

Echeverri, Juan Alvaro. 2005. "Territory as body and territory as nature: Intercultural dialogue?", en Alexandre Surrallés & Pedro García Hierro (eds.), *The Land Within: Indigenous territory and the perception of environment*, pp. 234-250. Document no. 112. Copenhagen: IWGIA

TERRITORY AS BODY AND TERRITORY AS NATURE: INTERCULTURAL DIALOGUE?

Juan Álvaro Echeverri

*Instituto Amazónico de Investigaciones (IMANI),
Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Sede Leticia*

In the second half of the eighties the Colombian government recognised and titled large territorial extensions of the Colombian Amazon in favour of indigenous groups. In 1988, and subsequent years, approximately twenty million acres constituting more than half of Colombia's Amazon (UAESPNN 2001) were titled as indigenous *Resguardos* (preserves).¹ These Preserves stretch almost uninterruptedly all the way to Colombia's southern and eastern border, an area still unaffected by peasant colonization crossing the Andean mountains.

Various factors contributed to the hasty introduction of this large-scale cultural protection and territorial recognition policy which, in fact, also constitutes an environment protection policy, given that these large areas inhabited by indigenous peoples are now segregated and protected from future occupation and titling. Without getting into an analysis of the role played by external forces driven by a swing in environmental and defence of ethnic minorities' rights policies on the part of international financial organizations, the fact is that the existing indigenous organizations of the Colombian Amazon sprang from this collective land recognition and titling process. In the particular case of the Predio Putumayo Preserve, the largest one in the country, occupying nearly six million hectares, conflicts of interests arose within the Colombian State itself. What is now Preserve was previously titled in favour of a state-owned bank (Caja de Crédito Agrario, Industrial y Minero) which, back in the forties, had purchased its rights to the land from the heirs of the notorious Peruvian Amazon Company, also known as Casa Arana. The bank had already initiated an ambitious 'development project' for the whole region, which was aborted when the rights to the land were transferred to its initial owners – the same indigenous people who, at the turn of the twentieth century, survived the massacres and forced labour conditions under the hands of the very same rubber company.

This recognition was highly significant and it was to equip native communities with a new political vocabulary essential for expressing the values of the indigenous organizations that emerged in the eighties and gradually consolidated themselves in the following decade. The term 'territory' has been one of the keywords to this new ethnical-political vocabulary, although its meaning and usage hold complex connotations which do not exactly reflect its judicial-political or natural sciences' meanings. One of the fundamental reasons behind this lack of concordance lies in the fact that these Amazon indigenous peoples use the Spanish term *territorio* as an approximate translation of their own languages' native concepts. The use and meaning of this term has its own particular history originating in Colombia's indigenous movements in the Andes, which nurtured the more recent political developments of Amazon Indians, and gained ground in Colombia's political agenda, after the promulgation of Colombia's 1991 new Political Constitution.

But before going any further, let's take a closer look at these territorial issues.

The semantics of territory

In Spanish, as well as in Indo-European languages in general, we can recognise two general senses for the concept of territory. On the one hand, 'territory', in a political-jurisdictional sense, is understood as the geographical space that defines and delimits the sovereignty of a political power. The prototypical example of territorial jurisdiction in modern times is the national territory, framed by a closed-border polygon. The precise and complete limit constitutes the decisive element of this political-territorial notion - from national states that demarcate and protect their borders using physical barriers and armies, to the title deeds that define each property's precise boundaries.

Another sense of the term territory, derived from the natural sciences, particularly etology (the study of animal behaviour), refers to the protection of a space in which an individual or a species reproduces and obtains its resources. *Territoriality* is defined with signals such as occupation marks, reactions to intruders, real or ritualized combats, etc. 'Territories', in this sense, can be delimited. However, one or more species can define different territorialities within the same area, thus generating competition for the same resources, coexisting when occupying different niches or establishing complementary relationships. Territories so defined lack clearly delimited borders and thus can be perceived as networks of niches interlacing and competing with other networks.

Although both the above senses share common elements with the meaning employed in the indigenous 'claims' vocabulary, neither one matches it exactly. The indigenous movement's use of this term stems from a particular political history, at least in Colombia. Its most remarkable roots originate from the differ-

ences between the indigenous movement of Southern Colombia and the left-wing movements of Marxist revolutionary ideology. These latter movements brandished a 'land struggle' slogan in which the 'land' was understood as the peasantry's fundamental means of production, whose control had to be recuperated. In this left-wing ideology, the indigenous communities were generally considered as belonging to both the peasantry and the proletariat. The disagreement that led to the split between the indigenous' claims and the class struggle claims came about precisely from the emphasis placed on the difference between the peasantry's 'land struggle' claims and the indigenous' territorial claims. This particular concept of territory was to be widely used in the national indigenous movement, acquiring a remarkable subtlety and complexity that set it apart from its mere political-jurisdictional meaning (with which it is occasionally erroneously compared), its animal territoriality sense, as well as with the senses implied in the land struggle claims.

