6-1-2015

In Search of Ordenamiento Ambiental Territorial in the Peasant Reserve Zones of Colombia

Manuela Ruiz Reyes
Syracuse University

Abstract

This thesis is an intersection between political ecology, rural development and agrarian studies. It examines the Peasant Reserve Zone (ZRC) as a land planning designation in Colombia created in the 1990s as part of the Colombian state's effort at agrarian reform, and the expressions of *Ordenamiento Ambiental Territorial* (glossed as environmental land use planning), by the state and the peasants as ways of constructing territory. Beginning by situating the emergence of the ZRC as part of the classic agrarian question of the fate of the peasantry in capitalism, it then intersects that political-economy perspective with a geographic approach to the concept of territory. The establishment of the political technology of *Ordenamiento territorial* and its environmental version, *Ordenamiento Ambiental Territorial* are analyzed together with arrival of neoliberalism in the 1990s in Colombia. Using a political ecology lens, *Ordenamiento Ambiental Territorial* is dissected by searching the current meaning of environment from its roots in the meanings of nature and particularly with the production of nature under capitalism. Finally, through three perspectives on development, this thesis analyzes diverse forms of development planning in the ZRC (Sustainable Development Plans of each ZRC, results of the ZRC pilot project financed by the World Bank, and fieldwork results) to examine cross-cutting issues of environmental governance in the ZRC including participation, expectations and imaginaries of the state, the ZRC and "the peasant community". The main message of this work is that ZRC peasants are not only claiming land rights but are demanding a recognition of territory through their engagements with *Ordenamiento Territorial*, their uses of *Ordenamiento Ambiental Territorial* and their participation in development planning.

IN SEARCH OF *ORDENAMIENTO AMBIENTAL TERRITORIAL* IN THE PEASANT RESERVE ZONES OF COLOMBIA

by

Manuela Ruiz Reyes

B.A. Pontificia Universidad Javeriana, 2007

Thesis
Submitted in partial fulfillment for the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Geography

Syracuse University
June, 2015

Table of Contents

Chapters:

List of Illustrative materials

List of acronyms

ANUC: Asociación Nacional de Usuarios Campesinos
ANZORC: Asociación Nacional de Zonas de Reserva Campesina
CAR: Corporación Autónoma Regional
CDA: Corporación para el Desarrollo Sostenible del Norte y el Oriente Amazónico
CONPES: Consejo Nacional de Política Económica y Social
DMI: Distrito de Manejo Integrado
EGAL: Encuentro de Geógrafos de América Latina
EOT: Esquema de Ordenamiento Territorial
FARC-EP: Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia –Ejército del Pueblo
IGAC: Instituto Geográfico Agustín Codazzi
ILSA: Instituto Lationoamericano para una Sociedad y un Derecho Alternativos
INCODER: Instituto Colombiano de Desarrollo Rural
INCORA: Instituto Colombiano de la Reforma Agraria
INDERENA: Instituto Nacional de Recursos Naturales
IUCN: International Union for Conservation of Nature
JAC: Junta de Acción Comunal
LIL: Learning and Innovation Loan
M-19: Movimiento 19 de Abril
MOG: Manual Operativo General
MOZ: Manual Operativo Zonal
NGO: Non-Governmental Organization
NP: National Parks
OA: Ordenamiento Ambiental
OAT: Ordenamiento Ambiental del Territorio (or Territorial)
OT: Ordenamiento Territorial
PNN: Parques Nacionales Naturales de Colombia
POA: Plan Operativo Anual
POMCA: Plan de Manejo y Ordenamiento de una Cuenca
POT: Plan de Ordenamiento Territorial
REDD+: Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation
SDP: Sustainable Development Plan
SDP-C: Sustainable Development Plan of Cabrera
SINAP: Sistema Nacional de Areas Protegidas
SINPEAGRICUN: Sindicato de Pequeños Agricultores de Cundinamarca
UACA: Unidades Ambientales Campesinas
UAF: Unidad Agrícola Familiar
UMATA: Unidad Municipal de Asistencia Técnica
UP: Unión Patriótica
UPRA: Unidad de Planificación Rural Agropecuaria
WB: World Bank
WBPP: World Bank Pilot Project of Peasant Reserve Zones
ZRC: Zona de Reserva Campesina

CHAPTER 1.

> The agreement acknowledges that the Peasant Reserve Zones are a figure [*sic*] that the State has to promote peasant economy and contribute to close the agricultural boundary and the production of food supplies. For that reason, it was determined that the National Government will bring into effect the support for development plans for the already constituted zones and those to be constituted, in response to the initiatives of the communities and of the agrarian organizations they may consider representative, following the provisions set forth in the current regulations, and promoting active community participation in the execution of these plans[1].

This fragment is part of the first agreement in the peace dialogues between the government of Colombia and the guerrilla of the *Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia-Ejército del Pueblo* (FARC-EP). The content of this agreement is part of their first broad discussion point: *Comprehensive Agricultural Development Policy* negotiated during 2013. The agreements on this first point have not been approved because the participants of the dialogue have said "nothing is agreed until everything is agreed." It is important to set this quote as an initial situated reference to this study because it refers to the topic of this thesis, the *Peasant Reserve Zones* (ZRC in this document). The quote also mentions issues that will be explored in this study: peasant economy, development plans and community participation. Mentioning the ZRC in the peace dialogues has placed this designation, the peasants and their organizations as part of the current political agenda in Colombia. With this study, I am contributing to a growing interest by Colombian scholars on the ZRC due to their political relevance. Hopefully I can also

[1] Official translation of the English version of the First joint report of the dialogue table between the government of the Republic of Colombia and the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia – People's Army, FARC – EP. Accessed in: https://www.mesadeconversaciones.com.co/sites/default/files/Informe%20%20Conjunto%201-%20Mesa%20de%20Conversaciones%20-Gobierno%20y%20Farc%20-%20Version%20ingles.pdf

contribute with a perspective on the ZRC informed by my transition from ecologist-conservationist to geographer-political ecologist during my master's study.

Taking Joel Wainwright's definition of political ecology as a field with "an anti-disciplinary project aimed at calling into question the nature of politics and the politics of nature" (2008: 30), this research focuses on how the politics of the ZRC are constructed, and how within them, the politics of environmental aspects (broadly understood) are constructed, enacted, disrupted, resisted, or accepted.

The paths to theory.

I arrived to geography after having worked as an ecologist and conservationist in my native Colombia for seven years. For my research topic, I was seeking to bring my past academic knowledge and work experience in protected areas, civil society conservation initiatives and conservation projects to this new field of study. I wanted to combine my professional interest in *Ordenamiento Ambiental del Territorio* (OAT in this thesis) with a new topic for me, agrarian studies which I find particularly relevant in present day Colombian politics, as I will discuss later.

I soon found that *Ordenamiento Ambiental del Territorio* -literally translated as 'environmental ordering of the territory' and in practical terms as 'environmental land use planning'- was ambiguously referred to by many of my interviewees and was difficult to conceptually translate to an Anglophone audience. I combined my own perceptions of what OAT is; the descriptions and references that I got from my interviews; and a more familiar concept in Anglophone academy: *environmental governance*. This last concept allows mixing two main topics of my research. The first one, referred to the constant negotiations between state government and grassroots governance proposals. The second topic, about the social and

economic construction of *the environment* and where and how it fits with agrarian issues and government-governance shifts.

I chose as a study site the *Peasant Reserve Zones* (ZRC in this document) for reasons that I will explain later on. For now, it is important to say that I begin with a Marxist analysis of the emergence of the ZRC, framed around the agrarian question. I realized that the agrarian question debates were too economic and easily dismissed or not even mentioned the territorial component of agrarian issues. I think that framing the emergence of the ZRC with the agrarian question is relevant in terms of how agrarian reforms and the role of the state have been discussed in Colombia for the last century. Yet, to link the agrarian question with a geographic perspective of territory, and to later connect to this emerging perspective (agrarian question plus territory) how environmental issues appear, I go back to environmental governance as a framing concept. Bridge and Perreault (2009: 476) identify governance as an academic concept that arises partly with the skepticism towards traditional theories such as the Marxist analyses of the bourgeois state. This allows me to use governance to analyze the shifts in the ways of rule (government to governance) in agrarian and environmental issues in a specific time frame (1990s to 2010s).

The ZRC were legislated in the 1990s, during the rise of the neoliberal state in Colombia. This sets my case study, in a time when the state was changing its protective and regulatory role to favor opening to world markets, and civil society was gaining political strength through new ways of participation with the creation of NGOs. It was also the decade when the concept of *the environmental* took shape and got separated as a whole new concept to be legislated, negotiated, planned and commodified, apart from *the agro*. For instance in Colombia in the 1990s, INDERENA, the National Institute of Renewable Resources and Environment in charge of

environmental and some agrarian issues was liquidated and in its place came the Ministry of Environment and other responsibilities were distributed to other state agencies.

I find that the traditional perspective of understanding agrarian reforms as necessary answers of a welfare state to an under-attended sector of the population such as the peasantry is insufficient to understand the complexity of current politics around peasantry issues and territorial claims. That perspective, dominant during the 20th century, both among the state and among the peasants, clashes with a new way of govern*ing*. Nascent in the 1990s and parallel to the raise of neoliberalism, governance replaces government through new ways of defining non-armed, non-state political subjects with the term *civil society*. With this new social categorization come new ways to relate with the state through *participation*, and particular ways of negotiating government-governance between parts through the notion of *planning.* These emerging notions of participation and planning are political technologies. They come with sets of assumptions, and specific codes and languages. Linking this to my research topic, it is precisely this shift in the way the state offers an agrarian reform and the ways peasants claim agrarian changes that can be elucidated with the case of the ZRC. In this way, one of my observations is that while the peasants expect an agrarian reform in modernist, welfare terms of public services, the state offers (at least discursively) a neoliberal agrarian reform characterized by the ideal creation of self-sufficient entrepreneurial 'territories' competitive in global markets. And while the peasants organize in new ways and claim local autonomy and participation in a neoliberal scheme of governance, some state institutions insist on classic modernist ways of government such as restrictive public conservation designations such as national parks.

It is this constant contradiction and changing of ways of governing, claiming government and exercising governance that can be seen in this case study. To exemplify this statement: in

terms of socio-political representation, what in the late 20th century were political parties such as *Unión Patriótica* (UP) or peasant unions (*sindicatos agrarios*), are now predominantly NGOs (*Asociación Nacional de Zonas de Reserva Campesina*: ANZORC). What in the 1960s was a relation where the *Asociación Nacional de Usuarios Campesinos* (ANUC) worked from within the state institution of INCORA, now is a relation that can be mediated with a contract of three parties: a state agency, a national NGO and a local peasant organization (INCODER-ILSA-SINPEAGRICUN). These shifts in political arrangements are signs of gover*nance* and deserve analysis as new social and political relations in a specific historic time and place.

Now I move to the *environmental* part of environmental governance. I particularly chose the focus of *environmental* governance because it is an aspect where we can also trace the shift from Keynesian to neoliberal and from government to governance. From the modernist ideas of nature as natural resources, we turn in the 1990s to the appearance of environment as the way to understand nature. Currently, the terms nature and environment can be constantly seen as interchangeable in all sorts of discourses. *Protecting nature* and *protecting the environment* are interchangeable and equal ideas in social movements, state language and media, yet *environment* did not have the same meaning a century ago. This calls attention to the relationship between its current meaning to aspects which might have influenced this new definition and the imaginaries around it. This change of meanings also sheds light on changing notions of power over space, of understandings of nature and of economic relations with *nature* (or more specifically with the *environment,* as I show in this thesis). This is how we can move from a notion of property over land for agrarian productive purposes, to a notion of a REDD+[2] mechanism of carbon credits,

[2] REDD+ comes from "Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation" (REDD). The United Nations Collaborative Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries (UN-REDD Programme) explains that " 'REDD+' goes beyond deforestation and forest

also related to productive purposes but with new meanings of land productivity. Transactions in relation to nature change among political and economic actors even when it refers to a same space. The historical connotations of these changes helps to explain them and neoliberalism as a new capitalist logic that permeates the relation to nature *as* environment, is particularly relevant here.

With the concepts that have been mentioned above, this research might be called an intersection between three broad academic topics: agrarian studies, rural development and political ecology. It situates the ZRC as a territorial political proposal in constant evolution as part of an agrarian land reform; the impacts of development schemes on rural political projects; and the deconstruction of *the environment* from a political ecology view.

My broad research question is: *How is environmental governance being constructed in the ZRC from its inhabitants and from the state?* I begin dissecting this broad question in chapter two intersecting agrarian studies and a broad geographic scope, asking: *How is an agrarian reform mechanism such as a ZRC, also a territorial claim and what does this mean from a geographic lens?* Taking the rather rigid political-economy perspective of the traditional agrarian question, I introduce the geographic concept of territory to explain how *Ordenamiento Territorial* has to do with this relation. I attempt to weave agrarian question – territory to understand the evolution of capitalism and its different impacts to the Colombian peasantry. This analysis will help me situate the current discussion of the ZRC under neoliberalism.

Chapter three is at an intersection of agrarian studies and political ecology, which asks: *How is the idea of environment constructed in the ZRC and how is this related to agrarian issues*

---

degradation, and includes the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests and enhancement of forest carbon stocks." (Source: http://www.un-redd.org/aboutredd accessed on June 1st, 2015).

and related constructions in these peasant territories? I deconstruct the concept of environment tracing its roots in nature and in the capitalist uses of nature, to finally situate how environment is currently mobilized as a manageable nature in the ZRC.

I approach in chapter four a link between rural development and political ecology with the question of: *How are environmental governance and the ZRC rural development schemes responding to certain political logics?* The intersection of agrarian studies and rural development is also evident in chapter four which asks: *How can a political demand over territory and autonomous economy not get lost in a technical demand of assistance through rural development schemes?* Through three perspectives on development, I analyze how development planning shapes the ways political claims get enacted and the ways in which the ZRC peasants have to interact with the state.

It has been challenging to situate this research comfortably in theory. I take a Marxist approach by conceptualizing the creation of the ZRC as an example of the classic construction of the agrarian question since Karl Kautsky's work. This line of thought is about how peasants are or are not included in a capitalist economy. I consider this an applicable approach as it establishes a political-economic basis that I consider valid for macro analyses of how capitalism shapes access to land. Yet 'land' seems to me a barren concept if we do not combine it with 'territory' and 'territoriality' as the ways humans construct their presence in that land and politically claim it. The ways power over that land is enacted both by its peasant inhabitants and by the state in its exercise of sovereignty, leads to more Foucauldian approaches of government. The approach to planning as a state language to develop ZRC also begins with the Foucauldian concept of governmentality. The shifting of forms and structures of government both from the

state and from social actors, demands attention and the concept of ´governance´ offers a way of understanding and historically situating these shifts.

Another theoretical framework must lay the foundation to analyze 'environment' as a relatively recent conceptualization of nature, parallel or even perhaps linked to the rise of neoliberal capitalist expansion. Environment is both a discursive and a material enacting of territory. Both the state and the peasants use the term *territory* and give it meanings in particular ways in a specific historic period. In this sense, this study contributes to the possibility of understanding *environment* as a neoliberal term for nature through discursive analysis brought by poststructuralist thought where the Colombian scholar Arturo Escobar offers a good analytic framework for this case.

The theoretical links between the Marxist agrarian question, geographic insights of territory, and Foucauldian and poststructuralist analysis of government and environment are the conceptual mixes of this thesis. The work on 'environmental governance' has a similar theoretical background and is therefore a comfortable concept to situate the questions of this study.

Lost in translation.

Lucas Melgaço (2013) describes the situation of non-Anglophone scholars, and particularly Romance language speaking people very precisely. In the academic conference of the Association of American Geographers in 2013, of the approximately seven thousands attendants only two cited Milton Santos in their references. Meanwhile, in the parallel Encounter of Geographers from Latin America (EGAL) in Lima, with a similar amount of attendants, Santos was among the most cited authors and the namesake for a prize awarded to Latin American geographers. The name *Milton Santos* for this prize, is used in remembrance and recognition of

his contribution to geography. To put it more graphically: of the work of Milton Santos, basic to any Latin American geographer, only two works have been translated, but one of his most important pieces *A Natureza do Espaço* (The Nature of Space) has not been translated to English. This situation calls not only to examine the *geographies of geography*, its shaping barriers, and the bias of the development of geographic thought, a task that spans from geopolitics to linguistics; but also brings to scene another related situation to which non-Anglophone scholars (or for that instance, any scholar in a foreign language and culture context) are faced when having to present their work to an Anglophone academic audience: the difficulty of translating concepts deeply embedded in other cultures, in other epistemologies and to then describe them and analyze them disembedded from their linguistic, cultural, geographic and political context.

Although acknowledging the barriers in geography as an academic field, I must admit I am also falling into it. This thesis draws more on Anglophone theoretical literature than any other. This has at least two reasons. First, I am discovering a body of literature and I find it novel to analyze OT, OAT and ZRC through the critical lens it offers. Second, the audience for my thesis is the Anglophone academy and therefore I am trying to put in their language (broadly understood), my research interests. Some things are left unspoken here. If I am critizing the hegemony of Anglophone academia, why am I pursuing a degree in it? The answers to this are well beyond this specific academic exercise of a thesis and I will only say here that it is a question that is constantly with me and that involves more than a personal situation. It is also related to the power and the attraction and resources that United States' academy still has today. More of my positionality will be mentioned later on in this chapter and in the conclusions chapter.

In translating a social problem from its original language context to an audience that is not familiar with its particularities implies a certain negotiation. The grasp and comprehension of local meanings might be lost in the descriptive process of translating it, in this case to an Anglophone academic audience who cannot personally relate to the political imaginaries of Colombian history. In a different view, the possibility of not being entangled in specific meanings and imaginaries, charged with historic aspects, gives the possibility of an abstraction and generalization. This external perspective might even facilitate comparisons with similar situations elsewhere and offers the chance of giving new ways of understanding a situation. Below I will mention some key terms or concepts from the Colombian context that are essential to understand this case study. I have decided to leave the original term in Spanish, calling the reader to remember its context specific meaning.

In Colombia, the state planning mechanism over territory is called *Ordenamiento Territorial* (OT in this document). This is much more than its translation in English as 'land planning'. It involves zoning and management plans, but it is also an important democratic, participatory social space through which diverse sectors of the population should be able to set their territorial claims, proposals and democratically decide how to use state funds. *Ordenamiento Territorial* is a basic geographical theme for geographical literature in Latin America and Europe. I suggest the Anglophone geographic academy has to get some exposure to this concept because it is an essential part of state interventions on the territory, at least conceptually in other regions of the world. While the concept is not exclusive to Colombia, this thesis focuses on the particular meanings it has in that country. Further explanations of this concept, its uses and meanings in other countries will be given throughout the document and particularly in chapter two.

