero a diciembre.) Cubará, Boyacá Resguardo Unido U'wa.
- UDP and AW, U'wa Defense Project and Amazon Watch. 2006. Memorandum of Understanding U'wa Defense Project and Amazon Watch.
- UDP/AW, U'wa Defense Project at Amazon Watch. 2006. The U'wa Reject Consultation Process and Ecopetrol's Oil Project on Their Reserve in Colombia: Tribe Presents Historic Land Titles from the Spanish Crown Granting Legal Ownership Including Sub-surface Rights and Calls for Cancellation of Oil Project.
http://amazonwatch.org/newsroom/view_news.php?id=1240
- UN General Assembly. 2007. United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples: Resolution.
- Unidad de Planeación Minero Energética. 2009. *Los U'wa (Tunebo)*. Ministerio de Minas y Energía 2009 [cited November 10 2009].
http://www.upme.gov.co/guia_ambiental/carbon/areas/minorias/contenid/u_wa.htm.
- UNPFII, United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues. 2011.
<http://social.un.org/index/IndigenousPeoples.aspx>.
- Venne, Sharon. 1999. Only Nations Enter Into Treaties. *Indigenous Woman* 2 (2):28-

- Vidal, John. 1997. Cliffhanger: A Tribe's Suicide Pact. *The Guardian*, September 20.
- . 2011. Bolivia Enshrines Natural World's Rights with Equal Status for Mother Earth. *The Guardian*, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2011/apr/10/bolivia-enshrines-natural-worlds-rights>.
- Vivas, Ana. 2001. *Sangre de la Tierra*. DVD. Colombia/France.
- Vive Boyacá Turismo. 2011. *Cubará* [accessed Apr 4 2011]. <http://viveboyaca.com/web/index.php?IdTema=431>.
- Washinawatok, Ingrid. Statement by Ingrid Washinawatok, Indigenous Women's Network. Working Group on Indigenous Populations Subcommission on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, XVth Session, Item 8.
- . n.d. Unpublished autobiography.
- . 1991. Auntie Ing's Tips: On Parenting. *Indigenous Woman: A Publication of the Indigenous Women's Network*, 34-36.
- . 1992. 500 Years—A Continual Step Towards Progress. In *The Columbus Event: 500 Years of What?*, edited by T. S. B. C.-T. M. Center. Philadelphia: Lutheran Theological Seminary.
- . 1993. Rigoberta Menchu Tum Wins Nobel Peace Prize. *Indigenous Woman*.
- . 1994. The Essential Continuum: From Emergencies to Long-Term Sustainable Human Development. In *47th Annual DPI/NGO Conference: "We the Peoples: Building Peace."*
- . 1997. International Emergence: Twenty Years at the United Nations. *Native Americas XIV (2):13-21*.
- . 1998. International Emergence: Twenty-One Years at the United Nations. *New York City Law Review: 3:41-57*.
- . 1998. Opening Speech—Santa Fe Gathering. Santa Fe: Fund of the Four Directions.
- . 1999. Sovereignty Is More Than Just Power. *Indigenous Woman*, 23-24.
- Washinawatok-El Issa, Ingrid. n.d. Written Words, Spoken Words, Thoughts About an Indigenous Nation.
- . 1994. North America. In *Voice of Indigenous Peoples: Native People Address the United Nations*, edited by A. Ewen. Santa Fe, New Mexico: Clear Light Publishers.
- . 1994. Reports: 1st Summit of the World's Indigenous People—Guatemala.

Indigenous Woman 4:22.

- . 2011. *Ingrid Washinawatok el-Issa Reflects on Working Toward Peace*. Santa Clara University 2000–2011. Available from <http://scu.edu/ethics/architects-of-peace/el-Issa/essay.html>.
- Wirpsa, Leslie. 1997. Indians Threaten Mass Suicide to Safeguard Oil-Rich Land. *National Catholic Reporter* (32).
- Witness for Peace. 2010. www.witnessforpeace.org.
- World Rainforest Movement. 1999. Bulletin.
- . 2007. Colombia: The U'wa Indigenous People Resist Oil Exploration.
- Wycliffe Global Alliance. 2012. *Wycliffe Global Alliance: Partners in Bible Translation* <http://www.wycliffe.net/>.
- Williams, Bob. 2000. Unintended Consequences. *Oil & Gas Journal*.
- Weinberg, Bill. 2003. *Indigenous Resurgence: Colombia*. indiancountrytoday.com, Sept 10 [accessed July 8 2009].
- . 2007. Oil Expansion Threatens Colombia's Indigenous: U'wa Territory Again Targeted in Atmosphere of "Ecocide and Ethnocide." indiancountrytoday.com, Feb 5. [accessed July 8 2009].
- Werjayas, Cabildos, Cabildo Mayor, Equipo de Etnoeducación. 1996. Pueblo indígena U'wa: U'wchita (nuestro territorio). In *Naturaleza en Disputa*, edited by Uribe. Santa Fé de Bogotá: Ecofondo.
- White, Dan. 2012. Terry Freitas: Café Honors Memory of Inspirational Young Alumnus. *University News*, <http://news.ucsc.edu/2012/10/freitas-cafe-rededication.html>.