Territories so defined, in the indigenous sense, although encompassing settlement, productive and natural resources extraction areas could also include areas not necessarily associated with economic production. Although this territorial notion comes close to the concept of national territory, insofar as it represents a collective asset and an identity marker (national or ethnical), it differs in one crucial aspect. Whereas a political-jurisdictional territory is primarily defined by a closed and precise limit, an indigenous territory, although possibly demarcated and delimited, is defined not primarily by its borders and limits but by geographical marks which represent the bond between a group of humans, landscape and history. This concept of 'territory', which had already been widely used in the Colombian Andean area back in the seventies, was introduced into the political lexicon of the emerging Amazonian indigenous organizations in the Eighties and Nineties.

This process coincided in 1991 with the promulgation of a new Political Constitution which declared Colombia a 'pluri-ethnic and multi-cultural' country, recognised the indigenous languages as official "in their respective territories", and raised the indigenous Preserves to constitutional rank, declaring them 'unseizable, unenforceable, and imprescriptible'. But besides this, the new Constitution placed the country's 'territorial reordering' issue at the top of the political agenda, which meant the redefinition of the existing Territorial Entities (Departments and Municipalities) as well as the creation of new Entities (Provinces, Regions and Indigenous Territorial Entities). This opened the door to the possibility of promoting the Preserves, especially the Amazonian macro-Preserves (which until then only constituted a means of land ownership) to these Indigenous Territorial Entities that held a political and administrative autonomy statute. To this day (2005), the Statutory Territorial Ordering Law, which should have been passed shortly after the new Constitution, has not been successfully approved in

Congress, despite the number of advanced Bills – some of which actively backed by the indigenous movement.

However, the questions concerning us here are not as much the political and judicial ups and downs of Colombia's territorial issues, as their effects on the semantics of the Amazonian peoples' concept of territory, nourished by all these factors.

First of all, the Constitution introduced the concept of territorial *ordering*, an expression that made little sense in the Colombian political vocabulary prior to 1991. Territorial ordering was often conflated with "environmental zoning", a technical task based on discriminating areas based on a range of physical-biotic attributes – and more recently, on data compiled by remote sensors. However, since the 1991 Constitution, the territorial ordering began to be conceived of as a political issue that put at stake the reordering of the electoral districts, the distribution of resources, competencies and jurisdictions, as well as opening new possibilities for autonomy and access to resources for marginalised sectors and regions –including also the indigenous peoples.

Both these meanings – technical and political – of territorial ordering have often been confused and overlapped in the decisions and debates, although the concept of territorial ordering as a matter concerning the zoning of areas has tended to dominate.

The ideas presented here stem from my participation as anthropology consultant for the implementation of a joint-management agreement of an area overlapping the above mentioned Predio Putumayo Preserve and the National Cahuinari Natural Park. The difficulties experienced in trying to bring together two territorial management concepts such as the ones reflected in the Parks' management programmes (based on the environmental zoning methodologies) and the indigenous' concepts of territorial management, led us to reconsider 'the territory' from another angle, which we came to denominate 'non-areolar territory'.

Non-areolar territory

If we review the 'territorial ordering programmes' elaborated by a number of Amazonian indigenous groups' organizations, (see, for example, Vieco et al. 2000), we get the feeling that the zoning of areas is far from their main concern. On the contrary, the programmes' key issue is the ethnic legitimisation of the group or groups, the reproduction of the people (education, health and economy) and the relationship with other groups, as well as with the rest of society. The so-called *planes de vida* ("life programmes"), a phrase coined by the *Organización Nacional Indígena de Colombia (ONIC)* at the end of the nineties, are exactly the same.

These territorial ordering programmes are usually accompanied by maps sketching a number of delimitations. The maps serve to indicate historical or mythological sites or legally defined territorial entities (Departments, Municipalities, Preserves and Parks). When new 'zonings' are attempted (the delimitation of sacred or reserved areas, or of areas belonging to specific groups), these zonings have a provisional or accessory character and do not reflect the programme's key objective, which is the ordering of relationships over and above the zoning of geographical areas.