The variation of *Ordenamiento Territorial* to *Ordenamiento Ambiental Territorial* (OAT in this document) will also be left in Spanish. This refers to a similar transition from land planning to environmental land use planning. The meanings of the environmental part of OT will also be found along the document.

Another important concept that will be present in the document given its importance in politics and as a common term in romance languages is *gestión*. This word originates from Latin *gestĭo* and means action and effect of administration[3]. It is usually translated as management, but this word in English, seems to leave behind complementary meanings of *gestión*. *Gestionar* (to manage) is to proceed diligently towards the achievement of something[4]. Diligently is an important adverb for explaining this meaning. It is actually a verb in itself in Spanish, *diligenciar*. When you tell someone in Colombia to *diligenciar* something, they will most likely know it involves bureaucracy and with it, comes a whole imaginary of how and why to *diligenciar* something. What you usually *diligenciar* is a form, but this is not simply to complete or fill-in a form, it requires a certain way of filling it, *diligenciarlo*, a specific knowledge, a savoir of what are the precise terms to use, where to take it after, whom and how to give it to, and what to expect to come after this part of the procedure is done. This is where *gestionar*, comes back. A *gestionador* is not necessarily a manager, but someone who has the savoir for these matters; who knows the language (the technical words for each format), the people (public officials or functionaries usually), the places (which public office, where in the office, where to go next), the times (when to file, when to expect an answer, what to do to get an answer). To be a

[3] http://lema.rae.es/drae/?val=gestión
[4] http://lema.rae.es/drae/?val=gestionar

gestionador or a *tramitador*[5] in Colombia is actually paid work. You can expect to find this spontaneous and informal technical profession in the main public offices where *gestiones* are to be accomplished. I will leave this illustration of *gestión* and its complementary terms (*gestionar* as verb*, gestionador* as noun) for now, but this topic will be resumed particularly in chapter four when I explore governmentality. The voices of interviewed peasants who need to get their titling documents or who want to participate in a ZRC project, will remind us how when you do not have the time, the money and /or do not know how to *gestionar*, you might simply not be able to access the state. As a peasant you might have to wait until the next development plan is constructed, maybe there you will try to speak the state language of *diligencias, trámites*, plans and projects, but in the end you might say (again) that state bureaucracy is too hard to understand and state benefits are too hard to obtain. A similar description of these terms is described by Javier Auyero in *Patients of the State* (2012) with a case study in Argentina. The uses of *gestión, trámite*, and most of the words in Spanish are not exclusive to Colombia, but I only concentrate here in their Colombian expressions.

Actors or subjects?

Focusing my research on the relation between the state and the peasants, there are at least two assumptions that are tempting and must be addressed. The first one is assuming that the state is a homogeneous, one-headed entity with a coherent mind and thought-out actions. The other is that the peasantry is one social category that can be identified with similar cultural and political traits and opinions. This can lead to the assumption that all inhabitants of a ZRC are peasants and that they all share the same conviction. Contradictory voices among state representatives and peasants will be more thoroughly explored in chapter four when addressing planning as a state

[5] This word also has a similar meaning to gestionador. It comes from *trámite* (noun) and *tramitar* (verb) which are the steps taken toward achieving something. *Tramitología* is the art or science of resolving, perfecting or facilitating *trámites* (http://lema.rae.es).

political technology, but in the other chapters a generalization of these actors as homogenous entities might be useful. This situation answers to grouping them as economic blocks or political forces. I admit it is a scale of abstraction that might be erroneous for certain analysis since it might take for granted important differences among these groups. Nevertheless, the scale of this study is also a spatial abstraction corresponding to delimitation by zoning and planning where peasants as a social block are conceived as an essential part of this delimitation and also react as one block in certain spaces through their representation and self-organization in a national organization (ANZORC). Also a level of abstraction of the state apparatus, facilitates theoretical analysis of discursive mechanisms and of historical moments.

In this selection of actors, there are others that I am leaving behind. Among them, the capitalists as individual land buyers (*terratenientes*), and corporations with their new ways of influencing the Colombian government. They will be indirectly mentioned through their resistance to the peace dialogues and in the conclusion as new questions that follow after this research in relation to peasant economies facing neoliberal food market regimes sponsored by the state in the shape of free trade treaties.

A further research engagement with the ZRC might benefit from taking apart the category *peasant*, and asking questions of gender differences in relation to land tenure, political participation, or comprehensions of *environment*; or with other forms of understanding differences among peasants in their ethnic, racial, cultural, historical connotations and how these reveal the ways in which identity gets constructed. These deconstructions could contribute to more precise understandings of the everyday practices of constructing territory, of enacting territoriality. Identifying more carefully these identities could also shed light on the application of specific forms of knowledge to the social constructions of ZRC, OT, OAT, or environment.

In relation to the geographic context of the ZRC and their inhabitants, the following map shows the location of the six ZRC legally established to date.

FIGURE 1: Map of Colombia with the Peasant Reserve Zones (ZRC) legalized to date.

ZRC-Cabrera
44,000 ha.
Municipality of Cabrera,
Department of Cundinamarca
Andean region
Resolution of 2000

ZRC Pato-Balsillas
135,163 ha
Municipality:
San Vidente del Caguán
Department of Caquetá
Amazon region
Resolution of 1997

ZRC-Calamar
38,596 ha
Municipalities of
Calamar, El Retorno and
San José del Guaviare
Department of Guaviare
Amazon region
Resolution of 1997

ZRC- Sur de Bolivar
29,110 ha
Municipalities of
Arenal and Morales
Department of
Bolivar
Caribbean region
Resolution of 1999

ZRC-Valle del Río Cimitarra
184,000 ha
Municipalities of
Yondó and Remedios
Deparment of Anioquia
Municipalities of Cantagallo
and San Pablo
Department of Bolívar
Caribbean region
Resolution of 2002

ZRC-Perla Amazónica
22,000ha
Municipality of Puerto Asís
Department of Putumayo
Amazon region
Resolution of 2000

Fragment of map obtained at:
https://zrcperlaamazonica.wordpress.com/about/. Reproduced with authorization of ANZORC.

Methods.

My research is based on qualitative methods with personal interviews, archival research, field visits and specialized bibliography such as technical reports, legal documents or small print-run local editions. From my previous knowledge of Cabrera, I had some knowledge of peasant organizational structures of the ZRC. My previous professional experience with the National Parks central office in Bogotá also gave me a prior sense of state agencies' roles in relation to OAT and ZRC. My academic formation as an ecologist for my bachelor's degree was in the School of Rural and Environmental Studies of the Javeriana University at Bogotá. There I had also taken courses with professors who work on agrarian studies, rural development and environmental studies so I also drew on this former experience to search for my current research information sources.

Following Syracuse University's Institutional Review Board's protocols, I contacted by email the director of the National Association of ZRC (ANZORC). Once I was granted an appointment, I presented my research interest and this lead to an organizational support that facilitated the consecution of interviewees with members of ANZORC because they are ZRC inhabitants and peasant leaders. Thanks to the communication with ANZORC, I was invited to attend a workshop they were having with World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) in relation to the REDD+ mechanism[6], this was followed by ANZORC's general assembly meeting, which I got to partially attend. Both spaces were the opportunity to interview peasant representatives of different ZRCs around the country and to grasp some of their concerns with the REDD+

[6] World Wide Fund for Nature formerly World Wildlife Fund was facilitating this workshop called: *Elementos para la construcción de los lineamientos para un esquema nacional de salvaguardas sociales y ambientales de REDD+ en Colombia. Ruta para la identificación de salvaguardas sociales y ambientales para REDD+ en Colombia*. I broadly translate it as: Identification of social and environmental safeguard guidelines for REDD+ in Colombia. More on WWF-Colombia's work on REDD+ safeguards can be accessed in: http://www.wwf.org.co/?231931/Estrategia-REDD

mechanism. I also did two field visits to the ZRC of Cabrera in the department of Cundinamarca, located in the central Andean region of Colombia, just four hours by ground transportation from Bogotá, the country's capital city. In Cabrera I interviewed the mayor, the director of the agricultural technical assistance office UMATA and four peasants, two of whom actively participate in local political spaces, while the other two peasants are more focused on their agricultural labor and with different levels of participation in ZRC processes and projects. Through email or telephone I also contacted institutions such as the Rural-Agrarian Planning Unit (UPRA), the National Parks office, or the World Bank (WB). Through all these links I was able to identify and contact other experts such as the planning director of INDERENA, the former state institution in charge of agrarian and environmental issues until the 1990s when the Ministry of Environment was created. Also, an expert on *Ordenamiento Ambiental del Territorio* (OAT) who had served as secretary of the *Ordenamiento Territorial* Commission in the 1990s and had worked in the Ministry of Environment developing the guidelines for OAT in Colombia. I also contacted a former state official of INCODER the state institution of rural development. Scholars specialized in agrarian studies, rural development or ZRC were also interviewed. In total, this thesis is the product of twenty-two interviews, sixteen of them with men, six with women. Eight are from representatives of state institutions, nine from peasants or peasant organizations, three to scholars and one to a WB representative.

Through archival work I was able to access planning documents and project texts. A grant from the Alejandro Angel Escobar Foundation allowed me to buy Colombian books which are difficult to access or which are of small print-run editions. The National Library, the Luis Angel Arango Library, the main library of the Javeriana University (where I am alumni) and the

Lerner bookstore at Bogotá were particularly important in this task as were the Regional Environmental Authority of Cundinamarca (CAR) and the Ministry of Environment.

Chapter structure.

This work begins with a conceptual framework in geography situating ZRC and OAT within geographic concepts of space, territory and territoriality. In that second chapter I link a theoretical background on the agrarian question as a political economic approach to understand the historic context that lead to the emergence of ZRCs.I contextualize the ZRC in the classic agrarian question debate of the construction of capitalist states and the ways the peasantry is included (or not) in this economic scheme through the recognition of land rights and state support. I explain that the ZRC are not only a response to the roles of the agricultural and peasant sectors of society in the national economy, they are also a claim of territorial rights. Therefore, I argue that an agrarian studies perspective such as the agrarian question literature has to be woven together with the concept of territory to grasp it beyond its economic significance and more towards its political importance through its territorial claims. Here I also set the historical context of the 1990s, the decade when several relevant concepts and issues of this research converge. Beginning with the new national constitution of 1991 representative of the strong beginning of the neoliberal era in the state construction but also of *Ordenamiento Territorial* as the territorial planning mechanism of the state. The 1990s is also the decade when the current meaning of environment takes shape and begins influencing some public policies like the Environmental Law of 1993. During this time, the designation of the ZRC appears in the Agrarian Reform Law 160 of 1994. In 1996, colonists of the Amazon region, did a huge march called *marchas cocaleras*. They denounced the impacts of fumigation on coca crops and demanded attention from the government and state investment in their territories if the coca

production was to be replaced for a legally viable agrarian economic option. Legalizing colonized public lands as private properties, access roads, basic infrastructure and public services, schools, health centers, credit and support for legal agrarian production, were the kinds of demands they had. As a result of the *marchas cocaleras* the first six ZRC were created. To date they remain the only ones with legal status although some peasant communities have self-proclaimed their territories also as ZRC.

Chapter three is the search for *Ordenamiento Ambiental Territorial*. It begins by tracing the current meaning of environment with the concept of nature. Then, it analyzes the production of nature in capitalism.

Chapter four shows how development schemes and planning instruments are the common language through which the state and the peasants lay out their political and territorial expectations. Environmental aspects are also shaped in planning schemes and turned to activities that can be financed, yet other aspects of this environmental governance seem to work out as informal internal agreements between local inhabitants and their organizational structures. The case of the World Bank ZRC pilot project (1998-2003) illustrates how for some actors, the ZRC are understood as development projects and the implications this has by "rendering technical" (Li, 2007) these initiatives. I use Arturo Escobar's (1995) call to scholars to encounter development by understanding development as another expression of colonialism. I put Escobar's perspective on development in conversation with David Gow's (2008) "countering development" which suggests that people use and transform development tools in different ways. Anthony Bebbington (2000) also enters this conversation by proposing that people's agency in development projects should be better understood because people use development schemes in creative ways to enhance their rural livelihoods.

My message with chapter four is basically that planning, either in the shape of *Ordenamiento Territorial* Plans, ZRC Sustainable Development Plans or WB project plans, tends to "render technical" certain political positions around territory. Nonetheless, people also welcome development schemes and will learn the language of planning in order to get some positive outcomes. There is an implicit discussion because on one hand, development planning can be understood as a threat but on the other hand it can be taken as an opportunity. I suggest that development planning tends to reduce political-territorial proposals to plans and project activities where the political reasoning gets lost, and where its activists might be reduced to technical support personnel "instructing people in the proper practice of politics" (Li 2007:25). In this way, political, territorial positions on environmental governance might also fall in this planning maze and get absorbed in the process of planning. Yet, how is environmental governance enacted if not through plans? A conclusion of this chapter is that making people participate through communities and with plans, somehow disperses possibilities of a more impactful political action. However, people are also seeking to participate in the development plans and it even helps them to have projects such as the World Bank ZRC Pilot Project (WB-PP in this text), to de-stigmatize the ZRC as guerrilla zones. This leaves an open question remembering the fragment that initiates this document and the expectations on rural development that seem to permeate the peace dialogues.

The thesis closes by setting the ZRC and environmental governance in the current peace dialogues between the state and the FARC guerrilla. It also questions how younger generations of peasants are seeing their future as political, environmental and economic actors, or in other words, as ZRC territorial actors. This leaves the question of the ZRC and the next generations asking if the ZRCs are a one-generation project or how they are dealing with leaving this

struggle and this legacy in the face of the global and local rural exodus; the new environmental challenges with the global climate change scenario; and the national post-conflict ambience that is building up in Colombia.

My personal experience with the ZRC is related to being part of a collective effort of Andean forest conservation in the municipality of Cabrera, department of Cundinamarca since the early 1990s. This initiative precedes the declaration of the municipality of Cabrera as a Peasant Reserve Zone (ZRC) by almost a decade. Since our collective land use proposal with the communal nature reserve is a sort of environmental land use planning/*Ordenamiento Ambiental del Territorio*, my choice of research topic is directly related to my personal interests. In this way, this research is a search for an answer with personal interests and has elements of self-positioned recognition in the choice of research question, case studies and methods. My initial personal worry around the topic was: how does the collective environmental proposal that I am part of, fit (or not) in the development of the Peasant Reserve Zone of Cabrera?

It is a personal struggle to situate my research within Anglophone geography with a study that I have tried to construct from a Latin American perspective. This implies understanding the concepts immersed in the discussion from a critical perspective but also from a perspective that is close to the one where the discussions are taking place, close and comprehensive for the actors that use this term on a daily basis. Perhaps, this research is a first step in understanding a process where I hope to eventually be relevant. I take Staeheli and Mitchell's reflection of *The Complex Politics of Relevance in Geography* in the sense that "relevance can be intended –can be an attitude, perhaps- but not a neatly defined product" (2005: 368). I stand in an uncomfortable position of having to dissect the idea of ZRC and the environment to understand these concepts from the lens of core geographic concepts that show them as mere discursive mechanisms, and

then I try sewing them back together to give them back their political meaning in the current political scenario of Colombia. I have to (conceptually) attack something I (politically) defend. I do consider myself an environmentalist knowing that the connotations this term has are different for everyone. Growing up in a country full of contrasts like Colombia with its violent past and present; its deep social, political and economic differences; and its natural and cultural richness, gives many Colombians a sense of responsibility for transforming our violent past with analytic, creative, socially and environmentally sound ideas. In some way, this research is my grain of sand to this collective dream.

CHAPTER 2.

The Agrarian Question and Territory.

The conceptual basis for the emergence of the Peasant Reserve Zones.

> *To concentrate on the political-economic risks reducing territory to land; to emphasize the political-strategic blurs it with a sense of terrain. Recognizing both, and seeing the development made possible by emergent political techniques allows us to understand territory as a distinctive mode of social/spatial organization, one which is historically and geographically limited and dependent, rather than a biological drive or social need.* (Elden 2010a: 810)

This chapter is a dense review of heavy concepts. The agrarian question, neoliberal capitalism, peasantry, space and territory are the building blocks that aim to set a conceptual basis for some of the main topics treated in this thesis. They are woven with their particular manifestations in Colombia arguing why they go together through examples or with legal developments. The concepts are initially exposed by unpacking the terms carried by "Peasant Reserve Zones." In this way, I set the relation between economy and space as the first important abstraction. Then I organize the following topics in three main sections. The first refers to the agrarian question and does a general overview of the classic agrarian question authors and relates it to this study. The second section is about the evolution of capitalism in Colombia and its relation with the peasantry to eventually arrive to the creation of the ZRC. This section is divided into five subsections: 1) origins of the Colombian peasantry; 2) neoliberalism; 3) 1990s in Colombia as a turning point; 4) peasantry and neoliberalism; 5) neoliberalism and agrarian reforms. The last section is called "From space to *Ordenamiento Territorial."* The section begins with the concept of space through the lens of Henri Lefebvre to set up the concept of territory through the lens of several geographers, particularly Stuart Elden. Finally, the analysis leads to *Ordenamiento Territorial* as a political technology but one that is not only dominated by the state but where the organized peasants of the ZRC are currently trying to enter with political claims on territoriality.

The examples of *vereda*, Environmental Peasant Units (UACA) and the claims of ANZORC in public spaces such as the protected area conference aim to show how the peasants position their territoriality.

Situating the question. Peasants+ reserves+ zones = …

When taking separately the words in the term "peasant+ reserves+ zones" for a geographic analysis, two essential concepts seem to be embedded in the term: space (the notion of zoning and reserving a space) and economy (understanding the peasantry as an agrarian economic actor). This first layer of analysis leads to a general question about the *spatialization* of the economy. To shape this broad topic to a specific case study, we need to refer to the types of spaces and economies that we are dealing with. Lefebvre (2000) like Smith (2008) and Santos (2006) warn us about the difficulty of analyzing 'space', with its broad discussions from physics to philosophy, but still call for its importance in geography, particularly in the construction of states, economies and social movements.

The term Peasant Reserve Zone suggests that we initially explore what "peasant" means. From an academic perspective, peasants can be studied in cultural, sociological, economic, gendered or geographical perspectives, giving different definitions. I chose to limit my scope and begin tracing the peasantry as an economic, political and territorial actor in a capitalist setting. The peasantry represents various degrees from pre-capitalist forms of production to entrepreneurial capitalist forms of production and has different territorial and political demands related to its position within the local, regional and national economy. For the level of abstraction of this study, I consider the peasantry of the ZRC as a political-territorial actor seeking to participate in a national economy that is immersed in capitalist relations but where the relations of this organized peasantry do not necessarily imply capitalist relations in themselves.