Secondary Sources

- Alexander, M. Jacqui. 2005. *Pedagogies of Crossing: Meditations on Feminism, Sexual Politics, Memory, and the Sacred*. Durham & London: Duke University Press.
- Alexander, M. Jacqui, and Chandra Mohanty, eds. 1997. *Feminist Genealogies, Colonial Legacies, Democratic Futures*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Anaya, S. J. 2005. Divergent Discourses about International Law, Indigenous Peoples, and Rights over Lands and Natural Resources: Toward a Realist Trend. *Colorado Journal of International Environmental Law and Policy* 16:237.
- Anaya, S. James. 2006. Indian Givers: What Indigenous Peoples Have Contributed to International Human Rights Law. *Journal of Law & Policy* 22:107-120.
- Anaya, S James. 2009. *International Human Rights and Indigenous Peoples*. Austin: Aspen Publishers.

- Anzaldúa, Gloria. 1987. *Borderlands, La Frontera*. Edited by G. Anzaldúa. San Francisco: Aunt Lute.
- Arenas, Luis Carlos. 2001. *Postscriptum: Sobre el caso U'wa*. In *El caleidoscopio de las justicias en Colombia: análisis socio-jurídico*, edited by B. De Sousa Santos. Bogotá: Siglo Del Hombre Editores y Universidad de los Andes.
- . 2007. The U'wa Community's Battle Against the Oil Companies: A Local Struggle Turned Global. In *Another Knowledge Is Possible: Beyond Northern Epistemologies*, edited by B. d. S. Santos. London: Verso.
- Arendt, Hannah. 1968. The Decline of the Nation-State and the End of the Rights of Man. In *The Origins of Totalitarianism*: Harcourt.
- Avirama, Jesus, and Rayda Marquez. 1994. The Indigenous Movement in Colombia. In *Indigenous Peoples and Democracy in Latin America*, edited by D. L. Van Cott. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Balfour, I., and E. Cadava. 2004. The Claims of Human Rights: An Introduction. *Southern Atlantic Quarterly* 103 (2-3 Spring/Summer): 277-296.
- Barker, Joanne, ed. 2005. *Sovereignty Matters*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Barsh, Russel Lawrence. 1986. The Nature and Spirit of North American Political Systems. *American Indian Quarterly* 10 (3): 181-198.
- Bartelson, Jens. 2001. *Critique of the State*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Baxi, Upendra. 2006. *The Future of Human Rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2006. *The Future of Human Rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Beck, David R. M. 2001. An Urban Platform for Advocating Justice: Protecting the Menominee Forest. In *American Indians and the Urban Experience*, edited by S. Lobo and K. Peters. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press.
- Bernal Carrera, Gabriela 2011. ¿Cuál interculturalidad? Reflexiones desde las experiencias de Sudamérica. In *Commons-Conference*. Rome: Rosa Luxemburg Foundation Brussels.
- Beuchot, Mauricio. 1994. Bartolome de las Casas, el humanismo indígena y los derechos humanos. *Anuario Mexicano de historia del derecho*.
- Bevington, Doug, and Chris Dixon. 2005. Movement-Relevant Theory: Rethinking Social Movement Scholarship and Activism. *Social Movement Studies* 4 (3):185-208.
- Brock, Lizzie. 2007. Protection Through Diplomacy in Colombia. In *Humanitarian Diplomacy: Practitioners and Their Craft*, edited by L. Minear and H. Smith: United Nations University Press.
- Brysk, Alison. 2000. *From Tribal Village to Global Village: Indian Rights and International Relations in Latin America*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