This manner of 'territorial ordering' is based on a *different* concept of 'territory'. By highlighting the word 'different' we emphasise that this is not only about 'cultural' difference. It is not so much a question of this territorial ordering concept being uniquely 'indigenous', but rather that the indigenous peoples have articulated that notion of territory in this manner. However, in no way is it 'unique' or culturally specific to them. It is different because it is another, non-areolar, way of perceiving the territory. The political-administrative zoning and ordering tasks require an areolar notion of territory. 'Territory' is a geographical area to which meanings or attributes are assigned (physical, political jurisdictional, ownership and legal statute characteristics). The non-areolar ('indigenous') notion of territory is conceived based on a *relational* model – as a fabric, not as areas. If the areolar notion of territory corresponds to the image of two-dimensional maps, the non-areolar notion coincides, to a greater extent, with an image modelled as a living body that nourishes itself, reproduces and weaves relationships with other bodies. Parting from this idea, it seems coherent that, in 'indigenous' versions, the 'territory' is frequently represented, for example, as a *maloca* (a woman's body) or that the rituals and ceremonies are conceived as territorial management (ordering).

In an article written by Rodrigo Botero and myself (Botero and Echeverri 2002), about the territorial policy of the Ministry of the Environment's Park Division (UAESPNN), we propose the application of this non-areolar territorial notion to the UAESPNN'S territorial policies on the management of protected areas overlapping with indigenous Preserves. The instrumental notion of territory that we propose is based on a basic formula: 'territory' is primarily understood as "appetite" – vital impulse, desire. In order to understand how, from this fundamentally non-areolar notion, we arrive at territories, expressed as geographical spaces, we go back to the model of a living being's development. Thus, we affirm that every creature's *first territory* is the maternal womb, a salted sea from which the creature obtains its nourishment and satisfies its needs. After the birth, the baby's territory becomes its mother's body, especially her breasts. From this unique and self-containing territory, it has to establish relationships and find nourishment in other 'territories'. During its development, the human being has to find nourishment in the natural environment (plants and animals), an environment that is also the territory of other species. Later, upon reaching the reproduc-

tive phase, it also has to seek a partner from another human group. This fundamental need to use others' territories (i.e., others' bodies) in order to grow and reproduce is what makes the territory to naturalise itself, as well as to socialise itself by establishing relationships, of a conflictive or bonding nature, with other natural or human agents.

The spatial weaving of the territory produces a relational fabric with other beings' territories. A fundamental characteristic of this territorial notion is its net-like shape and structure based on what we term 'channels'. *Channel* is defined as the appropriation of another territory's energy or vital substance, which leads to domination, conflict or competition, or to the establishment of ordered relationships.²

Territorial vision

These ideas help us to redefine the spatial structure of the territory and relocate the observer or agent's position who 'sees' that territory from a specific 'territorial vision'.

Our cartographical habits have accustomed us to seek the territory in two-dimensional scaled maps. The observer's vision is from the top and *simultaneous* - covering all the points of the map - given that a scaled map's representation has no perspective distortions, i.e., the observer is necessarily outside of the map.

By contrast, the vision of territory that we propose is not based on the model of the two-dimensional scaled map but on the model of the human body that grows, consumes food, has sex, establishes relationships, reproduces and intermingles with other territories which also grow, consume food and have sex. In this vision, the spatial representation of the territory acquires the shape of a net, or a network of relationships that may be partially mapped and where scale does not constitute a crucial element. The crucial elements indeed are the *channels* that connect the net's nodes. In addition, instead of the observer being outside and above the territory, she is located in one of its nodes from where she builds and maintains the channels or conducts with neighbouring nodes and participates, or contributes, to the order or disorder of the system as a whole.

This model has interesting methodological consequences. First of all, our redefinition of territory and territorial vision forces us to reconsider the meaning of territorial ordering. The structural model that compares territory with cartographical representations of geographical areas leads to an ordering methodology consisting of arranging the 'information' in layers (geology, soil, vegetation, human settlements, public services, etc.) and subsequently, by combining and selecting these information layers, it delimits areas which break down the compilation of information into roughly homogenous groupings. The most sophisticated version of this method is landscape ecology, based on images captured by

remote sensors, which identifies homogenous areas (by colours, textures and densities) and then explains these areas as the hierarchical combination of different formative factors.

By contrast, our territorial vision leans towards an ordering methodology that emphasises the operation of the territorial net based on specific spaced nodes, and not on the definition of areas which characterise its formative elements based on a hierarchical explanatory chain. Our aim is not to propose a divorce or competition between these alternative ways of conceiving the territory and its ordering. On the contrary, we propose an instrument to improve the resolution to understand the territory as a fabric of relationships, without losing sight of the potential of other instruments which aid to obtain a global spatial vision.

Interculturality and territorial management in overlapping areas

The notion of territory as a fabric of relationships may serve as an adequate focus for introducing the notion of interculturality to the definition, for example, of a system of protected areas, and thus applying a methodological principle to the elaboration of management programmes for these areas.