This is why some of their actions and political positions cannot be approached through the limited importance of the private property as the basic spatial unit of economic production. As will be shown throughout this thesis, sometimes their positions as a political actors respond to territorial logics of communal decision taking and non-capitalist logics, as can be appreciated with the environmental arrangements they suggest with the Environmental Peasant Units (*Unidades Ambientales Campesinas*, UACA for its acronym in Spanish.) I will explain further on, what matters most with the UACA or the importance of the *vereda*[7] is not an individualistic, capitalist logic, but a communal relation with the land, its production, its protection, its management, the history of populations who arrived there after stories of violence, that I find defines a territorial positioning. It is precisely this link between the ZRC as both part of an agrarian reform in capitalist terms and a struggle for territory that I aim to explain in this chapter, drawing the links to what this implies for *Ordenamiento Territorial* and *Ordenamiento Ambiental Territorial.*

Since capitalism is the type of economy that must be addressed as a driving force of the global and national economy, the general agrarian question literature is useful as a way to approach how the peasantry is included in capitalism. Yet capitalism has had different developments and can be understood in diverse ways. Therefore I will include a brief differentiation of the development of capitalism in Colombia, relevant for this case study. I concentrate on neoliberal capitalism as the type of capitalism that the Colombian peasants of the ZRC have to face due to the historical time period when the ZRC designation emerged in the 1990s.

[7] As will be expanded in the last part of this chapter *vereda* in Colombia refer to a sort of rural neighborhood composed of private properties and sometimes other land tenure situations.

From a geographic perspective, I find that it is necessary to include the rich discussions of how space counts in economic arrangements. This is a way to address the first broad question of how the economy is spatialized. Now more situated, the question focuses on why the peasant economy is spatialized in zones and what it means to be "reserved".

I superficially mention the perspective of space, more commonly used in Anglophone geography, but I then concentrate more on the notion of territory that is more commonly used in Latin America and for my particular case study. I take Stuart Elden's geographic analysis of the concepts of space and territory to approach a more situated analysis about how agrarian production (as the peasants' characteristic field of production) is also a territorial issue influenced by political relations. With this approach, a more precise question for this chapter appears: How is an agrarian reform mechanism such as a ZRC, also a territorial claim and what does this mean from a geographic perspective?

Territory arrives as a more precise meaning of space for this study because it presents the influence of politics (broadly understood from state construction to social organization) on the construction of spaces. I understand the meaning and the construction of the concept of territory as one spatially situated struggle for land and for the social relations that happen in that land, not because it is 'land' in capitalist economic terms of a tradable commodity, but because land carries a communal history of relation and knowledge of the place that creates belonging. A sense of belonging to a land (now more broadly understood as a territory) implies struggles for its defense. Its defense is not only about a recognized individual property right (although in contemporary legal and economic terms, it passes by that too), but also about recognition of *power over that land*, which is better glossed as *territorial power*. Territorial power for the state implies things such as military control and state presence through institutions, but in this case for

peasants it carries other meanings. In this chapter, I explain the situated political importance of this constant negotiation, a permanent dialogue between state and peasants through the political technology of *Ordenamiento Territorial* (OT) as more than just land planning. This is not to say that other political actors do not enter this conversation of territorial power through OT or through other tools, but the dialogue between state and peasants in this construction is what I prioritize in this chapter.

Stuart Elden's view is relevant for the analysis I want to do on territory because he says that concentrating on the political-economic risks reducing territory to land; to emphasize the political-strategic blurs it with a sense of terrain (2010[a]: 810), but land and terrain as political-economic and political-strategic relations are insufficient to grasp territory (2010[a]: 811). While I consider this view important, I think it leaves actors apart from the state as passive elements of territory, as mere populations, subjects of the state. By showing territorial expressions of the peasants in the ZRC such as the importance of *vereda*, or the proposal of the Environmental Peasant Units (UACA), I argue that peasants in this case, also claim and construct territory because their struggle is not only about land, nor is it only about being an active and recognized economic actor. Rather, it is a claim of political participation in the construction of this territory, or in bare geographic terms, political claims to space. Only through controlling space can they have direct control on their economy. Their call for autonomy in decisions over territory also passes by of the uses and organization of nature. The negotiating of nature as part of territory will be treated in the next chapter in relation to how *Ordenamiento Ambiental Territorial* (OAT) is constructed. I also analyze how peasants use the state language of planning to be heard, participate and express their positions about territory. Through planning though, the state also uses peasants. The mutual use of planning will be the main topic of chapter four.

Now I will examine the initial agrarian question literature as a starting point to how and if peasants are seen as economic actors by capitalist states. The agrarian question is an important focus because although it began with examples of 19th century Europe, the impacts of capitalism such as the "emerging internationalization of the food systems as a result of imperialism" mentioned by Friedrich Engels (in Akram-Lodhi and Kay 2010 a: 185), continue to inform the globalization of the agro-industry as we understand it now. Capitalist dynamics affect 21st century Colombian peasants in similar ways as they affected European peasants in the 19th century. This is why the agrarian question is relevant here, yet that literature is short in explaining political-territorial issues as will be explored later on in the chapter.

The Agrarian Question as a conceptual frame for the emergence of the ZRC.

What is called the 'agrarian question' traces back to an analysis of the consequences of capitalist relations in agricultural societies. Since the ZRC are about peasants as an agricultural society immersed in a capitalist economy, the debates on the agrarian question are highly relevant. The general inquiry begins with Karl Marx's analysis of the capitalist economic system and how its dynamics of commodification and of wage labor relations absorb populations into its dynamics. It continues with the building on this Marxist political economic theory by others such as Vladimir Lenin (1920), Alexander Chayanov (1991) and Karl Kautsky (1988). Further interpretations were developed by economists, sociologists and other social scientists during the 20th Century and for specific cases. For the purpose of this chapter, further developed notions of this concept will be used to situate the conditions of the Colombian Andean peasantry in relation to land tenure and agricultural economic production. This setting is taken as the explanatory framework for the establishment of the Peasant Reserve Zones in the Agrarian Reform Law 160 of 1994 in Colombia.

It is inevitable to begin with Karl Marx when tracing the origins of the term 'agrarian question'. In his analysis of capitalism, he emphasized the way in which peasants pass from pre-capitalist to capitalist economies. He analyzed the "relationship between small-scale pre-capitalist peasant farming, petty commodity production, and the emergence of agrarian capital" (Akram-Lodhi & Kay 2010 a: 181). The role of peasants in the revolution of the proletariat was a matter of concern to him because peasants can simultaneously be the exploited labor force and the exploiter capitalist in their production unit. In this way, Marx (1967: 935) said about peasants: "the only absolute barrier he faces as a petty capitalist is the wage that he pays himself, after deducting his actual expenses". He mentioned how this payment to himself usually falls into not paying his work and harshly exploiting his body in the rate of work input to production[8]. These acts that the peasant imposes on himself (and his family) are the market imperatives of capitalism: exploit labor, improve productivity and cut costs of production (Akram-Lodhi and Kay 2010 a: 183). Yet not all peasants exploit themselves in the same way. Some can use the capitalist dynamic to generate enough profit to exploit others and then reproduce uneven and exploitative social class relations. So in Marx's analysis of the fate of the peasantry (at least of the European peasantry of the 1800s) and therefore as a solution of this first approach to the agrarian question, there are three possibilities: 1) peasants are gradually dispossessed of their land and become wage-laborers (urban or rural) as they are not capable of coping with the production demands of the capitalist market; 2) but when they are capable of playing within the capitalist market being commodity producers, they become a rural middle class "thus completing the transition to a fully capitalist mode of production" (Akram-Lodhi and Kay 2010 a: 183); or 3)

[8] The masculine portrayal of the peasant is a situation that can be contested from a feminist perspective of how gender and age (labor exploitation of minors) is not explicit in this analysis. It can certainly be extended from Marx's analysis of capitalist exploitation, yet for this paper, this gender bias will be used in the language, as it was how Marx originally wrote.

they can unite their work forces and land to create a collective production and a social structure of a commune which is an example of a hybrid form emerging where capitalism is used but where neither people or land succumb to its forces of privatization. The first two options imply that the peasantry disappears in capitalism, dissolved in its forces with no choice but to become a rural (or urban) proletarian or a capitalist rural bourgeoisie. In the third option the identity as peasant seems to be more easily kept through non-capitalist social and cultural relations to land and to one another, not only as a relation between individuals but in a relation as a community.

After Marx, Friedrich Engels added to the question of the peasants in capitalism by posing the situation of how the expansion of resource exploitation in the world, referring specifically to "the emerging internationalization of the food system as a result of imperialism was undermining peasant livelihoods" (Akram-Lodhi and Kay 2010 a: 185). As will be analyzed later on in this study, this concern is still relevant today.

With the bases set by Marx and Engels, the 'agrarian question' began as an analytical framework in political economy that intended to grasp "the place of farming and agriculture in emergent and mature capitalist societies" (Akram-Lodhi and Kay 2010 a: 179). The origins of the explicit definition of the term can be attributed to Karl Kautsky who posed it in his book *The Agrarian Question* "whether and how capital is seizing hold of agriculture, revolutionizing it, making old forms of production and property untenable and creating the necessity for new ones" (Kautsky 1899 in Akram-Lodhi and Kay 2010 a: 179). De Janvry (1981: 98) adds that Kautsky's book "analyses the situation in which the capitalist mode of production is dominant but vestiges of other modes remain". Perhaps these vestiges refer to cultural practices particular to histories of place, another hint towards a relation of territorial construction that goes beyond the capitalist relations.

Lenin, revisiting Kautsky's book (De Janvry 1982: 98), established that it is not in the interest of capitalists to totally destroy the small peasantry because it is this group who serves as a source of labor perhaps as they will eventually have to migrate to the cities to seek proletarian work or will succumb to work for agro-capitalists remaining in rural areas. He stated that this is the reason why landowners and capitalists pass laws to artificially maintain the small peasantry. It is a form of maintaining the supply of labor power. This is ultimately a subsidy to capital. In a contemporary analysis of capitalism, Neil Smith (2008) explains how uneven development is a result of the needs of capitalist maintenance and expansion. If we take the relatively recent notion of development -that will be explored in chapter four- through development planning, perhaps development is a modern way of maintaining a passive mass of "patients of the state" (Auyero 2012). These patients of state are kept in an eternal expectation for the state to ameliorate their living conditions. It could be argued that actually they are being held submissive until they are useful for capitalism as an urban proletarian labor force or in current conditions as agrarian labor for capitalist agro-industrial projects.

Alexander Chayanov (1991) examined the third possibility of peasant societies posed by Marx with *The Theory of Peasant Co-operatives*. The peasantry uniting their work forces and land to create a collective production and a social structure of a commune as a hybrid form emerging where capitalism is used but where neither people nor land are fully subsumed under capitalist relations of production. Chayanov's view of the peasantry was of homogeneous, self-sufficient, petty commodity producers, constituting a pan-historical, socio-economic category of people, in other words, as a mode of production (Bernstein 1982, de Janvry 1981). The communal work for cooperative production was not identified through this study in ZRCs. As was mentioned before, there are proposals of a more communal land management, particularly

for environmental matters, that can express ways of acting as a collective with their own terms of bordered and enclosed territories beginning with the *vereda* and up to the delimitation of the zones as Peasant Reserve *Zones*.

De Janvry (1981) later exposes why peasants cannot be seen as a mode production but rather as a class or fraction of a class with different modes of production that coexist. In Latin America this is expressed as different peasant classes corresponding to different modes of production. Leon Zamosc and Orlando Fals-Borda explore these particular differences for Colombia and their work will be mentioned later. De Janvry (1981: 7) situates the agrarian question as a problem deeply rooted in class structures and the "particular process of accumulation it undergoes". Yet he acknowledges that doing an analysis of agrarian structures falls into developing a typology of farm enterprises "based on the concepts of mode of production, articulation of modes of production within a specific historical social formation, and social classes within modes of production" (De Janvry 1981: 94). He continues saying that this implies "taking sides in the active debate on the characterization of peasants: who they are, how they behave economically and politically, and whether they will disappear or remain as a social category" (De Janvry 1981: 94). De Janvry's scope is useful to acknowledge that there are class differences among the peasantry but does not seem to acknowledge peasants' history to a place, and how they became the classes he so much emphasizes. Another approach will need to be taken to reinforce the possibility that the peasantry is politically claiming more than just land tenure and economic changes. As will be shown further on in this chapter, the Colombian scholar Orlando Fals-Borda (1987) through his historical analysis done with his methodology of Participation Action Research, showed how the peasantry can be categorized differently due to specific historical and geographical circumstances, which he refers to as regional differences.

Bernstein (1982) continues in this discussion of the agrarian question asking "[h]ow the conditions of production and reproduction are determined by the operations of capital" (Bernstein 1982: 160). He considers there is no such thing as a 'peasant economy' or a 'peasant mode of production' (which is an essentialist view). He rather situates his question in particular social formations, at the level of world economy and of the state. For him, "peasants have to be located in their relations with capital and the state… within capitalist relations of production mediated through forms of household production which are the site of struggle for effective possession and control between the producers and capital/state" (Bernstein 1982: 176). He especially emphasizes, "That there is no single and essential 'peasantry' [and] there can be no single and abstract formulation of the relation of peasants to revolutionary politics" (Bernstein 1982: 177). This analysis takes us closer to a possibility of linking agrarian question interests with specific territorial claims, yet it is not spelled out that particular way in his work.

Brass (1990: 448) poses an anti-essentialist view of the peasantry by analyzing a case of the Andean Colombian peasantry done by Reinhardt (1988 in Brass 1990). He considers that the agrarian question must not be posed in an either/or situation (persistence or elimination of the peasantry as a whole) but as encompassing both the development of the peasantry as small capitalists (generating surplus) and as agricultural workers who sell their labor-power. For him, neglecting that there is an economically differentiated peasantry in a wide spectrum of possibilities, is also neglecting political differences that may arise, for example in demands to the state or in organizational structures and political interests. Not only might there be differences within the peasantry but these differences might represent incompatible and opposed political projects, an issue that cannot be ignored in any analysis (Brass 1990:49). In this sense it is important to mention that this case study is not including the whole Colombian peasantry but

only that one organized in the ZRC. Political differences among the peasantry cannot be fully addressed in this thesis because the geographical focus is on the peasantry of the ZRC which to date are only six legally defined zones as was explained in the introduction, and because the level of abstraction to analyze OT and OAT only allows glimpses of these differentiations more thoroughly shown in chapters three and four. It can be said though, that the distinct regional contexts of each ZRC have influence on specific claims. For instance, the claims and relations of the peasantry of Andean ZRC-Cabrera is different to the claims of peasants in the Amazonian ZRCs (Perla Amazónica, Pato-Balsillas, Calamar) colonized after the 1970s. The peasants of ZRC Cabrera colonized their lands a century ago through an extractive logging economy after having been coffee haciendas laborers. Then they were stigmatized and attacked as communists in the 1950s and now have in most cases, private land titles and produce Andean fruits (tree-tomato, *lulo, granadilla, gulupa*) for regional markets (Bogotá and Fusagasuga). The peasants who colonized what are now the Amazonian ZRCs were in many cases immersed in the coca economy and have to deal with indigenous and with environmental authorities in the overlap of peasant lands with indigenous territories and with protected areas.

Tom Brass' contribution can also be aligned with Bebbington's (2000) discussion of "reencountering development" that will be explained in chapter four. Perhaps peasants also "reencounter" capitalism and use it in emergent and creative ways that reinforce their livelihoods as peasants or at least as rural populations, instead of only accepting its destruction and generating the inevitable path of urban migration. Brass takes from Marx the analysis of how labor is distributed in a peasant family. The unpaid labor of family members (traditionally this has been linked to a patriarchal control of land and production) "is geared to meet not the satisfaction of the peasant family subsistence requirements but rather the imperatives of primitive

accumulation" (Brass 1990: 453). There are also other internal capitalist exploitation dynamics within a peasant family. Brass mentions how fathers establish a sharecropper status for their sons, generating appropriation not just of surplus labor but also of surplus value. The analysis of Brass can also lead to an important gendered analysis of patriarchal exploitation of women and children. This unfortunately is beyond the scope of this study. Yet his mention of primitive accumulation might prove useful to understand how peasants of the ZRC use nature and how they are using the concept of environment in particular ways that might either be reinforcing primitive accumulation or generating, recuperating or maintaining different relations with nature that challenge these capitalist concepts. This will be further explored in chapter three.

This summary of some of the topics raised in the construction of the concept *agrarian question* are then: an inevitable path for peasants in a capitalist economy, either becoming proletarians, capitalists or collectivizing their efforts; the peasantry will not be destroyed as it is useful as a cheap source of labor for capitalism; the peasantry as a mode of production (an essentialist view) or as immersed in different social class struggles with different demands; how specific situations shape the different ways that peasants struggle and organize; and the inequalities within a peasant household leading to internal exploitation for the participation in the capitalist market. I identify in this general Marxist analysis of the agrarian question a core inquiry: in what ways does capitalism transform peasants? More specifically this panorama of the agrarian question should serve as a base to approach the particular case of a sector of the Colombian peasantry in the late 20th and early 21st centuries. The scope of the agrarian question should help to make a better sense of how beyond the importance of having control over a plot of land they are seeking collectively to face the various expressions of capitalism so that this transformation will be positive for their lives as individuals and as collectives with common

histories with a place and similar livelihoods. In this sense, the agrarian question approach needs to be challenged, mixed or complemented with geographical perspectives. In particular, a territorial approach will give meanings of belonging to that space and within it the contemporary meanings of the environment will gain some sense and utility to claim more than land (rights), that is, territory. As was said before, territory serves as a more precise meaning of space because it presents the influence of politics on the construction of spaces -and now I add- of the negotiating of economies and of the negotiation of nature within the construction of spaces.

For the case of the ZRC, the agrarian question implies wondering what uses the Colombian state gets out of this designation. Why does a capitalist state support the peasantry through an agrarian reform law? Is it about maintaining a reserve of labor force, or a type of food production, or perhaps about preserving cultural traits? Is it as Lenin suggested to keep the peasants pacified? Let us not forget that as I write this text the peace dialogues in La Havana are taking place. The relevance of this analysis is particularly timely.