- Brysk, Alison, and Gershon Shafir, eds. 2004. *People Out of Place: Globalization, Human Rights and the Citizenship Gap*. New York: Routledge.
- Bueno-Hansen, Pascha. 2010. Finding Each Other's Hearts: Intercultural Relations and the Drive to Prosecute Sexual Violence During the Internal Armed Conflict in Peru. *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 12 (3-4):319-340.
- Camilleri. 1994. Rethinking Sovereignty in a Shrinking, Fragmented World. In *Contending Sovereignties: Redefining Political Community*, edited by R. B. J. Walker and S. H. Mendlovitz. Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Carroza, Paolo G. 2003. From Conquest to Constitutions: Retrieving a Latin American Tradition of the Idea of Human Rights. *Human Rights Quarterly* 25:281-313.
- Castillo Guzman, Elizabeth, and Jose Antonio Caicedo Ortiz. 2008. La educacion intercultural bilingue: El caso Colombiano. Buenos Aires: Foro Latinoamericano de politicas educativas.
- Castro Suárez, Celmira. 2009. Estudios sobre educacion intercultural en Colombia: tendencias y perspectivas. *Memorias: Revista digital de historia y arqueologia desde el Caribe* 6 (10):358-375.
- Cesarini, Paola, and Shareen Hertel. 2005. Interdisciplinary Approaches to Human Rights Scholarship in Latin America. *Journal of Latin American Studies* 37:793-809.
- Clifford, James, and George E. Marcus, eds. 1986. *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography, A School of American Research Advanced Seminar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Cornstassel, Jeff J., and Tomas Hopkins Primeau. 1995. Indigenous "Sovereignty" and International Law: Revised Strategies for Pursuing "Self-Determination. *Human Rights Quarterly* 17 (2): 343-365.
- Correa Rubio, François 2000. Sierras Paralelas. Etnología entre los Kogí y los U'wa. *Geografía humana de Colombia, Región Andina Central* 4 (3).
- Culler, Jenny R. 2001. The U'wa Struggle to Protect Their Cultural Lands: A Framework for Reviewing Questions of Sovereignty and the Right to Environmental Integrity for Indigenous Peoples. *Georgia Journal of International and Comparative Law* 29:335.
- de la Cadena, Marisol. 2008. La producción de otros conocimientos y sus tensiones: ¿de una antropología andinista a la interculturalidad? In *Antropologías del mundo. Transformaciones disciplinarias dentro de sistemas de poder*, edited by G. L. Ribeiro and A. Escobar. Bogotá: Red de Antropologías del Mundo/World Anthropologies Network.
- De Sousa Santos, Boaventura. 2001. El Significado Politico y Juridico de la Jurisdiccion indigena. In *El caleidoscopio de las justicias en Colombia:*

- analisis socio-juridico*, edited by B. De Sousa Santos and M. G. Villegas.
- Dunning, Thad, and Leslie Wirpsa. 2004. Oil and the Political Economy of Conflict in Colombia and Beyond: A Linkages Approach. *Geopolitics* 9 (1): 81-108.
- Dussel, Enrique. 2000. Europe, Modernity, and Eurocentrism. *Nepantla: Views from the South* 1 (3): 465-478.
- Enciso Patiño, Patricia. 2004. Estado del Arte de la Etnoeducación en Colombia con Énfasis en Política Pública, edited by M. d. E. Nacional: Dirección de Poblaciones y Proyectos Intersectoriales, Subdirección de Poblaciones.
- Engle, Karen. 2010. *The Elusive Promise of Indigenous Development: Rights, Culture, Strategy*. Durham & London: Duke University Press.
- Escárcega Zamarrón, Sylvia. 2009. *Trabajar haciendo: Activist Research and Interculturalism*. *Intercultural Education* 20 (1): 39-50.
- Escobar, Arturo. 2003. Mundos y Conocimientos de Otro Modo: El Programa de Investigación de Modernidad/Colonialidad Latinoamericana. *Tabula Rasa* (1): 51-86.
- Evans, Jennifer. 1997. U'Wa Protests Stall Occidental's Development Plans in Colombia. *Colorado Journal of International Environmental Law and Policy* 131.
- Falchetti, Ana Maria. 2001. The Transformation of the Seed: Ritual Offerings and Trade among the Uwa of Colombia. *Journal of Latin American Lore* 21 (1):109-142.
- Falchetti, Ana María. 2003. *La búsqueda del equilibrio: Los uwa y la defensa de su territorio sagrado en tiempos coloniales*. Vol. CLX. Bogotá, D.C., Colombia: Biblioteca de historia nacional, Academia Colombiana de Historia
- Falchetti, Ana Maria. 2005. Los Uwa y la Percepción Indígena de la Historia. *Boletín de Historia y Antigüedades* XCII (828):45-64.
- Falchetti, Ana Maria, and Guiomar Nates-Parra. 2002. Las hijas del sol: las abejas sin aguijón en el mundo Uwa, sierra nevada del cocuy, Colombia. In *Rostros culturales de la fauna: las relaciones entre los humanos y los animales en el contexto colombiano*, edited by A. Ulloa. Bogotá: Instituto colombiano de antropología e historia. ICANH—Fundación Natura.
- Falchetti de Saenz, Ana Maria. 1997. La Ofrenda y la Semilla: Notas sobre el simbolismo del oro entre los Uwa. *Boletín del Museo del Oro* 43.
- . 2007. *El legado milenario de los Uwas: la sabiduría ancestral de un pueblo indígena*. Bogotá: Banco de la República-Biblioteca Luis Angel Arango.
- Fields, Les with Cheryl Seidner, Julian Lang, Rosemary Cambra, Florence Silva, Vivien Hailstone, Darlene Marshall, Bradley Marshall, Callie Lara, Merv George Sr., and the Cultural Committee of the Yurok Tribe. 2008. *Abalone*