The Colombian lawyer Roque Roldán has pointed out that in the areas where indigenous territories and natural protected areas overlap, "two administrative authority figures cannot coexist simultaneously" and, taking into account the higher juridical hierarchy of the Preserve and the precedence of indigenous peoples' rights, "is clear the deduction that points to the inapplicability of the administration's postulates concerning the Parks in these types of territories" (Roldán 2001:37). The Colombian natural parks' system is conceived on the premise that the Ministry of the Environment's Parks Division (UAESPNN) holds absolute power and control over them. However, in the vast majority of areas this absolute control is far from reality, and the fact that a 'social participation conservation policy' was recently formulated (UAESPNN 2001), highlights the need to negotiate and interact with other territorial players in an effort to reach the objectives of the protected areas' system. The protected areas overlapping with indigenous Preserves are an extreme example, where the UAESPNN's decision power is limited to a high degree by indigenous rights and national and international laws governing indigenous communities.³

'Interculturality' – and other related terms, such as participation, dialogue, consensus, etc. – should be key concepts for the planning of parks and protected areas, although that label is often used as meaning the taking of fragments of the native 'world view' and adding them as footnotes to a plan elaborated from an areolar and zoning territorial vision. What we propose is rather the meeting of territorial visions (not environmental visions), as a conceptual tool for addressing the *intercultural* construction of management programmes. It entails addressing

interculturality as a combination and creation, not as a device. This not only implies the gesture of 'recognising' and 'valuing' indigenous thought, but also adopting it as part of oneself, experiencing and re-creating it. It entails a type of reversal of the conventional discursive hegemonic relationships: instead of adapting the indigenous peoples' 'world view' to an environmentalist paradigm, it is rather about integrating the UAESPNN, for example, into the indigenous or social territory in which it operates. To use a apt expression pronounced by the Miraña leaders during the first Governing Body's meeting to discuss the implementation of the joint-management agreement for the Cahuinari Park, interculturality means that "We are a single mass".

One of the key components of the National Parks' management programmes is the zoning, which is based on a rigorous framework determined by the Law. The application of these regulations, as well as of the management programmes' elaboration frameworks, need to be reviewed, starting with the overlapping areas. This could have interesting consequences on the methodology of the programmes used for the entire system of protected areas.

In the above mentioned article (Botero y Echeverri 2002) we made progress on a methodological proposal for the territorial organization of protected areas, which in fact constitutes a proposal for the shared construction of management programmes. In the non-areolar territorial vision that we propose, the observer is actor and agent, being that she is inside the territory, not outside or above it. The methodological steps of this method of territorial ordering are as follows: (i) identifying its 'appetite', which in institutional language can be denominated conservation mission or objective; (ii) this institutional appetite is found in other actors who share the same appetite for the same space: native communities or homesteaders who occupy them and from where they obtain their sustenance, other institutions that have their jurisdictions there, etc; the actor-node has to identify those other territorial nodes and establish and *organise* the channels between them. From here, two methodological rules emerge: (a) The channels are identified, established and organised *one by one*, not all at the same time, (b) the channels are not formal but vital and, furthermore, the maintenance of the channel is a daily and face-to-face activity. This procedural method can in effect be considered as the ordering of the territorial fabric.

This is the founding nucleus of a 'system' of protected areas, or better still, of a territorial system of protected areas.

One of the most difficult aspects of this methodology is to determine how to establish, maintain and cultivate those channels with the actors. The principles that may help to guide this task are the base of an ethic of new relationships methods, i.e. a political pedagogy.

The Miraña, the maps and the Agreement

The Miraña are currently settled in the middle and lower Caqueta River (known in Brazil as Japurá) and number approximately 200 people. They are linguistically related to the Bora and the Muinane. The Miraña from the middle and lower Caqueta River are the remains of a formerly numerous group that used to inhabit the basins of the Cahuinari and Pamá Rivers. It was during the rubber boom (1900-1930) that the Miraña, together with other groups from the area between the Caqueta and Putumayo Rivers, were left decimated after suffering epidemics and the brutal extortions of the infamous Peruvian Amazon Company or Casa Arana. Today, practically none of the groups which in the 20th Century occupied the area between the Caqueta and Putumayo Rivers remain in their ancestral territory, after resettling on the banks of the Putumayo, Caraparaná, Igaraparaná and Caquetá Rivers.

In the past, the Miraña were organised in patrilineal exogamic clans and apparently occupied their own exclusive territories – at least according to one of the 'traditional maps' elaborated by them. With the demographic decline, the exoduses and resettlements, many clans disappeared and the ones that survived remained socially weakened and reduced. In the current settlements we encounter the coexistence of different clans, with diverse social prestige and demography. The Miraña have also married women from other groups, mainly Yucuna and Carijona, as well as from non-indigenous groups.