Coming back to the utility for the Colombian state of supporting the ZRC designation, since what is more profitable for the state in economic terms is maintaining a reserve of labor force, this could settle an answer if there were no other variables. The perspective of a potential labor force leaves aside the possibility of the peasantry as a political force claiming recognition in the construction of territory, through their relation with land and through the types of agricultural production they defend. That perspective also leaves out the recognition of their own forms of social and political organization, plus other cultural traits related to their history with the territory. This statement is reinforced with their public declarations such as the one made by the National Association of ZRC (ANZORC) during the 2nd National Congress of Protected Areas (at Bogotá on July 2014) when they claim three main elements: 1) recognition of the

peasantry as a political subject of rights; 2) the reordering of the country's *Ordenamiento Ambiental Territorial* (OAT); and 3) the recognition of the peasantry as conservation subjects[9]. The last two claims will be more fully addressed in the next chapter. These claims show that the peasantry related to the ZRC is defining itself as a political actor. As such, it is claiming participation on territorial decisions through the reorganizing of OAT as an issue that the peasantry should be involved in. I understand these claims as a way of exercising a political position as well as a call for recognition of how the peasantry gives meanings to spaces and in this way creates territories. For that reason, the peasantry is a political-territorial actor.

Before passing to the emergence of the ZRC, it is necessary to situate the arrival of capitalism in Colombia, to historically and spatially locate the Colombian peasantry, specifically the one related to the ZRC.

The evolution of capitalism in Colombia and its relation with the peasantry.

The Colombian historian and sociologist Orlando Fals-Borda (1987) in his *History of the Agrarian Question in Colombia* illustrates the particularities of the different regions, social situations and cultures that shaped the agrarian question of the country. His historical and sociological view is not explicit about the importance of territory for this analysis. Nonetheless since he was a structural scholar in agrarian studies in Colombia, a key activist-scholar known for his contribution to the methodology of Participation Action Research (PAR), and an influential figure in the conception of *Ordenamiento Territorial* (OT) in Colombia, it is essential to include his situated analysis of the Marxist agrarian question.

[9] Taken from ANZORC's presentation on July 17th, 2014 called: Environmental land use planning, peasant rights: a route for the construction of peace. Original name: *Ordenamiento Ambiental, Derechos Campesinos, Una Ruta para la Construcción de la Paz.*

Fals-Borda (1985) argues that European feudalism cannot be used uncritically to explain other cases of transition to capitalism. For the case of Colombia he switches feudalism to seigneuriality (*señorío*) as what gave rise to new institutions (*encomiendas*[10]*, resguardos*) "imposed by the conquerors on the local populations and important innovations, such as the *hacienda* (extensive cattle farm). The social relations of production that arose from these innovations were not feudal, even though they could be just as exploitative and abusive. Most land tenure forms of today have their roots in those relations" (Fals-Borda 1985: 201). Fals-Borda (1987) situates the transition to capitalism in rural Colombia alongside the boom of tobacco in the 19th century. With the international tendency of economic liberalism at that time, the state decreed free commerce and ended the monopoly it had over tobacco production since colonial times. For the increase of tobacco production, the new entrepreneurs colonized public lands and dispossessed natives from their *resguardos* (Fals-Borda 1987: 93). The difference of this dispossession from previous ones was the type of production and labor relations that emerged. A triple economic process was taking shape, according to the author. Its first characteristic was the concentration of land; the second, was the increase of productivity; and the third, partial liberation of the work force. The combination of these three characteristics meant, "Colombian capital was passing by a stage of primitive accumulation" (Fals-Borda 1987: 95). Fals-Borda situates this Marxist analysis of primitive accumulation in the internal and direct

[10] Perhaps the most influential, or at least illustrative example, of a native cultural structure that was crushed to help shape Spanish dominion in the *Nueva Granada* (present day Colombia) and set the subsequent social base for a profoundly imbalanced present day Colombian society, was the case of the Muisca People. Their territory was partly where the city of Bogota was founded on the same place where main settlements (*Cacicazgos*) of the Zipas and Zaques (Muisca chiefs) were. The Muiscas were known as a highly hierarchical and gold rich People. The first Spanish conquistadores that arrived in 1537 early implemented a new political dominion in which new uses of land and social relations were established. This was achieved through armed force, murder, rape and generating opposing bands between Muisca chiefs. The resulting imposed political and land tenure arrangement over these dispossessed lands, were the *encomiendas*. The encomiendas covered vast areas (hundreds or thousands of hectares) but where not exploited in its entire domain. Muiscas could still use the land, but they had to pay tribute in kind, specie or service to the Spanish *encomendero*.

exploitation of the peasant work force in *haciendas*, yet other factors were also adding to the consolidation of a capitalist dynamic embedded in already present exploitative dynamics, such as the consolidation of cattle farms that also dispossessed peasant communities. The growth, transformation and acceleration of coffee production between 1890 and 1914 were important steps in the relation with the international economic dynamics. The control of gold production in the region of Antioquia by exploitative classes is situated as the basis for the formation of a financial bourgeoisie (Fals-Borda 1987:95).

Dario Fajardo *et al.* (1997: 53) explain that in the scenario of historical dispossession and land grabbing that generates high levels of property concentration and political power of big landowners, the only profitable possibility for small landowners is to sell the land before losing it due to debts. "The peasant seeks to escape to zones where there is no domination of landowners and where absolute rent of the land does not consume all the agricultural revenues. The zones of colonization are temporarily open spaces for the development of the peasant enterprise, as has happened with the coffee and coca colonization." (Fajardo *et al.,* 1997: 53)

In a nutshell, this is the historical base of the establishment of capitalism in Colombia that led to the peasant colonization of other lands. I proceed by describing settler-colonization processes in Colombia, particularly those that led to present day ZRC. The description introduces the characterization of the peasantry that composes the ZRC.

Origins of the Colombian peasantry.

At the arrival of the Spanish conquistadores to present day Colombia, once the native chiefs were assassinated or dismissed from their power, the lands were distributed among the Spanish soldiers in the form of land grants (*Mercedes reales* or *mercedes*[11] *de tierras*) and *encomiendas*.

[11]To date, a common way of respectfully referring directly to an unknown or to someone of more economic power in the Andean region of Cundinamarca and Boyaca, is "*su merced",* a linguistic relic of this way of

The native survivors where commonly included in the land grants (called *haciendas* from then on) as part of the stock owned by the new Spanish soldier who was granted this land by the Spanish colonizing power. The natives were to work for the *encomenderos* in the new emerging social and political structure, without rights to the land of their ancestors. Some were turned to slaves (resulting of their previous status within their culture) others had different levels of power and closeness to the new landowners. With time in this exploitative structure, the peonage became the normalized social position for land workers of indigenous origin or of early miscegenation. "Peonage… became rooted in the agrarian structure of Latin America and has endured to present day" (Stavenhagen 1970: 8). Leon Zamosc adds to this description of this new social rural order, that "the miscegenation had given rise to a growing population of mestizos who… were incorporated into the haciendas as *agregados*, a vague category that included different types of tenants, sharecroppers, and peons tied by bondage debts" (Zamosc 1986: 9). It is the descendants of this situation that will then become the actors of peasant revolts in the 20th Century and of an oppressed rural social class who will migrate to colonize new lands beyond the agrarian frontier in the Andes towards the Amazon, Orinoco and Pacific regions of Colombia (the case of present day ZRC of Calamar in Guaviare, ZRC Pato-Balsillas in Caquetá or ZRC Perla Amazónica in Putumayo), or within the Andean region in unused parts of haciendas (the case of the ZRC of Cabrera in Cundinamarca)[12]. A more specific description of this settler-colonization process is described below.

The initial colonization of the present day ZRC occurred within the agrarian frontier in the Andes, as is the case of present day ZRC-Cabrera, where peasants colonized unused parts of the coffee haciendas in the first decades of the 20th century; then it expanded to the Andean-

---

dominion imposed by the Spanish to the Muisca people of the Boyacá and Cundinamarca departments of Colombia. The original term used was "*vuestra merced",* meaning *"your mercy"* or *"your grace"*

[12] Refer to map with location of ZRC in the Introduction of this thesis.

Amazon (Caquetá and Putumayo) and further into the Amazon region (Guaviare). The first peasants who colonized the Andean-Amazon were in a great part displaced populations fleeing the military oppression brought by the dictatorship of Gustavo Rojas Pinilla in the 1950s to the first peasant guerrillas[13]. Then the governments during the 1960s supported colonization of these lands to avoid having to do land reforms within the agrarian lands of the Andes and the fertile inter-Andean valleys (of the Cauca and Magdalena rivers) which are vastly possessed by landowners and polititians. A second migration that expanded in the 1980s was related to seeking new land and economic opportunities. Although the migration began since the 19th Century with the fur, rubber and quinine booms and the frontier wars with Peru, the migration increased significantly with the expansion of the coca economy in the Andean-Amazon (current day ZRC of Pato-Balsillas in the department of Caquetá and ZRC Perla Amazónica in the department of Putumayo), and Amazon (ZRC Calamar in the department of Guaviare), among other places.

Since all these economic dynamics are about control of land for types of production and generation of profit in a capitalist logic we can abstract again from the particular Colombian case, to a general analysis of how the agrarian question is, through its struggle for land, a territorial issue. Kuehls (1996: 70) refers to Locke's influence on capitalist economics in considering useful land only the one which has been transformed to produce for capitalist markets. In the 19th century it was primarily for the revenues of the state, and in our current world of the 21st century for corporate global capital. Any other use of the land that does not imply its transformation for capitalist markets is rendered wasted or unproductive. This can be

[13] Extensive narrations of these histories of displacement can be found in: *Historias de Frontera, Colonización y guerras en el Sumapaz* (Gonzales Arias and Marulanda Álvarez 1990); *Guerrilleros, campesinos y política en el Sumapaz. El Frente Democrático de Liberación Nacional 1953-1957* (Buitrago Parra 2006); *Colonización y Conflicto. Las lecciones del Sumapaz* (Marulanda, 1991).

exemplified in our case with the legal notion in Colombia of productive land and therefore land available to be titled. Law 200 of 1936[14] "On the regime of land" stated in its first article:

> It is presumed that they are not barren, public lands, but private property, the estates possessed by individuals, understanding that possession consists of an economic exploitation of land, evident through positive evidence of the owner such as plantations or crops, the occupancy with cattle or others of equivalent economic significance. (my translation)

Complementarily, the 2nd Article states: "Public or barren lands are rustic plots that do not show possession as has been established by the previous article." The interpretation of this law in this case study context is as follows. The previous natural cover, -especially if it was a forest cover-, is chopped down and rendered productive initially by logging useful species, then by 'opening' grasslands for extensive cattle ranching or for legal crops. In this way, people become citizens as their economic activities contribute to a capitalist economy. Two 'useful products' are implicitly created: the individual or the social group/community as a productive force, and the transformation of nature into tradable products in a capitalist transaction. In this way, peasants are to be transformed to capitalist subjects, and extractive activities (logging, fishing, and hunting) are to be transformed to commodifiable goods in the capitalist market. The notion of

---

[14] A more precise interpretation can be grasped from the original text:
ARTICULO. 1.- Modificado, Articulo. 2, L. 4 de 1973. Se presume que no son baldíos, sino de propiedad privada, los fundos poseídos por particulares, entendiéndose que dicha posesión consiste en la explotación económica del suelo por medio de hechos positivos propios de dueño, como las plantaciones o sementeras, la ocupación con ganados y otros de igual significación económica. [AUTHOR'S NOTE: this is the segment translated in this page]

El cerramiento y la construcción de edificios no constituyen por sí solos pruebas de explotación económica pero sí pueden considerarse como elementos complementarios de ella. La presunción que establece este Artículo se extiende también a las porciones incultas cuya existencia se demuestre como necesaria para la explotación económica del predio, o como complemento para el mejor aprovechamiento de este, aunque en los terrenos de que se trate no haya continuidad o para el ensanche de la misma explotación. Tales porciones pueden ser conjuntamente hasta una extensión igual a la mitad de la explotada y se reputan poseídas conforme a este Artículo.

ARTICULO. 2.- Se presumen baldíos los predios rústicos no poseídos en la forma que se determina en el Artículo anterior. [AUTHOR'S NOTE: this is the segment translated in this page]

productive land is dependent on how its space or its components can be commodified and who is capable of transforming it to a commodity. The struggle of the native peoples for the recognition of "unused" lands as their territories within the Colombian state's territory and in some cases in relation to peasant colonists can also be seen with this lens of capitalist production. Unfortunately, the scope of this study will not extend to this important issue.

Not just any capitalist transformation is desirable for the state. For instance, the transformation of forests to a final product of cocaine is very lucrative in capitalist terms, yet as the profit escapes state benefit and generates alternate armed economic powers that can exercise power over territory or territoriality, these will be condemned by the state through the use of its armed power to exercise government and territoriality. The claims of the *cocaleros* (coca leaf collectors and initial cocaine base production agricultural workers) with the *marchas cocaleras* (marches of the coca growers) of the 1990s in the Caquetá and Putumayo regions, were an important piece in negotiating with the government substitution alternatives to coca production and eventually to the designation of the ZRC as part of a solution to this situation[15] (Ferro and Uribe 2002).

Going back to the analysis of understanding modern capitalist states as structures that enact their power through the possibilities of profit from capitalist relations, the importance of a space is directly related to the possibilities of extracting economic profit from its use. In this sense, part of what is being implicitly negotiated between peasants (as economic subjects in this regard) and the state, is an economic use of land with mutual benefit (profit). As will be explored in the next chapter, nature as a commodifiable opportunity is essential to construct these new

[15] I will not extend into the relation of the FARC with the coca economy in this region. I understand its relation primarily in military terms therefore it is not the scope of my study. For detailed analysis of the relation of FARC with the coca economy in the region, see: Ferro and Uribe 2002 or Citurna Producciones 1989.

economic prospects. The common "ground" where these negotiations occur is through *Ordenamiento Territorial* as a political technology, yet one that is not exclusive to the state, as will be discussed further on in this study. Before getting into that discussion I present an analysis by Leon Zamosc (1986) about the Colombian peasantry up to the 1980s. His analysis contributes by suggesting that according to their socio-economic situation, the peasants might have different claims.

Zamosc (1986) categorized the Colombian peasants and their specific demands particularly until the 1960s according to economic activities and land tenure situation. The usefulness of this division is in showing how depending on the type of land tenure, the peasantry organizes and has different political and economic demands. For instance, agricultural laborers are said in his work to be the only ones able to work in community enterprises and willing to receive collective titles because they are used to industrial agriculture and therefore used to work in teams (1986: 161). This might be related to Chayanov´s idea of peasant cooperatives. But also, the agricultural laborers are closest in their work dynamic to urban industrial workers, therefore can be expected to have similar political and economic demands in relation to labor situations. In this sense they can also be related to a proletarian group, closer to Marx´s first option of the peasants´ fate in capitalism. The other "type" of peasants, small holders (*minifundistas*) colonists, do not like this format of community enterprises because they are not used to working in groups and would not be willing to receive collective titles. They might also have other livelihood aspirations and therefore political demands.

Table I. Summary of Zamosc's (1986) categorization of Colombian peasants and their demands.

Types of peasant	Characteristics	Demands
Stable	Small property owners and small-scale agriculture.	Improve conditions of reproduction: -Prices -Market access -Access to credit -Adequate provision of services
Tenants and sharecroppers (*aparceros* or *parceleros*)	Originally labored in *latifundios*, then opening new lands through pasture-rent, finally selling their *mejoras*[16]. Pasture-rent in fallow lands or other types of rent in kind or money.	Land for their reconstitution as peasants. Solving of disputes over public lands, forests, draining swamps.
Colonists of public lands (*tierras baldías* or *baldíos*)	Migrants from La Violencia. Result of peasant dissolution of the Andes. Formed a transient peasant economy with the expansion of agrarian frontier continuously moving and extending it "leaving behind a concentration process in which new cattle *latifundia* expanded on the freshly cleared lands that the landowners bought from the colonists".	Create new bases for a restoration of the peasant economy. Demand state presence with: -Roads -Communications -Infrastructure (to bring products to market) -Prices of pioneering crops -Basic credits -Procedures for land titling -Introduction of services
Agricultural Laborers	Semiproletariats, temporary employment, seasonal migrants: "nomadic agricultural proletariat". Not interested in unionizing, but on making the most out of the season.	Transient, immediate demands: Better piece-work payments, proper food, decent place to sleep during harvest period.

Corrales and Forero (1992:55) define the peasant economy as the small rural family production. Their description of the peasant economy in Colombia in the early 1990s suggests that this sector offered 65% of the national agricultural production in foods of direct consumption (maize, potato, plantain, yuca, beans, cane sugar, fruits, vegetables) and also dairy

16 *Mejoras* are referred to public lands that have been "bettered" (literal translation) when a colonist "opens land" he has the right to be titled the land when it is evident he has done some *mejoras*. This begins by clearing the forest of the land but also can include other activities like fencing, including cattle, opening paths, bringing electricity cables. It is also common that a peasant who has done *mejoras,* sells his possession rights to others who can then claim the title.

and meats. They include in their description of the peasant economy a multi-active and diverse production with strategies that combine diverse productive alternatives for both family-consumption and for the market. When they did their study at the beginning of the 1990s, "at the preamble of the economic openness, Colombia maintains an agro-alimentary system relatively self-sufficient" (Corrales and Forero 1992: 67). Heterogeneity is meant in terms of various degrees of integration to the market, unequal access to resources, geographical location, ecologic and cultural diversity as well as in access and uses of technologies. Multi-activity, the authors consider is an inherent characteristic of peasant production and a mechanism to face risk in the market, searching to combine merchandising with family-consumption production. They consider that resistance to change -which has been widely criticized as a negative attribute of peasants- has actually helped them survive and has helped preserve genetic diversity of seeds and breeds.

We are now entering the situation of the Colombian peasantry in the 1990s. Therefore, it is important to address the evolution of the economic context in the 1990s that Corrales and Forero called "economic openness", to shed light on how the context influences the appearance of the ZRC as part of an agrarian reform. Additionally, it will be important to analyze what type of agrarian reform it is in relation to the context of the 1990s and the expansion of neoliberal capitalism. This time context will help to situate the appearance of the concept of *Ordenamiento Territorial* (OT) in the construction of the modern state with the Colombian National Constitution of 1991. Elements from the agrarian question analysis now reemerge and find new validity in the time of neoliberal capitalism. What still seems a lose end is how OT is related to this. Being attentive to the modernist project of the state after the 1991 Constitution should begin shedding light on these links.

Neoliberalism.