- Tales: Collaborative Explorations of Sovereignty and Identity in Native California*. Narrating Native Histories. Durham & London: Duke University Press.
- Forsythe, David P. 1998. Human Rights Fifty Years after the Universal Declaration. *Political Science and Politics* 31 (3): 505-511.
- Fox, Jonathan. 2006. Lessons from Action-Research Partnerships: LASA/Oxfam America 2004 Martin Diskin Memorial Lecture. *Development in Practice* 16 (1): 27-38.
- Fregoso, Rosa Linda. 2006. "We Want Them Alive!": The Politics and Culture of Human Rights. *Social Identities* 12 (2): 109-138.
- Fulmer, Amanda. 2009. Rejecting Rights: The U'wa People of Colombia and Indigenous Consultation. In *Western Political Science Association*. Vancouver, BC Canada: <http://www.allacademic.com/meta/>.
- Gedicks, A. 2001. *Resource Rebels: Native Challenges to Mining and Oil Corporations*. Cambridge, MA: South End.
- Gibson, Alicia. 2000. The Real Price of Oil: Cultural Survival and the U'wa of Colombia. *Colorado Journal of International Environmental Law and Policy*, 139.
- Glendon, Mary Ann. 2003. The Forgotten Crucible: The Latin American Influence on the Universal Human Rights Idea. *Harvard Human Rights Journal* 16:27-39.
- Godshall, Lauren E. 2003. Making Space for Indigenous Intellectual Property. *Georgetown International Environmental Law Review* 15 (3):497-530.
- Goldsmith, Jack. 2000. Review: Sovereignty, International Relations Theory, and International Law. *Stanford Law Review* 52 (4): 959-986.
- Grace Church. 2012. *Missionary Detail: Paul and Edna Headland—Texas and Latin America* [accessed March 16 2012].
- Gunn Allen, Paula. 1986/1997. *The Sacred Hoop: Recovering the Feminine in American Indian Traditions*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Hale, Charles. 2002. Does Multiculturalism Menace? Governance, Cultural Rights and the Politics of Identity in Guatemala. *Journal of Latin American Studies* 34 (3).
- . 2006. Activist Research vs. Cultural Critique: Indigenous Land Rights and the Contradictions of the Politically Engaged Anthropology. *Cultural Anthropology* 21 (1).
- Hall, Stuart. 1986. Variants of Liberalism. In *Politics and Ideology*, edited by J. Donald and S. Hall: Open University Press.

- Hernandez-Truyol, Berta Esperanza, ed. 2002. *Moral Imperialism: A Critical Anthology*. Edited by B. E. Hernandez-Truyol. New York: New York University Press.
- Higginbottom, Andrew. 2008. Solidarity Action Research as Methodology: The Crimes of the Powerful in Colombia. *Latin American Perspectives* 35 no.5 (162): 158-170.
- Hinsley, F. H. 1966. *Sovereignty*. New York: Basic Books Inc.
- Holder, Cindy L. and Jeff J. Corntassel. 2002. Indigenous Peoples and Multicultural Citizenship: Bridging Collective and Individual Rights. *Human Rights Quarterly* 24 (1): 126-151.
- Houghton, Juan. 2008. Estrategia petrolera en los territorios indígenas: Conflictos territoriales de los pueblos indígenas en Colombia. In *La tierra contra la muerte*, edited by J. Houghton. Bogotá: Centro de Cooperación al Indígena CECOIN.
- Howard-Hassman, Rhoda , and Jack Donnelly. 1996. Liberalism and Human Rights: A Necessary Connection. In *The Human Rights Reader: Major Political Essays, Speeches and Documents from the Bible to the Present*, edited by M. Ishay. New York: Routledge.
- Hunt, Lynn. 2007. *Inventing Human Rights: A History*. New York and London: W.W. Norton & Company.
- INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence, ed. 2007. *The Revolution Will Not Be Funded: Beyond the Non-Profit Industrial Complex*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Ishay, Micheline. 1997. Bartolome de Las Casas: In Defense of the Indians. In *The Human Rights Reader*, edited by M. Ishay: Routledge.
- Jackson, JE. 2007. Rights to Indigenous Culture in Colombia. *The Practice of Human Rights: Tracking Law Between the Global and the Local*.
- Jackson, Robert H. 1990. *Quasi-states: Sovereignty, International Relations and the Third World*. Vol. 12, *Cambridge Studies in International Relations*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1999. Sovereignty in World Politics: A Glance at the Conceptual and Historic Landscape. *Political Studies* 47 (3): 431-456.
- . 2007. Sovereignty and its Presuppositions: Before 9/11 and After. *Political Studies* 55:297-317.
- Jackson, Robert H., and Georg Sorensen. 2003. *Introduction to International Relations Theories and Approaches*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jacob, Michelle. 2010. Claiming Health and Culture as Human Rights: Yakama Feminism in Daily Practice. *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 12 (3-

4): 361-380.