Since the creation of the Cahuinari Park in 1987 and the Predio Putumayo Preserve in 1988 (85% of which overlaps the Park's area), the relationships between the Miraña and the environmental authorities (the UAESPNN and previously, the *Instituto Nacional de los Recursos Naturales Renovables* INDERENA) have gone from direct opposition to occasional agreements on local issues. In June 2001 an 'inter-administrative agreement for the coordination of the government task of conservation and management of the Cahuinari National Natural Park's area, between the Ministry of the Environment and the Miraña public authority' was signed. This agreement marked a significant step forward towards ending more than ten years of differences about each party's territorial legitimacy. The Miraña affirmed that the Park's area was part of their traditional territory and the environmental authorities defended their territorial competence in protecting the resources, a responsibility handed down from central government.

In these disputes, the maps played a role in both parties' vindications of territorial knowledge and representation. In the Nineties, the elaboration of indigenous maps experienced a significant boom very much linked to political vindications. The Miraña, on their part, produced several maps. In 1989, they produced a magnificent traditional map showing all the Miraña names of all the streams and rivers, indicating the salt licks, the mythological sites as well as the

places of origin of the clans.⁴ It is a map of the 'ancestral territory' covering the entire area of the Cahuinari Park and stretching beyond it several times over. This map is full of mysteries, partially revealing a truth that always escapes us; the places are traces of mythological stories whose meanings are barely insinuated; it is full of 'secrets' that cannot be revealed. The map is an immense and detailed act of symbolic possession, and even though we do not understand its details and logic, we do understand that it constitutes an affirmation of territorial legitimacy weighted with political power to dispute the Colombian environment authorities' territorial pretensions to the Cahuinari Park.

It is not surprising to discover that few Miraña recognise and understand the names and places of this traditional map, in the same way that it is no surprise to see that few 'whites' understand the maps that scientists – geologists, ecologists, botanists – also draw up to justify and manage their protected areas: geology, geomorphology, edaphology, vegetation, climate – with a 'legend' (instead of a myth) explaining everything. Shamans and scientists holding undecipherable maps who cannot find one another.

After drawing up this first traditional map, efforts continued to be made to complete and correct it. Inspection tours and investigations, backed by Non-Government Organizations and cooperation agencies, left little more than drafts and manuscripts which were even harder to understand. From 1997 onwards, and as the result of a project financed by the International Organization for Tropical Timber (OIMT), the maps' issue was reviewed in an effort to reach agreements on the joint-administration of the Park. The initial focus was changed. It was now a question of finding common ground between the shamanic concept and the conservation interests. The maps were gradually domesticated, so to speak, in two ways. On the one hand, maps that came closer to the houses and current uses (settlement and cultivation areas, paths, fishing, hunting and wild resources areas) were drafted. Here, women, fishermen and hunters, not only the shamans, were given a say in the matter. On the other hand, attempts were made to move away from the shamanistic notion of the traditional map and, without explaining their mysteries and secrets, efforts were made to draw-up management zones in the same way as environmental zones: a housing and sustenance zone, a 'sacred' zone where no one can enter or investigate, a protection zone, a special management zone where the *charapa* tortoises lay their eggs, etc. All in all, seven zones were drawn-up, delimited by thick lines and filled-in with colours.

Later, in an attempt to make the maps more accessible to the whites' cartographical, biophysical and zoning conventions, these indigenous maps gradually lost their power – they represented the areas but not the vital territory.

The territory that we refer to is vital and relational, not cartographical. What we proposed to find when we were invited as consultants was not so much the 'Miraña territory', which is outside our sphere of competence, but something that we could call 'the territory of the agreement' – the relational space where mutual

appetites coincide or fail to coincide. This territory is a channel, a fecundation area, a playing field. Scientists' and shamans' maps do not manage to reflect this territory. In the excesses of their mutual inscriptions (exhaustive nomination of *all* the mythological sites and streams, exhaustive demarcations of *all* the physiological and vegetation zones), what they were illustrating was the deficit of signification of the encounter. There were maps but there was no agreement, no play and no channel. Those maps – the scientists' and shamans' – signalled this territory, but by its absence.

To find this territory, more than detailed maps, what are needed are the points of encounter. The area of the Cahuinari Park is what brings the Miraña and the UAESPNN together. The more significance each party gives to this area (the more the area is drawn-up and explained) the more the parties draw apart. The maps that attempt to illustrate the entire area as known territory are a distraction to the search of the territory that needs to be found, known and investigated – the mutual relationship territory. Indeed, this is a territory that we could call 'sacred' because it is vital, because the things that matter are at stake.