David Harvey gives us a useful overview of the emergence and meanings of the concept of neoliberalism. He begins by stating how "the founding figures of neoliberal thought took political ideals of human dignity and individual freedom as fundamental, as 'the central values of civilization'" (Harvey 2005:5). Harvey later traces in Karl Polanyi's thought how Polanyi argued that in a free market economy "free enterprise and private ownership are declared to be essentials of freedom" but that "the idea of freedom 'thus degenerates into a mere advocacy of free enterprise' which means 'the fullness of freedom for those whose income, leisure and security need no enhancing, and mere pittance of liberty for the people who may in vain attempt to make use of their democratic rights to gain shelter from the power of the owners of property' " (Polanyi 1944 in Harvey 2005: 37). In this way, Polanyi had warned that no distinction was being made on 'good' and 'bad' acts of freedom, and that the bad ones lead to more exploitative schemes. This analysis will be particularly relevant when analyzing why a peasant, even if managing to obtain a land title, is not as 'free' to engage through enterprise in the market with other 'free' entrepreneurs globally with whom he has to compete to set his products in the market. The 'starting point' for freely competing in the market is not the same when some sort of regulation of the market or promotion to access the market in equal terms has not been done by an entity, usually, the state. This is also an important aspect to analyze the possibilities of peasant economies in neoliberal capitalist economies.

Continuing with the definition of neoliberalism and particularly the definition of the neoliberal state, Harvey differentiates the neoliberal state in theory and in practice. In theory he says "the neoliberal state should favour strong individual private property rights, the rule of law, and the institutions of freely functioning markets and free trade" (Harvey 2005: 64); "individual

success or failure are interpreted in terms of entrepreneurial virtues or personal failings" (Harvey 2005: 65). In practice he recognizes that there are many contradictions. The first is that to generate a "good business or investment climate", capitalists need the state's intervention. Neoliberal states tend to behave in a biased way by siding with a good business climate rather than supporting collective rights of labor, or protecting the environment or letting it regenerate from extraction (Harvey 2005: 70). They will also favor "the integrity of the financial system and the solvency of financial institutions over the well-being of the population or environmental quality" (Harvey 2005: 71). Key to the analysis in this thesis is the characteristic of the neoliberal state of shifting "from government (state power on its own) to governance (a broader configuration of state and key elements of civil society)" (Harvey 2005: 77). Other authors offer complementary descriptions of neoliberalism and the neoliberal state that are relevant here. Noel Castree (2008: 142) identifies privatization, marketisation, de-regulation, re-regulation, market proxies in the residual public sector and the construction of flanking mechanisms in civil society, as the ideal-typical characterization that constitutes 'neoliberalism'.

In the context of Colombia, the economist scholar Absalón Machado (1998:18) said that for neoliberals, the agrarian question is an issue of competition and excessive state intervention. Neoliberalism privileges deregulation and liberalization of markets, neutrality in the instruments of economic policies, passivity of the state in not giving tariff protection or subsidies and in trusting that the market will achieve the best resource allocation. The neoliberal perspective leaves out issues of equity, differentiation, marginality and institutional limitations. In this way, agriculture is seen as the rest of the economic sectors without acknowledging the relations with the urban-industrial sector and the asymmetries with international commerce. It also subjects all actors and subsectors of the agrarian economy to a sole pattern of economic growth (Machado

1998:18). He also calls to situate the international context of the globalization of economies; formation of regional economic blocs; decreasing state intervention, privatizing of companies and public services; increasing urbanization; continual modernization; complexity in mass media; domination of markets by transnational enterprises belonging to powerful financial groups; and changing consumption patterns.

Besides these impacts of neoliberalism, I argue throughout this thesis that issues around environmental policies and development planning also respond to the neoliberal logic. Basically this will be exemplified with how nature as environment is made manageable and amenable for transactions (e.g., REDD+) and how planning language includes social, political and economic relations framed in a neoliberal logic. In the meantime I proceed by linking the entrance of neoliberalism in Colombia with an important historical moment for the country, the creation of the National Political Constitution of 1991. Then I focus on the influence of neoliberalism in peasant economies and agrarian reforms.

The 1990s in Colombia. A turning point.

Colombia's national constitution of 1991 is the result of an interesting construction of diverse political sectors. Its previous constitution dated from 1886. The construction of the 1991 Constitution included sectors of society and political forces that had not been recognized before by the ruling traditional liberal and conservative parties. These political forces included the *Union Patriótica* party (which was the political arm of the FARC guerrilla); members of the M-19 guerrilla organization that had surrendered in the late 1980s; indigenous groups and the afro-Colombian population. Individuals such as scholars, entrepreneurs and artists also were part of

the construction of the new constitution. They all made part of the National Constitutional Assembly[17].

Seeking relevant emphasis of the 1991 Constitution for the purposes of this thesis, I mention that Colombia is described in the Constitution as a decentralized, participatory and democratic republic with autonomy of its regional territorial authorities (departments). The state establishes principles such as the family as the basic institution of society; rights such as to be protected by those in weak economic conditions; or the guarantee of private property (Art. 58). This notion of private property has two additional descriptions. It "is/has a social role that implies responsibilities and as such it has an intrinsic ecologic responsibility. The state will protect and promote associative and solidary forms of property"[18]. Expropriation is allowed for purposes of public use or social interest, only through a legislative act and with previous compensation to those who will be expropriated. The state will promote access to property (Art. 60). Article 64 is particularly relevant for this thesis' focus, because it establishes that the state must promote progressive access to land property to agrarian laborers. This can be done individually or through association. The Article also mentions access to public services, credit, commercialization of their products, technical and entrepreneurial assistance "with the objective of improving the incomes and life quality of peasants." The concept of *Ordenamiento Territorial* (OT) is central to the chapter of territorial organization[19]. The Constitution mentions that the Organic Law of OT will establish the distribution of responsibilities between the nation

---

[17] http://www.constitucioncolombia.com/miembros.php

[18] This is my own translation of parts of Article 58. The original text is: "*La propiedad es una función social que implica obligaciones. Como tal, le es inherente una función ecológica. El Estado promoverá las formas asociativas y solidarias de propiedad.*"

[19] As I mentioned in the introduction, although this concept can be translated as 'land use planning', I prefer to continue using the term in Spanish since its meaning, besides having technical aspects such as planning and zoning, is more related to the politics of territory in relation to different roles of state institutions in their scales of jurisdiction (from ministries, to regional authorities, to local municipal governments) and aspects of social participation in all its processes.

and the territorial entities. This law will not be analyzed as it was finally approved in 2011 after much controversy on issues about indigenous lands and previous consultation to indigenous authorities who are considered public authorities.

This brief description of the Colombian Constitution gives hints on how it gives a setting of a state that prioritizes private property and is decentralized, which are characteristics of a neoliberal state. Nonetheless it portrays a state that will aim to aid its subjects by providing public services and that has the ability to expropriate land, which are not neoliberal policies but could rather show strong regulatory and protective roles. Yet this regulatory power can be used by both Keynesian type states to intervene in land markets and do land redistributions, but can also be used by neoliberal states to support corporate investments in the land.

Now to link the agrarian question with the Colombian peasantry I turn to the definition of Peasant Reserve Zones (*Zonas de Reserva Campesina* -ZRC) in the Colombian Agrarian Reform Law 160 of 1994 (Article 79). This law defines the ZRC as places where there is a predominance of public lands and where the interventions of public authority will have the purpose of regulating, limiting and ordering rural property; eliminating land concentration and hoarding of public lands through the acquisition of *mejoras;* preventing the decomposition of the peasant economy of the colonist and seeking the transformation to a medium entrepreneur. In Marxist terms this means it is a role of the state through the designation of ZRC to prevent dispossession and to prevent the transformation of the peasantry to laborers in the ZRC spaces. It also implies that the state wants to address the agrarian question in the ZRC by turning peasants into capitalists (medium entrepreneurs). This means that the state should support the transformation of agricultural laborers, colonists, tenants and sharecroppers to stable peasants, owners of small properties who develop small- scale agriculture. To accomplish this, the state must improve the

conditions for capitalist production by regulating prices, facilitating access to markets, to credit, and providing basic services and infrastructure. It is important though, to take a closer look at how neoliberalism affects the peasantry in Colombia.

Peasantry and Neoliberalism.

When Corrales and Forero (1992) as social scientists of rural Colombia wrote about the peasantry under the neoliberal development model (then called economic openness) they denounced that in the omnipresent logic of the market, peasants, communities, municipalities and regions were assumed as well informed demanders with a good access capacity to resources. "It supposes that supply exists and that all that needs to be done is the transaction" (Corrales and Forero 1992: 61). Not only would peasants suffer the neoliberal policies with the entrance of external agricultural production, but small, national, capitalist producers in more agroindustrial models of production of rice, cotton or sorghum would suffer as well. Effects on their small agroindustrial capacity would affect the source of labor for peasants who temporarily search for wage labor in those industries as a complement to their livelihood. The authors argued that the model of economic openness that was being applied to areas of the economy -including the agrarian sector- had not created the basic conditions for its implementation. In this way, the intended economic competition was not offering access to technology, credit and water. Besides, land and water were not only suffering being commodified and monopolized but also deteriorated. Therefore, they argued, the entrepreneurial potential of producers that had shown a great capacity of growth could not develop any further. They estimated that approximately over one million farms had insufficient land while millions of hectares were being taken as semi-unproductive large estates. As they stated, the basic assumptions of a neoliberal free market were not available to peasants to respond positively to external competition. In their opinion, the basic

conditions for a fair competition referred to technological generation, worker qualification and land mobility. They argued that for peasants, technological generation depends on the state; the workers' qualification depends on an adequate educational system for the rural sector; and land mobility must face the land concentration in the hands of cattle ranchers whom have for objectives power, political control and unproductive speculation (Corrales and Forero 1992: 57).

Land grabbing leads to elevated prices of land rent, impacting crop costs and creating an uncompetitive situation. In the early 1990s, the rise of new capitalists emerging from illegal drug economies was setting new economic opportunities and limitations for peasants. Land was being bought from them by this narcotraffic economy generating displacement and the transformation of productive lands to extensive cattle ranching that reduces rural work, but it was also generating a new source of rural employment in the coca, poppy and marijuana crops and processing.

In the scenario of economic openness of the 1990s, the only alternative that Corrales and Forero saw for the Colombian peasants was to become modern entrepreneurs capable of accessing the markets of land, capital, technology in equal conditions as the rest of society, or to disappear (Corrales and Forero 1992: 60). Yet, decreasing financial subsidies and the privatization of the National Agrarian Bank have been disadvantageous for the peasants. This reminds us of Marx's analysis of the three possibilities for the peasants under capitalism and of the general debates around the agrarian question. Below, I will continue exploring the influences of neoliberalism on the peasantry, particularly in the types of agrarian reforms that states carry out.

Neoliberalism and agrarian reforms.

Machado (1998) argued that the agrarian question in Colombia needed to be posed now in the neoliberal context. The economic openness of the 1990s decreased the yield of agriculture in a differentiated manner (commercial agriculture, peasant economy, exports, and import goods). Occurring at the same time was a drop of international prices of agrarian products, revaluation, breaking of the international pact on coffee and its decrease in prices, and difficulties of the National Agrarian Bank, and high interest rates. Yet he states that the crisis of agriculture is not just related to the economic openness but also to the economic, social and political structure, institutions, new international contexts, agrarian policies of industrialized countries, and in general with the economic model that the country began to follow (Machado 1998: 21).

Hernandez (2013: 47) argues that the neoliberal model of modernization began during Cesar Gaviria´s presidency (1990-1994). According to Hernandez, this influenced how the Agrarian Law 160 of 1994 established a new logic, where the state´s role was to guarantee a land market, passing from a distributive logic to a retributive one in state spending. Therefore, the new law that replaced the Agrarian Law of 1961 changed its conceptual frame from one of an agrarian reform to the creation of a National System of Agrarian Reform and Peasant Rural Development. Peasants are to access subsidies from the state to buy land in an open market of land, instead of accessing lands previously bought by Incora to redistribute to peasants as had been the spirit of the 1961 law. The new neoliberal mechanism lead to an increase in the colonization of new lands, the titling of public lands but left intact the fertile and adequate lands for agriculture that were already unproductive haciendas or in the hands of narcotraffickers. Indirectly, the open market scheme of land acquisition weakened peasant agricultural production and promoted the expansion of the illegal coca economy (Hernandez 2013: 48).

In relation to the establishment of neoliberalism and its relation to land reforms, Wendy Wolford suggests differentiating between neoliberal and populist approaches to land reform. A neoliberal land reform also known as Market-Led Agrarian Reform (MLAR) "attempt[s] to create or restore private rights to property for the purpose of improving the smooth functioning of rural markets (usually markets in land, credit and agricultural inputs) and increasing efficiency and production through security of title...[while] Populist reforms, on the other hand, attempt to create or restore the connection between peasant communities and the land, improving social justice by distributing resources to the poorest" (Wolford 2007: 550.)

The World Bank particularly promoted MLAR between 1995-2004 (Borras 2003, Wolford 2007). This coincides with the implementation of a pilot project of a Learning and Innovation Loan of the World Bank for the development of the ZRC during 1998-2003 that will be analyzed in some detail in chapter four. Wolford argues, "the World Bank has promoted attention to secure property rights as key elements of functioning markets and economic growth... [because] insecure land tenure, outdated regulations, and dysfunctional land institutions constrain private investments and undermine local government's ability to raise taxes" (Wolford 2007: 556.) A neoliberal way of thinking can be traced in this logic and Wolford puts it as "the goal of land reform is to transfer land away from unproductive people to productive ones [because] ... self-interested maximizing land users... will respond rationally by improving their land and more efficiently allocating resources to work it" (Wolford 2007: 556 drawing on Borras 2003). For Wolford the MLAR logic also assumes "that secure property rights will allow people to profit from their labor" (Wolford 2007: 557). In this sense it reminds us of Marx's initial analysis of the peasants in capitalism where he situated them as either exploiting themselves trying to be able to compete in the market with low prices but either failing and losing their land,

or becoming wage laborers when failing to participate in the capitalist market[20]. The importance of Wolford's differentiation of types of agrarian reforms for this study is in situating the ZRC. Using her analysis, what is suggested is that the ZRC as designed in the state Law 160 of 1994 wants the peasants to become medium entrepreneurs. The assumptions are that these 'emerging entrepreneurs' begin with the same economic, political and spatial conditions as the rest of the competitors of the global market. The history of the Colombian peasantry has shown us that this is not the case. Therefore such an assumption is ignoring the context specific situations that Bernstein discussed. Let us see now what other scholars suggest.

Borras (2003) identifies the type of agrarian reform of Law 160 of 1994 as a partial implementation of a Market-Led Agrarian Reform (MLAR). It shares the characteristics of "targeting only those who seek land and those willing to sell it; potential buyers receive a grant and must seek in the market for their land; creation and development of efficient and competitive individual family farms is the main objective" (Borras 2003: 371); it requires beneficiaries to organize so that the organization can "carry out a 'peer monitoring' process in order to bring down the programme's transaction costs" (Borras 2003: 371); local government agencies are assigned the role of land purchase mediation and tax collection. Since land is acquired through purchase, land titles can be collateral for bank loans (Borras 2003: 372). Differentiating from other MLAR, Law 160 prohibits beneficiaries the possibility of selling their land. An important topic is the role of multi-lateral agencies in these land reforms. "Multilateral and bilateral aid agencies are also expected to invest in [them], especially on the 'grant-side' for post-land transfer development" (Borras 2003: 373). This aspect can explain the Learning and Innovation

[20] The third scenario of the cooperative, collective peasant work will not be explored, as it would imply not favoring individual private properties but collective ones and not having the individual as the economic subject, but the producing collective in its organizational form.

Loan that the World Bank did for the Colombian government in order to begin the development of the ZRC. More of this will be exposed on chapter four.

I now proceed to weave together the previous topics with the notion of territory. As was mentioned before, the agrarian question focus does not seem to give enough importance to the space where the agrarian evolves. It is somehow as if the economy existed in a vacuum, unrelated to natural processes, undetermined by the histories of people in a place and their power to transform that place. In a way, the abstraction of the agrarian question to territorial issues is comparable or related to Polanyi's understanding of the disembeddedness of the market economy, unrelated to its forming natural and cultural issues. Precisely, the danger of falling into a segmented and incomplete analysis by not relating economic issues with spatially situated conditions is what calls to position territory as the analytic tool that geography provides.

From space to *Ordenamiento Territorial.*

When Lefebvre (2000) reminds us that space can be interpreted either as absolute or relative, he is calling for a critical analysis of what traditionally had been conceived as a static, blank canvas where things happen. Geography then, as a spatial science, must be concerned with thinking about the construction of space as others have done (e.g. Smith 2008 or Santos 2006) to show how it is a social product, an active scenario and a relative notion in relation to something else. As extensive as the literature and interpretations of space are, I mention only some reflections that can lead to other structural concepts useful for this study such as territory, nature and power.

From Lefebvre's theory of space, I consider that *Ordenamiento Territorial*, zoning, "reserving" (meaning the process of creating reserves), Peasant Reserve Zones (ZRC) and protected areas (natural national parks and its buffer zones) are "representations of space." They refer to conceptualized space in the sense of "the space constructed by assorted professionals and

technocrats… This space comprises the various arcane signs and jargon, objectified plans and paradigms used by these agents and institutions." (Merrifield 2006: 109). These sort of conceived spaces usually include "ideology, power, and knowledge" for their representation (Lefebvre in Merrifield 2006: 109). This relation with state power and the state apparatus leads to a Foucauldian analysis of "governmentality" that will be treated in chapter four. For now, it can be suggested that from a technocrat's urban office, all these designations (OT, ZRC, NP) are "representations of space" because they are imagined as neatly delimited and 'organizable' spaces that can be planned and managed. These spaces are more easily reduced to notions of land as a commodifiable good, than a political idea of territory as a claim to how a space is lived and transformed.

I turn then to another possibility Lefebvre offers which is "spaces of representation". This concept is related to: "directly lived space…it may be directional, situational or relational, because it is essentially qualitative, fluid and dynamic" (Lefebvre in Merrifield 2006: 110). In my opinion, this is what peasants are negotiating through the already established "representation of space" that OT and ZRC offer as state languages of governmentality. I consider that their colonization stories; the personal stories of each of these peasants; the ways they have constructed livelihoods in public lands, in hacienda lands, or in protected areas; or by colonizing forests in general, are spaces of representation. Their experiences are essentially manifestations of territoriality. Territoriality has been enacted through transforming nature and generating new social relations. Specific examples of this territoriality will be addressed throughout this document, beginning with some at the end of this chapter. I argue that what is politically claimed by peasants are the rights to these "representations of space" (OT, ZRC, NP with their political technologies) and to the belonging to the space *through* the "spaces of representation" of

inhabiting and constructing a territory that can be then called a ZRC. This leads to Raffestin's differentiation of space and power where "Space is an issue of power while territory is a product of power" (Raffestin's 1998: 168) because it is about the capacity people have not just to transform nature through labor but also through their own social relations. Through technological and economic transformation they transform their natural surroundings, and through social and cultural innovation they transform their social surroundings (Lapierre 1968 in Raffestin 1998: 168). This interpretation is valid for this study as it implies that territory should not only be considered a state's issue, but that it is a social issue in general, where other actors (in this case the peasants) also transform their social surroundings (*leur milieu social*).