James, Alan. 1986. *Sovereign Statehood: The Basis of International Society*. London and Boston: Allen & Unwin.

———. 1999. The Practice of Sovereign Statehood in Contemporary International Society. *Political Studies* 47 (3): 457-473.

James, Michael Rabinder. 1999. Critical Intercultural Dialogue. *Polity* 31 (4): 587-607.

Janes Eller, Arinya Nikki. 2007. The Struggle for Black Gold and the Blood of Mother Earth: A Case Study of the U'wa and Their Plight Against Big Oil. Latin American Studies, University Of Kansas.

Keck, Margaret E. , and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Koopman, Sara. 2011. Alter-geopolitics: Other Securites Are Happening. *Geoforum* 42 (3): 274-284.

———. 2012. Making Space for Peace: International Protective Accompaniment in Colombia (2007-2009), Geography, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C..

Krasner, Stephen D. 1999. *Sovereignty: Organized Hypocrisy?* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Krasner. 2001. Abiding Sovereignty. *International Political Science Review* 22 (3): 229-251.

Krasner, Stephan D. 2005. Building Democracy After Conflict: The Case for Shared Sovereignty. *Journal of Democracy* 16 (1): 69-83.

Lee, Taehwa. 2008. Conflicts and Dialogues Among Technological, Ecological, and Indigenous Paradigms in a Globalized Modernity: A Case Study of the U'wa Peoples' Struggle Against Oil Development in Colombia. *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society*.

———. 2010. The Conflicts and Dialogues Among Techno-Developmental, Ecological, and Indigenous Paradigms in a Globalized Modernity: A Case Study of the U'wa People's Resistance Against Oil Development in Colombia, Urban Affairs and Public Policy, University of Delaware.

Leyva, Xochitl, Araceli Burguete, and Shannon Speed, eds. 2008. *Gobernar (en) la diversidad: experiencias indígenas desde América Latina. Hacia la investigación de co-labor*. Edited by F. CIESAS. México: Publicaciones de la Casa Chata.

Lorde, Audre. 1984. The Master's Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master's House. In *Sister Outsider*. Freedom, CA: The Crossing Press.

- Lugones, Maria. 2003. *Pilgrimages/Peregrinajes: Theorizing Against Multiple Oppressions*. Lanham, Boulder, New York, Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- . 2007. Heterosexualism and the Colonial/Modern World System. *Hypatia* 22 (1): 186-209.
- . 2010. Toward a Decolonial Feminism. *Hypatia* 25 (4): 742-759.
- MacDonald, Theodore. 2005. Approaching Indigenous Rights in the Early 21st Century: International Norms, Social Movements and Citizenship Claims. In *From Goals to Tools: Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in Latin America*. Edited by A. E. Yamin. Lima, Peru: Asociación Pro Derechos Humanos de Perú.
- Mancera, Pablo Emilio. 1995. Hidrocarburos, pueblos indígenas y licencias ambientales. *Ecológica* 21.
- Mignolo, Walter. 2000. *Local Histories/Global Designs: Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges, and Border Thinking*: Princeton University Press.
- . 2007. Coloniality of Power and De-colonial Thinking. *Cultural Studies* 21 (2-3): 155-167.
- . 2011. *The Darker Side of Western Modernity: Global Futures, Decolonial Options, Latin America Otherwise: Languages, Empires, Nations*. Durham & London: Duke University Press.
- Mignolo, Walter D., and Freya Schiwy. 2002. Beyond Dichotomies: Translation/Transculturation and the Colonial Difference. In *Beyond Dichotomies*, edited by Elizabeth Mudimbe-Boyi. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Miller, Susan A. 2008. Native America Writes Back: The Origin of the Indigenous Paradigm in Historiography. *Wicazo Sa Review* 23 (2): 9-28.
- Miranda, Lillian Aponte. 2006. The U'wa and Occidental Petroleum: Searching for Corporate Accountability in Violations of Indigenous Land Rights. *American Indian Law Review* Symposium: Lands, Liberties, and Legacies: Indigenous Peoples and International Law to the problems of Indigenous Peoples: The Indigenous Rights Movement in Other Contexts: 651-673.
- Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. 2003. Cartographies of Struggle: Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism. In *Feminism Without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*, edited by C. T. Mohanty. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- . 2003. Sisterhood, Coalition and the Politics of Experience. In *Feminism Without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*, edited by C. T. Mohanty.