We have mentioned that this territory is a channel and have also insinuated that it is a playing field, a regulated space where two players come face-to-face. The question here is – What are the rules of the game?

The Cahuinari Agreement as intercultural dialogue

In the Governing Body's first plenary session, in which the implementation of the Cahuinari Park Agreement was discussed, it was made clear that 'the Agreement', over and above a legal instrument that formalises the coordination between the national environment authority and the Miraña indigenous authorities, is a political and pedagogical process. It entails a new way of engaging in politics, insofar as sharing the government task of conservation, which is not simply a question of transferring a few responsibilities to the 'communities', but it implies *combining* two ways of conceiving that government task – for the UAESPNN it means the conservation of a protected area, and for the Miraña authorities, looking after the territory. This combination leads to new management methods that are not strictly in response to one or the other, but emerge from dialogue, trust and mutual teaching and learning. This is the reason why the Agreement is a political exercise through pedagogy.

But this is not simply a question of mutual learning (which is essential for the process), but more a question of the teaching and learning responsibilities that each party had been performing. For the Miraña, all the maps drawn-up at the end of the eighties, all that 'design' work was, in the words of the Cacique Boa, "for the new generations, so that they would familiarise themselves with their ancestral territory". Likewise, today the Agreement with the UAESPNN implies

that the indigenous leaders and authorities familiarise themselves with new responsibilities. That very same Governing Body's session became a learning opportunity – a workshop. But this is not just about a learning exercise exclusively targeted to the indigenous peoples. The UAESPNN seems to conceive and manage all the issues deriving from the Agreement as learning and teaching processes. For example, the main activity implemented by the Park's administrative workers after the signing of the Agreement focussed on 'socialisation' routines, consisting of awareness workshops to explain the meaning of the Agreement's text.

One of the objectives of the Agreement is 'intercultural training'. In the Governing Body's plenary session it was made clear that this training was not meant to be formal training courses, but that it was at the very heart of the Agreement, stemming from the fact that the essence of the Agreement was the *sharing* (and not merely the delegation) of the government conservation task. This requires conceptual readjustments by both parties and imposes challenges that can only be overcome through dialogue and mutual learning. That is, neither party knows beforehand how this combined management method should be. Both parties know and manage their own organization skills, and they lean towards the others' with curiosity and perplexity, increasingly becoming aware of their mutual ignorance. The Agreement has implications for the very definition of the conservation objectives which should guide the Park's management programmes. For the Miraña, the management is founded on two principles which they call 'territory' and 'law of origin'. In the Governing Body's plenary session the Miraña did not reveal much information about the meaning of these concepts, limiting themselves to explain that they are fundamental concepts and that, for them, they hold a 'more profound' and different meaning than the interpretation that the 'whites' could possibly give them. However, one thing is definitely clear, the notion of 'territory', the base of the Miraña management programme, is centred on the concept of human life and its reproduction. As the Cacique Boa expressed it, "Our territory is Centre" and "it is with nature that we must consult". 'Centre' means human life (which socially and spatially manifests itself in families, clans, cultivation fields, fallows, landscape), and natural beings also have their 'territories', therefore the management has to be 'consulted', negotiated. As examples of this consultation, the Cacique Boa described the chopping of trees to prepare a cultivation field (where humans speak to the natural owners to explain that they are going to strip down a section of the forest but that they will replant it with fruit trees), and a hunting expedition (where the humans ask the natural Master of the Animals to give them some of his 'fruits'). The territory is a space for human life which expands, from the centre, in negotiations with other spaces (natural and social).

By contrast, the territorial notion based on the science of conservation is centred on wild life and human action consists of delimiting and demarcating areas to guarantee the reproduction of this wild life. These differences are illustrated in the following table:

	<i>Indigenous Territory</i>	<i>Conservation Area</i>
What is its focal point?	Reproduction of human life	Reproduction of wild life
How does it spatially express itself?	A centre that expands and enters into relationships with other centres	A limit that segregates an area to protect it
Conservation objectives	Consolidation of the territory (expressed in a <i>plan de vida</i> 'life programme')	Maintenance of the conditions for the reproduction of wild life (management programmes)

Territory as nature and as body

The above chart summarises, in political and management of an area terms, the contrast between an areolar (environment authorities) and a non-areolar vision (Miraña authorities) of the 'territory'. It is not a question of an agreement between different 'territorial' visions, which would need to be discussed. It is rather about different 'perspectives' which are elaborating, in contrasting fashions, the very object of what is being negotiated.