Lefebvre's work on space seems to be centered on urban space and he uses examples of urban space. The notions of nature that will be approached in chapter three should help to relocate these notions and to be able to apply them to rural spaces and to non-European settings with the interest of feeding the idea of the production of space.

Territory.

It is necessary to analyze how the ZRC become delimited spaces for the state and for the peasants through a legal designation, in order to relate them to *Ordenamiento Territorial* (OT) and *Ordenamiento Ambiental del Territorio* (OAT). Following that condition of a spatial legal designation, I question how the ZRC become conceived as territories by different actors (state, peasants, or scholars). In this sense, I begin weaving the relation of space and state through territory, borrowing Stuart Elden's argument that territory "is *a* key term in thinking the relation of the state to geography, and it is still one of the key terms in thinking the relation of politics and geography, power and place, more generally." (Elden 2014: 323).

Elden (2010[b]) brings Michel Foucault to geographic analysis of territory: "Territory is, to borrow Foucault's term, a political technology" (2010[b]: 760). An important advancement in the discussion of its conceptualization was brought by Sack (1986 in Elden 2010[a]: 802), "a place can be a territory at times but not at others, 'territories require constant effort to establish and maintain'… they are 'the results of strategies to affect, influence, and control people, phenomena, and relationships'." This is why he suggests that "[t]erritory must be approached as a topic in itself" (Elden 2010[a]: 811) because it is a historical question in the sense that it is produced, mutable and fluid, but it is also "geographical… because it is profoundly uneven in its development" (812). Elden says "territory needs to be interrogated in relation to state and space" (801) so its political aspects can be expanded in its political-legal and political-technical issues. This suits the intention with this thesis of analyzing *Ordenamiento Territorial* (OT) beginning by exploring it as a state construction of territory but also questioning how peasants interact with this political technology.

I consider that to arrive to the political technology of conceiving an idea of territory widely recognized as such, previous political technologies are implemented, at least by the state. These can refer to armed actions (violent acts of dispossession, wars of independence, military basis and permanent presence, guerrilla warfare) or political actions (legislations, creation of state institutions, bureaucratic presence). Governments can claim power over the same territory by military force to shape who gets to live in that space and how. In Colombia, not only does the state military shape who lives in once place, but also the illegal armed forces, either guerrillas or paramilitaries. State power is also manifested through the state apparatus, which through laws, institutions, and actions, also shapes the landscape. Roads, electric infrastructure, dams, are forms of a state's physical power over its territory. State power can also manifest itself through

rights such as land titles, concessions for extraction of resources or land designations as protected areas. These acts and its impacts in time also shape a territory and give it meanings. Yet, territory is not only a state political technology.

Peasants as other actors also actively use or construct the political technology of territories. Beyond the modern concept of 'rights' and within it 'land rights', the idea of territoriality has strong links to the notion of power over a space. Inhabitants of a space can claim power over it by their physical power to shape the landscape that defines that space for themselves and for others. Estrada Alvarez *et al*. (2013: 33) conceptually situate the process of ZRC peasant territoriality as a material and symbolic appropriation that may or may not coincide with state forms. As I will show in chapter three, the idea of environment as a way of naming the use of nature facilitates this exercise of territory for peasants. The idea or participation and planning established in the National Constitution of 1991 and the development of the concept of *Ordenamiento Territorial* should also be ways in which the peasants can share with the state in the transformation of representations of space. In this way, the construction of territoriality is exercised with peaceful intentions of politically building territories. Space is therefore shaped as territory through diverse manifestation of power in constant action of the state, the inhabitants and other actors as its shaping forces.

For Raffestin (in Elden 2010a) "the problem of territoriality is one of the most neglected in geography and…. the history of this notion remains to be done" (799). One of the reasons is because it seems universal, therefore it is overlooked by political theory and this is why 'territory' lacks political theory (Elden 2010a: 799). For Sack (1986 in Elden 2010a: 802), "territoriality is a social construct (not quite a product) forged through interaction and struggle, and thoroughly permeated with social relations". So Elden suggests, "there is a need to

understand territory to grasp what territoriality, as a condition of territory, is concerned with" (Elden 2010a: 811). There is a constant struggle between states and its subjects to enact that power over space and claim territoriality. A struggle of dependence and autonomy, control, supervision and protection, are constant notions related to this negotiation of power over space and claims of territoriality.

A group of Colombian scholars situates the experience of the ZRC as a socio-territorial movement (Estrada Alvarez et al. 2013). They draw on Agnew, Schneider and Raffestin to approach these peasant territories. For them, the study of territory requires an analysis of the social relations that configure its process of production and within it, its process of appropriation. A territorial configuration is a process in which the use of space implies the generation of power mechanisms with a sense of forging forms of domination. In this sense, *Ordenamiento Territorial* and within it *Ordenamiento Ambiental Territorial* will be analyzed as forms of power mechanisms where the state and the peasants interact in different ways shaping territorial outcomes

Defining *Ordenamiento Territorial* (OT).

Ordenamiento Territorial literally means, "territorial ordering" but is better glossed as 'arrangement' rather than order or planning. The term is usually translated as "land planning" or "land use planning". I prefer to use the term in Spanish as it includes other meanings that are both political and technical. I share Asher and Ojeda's (2009) argument that they use the term *Ordenamiento Territorial* from Spanish, "because it illustrates the ideas of *giving and imposing order* to national territory better than the English translation 'territorial zoning' which risks appearing more literal and technical" (Asher and Ojeda 2009: 293).

As I have mentioned in the introduction, it is challenging to expose in English and to an Anglophone audience the meanings of this concept. The English and British inherited tradition (United States of America, Canada, Australia, etc.) does not seem to use the concept of land planning as it is used in Latin America or parts of Europe with the terms *ordenamiento* or *ordenacion territorial* (Spanish), *ordenamento territorial* (Portuguese), or *aménagement du territoire* (French) just to mention a few. It is enough to browse in institutional pages or academic programs' emphasis (thematic degrees offered) of countries like Brazil, France, Spain or Argentina to demonstrate the importance that this topic has in geography as an academic field or in policy building outside the Anglophone world[21].

León Linares (2011) traces the roots of Colombian *Ordenamiento Territorial* to a document during the construction of the National Political Constitution of 1991 *Reflexiones para una Nueva Constitucion* where the new Colombian state is defined as an intermediate form between a unitary and a federal state. It is "aimed at solving Colombian problems, not copying foreign models" but it recognizes influences from the Belgian and Portuguese Constitutions, modifications of the French *aménagement du territoire*, the English Devolution, the Autonomic

[21] To support this statement, this is a non-exhaustive set of the examples found about OT in other countries: *Ecole Supérieure d´Aménagement du Territoire et de Développement Regionale* at Francophone Quebec City, Canada: https://www.esad.ulaval.ca ; France has a *Delégation interministerielle à l 'amenagement du territoire et à attractivité régionale* (DATAR) to direct service of the prime ministre. An article in Le Monde about presidential elections and the importance of addressing amenagement du territoire: http://www.lemonde.fr/idees/article/2014/02/07/amenagement-du-territoire-la-fin-d-une-ambition-politique_4362318_3232.html ; Universidad de Puyo at Mendoza, Argentina, offers a doctoral degree in OT and Sustainable Development: http://www.uncuyo.edu.ar/estudios/posgrado/179; Ecuador offers a Masters degree in *Ordenación Territorial*. In University of Cuenca at Ecuador, *Ordenación Territorial* has been elevated to the category of a constitutional norm. http://www.mot.com.ec/?Menu=503&ptr=503; The *Autónoma de Madrid* University offers a masters' program on OT and Environmental management with cultural relevance (from the Mayan People): http://www.uam.es/ss/Satellite/es/1242654675830/1242671756653/estudiopropio/estudioPropio/Master_en_Ordenamiento_Territorial_y_Gestion_Ambiental_con_Pertinencia_Cultural_(desde_los_Pueblos_M.htm; An article about Brazil's national policy of OT: http://www.ub.edu/geocrit/sn/sn-24566.htm; As an example, the book "Ordenamiento territorial e ambiental" published by the editorial house of the Universidade Federal Fluminense. http://editoradauff.com.br/ciencias-exatas-e-da-terra/194-ordenamento-territorial-e-ambiental-9788522808472.html

Spanish state, the Italian Regional state, the federal states of the USA and Germany (León Linares 2011: 203).

In the Colombian Political Constitution of 1991 decentralization was meant to be an important dynamic of the new state construction. The *Ordenamiento Territorial* Commission set in the 1990s, defined the term as:

> a group of agreed actions to orient transformation, occupancy, use of geographical spaces searching for its socio-economical development, considering the needs and interests of the population, the potentialities of the territory and the harmony with the environment" (IGAC 1991: 30 in Leon Linares 2011: 215).

For the Colombian Geographic Institute Agustin Codazzi (IGAC), OT is:

> [a] state policy and a planning instrument that allows an appropriate political-administrative organization of the Nation, and the spatial projection of social, economic, environmental and cultural policies of society, guaranteeing an adequate living standard for the population and the conservation of the environment. (IGAC 1991: 31 in in Leon Linares 2011: 215)

Curiously enough it seems that in the same document[22], OT is described simultaneously as a set of agreed actions and as a policy. León Linares observes how the document does not establish who has to agree on the actions, signaling that it not clear what actors are called on to decide about the arranging of the territory; or why the population seems as a homogenous mass without economic differences and differentiated access to political power. These contradictions might come from how the territory is conceived by the state. Paul Alliés in "*L'invention du territoire*" (1980) explains that in juridical developments, territory can be understood in three different ways. The first is territory as an *object* of state which implies a special right of sovereignty over national land, different from the power the people have over it; second, it can be understood as a

[22] This refers to the document: Instituto Geográfico Agustín Codazzi.1997. *Guía Metodológica para la formulación del Plan de Ordenamiento Territorial Municipal.* Editorial Linotipia Bolivar. Bogotá. This document was not directly accessed in this study, the references to it come from: León Linares, G. 2011. *Ordenamiento territorial en Colombia: reseña histórica de un desconcierto.* Prensa Moderna. Bogotá.

subject of the state which "means it defines territory as a constitutive element of the State as a juridical subject… it is an element of *being* the state, not of *having*[23]" (Alliés 1980: 12 drawing on Jellinek and Duguit). Finally there is the interpretation of territory as a *function* of the state where the state is a custodian or trustee of a collective right over the territory (Allies 1980: 15). To me, Allies contribution seems more a reflection of the role of the state in relation to the space that is transformed as territory, and does not necessarily serve to understand what territory means to the people in relation to the state. Alliés' approach does help us to understand how the state may be struggling to situate itself in relation to the space it is meant to rule and the inhabitants of that space as its subjects. To examine what territory means to the people in relation to the state it is important to draw on examples of how the people, in this case the ZRC peasants, enact their own meaning of territory and interact with the state in this relation. This will be exemplified further on in this chapter and throughout this thesis.

Before drawing on notions of territory from the peasants, I include some more developments of OT from the state with the legislative development of the concept. Law 388 of 1997 defines municipal *Ordenamiento Territorial* (OT) as the set of political-administrative and planning actions in the exercise of their public functions. It is meant to dispose of efficient instruments to orient the development of their territory, regulate the utilization, transformation and occupation of space in accordance to socio-economic strategies of development (Art. 5). In this way it complements social and economic planning with the territorial dimension, rationalize interventions on the territory, and orient their development and sustainable use through the definition of territorial strategies of use, occupation and management of the land.

[23] Italics are not in original text, they are meant for emphasis. This is an author's translation of P. Allies 1980.

The "organic law of development planning", Law 152 of 1994 has as one of its principles: autonomy of territorial entities. In relation to this, the municipal *Ordenamiento Territorial* Plan (POT) is defined. POTs should recognize 'determinants' which are laws or norms of superior hierarchical status (more legal importance or power) like those related to conservation and protection of the environment, natural resources and prevention of natural risks. These refer to limitations from "zoning for the adequate use of the territory and national regulations about land use in relation to environmental aspects" (Art. 10). These limitations include all those protected areas, integrated management districts (DMI), national forestry reserves, or guidelines for water basin management established by national and regional environmental authorities. This law organizes topics of planning at the local level of municipalities and defines some technicalities of the structure of other planning entities in the state apparatus.

León Linares (2011: 215) defines *Ordenamiento Territorial* in Colombia as a way of being and enacting power, particularly political power. Also how an economic dynamic corresponds to that power. So when referring to it as a state policy, it expresses the relation between power and use. In this way, we link the economic dilemmas in which the agrarian question is included as a political-territorial issue of the more capitalist uses of land and of the land's inhabitants as economic subjects, with other environmental concerns. Environmental issues are important also in relation to the economy, as they should be addressed to maintain and assure the natural resource base that helps sustain economic growth. The workings around the concept of "environment" will be addressed in chapter three. The other important element of the Constitution of 1991 and the construction of OT related to participation that will be addressed in chapter four.

We have to recall the three fundamental claims made by ANZORC at the 2nd National Protected Areas Congress held in July 2014 at Bogotá[24] : 1) recognition of the peasantry as a political subject with rights; 2) reordering of OAT of the country; 3) recognition of the peasantry as conservation subjects. In relation to these elements and the claim for OT they demand that peasant communities should also have prior, free and informed consent as a right like it is granted by the National Constitution of 1991 to indigenous and afro-Colombian communities in relation to interventions that affect the territory in social, cultural and/or environmental terms. They also demand respect for the mechanisms of territorial autonomy that peasant communities have developed due to state abandonment and a lack of recognition of the peasantry. When peasants claim in public spaces with state institutions that they are political subjects of rights and relate it with being conservation subjects it is because through their direct uses of nature that shapes territories, they are claiming not only the transformation for economic production but their power as territorial actors. Examples of their proposals in relation to this idea are exposed below.

Examples of territorial representations in the ZRC.

The concept of the Family Agricultural Unit (*Unidad Agrícola Familiar*-UAF[25]) was defined in the law not as a minimum *area*, for the subsistence of a family, but as a "basic enterprise" of agricultural, livestock, forestry or aquaculture production. Its extension is to allow for a productive project and adequate technology, the generation of a minimum of two legal, monthly

---

24 Named *Ordenamiento Ambiental, Peasant Rights, a Route for the Construction of Peace.* Author´s translation of the original title: *Ordenamiento Ambiental, Derechos Campesinos, Una Ruta para la Construcción de la Paz.*

25 The description I am giving in this paragraph is my interpretation of the original definition of UAF in Spanish which is: "Es la empresa básica de producción agrícola, pecuaria, acuícola o forestal, cuya extensión permite, con su proyecto productivo y tecnología adecuada, generar como mínimo dos salarios mínimos legales mensuales vigentes. Además, permite a la familia remunerar su trabajo y disponer de un capital que contribuya a la formación de su patrimonio."
http://www.incoder.gov.co/contenido/contenido.aspx?catID=2195&conID=1663

salaries. It should also allow a family to remunerate its work and dispose of capital to contribute to the formation of its capital accumulation (*patrimonio* is the word used in Spanish). The UAF began to operate with the Law 041 of 1996, when its size for some municipalities was established. Recently, the UAFs have been regulated for some departments and their municipalities that did not have UAF sizes established with the 1996 legislation. The UAFs range from 3 hectares in Andean municipalities to 60 ha in the Amazon departments. The "spirit" of the law seems benign, it is after all, a mechanism to prevent land hoarding. The criteria for the size of UAFs is based on an estimation of the average potential productivity based on the agricultural productivity average conditions of each municipality (UAFpm) and what has been named the Geoeconomic Homogeneous Zones that are also established for each municipality (Ministry of Agriculture 2013: 3). Deciphering all the terms and notions that make up this criteria is a way of understanding the "logic" of the state or its vision of what a rural family holding should be. As James Scott (1998) suggests, these types of codes are ways states have to render legible their subjects, assign land a value as a productive asset or as a commodity for sale, generating taxing opportunities, and simplifying complex socio-ecological relations with the land. For the context of Colombian peasants, this calculation should at least generate regulations to prevent land hoarding, equitably distribute land titles among a population of similar socio-economic characteristics and calculate how to provide state attention in topics such as technical assistance for production.

The Law 607 of 2000 defined "small agricultural producers" as those proprietors, tenants or possessors of any title that directly or with their families, exploit a rural plot that does not exceed the area and income of two UAF and always derive from agricultural, forestry, agro-forestry, cattle, aquaculture or other types of farming at least 70% of their income. A "medium

sized rural producer" is defined with similar activities and legal characteristics of tenure but has a land that exceeds the area and income from two to five UAF in their farming activities, not exceeding the generation of income by ten minimum, monthly salaries.

Interestingly in territorial and organizational terms, at ANZORC's presentation at the 2nd National Congress for Protected Areas -with an audience composed mainly of environmental authorities and organizations- ANZORC called to consider the *vereda* as the minimum territorial unit for territorial and environmental planning, instead of each parcel/farm of private property. Complementarily, they propose UACA (acronym in Spanish for Environmental Peasant Units) instead of the institutionally existing UAF (Family Agricultural Unit) as the designation for the maximum land size distribution to a family[26].

A *vereda* is a sort of rural neighborhood composed of private properties and sometimes other land tenure situations. Each *vereda* usually has its own elementary school and a basic organizational structure that will be further explained in the next chapter: *Junta de Acción Comunal*. There is a special meaning about peasants not proposing individual properties but these collective social spaces represented by *veredas.* A territorial planning proposal that sets the *vereda* as the minimum scale planning space instead of the individual private property sheds light on a shared responsibility for OT and diminishes the importance of the individual as the basic political actor calling for a collective decision-making process on territorial matters. This spatial-political (territorial) proposal is not prioritizing the relation individual-State, or individual-market, but the relation individual-community-state seeking for a communal relation with the state and prioritizing communal decision making over individual, private property decisions.

[26] From a feminist perspective it would be interesting to study how 'family' is defined and conceived as well as land distribution implications from a gender perspective. However, this study will not approach this topic.

Complementarily, a proposal of an environmental (UACA) instead of an agricultural unit (UAF) can also be placing the territorial over the economic. ANZORC mentions it as a designation that "in which the environmental is primordial in land tenure… productive and environmental *Ordenamiento* requires advancing in the identification of the productive and ecological potentialities of the territories that plan an environmental zoning that defines the productive zones of each vereda[27]." (ANZORC, July 17th 2014, Bogota)

In relation to territory, the peasants are claiming that their expressions of territorial autonomy were achieved due to the lack of recognition of the peasantry and the abandonment of the state (ANZORC, July 17th 2014, Bogota). They are also calling for re-ordering or re-arranging the environmental and territorial *Ordenamiento* (*reordenamiento territorial y ambiental*). This means a use of land and its soils according to its vocation. They propose achieving this by reversing the advancing of extensive cattle ranching, the increase of the surface area dedicated to peasant agriculture organized in small and medium properties. This way, cattle ranching could be a sustainable and environmentally friendly activity. Territorial environmental protection designations should contemplate traditional knowledge and relations of the community with nature, allowing them to inhabit them with clear norms and regulations of strict enforcement of limits and responsibilities.