- , ed. 2003. *Feminism Without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Mohanty, Chandra Talpade, Ann Russo, and Lourdes Torres. 1991. *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*. Indianapolis: University of Indiana Press.
- Moraga, Cherrie, and Ana Castillo, eds. 1988. *Esta puente, mi espalda: Voces de mujeres tercermundistas en los Estados Unidos*. San Francisco: ism press.
- Moraña, Mabel, Enrique Dussel, and Carlos A. Jáuregui. 2008. Colonialism and its Replicants. In *Coloniality at Large: Latin America and the Postcolonial Debate*, edited by M. Moraña, E. Dussel and C. A. Jáuregui. Durham & London: Duke University Press.
- Murra, J.V. 1956. *The Economic Integration of the Inca State*, University of Chicago.
- Ng'weno, Bettina: *Territory and Citizenship in the Contemporary State*. 2007. *Turf Wars*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Oldham, Paul, and Miriam Anne Frank. 2008. "We the peoples..." The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. *Anthropology Today* 24 (2): 5-9.
- Pachón Soto, Damián. 2008. Nueva perspectiva filosófica en América Latina: el grupo Modernidad/colonialidad. *Ciencia Política* 5 (Enero-Junio):8-35.
- Pasqualucci, Jo M. 2006. The Evolution of International Indigenous Rights in the Inter-American Human Rights System. *Human Rights Law Review* 6 (2): 281-322.
- Perafán Simmonds, Carlos César, and Luis José Azcárate García. 2002. *Sistemas Jurídicos Uitoto, Yukpa, U'wa y Tikuna*. Bogotá: Instituto Colombiano de Antropología e Historia/Colciencias/Ministerio de Cultura.
- Perla, Hector. 2008. Si Nicaragua Venció, El Salvador Vencerá: Central American Agency in the Creation of the U.S.–Central American Peace and Solidarity Movement. *Latin American Research Review* 43 (2):136-158.
- Peroff, Nicholas C. 1982. *Menominee DRUMS: Tribal Termination and Restoration, 1954-1974*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Perry, Robin. 2011. Balancing Rights or Building Rights? Reconciling the Right to Use Customary Systems of Law with Competing Human Rights in Pursuit of Indigenous Sovereignty. *Harvard Human Rights Journal* 24:71-114.
- Philpott, Daniel. 1999. Westphalia, Authority and International Society. *Political Studies* XLVII:566-589.
- . 2000. The Religious Roots of Modern International Relations. *World Politics* 52: 206-245.

- Pratt, Mary Louise. 2007. Afterword: Indigeneity Today. Paper read at Indigenous Experience Today, at Oxford.
- . 2008. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. 2nd ed. London & New York: Routledge.
- Prebisch, Raul. 1960. *The Economic Development in Latin America and Its Principal Problems*. New York: ECLA United Nations.
- Prokhovnik, Raia. 2008. *Sovereignty: History and Theory*. Exeter, UK: Imprint Academic.
- Quijano, Anibal. 1995. Raza, etnia y nación en Mariategui: cuestiones abiertas. *Estudios Latinoamericanos*, 2 (3):3-19.
- . 2000. Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism and Latin America. *Nepantla* 1 (3): 533-580.
- . 2007. Coloniality and Modernity/Rationality. *Cultural Studies* 21 (2-3): 168-178.
- Rappaport, Joanne. 2005. *Intercultural Utopias: Public Intellectuals, Cultural Experimentation, and Ethnic Pluralism in Colombia*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- . 2008. Beyond Participant Observation: Collaborative Ethnography as Theoretical Innovation. *Collaborative Anthropologies* 1:1-31.
- Rathgeber, Theodor. 2004. Indigenous Struggles in Colombia: Historical Changes and Perspectives. In *The Struggle for Indigenous Rights in Latin America*, edited by N. G. Postero and L. Zamosc. Brighton: Sussex Academic Press.
- Reagon, Bernice Johnson. 1981. Bernice Johnson Reagon—"Coalition Politics: Turning the Century."
- Representantes de las comunidades Tunebas, Karekas autoridades tradicionales y miembros de los Cabildos indigenas de Cubará, Boyacá. 1984. Letter re: con el fin de contar los problemas de educacion que nos afecten. Villeta Cundinamarca, May 10.
- Restrepo, Luis Fernando. 2007. Tengo los pies en la cabeza, de Berichá, los U'wa y los retos de la cultura del reconocimiento. *Cuadernos de Literatura, Bogotá (Colombia)* 11 (22): 153-167.
- Reus Smit. 2001. Human Rights and the Social Construction of Sovereignty. *Review of International Studies* 27 (4):519-538.
- Rich, Adrienne. *A Politics of Location* 1986. Available from <http://www.medmedia.org/review/numero2/en/art3.htm>.
- Rodriguez-Garavito, Cesar, and Luis Carlos Arenas. 2005. Indigenous Rights, Transnational Activism, and Legal Mobilization: The Struggle of the U'wa