I use the term 'perspective' deliberately here, in the sense employed by Eduardo Viveiros de Castro (in this volume). Viveiros de Castro confirms certain frequent facts in South America's ethnography (and probably far beyond it) which are difficult to understand from a strictly naturalist perspective as, for example, the common belief that certain animals (tapirs, tigers, fish, etc.) are 'people' and that, from their own point of view, we humans, are 'animals'. That, which from our own perspective (as human beings) are natural objects – a salt lick and wild fruit trees –, from the tapir's perspective is a house and a cultivation field. These types of affirmations are unintelligible (indeed, irrational) from a perspective that conceives nature and its objects (plants, animals, landscapes, etc.) as something that is given and is equal to all. Therefore, from this naturalist perspective, a tapir is a tapir and a human being a human being and they are different from one another. From a contrasting, non-naturalist, point of view, the affirmation that tapirs are people is understandable, from a point of view that takes for granted, that which is 'given', not nature and its objects, but a knowing subject. Human beings are subjects, as are tapirs, and each one, from its own point of view 'builds' its nature; from the human point of view, a nature where the tapir is tapir and a salt lick a salt lick; from the tapir's point of view, a nature where the human is a 'tiger' (because it is its hunter) and the salt lick is a *maloca* where it dances.

The same applies to the 'body'. In Amazonian ethnography we often come across the general belief that having a *Homo sapiens* body is not a guarantee for being a 'human being'. In other words, a human body is not a 'natural' object; it must be constructed by way of nourishment, healing, marks and transformations. If, from a non-indigenous point of view, we understood that there exists a unique human nature, common to all, on which multiple human 'cultures' are constructed; from a contrasting perspective we would then understand that we have a unique culture (the human one) on which multiple human natures are built on. As Viveiros de Castro affirms, instead of a multi-culturalism, we would talk about multi-naturalism.

These perspectives, based on defining what is conceived as 'given' and what must be constructed, can help us to interpret the above table, in which the territorial visions of the UAESPNN and the Miraña authorities are compared and which we, in principle, have identified as an areolar vision (the first) and a non-areolar vision (the second). From the UAESPNN'S point of view, what is 'given' and is common to both parties, that which raises no doubts, is the geographical area of the Cahuinari Park, a natural object. On the other hand, what needs to be built are the actions and decisions concerning the area, a 'management programme', an issue that they are prepared to settle and negotiate with the indigenous people though a type of intercultural dialogue - to incorporate into the biology principles of conservation what supposedly are comparable and complementary principles of indigenous management (derived from a peculiar shamanistic vision, etc.)

From the traditional Miraña authorities' point of view, and taking as hypothesis our idea of the non-areolar vision of the territory, what is 'given' (and what would be equally common to the indigenous, to the UAESPNN as well as to other actors) is the vital and reproduction impulse of a body (individual or social) which gradually grows, establishes channels and interchanges with other bodies (social or natural); and what needs to be built is the social and natural landscape where this body can expand and reproduce, modifying it, nominating it, establishing links, etc.

We normally take for granted that the indigenous people have 'different' visions or conceptions of things that we assume are given. An example of this would be the Park's 'territory'. It would then be a question of trying to understand, through an intercultural dialogue, that 'different' vision. Based on the previous analysis, we would be coming to terms with the idea that it is not so much a question of different visions of the same thing but, from the indigenous perspective, of the same vision that builds different objects. In other words, for the Miraña, the 'Park' would not mean the same to the UAESPNN, but what would indeed be the same is each other's 'humanity'.

A couple of interventions during the first Governing Body's plenary session serve to illustrate this contrast. A UAESPNN high official summarised the importance of the Agreement in the following terms, (my italics) "The Convention is not just a text, but a *new* method of making decisions about managing the terri-

tory." Let us compare this with another affirmation pronounced by the Miraña's Cacique during the same session, "It is not another thought [referring to the Agreement] it is the *same* thought as ours', this is the way to make people understand. This is how the Agreement is socialized, by talking to the people."

For the UAESPNN, what is interesting about the Agreement is that it is innovative, a new way of doing things. By contrast, for the indigenous people the Agreement does not have to be anything new, it must be the same, the same thought. What needs to be done is to communicate it to the people. We have here what appears to be a typical example of intercultural (mis)communication but, in fact, from the indigenous point of view, the 'interculturality' issue is not important. It is not a question of interchanging knowledge, where a dialogue about shamanic and scientific concepts of nature and its management would come into play. For the UAESPNN, following a general trend of recognition and positive evaluation of indigenous issues, this intercultural dialogue would mark a political step forward. What is essential for the indigenous people, for the management of the Cahuinari Park, is not the exchange of concepts, notions and principles (as expressed in the Agreement's objectives), but the exchange of food and objects. To express it in Viveiros de Castro's words, this is not a question of constructing 'souls' (as the conceptual principles of a management programme would have) but the construction of bodies. Perhaps it is for this reason that UAESPNN administration officials had the feeling that the indigenous people did not appear to be conscious of the fact that this was an opportunity given to them by the State, to participate in the elaboration of environment policies and, by contrast, they seemed to be more interested in having access to the job vacancies available in the Park (and their respective salaries), and to productive projects, etc.