Conclusions.

This chapter has been an extensive review of concepts. These concepts of agrarian question, neoliberal capitalism, peasantry, space and territory with its particular manifestations in Colombia should set a solid base for the rest of the topics treated in this thesis. Opening with

[27] ANZORC's presentation "*Ordenamiento Ambiental, Derechos Campesinos, Una Ruta para la Construcción de la Paz*" at the 2nd National Congress for Protected Areas, July 17th 2014, Bogota.

unpacking the terms carried by "Peasant Reserve Zones" I set the relation between economy and space as the first important abstraction. Through the initial debates of the fate of the peasantry in capitalism with the agrarian question I proceed to introduce the particularities of the Colombian peasantry that composes the ZRC. A description of their evolution as the country adheres to the global capitalist dynamics and their situation in the current neoliberal capitalism serves to question what sort of agrarian reform the state is favoring with the establishment of the ZRC in the 1990s. The chapter proceeds by analyzing agrarian reforms influenced by neoliberalism. The conclusion of that part is that the state idea of the ZRC through Law 160 of 1994 imagines peasants that will turn into entrepreneurs carrying all the false assumptions that peasants enter the competitive market economy in the same conditions that capitalists. Although doomed to fail due to these contradictions, the ZRC can be seen from a different perspective when the optic of territory is introduced. I turn then to the concept of space and particularly Lefebvre's analysis of "spaces of representations" and "representations of space" to show how the same space means different things to the state and its urban technocrats and to the peasants that inhabit these spaces. Finally *Ordenamiento Territorial* as a political technology where both actors (state and peasants) dialogue about what this space means and how it should be understood as a territory where both have power. The examples of vereda, UACA and the claims of ANZORC in public spaces such as the protected area conference aim to show how the peasants position their territoriality.

With these links of the economic with the territorial we can proceed to the next chapter where I analyze how "the environmental" is conceived by the state and by the peasants. As will be seen beginning with the production of nature, the "uses" of environment through *Ordenamiento Territorial Ambiental* (OAT) have particular meanings both in economic and territorial terms.

CHAPTER 3.

Beyond Poor Soils: Dispossession, *Ordenamiento Territorial* and Environment.

> We do not propose to continue expanding the agricultural frontier, colonizing forests or climbing to *páramos*[28]. Clearly these are meant to be protected zones, protected areas, but in the context of political violence and pressure on peasants and inhabitants of the rural world, we say people have rights even in those areas (Interview 16, ANZORC.)

Blaikie and Brookfield reminded us in their classical work of political ecology, "Marginality is both cause and effect of land degradation" (1987, in Castree and Braun 1998: 12). This serves as a starting point to explain why political ecology is an appropriate analytic frame to analyze the relation between *Ordenamiento Ambiental Territorial* (OAT) and ZRC. Both peasant representatives and OAT experts agree on establishing soil quality as a limiting factor for the appropriate development of the ZRC, at least from an environmental perspective. But beyond soil quality, there is a broader issue. It refers to the unresolved history that lead people to colonize the Amazon, the Orinoco region, the Pacific rainforests, *páramos* and national parks. It is the issue of past agrarian reforms that did not redistribute fertile lands within the agrarian boundary because they were mainly taken by big landowners who were also politicians. Up to the 1960s, sectors of the state preferred to support the colonization of Amazonian lands than to deal with deep political histories of land dispossession within the agrarian boundary. After the 1970s and specifically after the 1990s when 'the environmental' emerges as a defining ordering category, other sectors of the state (mainly environmental authorities) have to deal with the

[28] Páramo is a high mountain tropical ecosystem, of alpine life forms, widely considered as a main producer of water. In Colombia it ranges approximately from 2800-4000 meters above sea level. It has been highly debated in Colombia if the páramo should have a status of special protection and no extractive or agro-productive activities or inhabiting should be allowed in them. Mining, potato production and cattle ranching are among the most conflictive activities in páramos. (*Procuraduría delegada para asuntos ambientales y agrarios,* 2008)

contradictory messages of colonization and conservation in ecologically fragile lands. The starting quote summarizes how the peasants feel in this contradiction and position themselves.

These particular issues of colonization, conservation and the histories of how territories are constructed, are deeply embedded in what *Ordenamiento Territorial* (OT) is all about. Yet to understand the 'environmental' part of this discussion, and to be able to arrive at the use of *Ordenamiento Ambiental Territorial* (OAT), I had to previously understand how the current understanding of 'the environment' came to be. To approach this question requires previous steps. The first one is going back to the meaning of nature, as the conceptual background of 'environment.' Searching for definitions of nature serves to explain how 'environment' is a current way of defining nature, its origins and implications in contexts such as the ZRC case study.

For the purpose of analyzing the meanings of environment and the consequences of its use, I am taking a political ecology perspective. I like Robbins' (2004) definition of political ecology as a mode of explanation that seeks to explicitly analyze assumptions regarding the environment. This chapter is all about assumptions of the environment.

Another analytical tool that I find useful to approach the construction of the environment and its relations with the state is what Arun Agrawal (2005: 8) defines as *environmentality*, uniting the concept of *environment* and the Foucauldian idea of *governmentality*. The environmentality idea serves to analyze environmental government and perhaps seek its differences with environmental governance trying to establish what social and political consequences this government-to-governance change has. In this use of Agrawal's environmentality, I explore boundaries between the public and the private. In the level of abstraction of seeing the ZRC' peasants as a unitary political force and the state as bloc with

which the peasants have to relate for territorial issues and for the construction of OT and OAT, I am making a binary -and perhaps arbitrary- division of the state and the peasants. Nonetheless, in this search I also try to unravel the roles of communities and states in environmental control, especially when another category over a territory has been prioritized: that of being a 'peasant zone,' which means agriculture is a prevailing category that should be informing these roles and the types of environmental control needed in these spaces. A link from the previous chapter on the agrarian question and territory should enlighten this discussion on how beyond fighting for rights over land, peasants are constructing territoriality which includes in many ways how to deal with the environment, who takes the decisions about its management and how this is enforced. The negotiations of what environment means and how to deal with it territorially is also what this chapter aims to show.

I understand environmentality -as Agrawal explains it- more about the technologies of government than about environment as a thing. That is why I initially unpack the meaning of environment in this chapter and resume notions of environmentality in the next chapter where I use Foucault's governmentality concept to explain the specific workings of development planning and how it can be related to the environment. Planning the environment is a way of environmentality. This chapter and the next one feed this idea. Other elements of environmentality -perhaps better understood in chapter four- refer to the "appropriate goals of environmental management" (Agrawal 2005: 8.) The meaning of these "appropriate goals" is questioned when examining development plans and the influence of the 'facilitator's' expertise. This aspect will also be discussed in the next chapter when analyzing Sustainable Development Plans of the ZRC.

Linking to the political ecology literature I use the Polanyian notion of the disembedded economy to draw a parallel and explain how I find that both the state and the peasants are currently constructing 'the environment' as a self-contained disembedded sector ignoring many of its intrinsic relations. Just as Polanyi signaled that the "disembedding" of the economy was serving capitalist interests to generate a faith on a self-regulating market, I perceive that the new constructions of the environment, are also generating some sort of faith on a neatly planned, controlled, managed, agreed upon, environmental sector. What I observe in this chapter are the ways both the state and the peasants use and construct this notion and how this is as politically and socially dangerous as disembedding the economy has proven to be.

I show examples of the disembedding of nature through environment with examples of discourse (guidelines for OAT, *gestión ambiental territorial*); with how some problems are not being treated as territorial problems but only as environmental problems when they are about the overlap of protected areas and peasant territories; with the environmental sector in organizations and the environmental sections in plan documents that also treat environmental problems as distinct from other situations. Other examples such as the recognition of *veredas* and *Juntas de Acción Comunal* as the basic spatial and organizational structures cannot be neatly identified as examples of governance. They are internally, ways of governance, but they are also calling for government in the sense of calling for state support and regulation in issues such as the REDD+ mechanisms.

Defining Nature.

'Nature' is, in Raymond Williams' terms, "the most complex word in the [English] language" (1976: 219) because among other reasons, it began as a word describing a process, meaning 'to be born', from the Latin root *nasci*, and later became an independent noun. Escobar (1996: 337)

reminds us that nature is a 'material-semiotic' actor. This means that it is always a social construct that is shaped by other variables of society (geographical location, history, economy, religious beliefs, and ethics) that give it particular meanings. For the purpose of this study, I will approach the meanings of nature as constructs for specific political and economic moments. The previous chapter established the National Constitution of 1991 and the entrance of neoliberalism as the historical setting for the emergence of the ZRC. In that scenario, participation schemes and decentralization of state roles are key political elements. The setting of the political conditions for the particular economic development of neoliberalism, frame the meaning(s) of nature that I explore in this chapter.

I display the idea of nature, as a social construction to illustrate how currently, nature is understood as 'the environment.' The current meaning of 'environment' is related to economic trends and has territorial effects in terms of power relations. I argue that the discursive shift from 'nature' to 'environment' is a key element for political and economic purposes for both the state and the peasants, to set their territorial interests. This shift is due to the malleability of nature as environment done particularly through the political technology of planning which tends to compartmentalize or isolate some issues as 'environmental' and abstract them from other relations of causality and effect. Results from interviews show that both the state and the peasants use the discourse of nature as environment for economic and territorial purposes and seek the instrument of *Ordenamiento Territorial* (OT) through the language of planning. This allows us to explore *Ordenamiento Ambiental Territorial* (OAT) as a political technology, a mechanism both contested and used by peasants of the ZRC as a way to settle their meanings and uses of nature as environment.

Nature and Capitalism.

For Arturo Escobar, under current capitalist dynamics, nature, people and knowledge "are seen as the source and creators of value- not merely as labour or raw material… [they] are valuable not so much as 'resources', but as reservoirs of value" (1996: 334-335.) Neil Smith (2008) also explored the idea of nature as a reservoir of value. For him, from a Marxist perspective, nature is produced under capitalism in the sense that naturally occurring materials, substances and spaces can be transformed as products for capitalist relations. This interpretation is transposed to this study in terms of how, for example, the forests that are territorially claimed by peasants and by the state because of their economic importance, and for the possibilities of their transformation, are important because of their potential exchange value and further possibilities of profit and revenue[29]. So too is the water, and the land -or rather the soil- with its potentially productive capacities. All 'nature' in a ZRC is important in its potential use under capitalism. Following this idea, we could say that the struggle for territory in a ZRC is a struggle for domination over the economic possibilities of a space and its contents because it represents the possibilities of generating profit as an economic class project. Yet arguably, one actor cannot do without the other for its economic project. Peasants need the state for the economic flows that make possible or facilitate economic relations and the generation of profit from production. This need is exemplified with the call for infrastructure -basically through roads and bridges- but also with political-economic support through subsidies, protection for national markets and avoiding international free trade agreements where peasant products cannot compete against foreign agro-industrial products. The state needs the peasants as laborers or entrepreneurs for capitalist development since they transform raw materials into commodifiable goods through the

[29] For instance, a big chunk of the Amazonian forests had been reserved by the state in 1959 as Forestry Reserves.

productive processes they generate. In this way, they can contribute to the economic growth for the state. This is related to at least two possibilities of how the state regards the peasants: either as a capitalist productive force, or as mere labor force for production subsumed under capitalist control. A further analysis of this issue is explored in chapter two in relation to the agrarian question and to territory. The language used in Law 160 of 1994 suggests that the state is seeking to transform the peasants to capitalists (medium entrepreneurs is the term used in the law), but that it needs to offer regulations such as protecting national production in order for these emerging capitalists to actually be able to access the 'free' market.

Borrowing a question from chapter two on territory, relevant to the analysis of nature in a capitalist scenario, Escobar (1996: 335) argues that peasant communities (like indigenous communities) "are finally recognized as the owners of their territories (or what is left of them), but only to the extent that they accept viewing and treating territory and themselves as reservoirs of capital." Using this idea, the examination of the term "peasant reserve" in *Zonas de Reserva Campesina* suggests analyzing if what is "reserved" by the state are: 1) the peasants as economic subjects or, 2) the zones as resource containers. Also, it calls into questioning how the peasants (and other inhabitants of the zones who are not necessarily peasants in economic or cultural terms) see themselves in this equation. "Zone", in this case implies a notion of container, a delimitation of space, and within it, aspects that are valued for some purpose and must be identified, classified and contained within the imaginary border line that determines the inside and outside of the spatial zone. It is also relevant, for the purposes of this study, to analyze the notion of a nature contained in a space (zoned, reserved) and how it is understood and negotiated by at least two of the actors involved in its use and transformation.

The question that follows is whether for economic purposes, the peasants and the state use the space and its contents - including the territory with its natural forests, water and soils -in a similar manner. In a Marxist approach this exploration is about identifying if there is a socio-economic class that can be neatly delimited behind these interests. The peasants in this case -as was explained in the introduction- are understood for the purposes of this study as a socio-economic class in itself because they are claiming to be a political actor and a subject of rights with clear identities in several public spaces, as will be seen later on in this chapter. Since the state is a conglomerate of social interests and power struggles, the answer of understanding it as a clearly defined social actor and economic class is more complicated and debatable. I will leave this question for chapter four when exploring issues of the idea of the state and government when using the image of Medusa as a way to represent the state and its contradictory and non-unitary actions.

Following Smith's (2008) terms of the production of nature in capitalism, we see how this requires political technologies that regulate the rate and ways of use of first nature (primary or raw materials transformed by labor) for the production of second nature (abstract, exchange values of nature produced by human relations)[30]. Ordering, planning, managing nature is important for both political actors (state and peasants) since they are both territorial actors. The management of nature tries to establish who will have power over the generation and control of exchange value of the space and its components, or of these 'naturally' present and occurring possibilities for capitalism. Preserving a forest is then mediated in economic terms. Is it more profitable to log its valuable woods (commercial timber); to generate an ecotourism business to

[30] For the purposes of this study I will not develop the notions of first and second nature, although it is a distinction important to many Marxist geographers. Neil Smith (1984[2008]) in his chapter of the production of nature explains how these notions of first and second nature have changed during the evolution of capitalism.

bring urbanites to pay for the recreational use of the forest; to sell carbon credits for the oxygen produced by the forest; to keep the forest cover for the preservation of water quantity and quality, used further down the river basin for agricultural or industrial uses, charging the industries for clean water use? Is it not that perhaps it is more profitable to 'clean' this land of its first nature (the forest) and set crops, build a road or begin a settlement? Which of these uses generates more revenues for the state? These sorts of questions are the ones embedded in a capitalist meaning for nature, and suggest the political construction and possibilities of OAT for political interests from the state and from the peasants in a ZRC territory in terms of how to spatially order these sometimes complementary and sometimes contradictory intentions and interests. Where do these interests differ, where do they coincide and why? Where is it possible to negotiate and where will one of these actors show more power to enact their will? These are the following questions to be addressed with the results developed in this chapter.

Why nature cannot be planned but environment can.

When nature is rendered useful, manageable for planning, at least for technical documents, such as development or state plans, it becomes 'environment'. This relation is identified by the Keyword project[31] when 'environment' is included as a new keyword, following the exercise of Raymond Williams' original work (1983.) The Keyword project suggests: "in contemporary public debate, environment refers to the whole natural world, rather than to the immediate physical context of a particular organism." The collective authors of this Keywords project, stress how the current definition of environment brings back the original meaning of the word in English of "the state of being encompassed or surrounded… the area surrounding a place of thing; the environs, surroundings, or physical context." In this sense, what is important in the

[31] Entry for 'environment, written by K. Allan. Accessed through: http://keywords.pitt.edu/keywords_defined/environment.html

current meaning of environment is that it has a political emphasis due to "a central concern with human relations to the physical world as the necessary basis for social and economic policy" (Williams 1983: 111.) It is not nature (the natural, spatial surroundings of humans) that impact and affect humans, but humans impacting their surroundings. This is a semantic change in subject-object position that is relevant for this analysis due to the shift in the power relation. Rather than nature having power over humans, humans have power over nature by naming it 'the environment[32]'. Humans interact with their environment (their environs) they shape it, plan it, manage it, organize it and order it. In an opposite condition, humans are impacted by nature, by natural disasters, by natural conditions. With this shift in power relations, planning nature becomes possible through *Ordenamiento Ambiental del Territorio* (OAT) or Environmental Land Use Planning. Linking this to Escobar's analysis of the discourse of nature and its relation with planning: "That nature and earth can be 'managed' is a historically novel assertion. Like the earlier scientific management of labour, the management of nature entails its capitalization, its treatment as commodity" (Escobar 1996: 328.) Just as when nature became scarce, it discursively became 'natural resources' (e.g. Bridge 2013), now that nature can be commodified in new ways either promoting its growth (biodiversity conservation), its planning (parks), its abstract negotiation (REDD+) or its negotiated destruction (compensation schemes), it becomes 'environment'.

'The environment' is more easily quantified, zoned, sold and bought than nature. Nature seems much more complex and inseparable in its relations, while the environment is more easily objectified. A planner is meant to produce a certain environment (zone it, transform it, protect it, restore it, reforest it). That is why discursively we refer to environmental engineering, not to

[32] In this objectification of nature as environment I have chosen to leave the term 'the environmental' as a translation of "*lo ambiental*" found in several of the interview answers for this study.

nature engineering as a profession; we refer to an environmental planner, not to a nature planner; to environmental land use planning, not to natural land use planning; and to *Ordenamiento Ambiental del Territorio*, not to *Ordenamiento Natural del Territorio*. Changing from natural to environmental implies different imaginaries. Discursively, we cannot control, plan and regulate nature in the same way we control, plan and regulate the environment, because nature is unbounded, it controls us. That is why disasters, are 'natural', but not 'environmental.' Environment is a manageable nature. Environment renders nature "amenable to a technique" because it is about "a whole set of practices concerned with representing 'the domain to be governed as an intelligible field with specifiable limits and particular characteristics'" (Rose in Li 2007: pages 7 and 286). 'Environment' then, is nature "rendered technical".