- People in Colombia. In *Law and Globalization from Below: Towards a Cosmopolitan Legality*, edited by B. De Sousa Santos and C. A. Rodriguez-Garavito. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rojas, Axel. 2004. Inclusión social, interculturalidad y educación. ¿Una relación (im)posible? Colombia: Universidad de Cauca.
- Rojas Curieux, Tulio 1999. La Etnoeducación en Colombia: Un trecho andado y un largo camino por recorrer. *Colombia Internacional* (46):45-59.
- Roldan Ortega, Roque. 2004. Models for Recognizing Indigenous Land Rights in Latin America. In *Biodiversity Series*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank, Environment Department.
- Rostow, Walt Whitman. 1960. *The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sánchez, Beatriz Eugenia. 2001. El reto del multiculturalismo jurídico. La Justicia de la sociedad mayor y la justicia indígena. In *El caleidoscopio de las justicias en Colombia: Análisis socio-jurídico*, edited by B. d. S. Santos and M. G. Villegas. Bogotá: Siglo del Hombre Editores y Universidad de los Andes.
- Sandoval, Chela. 2000. *Methodology of the Oppressed*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Schiwy, Freya. 2002. Intelectuales Subalternos?: Notas sobre las dificultades de pensar en diálogo intercultural. In *Indisciplinar las ciencias sociales: Geopolíticas del conocimiento y colonialidad del poder. Perspectivas desde lo andino*, edited by C. Walsh, F. Schiwy and S. Castro-Gomez. Quito: Ediciones Abya Yala.
- . 2007. Decolonization and the Question of Subjectivity: Gender, Race and Binary Thinking. *Cultural Studies* 21 (2-3):271-294.
- . 2009. *Indianizing Film: Decolonization, the Andes, and the Question of Technology, New Directions in International Studies*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.
- Serje, Margarita. 2003. ONG's, indios y petróleo: el caso U'wa a través de los mapas del territorio en disputa. *Bulletin de l'Institut français d'études andines*: 101-131.
- Sikkink, Kathryn. 1993. Human Rights, Principled Issue-Networks, and Sovereignty in Latin America. *International Organization* 47 (3): 411-441.
- Skinner, Quentin. 2010. The Sovereign State: a Genealogy. In *Sovereignty in Fragments: The Past, Present and Future of a Contested Concept*, edited by H. Kalmo and Q. Skinner. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2010. The Sovereign State: a Genealogy. In *Sovereignty in Fragments: The Past, Present and Future of a Contested Concept*, edited by H. Kalmo and Q.

- Skinner. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, Andrea. 2008. *Native Americans and the Christian Right: The Gendered Politics of Unlikely Alliances*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. 1999. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*: Zed.
- Speed, Shannon. 2006. At the Crossroads of Human Rights and Anthropology: Toward a Critically Engaged Activist Research. *American Anthropologist* 108 (1): 66-76.
- . 2008. *Rights in Rebellion: Indigenous Struggle and Human Rights in Chiapas*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Spruyt. 1994. *The Sovereign State and Its Competitors*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Spruyt, Hendrik. 2002. The Origins, Development, and Possible Decline of the Modern State. *Annual Review of Political Science* 5:127-149.
- Stammers, Neil. 1993. Human Rights and Power. *Political Studies* 41 (1): 70-82.
- Strange, Susan. 1997. *The Retreat of the State: The Diffusion of Power in the World Economy*. Vol. 49, *Cambridge Studies in International Relations*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sunseri, Lina. 2007. Indigenous Voice Matters: Claiming our Space through Decolonising Research. *Junctures* 9:93-106.
- Tate, Winifred. 2007. *Counting the Dead: The Culture and Politics of Human Rights Activism in Colombia, California Series in Public Anthropology*. Berkeley: University California Press.
- Tierney, Brian. 1997. *The Idea of Natural Rights: Studies on Natural Rights, Natural Law and Church Law, 1150-1625* Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press.
- Uribe Botero, A. 2003. El caso U'wa: Entre el vuelo de las tijeretas y la forma de la ley. In *Racionalidad y discurso mítico*, edited by A. Chaparro and C. Schumacher. Bogotá: Instituto Colombiano de Antropología e Historia; Centro Editorial Universidad del Rosario.
- . 2003. Entre los tunebo y los U'wa: El lugar de los argumentos históricos en favor de los derechos de grupo. *Estudios de filosofía (Medellín)* (28): 143-158.
- Uribe Botero, Angela. 2005. *Petróleo, economía y cultura: El caso U'wa*. Bogotá: Centro Editorial Universidad del Rosario: Siglo del Hombre Editores.
- Van Cott, Donna Lee, ed. 1994. *Indigenous Peoples and Democracy in Latin America*. In Association with The Inter-American Dialogue. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- . 2000. *The Friendly Liquidation of the Past: The Politics of Diversity in Latin*