The Cacique expressed it in a brilliant manner "The Agreement's thought is no other, it is the same thought as ours", and that concept of 'ours' (the human beings, and I would even go as far as to affirm that in that 'ours' the Cacique includes all human beings) is nothing more than living comfortably, eating, reproducing bodies and establishing relationships with others, including the UAESPNN and the tapirs.

The interesting aspect of an agreement (or, from another point of view, a channel) is not so much the formulation of principles and novel concepts, but the circulation of mutually reproducible substances and food. This circulation of substances is of course dangerous, requiring regulation and care; which, for the indigenous people, is the foundation and principle of 'territorial management.'

Words, like 'territory', can be the same but represent completely different concepts. It is not a question of having different 'meanings' but, because they stem from different perspectives, they have no way of making reference to the same objects. In the political exercise that we have reviewed, the main negotiation issue does not stem from the problem of the different cultural conceptions that would need to be placed on the 'dialogue' table, but more from the problem of establishing good *social* relationships that would enable the growth and repro-

duction of the bodies. This is how the Cacique clearly explained it "This is how the Convention is socialized, by talking to the people."

If the UAESPNN expects an intercultural dialogue from the indigenous people, in which certain shamanistic management principles would complement the principles of conservation biology in order to elaborate a management programme for that common objective, which is the Cahuinari Park; what the indigenous people expect from the UAESPNN is that it establishes a social relationship with them, which will allow both parties to reproduce in their respective bodies - the indigenous reproducing their families, fields and *malocas* as well as acquiring goods and substances from the whites, which they also need in their lives, and the UAESPNN reproducing its method of becoming a body, in the shape of a hut, monitoring stations, investigations, publications, etc.

The illusion of 'intercultural dialogue' produces the effect that in the end both needs and appetites remain unsatisfied. Neither does the UAESPNN obtain the elements of the shamanistic vision of nature (because they are 'secret', etc.) nor do the indigenous acquire the minimum return that they expect from an ally (because that is not what is 'important'). More than an intercultural dialogue towards understanding the territory (as nature), what is most needed are good social relationships to build the territory (as body). □

Notes

Translated from Spanish by Cruz Farina.

- 1 "Preserves" are different from "Reserves" in that a Preserve grants legal ownership of the land to the natives, whereas on Reserves the government grants the use of the land to inhabitants but retains property rights.
- 2 For example, the human being can obtain substances from animals (their bodies) in order to consume them, without giving anything in return. Some natives believe that these animal beings are agents capable of 'collecting their dues' by way of illnesses. They therefore regulate such appropriations through their natural owners, as if through social relationships of mutual benefit. Some anthropologists have interpreted this 'shamanic' concept of relationships with animals as native ecology.
- 3 The lessons learnt from the management of overlapping areas should reveal paths for the management of other areas where the Unit's decisive control and autonomy are compromised in various degrees by ownerships methods, historical rights, etc.
- 4 This map was elaborated with the help of the sociologist Nicolás Bermúdez and with the support of the Fundación Capacitar.

References

- Botero, R. & Echeverri, J. 2002: "¿Política territorial o territorializar la política?: Ensayo metodológico en la Dirección Territorial Orinoquia Amazonía" in *Parques con la gente II: Política de participación*

- social en la conservación*, Unidad Administrativa Especial del Sistema de Parques Nacionales de Colombia, Bogotá: Ministerio del Medio Ambiente, pp. 267-288.
- Echeverri, J.A. 2000: "Reflexiones sobre el concepto indígena de territorio y ordenamiento territorial" in J.J. Vieco, C. Franky & J.A. Echeverri (eds.), *Territorialidad indígena y ordenamiento en la Amazonia*, Bogotá: Unibiblos, pp. 173-182.
- Roldán, R. 2001: *Resguardos indígenas y parques naturales en Colombia: Una reflexión sobre la viabilidad o no de su coexistencia legal sobre un mismo espacio territorial*, Documento de trabajo No. 8, Bogotá: Consolidación Amazónica (COAMA).
- UAESPNN (Unidad Administrativa Especial del Sistema de Parques Nacionales Naturales, Ministerio del Medio Ambiente, Colombia) 2001: *Política de participación social en la conservación*, Bogotá: Ministerio del Medio Ambiente.
- Vieco, J.J., Franky, C. & Echeverri, J.A., eds. 2000: *Territorialidad indígena y ordenamiento en la Amazonia*, Bogotá, Unibiblos.