- America*. Pitt Latin American Series. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Vargas Delgado, Luis Saúl. 1999. *Enfoque mítico-social de los U'wa: Trabajo literario*. Bucaramanga, Colombia: Formas Graficas.
- Vasco Uribe, Luis Guillermo 1994. Reseñas: Las cuatro estaciones: Mitología y estructural social entre los u'wa. *Boletín Museo del Oro* 36.
- Velasco Jaramillo, Marcela. 2000. Tengo los pies en la cabeza: autobiografía de una mujer U'wa. In *Literatura y cultura: narrativa colombiana del siglo XX*, edited by M. M. Jaramillo, B. Osorio and Á. Robledo. Bogotá: Mincultura.
- Wagner, Martin. 2000. The International Legal Rights of Indigenous Peoples Affected by Natural Resource Exploitation: A Brief Case Study. *Hastings International & Comparative Law Review* 24:491.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 2004. *World Systems Analysis: An Introduction*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Walsh, Catherine. 2000. Políticas y Significados Conflictivos. *Nueva Sociedad* 165:121-133.
- . 2002. Las Geopolíticas de Conocimiento y Colonialidad del Poder: Entrevista a Walter Mignolo. In *Indisciplinar las Ciencias Sociales: Geopolíticas del Conocimiento y Colonialidad del Poder. Perspectivas desde lo Andino*, edited by C. Walsh, F. Schiwiy and S. Castro-Gomez. Quito: Ediciones Abya Yala.
- . 2007. Interculturalidad y Colonialidad del Poder: Un pensamiento y posicionamiento “otro” desde la diferencia colonial. In *El giro decolonial: Reflexiones para una diversidad epistémica más allá del capitalismo global*, edited by S. Castro-Gomez and R. Grosfoguel. Bogota: Siglo del Hombre Editores.
- . 2008. (Post)Coloniality in Ecuador: The Indigenous Movement's Practices and Politics of (Re)Signification and Decolonization. In *Coloniality at Large: Latin America and the Postcolonial Debate*, edited by M. Moraña, E. Dussel and C. A. Jáuregui. Durham & London: Duke University Press.
- . 2009. *Interculturalidad, Estado, Sociedad: Luchas (De)Coloniales De Nuestra Epoca*. Quito: Ediciones Abya Yala, Universidad Andina Simon Bolivar.
- . 2009. The Plurinational and Intercultural State: Decolonization and State Re-founding in Ecuador. *Kult* 6 (Epistemologies of Transformation: The Latin American Decolonial Option and its Ramifications.): 65-84.
- Warren, Kay B, and Jean E. Jackson, eds. 2002. *Indigenous Movements, Self-Representation, and the State in Latin America*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

- Weber, Cynthia. 1995. *Simulating Sovereignty: Intervention, the State and Symbolic Exchange*. Vol. 37, *Cambridge Studies in International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wiessner, Siegfried. 2008. Indigenous Sovereignty: A Reassessment in Light of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. *Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law* 41:1141-1176.
- Wilson, Shawn. 2008. *Research Is Ceremony: Indigenous Research Methods*. Halifax & Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing.
- Wirpsa. 2004. Oil Exploitation and Indigenous Rights: Global Regime Network Conflict in the Andes. Dissertation, International Relations, University of Southern California, Los Angeles.
- Wynter, Sylvia. 2003. Unsettling the Coloniality of Being/Power/Truth/Freedom: Towards the Human, After Man, Its Overrepresentation—An Argument. *CR: The New Centennial Review* 3 (3):257-337.
- Yashar, Deborah J. 2005. *Contesting Citizenship in Latin America: The Rise of Indigenous Movements and the Postliberal Challenge*. Edited by M. Goldstone, Tarrow, Tilly, Wood, *Cambridge Studies in Contentious Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zambrano, Carlos Vladimir 2008. Afrontamiento intercultural para la coordinación jurisdiccional con pueblos indígenas colombianos. *Iconos. Revista de Ciencias Sociales* 31:71-85.