Similarly to the previous argument, Castree and Braun (1998: 8) argue that in capitalist relations with nature "capitalism constructs and reconstructs whole landscapes as exchange values [including] the production of agrarian regions", in this sense, perhaps both the ZRC and the Enterprise Development Zones (legislated parallel to ZRC in Law 160 of 1994) are exchange value landscapes for the state or for other economic interests. This can help answer a previously posed question in this chapter: What is reserved in a ZRC, the zoned space and its *commodifiable* natural opportunities, or the peasants as economic subjects? It seems as though it is the zones as economic spaces, but perhaps with specific labor subjects that produce specific commodities.

Weaving environment with economy in neoliberal Colombia.

Archival research of the term *Ordenamiento Ambiental Territorial* (OAT) in Colombia in the 1990s provides useful insights to analyze how economy and environment are conceptually woven together. It is important to begin with Law 99 of 1993, which is the foundation for the Colombian Environmental Policy under the new National Constitution of 1991. This law states

as its "universal principles"[33]: social and economic development process, and sustainable development, guided by the Declaration of Rio de Janeiro of June 1992 on Environment and Development (Art.1). This law defines *Ordenamiento Ambiental del Territorio* as "the function of the state in regulating and orienting the design and planning process of uses of the territory and the renewable natural resources of the nation to assure its adequate exploitation and sustainable development" (Art. 7). Regional environmental authorities had been previously created[34] but this law redefines them and creates more by assigning them the administration of the environment (*medio ambiente*) and of renewable natural resources in their jurisdiction and to aim for sustainable development (Art.23). For the administrative and financial autonomy of Regional Autonomous Corporations (CAR[35]), this law establishes retributive and compensatory rates to charge for: direct or indirect use of the atmosphere, water, and soil; dumping waste, polluted water, smoke or other harmful substances; as well as the percentage of environmental taxes on landed property; and transferences from the electric sector. These taxing responsibilities are all domains of these regional authorities. These taxing schemes managed by regional authorities might be part of what Castree (2008: 142) describes as neoliberal reregulation, since this refers to state policies that facilitate privatization and marketization of environmental issues with the possibilities of generating revenue for the state, from the nature (or natural resources) used by the private sector. The scheme can also be understood as decentralization in terms of how it generates regional control, instead of central state apparatus control. However, these

[33] I am leaving the term "universal" found in Article 1 of Law 199 of 1993 to show how discursively, social and economic development are to be unquestioned and how they are matched with sustainable development.

[34] See Escobar (1995: 87-89) for a description of the first Autonomous Regional Development Corporation in Colombia, the Corporación del Valle del Cauca (CVC) and a thorough analysis for its creation during the beginning of the "age of planning" in the 1950s. CVC's creation was inspired by the experience of the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) and the World Bank initially financed its creation. After the National Constitution of 1991, these regional corporations were defined as environmental authorities.

[35] CAR is the popular acronym for Regional Autonomous Corporations, but it is also the name of the Regional Autonomous Corporation of Cundinamarca, the department where the ZRC of Cabrera is located.

responsibilities are not de-regulating mechanisms as they enforce state interference to environmental matters. It does not say, for example, that it will *prevent* pollution but that it will *charge* for it. In this sense, although not all of the intentions of Law 99 seem neoliberal (some regulating mechanisms are clearly not), we can characterize the roles of CARs with what Castree identifies as a biophysical fix of neoliberalism that "involves state bodies using neoliberal environmental measures to solve problems arising within the state apparatus or the wider economy and society" (Castree 2008: 146). He argues that the state must successfully manage the contradiction of the external confrontation with the biophysical world, while maintaining its own fiscal stability and credibility as a governing body (Castree 2008: 148). The way OAT is to serve the economic purposes, and the regional environmental authorities are to be state apparatus bodies that manage the commodification of nature via environment for fiscal purposes of state economic growth, makes sense from the state´s view point. Scott (1998: 12) explains how taxation became a state need for its growth and exemplifies how the management of forests for fiscal and revenue purposes has been one of the first interests of the nation-state on nature. Further analysis on the Colombian state apparatus in relation to the environment is found in chapter four, when I explore development planning in the ZRC and its relation with OAT.

Going back to archival research results, to understand the relations between environment and economy in 1990s Colombia, in 1998 the Advising Office for Environmental Planning of the Ministry of Environment[36] developed a document called *Guidelines for a National Policy of OAT*. This document was not an effective guide for policy construction as it is not commonly cited in laws, resolutions or policy documents, but it is currently available through the Ministry

[36] The Ministry of Environment has had several denominations since its creation in 1993. From 1993-2002 it was the Ministry of Environment, from 2002-2010 during Alvaro Uribe's government it was the Ministry of Environment, Housing, and Territorial Development; since Juan Manuel Santos' government 2010-present it has been called Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development.

of the Environment's web page. The document bases sustainable development as a national constitutional purpose that implies three main objectives: economic growth, social equity and environmental sustainability. It says that assuming sustainable development requires a change in the current development model, which is not an exclusive responsibility of the state, but involves all Colombians and opens participation to different actors in the process. The document portrays OAT as part of a set of instrumental actions of the environmental policy, basic for environmental *gestión*[37] and planning in national, regional and local levels to renovate natural capital, prevent deterioration of those ecosystems with highest value -due to their indispensable ecological services for national development- protect biological and cultural diversity, and consolidate the international presence of the country according to its national priorities and interests.

Environmental planning (*ordenamiento ambiental*) is expressed as a set of structural actions to identify and spatialize territorial units in accordance to their environmental responsibilities, and the appropriation processes and management tendencies in them. "OAT proposes to contribute in guaranteeing the functionality and sustainability of the natural system that supports the population and social and economic processes... it is at the same time a state role, a planning instrument and a scenario of analysis and agreement (7)... it is a technical-political process that begins with the zoning of adequate territorial uses with an ecosystem approach" (Ministry of Environment 1998: 8). These first pages of the document that situate and define OAT give a clear message: OAT is a political technology that aims to organize the territory for economic and population purposes (what the state is about); setting rules for economic uses of space according to their natural attributes (e.g. soil qualities, water availability, slope, ecosystem arrangement, biomass availability). Sustainability is portrayed as a way of

[37] See the Introduction of this thesis for a description of the meaning of the current meaning and implications of *gestión* in Colombia.

acting that will assure permanent availability of economically used, and therefore, valued natural resources. After showing with these examples what OAT means for the state, now there seems to be more coherence in terms of how the state tries to integrate economic, social, and natural conditions for specific state purposes: use of natural conditions for economic growth and population welfare. Yet, when we look at the actual development of the idea of 'environment', and the limited influence this document had in policies, its integrity seems to have vanished in practical terms. What I explore next is how 'environment' has been 'disembedded' from its causal relations. Polanyi's idea of the 'disembeddedness' of the economy from other aspects of society carries similar connotations to the invention of 'the environment'.

The 'Disembededness' of Environment.

Karl Polanyi in his work The Great Transformation, when explaining the problems of a market economy for a society, argued that the market-driven economic system was becoming a separate institution "[meaning] no less than the running of society as an adjunct to the market. Instead of economy being embedded in social relations, social relations are embedded in the economic system" (Polanyi 2001: 60). He further explained this idea of how the market economy was dis-embedding economy from social relations by relating how normally "man's [*sic*] economy, as a rule, is submerged in his social relationships. He does not act so as to safeguard his individual interest in the possession of material goods; he acts so as to safeguard his social standing, his social claims, his social assets. He values material goods only in so far as they serve this end" (2001: 48). Although there are many interpretations of Polanyi's disembedded economy (e.g. Cardoso 2011; Vancura 2011), I understand this idea as how capitalist relations have become known as 'the economy' as if it were the only possible way of exchanging values in social

relations; and how this understanding of the economy has been disembedded from the rest of social relations (political, cultural, natural) so as to facilitate capitalist relations without social, cultural, environmental, or basically, political control from those denouncing the negative impacts of these relations. In such a disembedded economy as is the market-driven economy, causal relations related to all the other spheres of human relations are to be ignored because if they were prioritized, then market-driven economy with all its social and environmental disasters would be stopped, either by organized social force, through strong welfare states, or other sorts of regulating mechanisms.

Drawing a comparison to the 'disembeddness' of the economy, I explore how nature is being disembedded from all its causal relations within human dynamics -particularly those also categorized as social, political and cultural- specifically when natural components and processes are referred to as 'environment'. I argue this by showing how the environment has become a 'sector', both for the state and for the peasants, as though it could be separated (disembedded) from all its other relations and negotiated as a separate aspect of political life. Perhaps in benefit of market economy, the 'disembeddedness' of the environment is useful because it allows paying only for certain aspects of the environment which are profitable (ecosystem services, REDD mechanisms, corporate environmental responsibility) without acknowledging those that are commonly called by economists 'externalities' (pollution, overexploitation, displacement, just to mention a few). Besides the financial separation of environmental matters between those profitable and 'costly', there is an additional problematic. It refers to the political frustration, the tiredness that participation generates as well as the planning expectations that derive from packing the environment as a particular sector of action, of rendering it technical. Examples of

how both the state and the peasants are disembedding the environment in their discourses and actions will be exposed below.

I believe that just as people do not make their economic decision individually but due to social relations like Polanyi suggests, they also have environmental criteria that are not individual but social. People value natural/environmental goods (clean water, good soils, natural surroundings such as forest vegetation and wildlife, clean air) for social reasons, as well as for individual welfare. At least for the case of the ZRC peasants, there are interview responses that suggest they would prefer to collectively -rather than individually- decide on environmental issues. Nonetheless, as a political group, they are currently 'speaking the language' of the disembedded environment.

While examining the answers related to how OAT is constructed or enacted in ZRC, there is another aspect that appears in the answers. It relates to how the concept of governance takes form with notions of autonomy, self-management, and the types of environmental territorial management supported by the state. In this way we can observe a clear shift from a "government of nature" to "environmental governance". But, what is the difference between government of nature and environmental governance and why is it important to establish this distinction?

Bridge and Jonas (2002) offer a good differentiation of how the government of nature can be different from environmental governance. They situate a previous state intervention in land-use planning, resource management, and nature conservation motivated by national development goals to ensure the territorial-economic integrity of the nation-state where "the state played a strong coordinating, regulatory, and financial role in relation to the management of nature within its territory" (Bridge and Jonas 2002: 958). They consider we are now

> in a post-state (post-territorial?) era in which the state's role in mediating the relationship between nature, the economy and society has fundamentally changed. Nature is no longer a national resource or instrument of national planning and production; it is something to be governed, consumed, and marketed-locally and globally" (Bridge and Jonas 2002: 959).

I would add that this shift not only comes with the government-to-governance shift of political and economic powers in diverse directions, but also in the discursive nature-to-environment shift of managerial differences and new capitalist transaction creations and opportunities. Bridge and Jonas also identify this trend when they mention "the assumption that nature (the "environment") constitutes a separate spatial and ontological category, which can be delimited and preserved independently of social intentions and practices" (2002: 961).

Bridge and Perreault (2009) suggest understanding environmental governance as a way "to describe and analyse the qualitative shift in the manner, organizations, institutional arrangements and spatial scales by which formal and informal decisions are made regarding uses of nature" (Bridge and Perreault 2009: 475). The authors signal that although "environmental governance provides a tool for examining the complex and multi-scalar institutional arrangements, social practices and actors engaged in decision making" (2009: 491), the concept is more precisely used when it is interpreted "not as the 'governance *of* nature' but as 'governance *through* nature' –that is, as reflection and projection of economic and political power via decisions about the design, manipulation and control of socio-natural processes" (Bridge and Perreault 2009: 492). This understanding of environmental governance supports the idea that what is important is not what nature as environment is, but how it can be discursively constructed and shifted to accommodate the managerial needs of each actor. That is why environment can be wood kept as standing forests (forestry reserves), it can be transactional chemical reactions (absorbed CO_2), ecotourism, or types of agricultural arrangements. What is

important in these understandings of environment is not the nature they carry or how natural they are (which would also be subjective and debatable measures) but how these environmental issues can be used, managed, constructed, sold, negotiated by different actors.

As we have seen in the first part of this chapter, there is at least a discursive transition from nature to environment suggesting a nature that is manageable. It can be argued that humans have always managed and planned their surrounding nature by generating agriculture or shaping landscapes. However, this new conceptualization of nature, called environment, separates nature from other aspects of social life and brings new ways of commodifying, conceptualizing and spatializing nature. Additionally, as will be seen in the next section, the concept of environment also invites new ways of governing nature. From what could be called a government of nature, where state institutions decide where and how preservation or restoration are done, we can now identify new ways in which society –in this case the peasants as a segment-, calls to participate in the *where* and *how* of nature preservation, conservation[38] or restoration. These new roles in environmental control are called through autonomy and self-management. These are not necessarily new ideas, but are now re-packed in the context of participatory democracy, development planning and a neoliberal market economy. The sum of these three factors gives this current demand and action of governance its characteristics. Perhaps without drawing into enough discussions of what government of nature means, what I want to stress is how it differs from environmental governance. I see in these shifts from state government to people's governance, and in nature as environment, the building elements to understand what OAT means

[38] IUCN currently defines conservation as: "The protection, care, management and maintenance of ecosystems, habitats, wildlife species and populations, within or outside of their natural environments, in order to safeguard the natural conditions for their long-term permanence." (Accessed in: http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/en_iucn_glossary_definitions.pdf)

for each of these actors, where a background setting of development planning and the expansion of neoliberal capitalism have been influential factors. The responses below shape this argument.

Environmental conflicts are not territorial conflicts.

> Definitively, a territory does require to be organized (*ordenado*) in its uses, *costumbres*, in the cultural, the environmental, the productive aspects, and if the state does not organize it, the people will. If there is no organization, the economic booms will organize it, while if there is organization, communitarian structures, forms, regulations, and agreements will be proposed and will finally organize the territory. In the case of the ZRC, the peasantry has already designed processes of autonomy and self-management that guarantee coexistence, land distribution, local environmental agreements, financial self-management to accomplish infrastructure works, and a whole series of ways and mechanisms that are political, administrative and *Ordenamiento Ambiental Territorial* (interview 16, ANZORC representative, August 2014.)

In this quote from interview 16 of this study, environmental issues are considered separately from other issues of social and political life that deal with territorial issues like land distribution or community organizing to accomplish needed infrastructure works[39]. Note also, how environmental aspects are disembedded from other issues (cultural, economic) and are understood as something that can be managed separately, locally and without the state's help if necessary. There is a call for state support, but also an acknowledgement that if there is no state support, the people will solve the issues themselves. It is implied that as a result of lack of state presence and attention, peasant organization is achieved. Autonomy and self-management are argued not as a starting point but as a result of state inefficiency. This is the difference between calling for government and deciding on governance. Land, environment and infrastructure are

[39] For instance, there is a traditional way of organizing among the Colombian peasants called *minga* or *manodevuelta*. These organizational schemes refer to collective work among neighbors to accomplish something of common benefit like fixing a road. In this collective work nobody gets paid but the one who calls for the *minga* usually offers lunch and *guarapo* (a traditional fermented beverage) during the day's work. This is usually organized through the *Junta de Acción Comunal,* an organizational structure that will be mentioned later in this chapter.

mentioned as specific issues solved through distribution, local agreements and financial self-management, respectively. With this idea of separating issues and mechanisms (land as an issue, distribution as its mechanism of resolution; environment as an issue and local agreements as its autonomous mechanism of resolution) it seems as though environment is something that can be agreed on locally, but is not touched by consequences of land distribution, or infrastructure works.

During the same interview mentioned above, environmental and territorial conflicts are mentioned. Within environmental conflicts, boundaries of national parks or forestry reserves and overlapping peasant territories are included. Although they are considered environmental conflicts, they do not seem to be considered territorial issues.

ANZORC's presentation at the 2nd National Congress of Protected Areas also referred to this conflictive situation between peasants and protected areas related to overlapping of the protected area designation in places that had been colonized previous to the national park's declaration, or had been settled after the declaration, but with no knowledge of the protected area designation. The settling communities without the help of the state have constituted *Juntas de Acción Comunal* (JAC), committees, schools, and even *veredas*[40], some of them within protected areas. All these forms of participation emerged due to the lack of state attention and access. They call for a joint effort to solve the conflict of inhabitants within the protected areas and propose re-delimitation of the National Parks. They call their proposal "Parks with people[41]" arguing that in some cases there have been up to three generations living within the boundaries of a national park, who have developed livelihoods and do not want to leave. They also consider

[40] A sort of rural neighborhood composed of private properties and sometimes other land tenure situations. Each *vereda* usually has its own elementary school and a basic organizational structure that will be further explained in this chapter: *Junta de Acción Comunal*.

[41] Institutionally, National Parks had a policy called "Parks with the people" during the 1990s that guided its activities for social participation in conservation (Parques Nacionales de Colombia, 2001).

and propose “decent relocation” but this point was not extended in the presentation. This conflict of overlapping and, also sometimes, the contradictory uses of the land, is also about territorial conflict that exceeds the responsibilities of the authority of the National Parks and the communities. Yet, when it is framed as an environmental conflict, it seems to be a matter of local agreements between the environmental authority and the local communities, instead of being treated as a conflict with broader origins and implications such as a wider agrarian conflict, deeply rooted in economic and political histories. Administratively, narrowing it to an environmental conflict means that only National Parks, as a state agency, has to commit part of its budget to this situation, instead of being able to involve other state authorities to address the apparently implicit situations of economic opportunities, political reasons of displacement and armed threat to welfare, health, education, and infrastructure, among other related situations. The conflict between National Parks and peasant inhabitants is reduced to an issue that peasants and National Parks authorities can solve between themselves through local agreements, instead of being conceived in broader terms, in an integral way, involving more complete state attention and action, not only as a responsibility of environmental authorities.

Sectoring and sectioning the environment.

Similar to the case of environmental, as not included like territorial conflicts, in terms of searching for the ‘disembeddeding’ of the environment, there is an environmental section in the development plans proposed by the ZRC “and we always seek that the development plans reflect the territorial and environmental agreements that we have in the territory” (interview 16, ANZORC representative, August 2014). An environmental section or team within the peasant organization is focused on relating to the environmental sector of public and private arenas. To relate to the state, the communities must master the institutional language of planning, and the

specific jargon and expertise of that sector. By speaking the language of planning, they hope to facilitate the negotiation of land uses. As will be seen in chapter four, speaking the planning language has more implications for what can actually be achieved through this planning dialogue between actors.

An important aspect of the above mentioned testimony is how the peasants are claiming OT and OAT. It is not as though OT was imposed by the state, but it is claimed as a safeguard mechanism by the peasants to protect their territory from spontaneous dynamics like economic booms. Although not mentioned in the interviews, impacts from military operations, mining, and oil exploration or drilling are other situations that change the territory and its political patterns. OT regulations might be requested to protect peasant territories from these impacts.

At the 2nd National Congress of Protected Areas held in July 2014 in Bogotá, ANZORC gave a presentation called *Ordenamiento Ambiental, Peasant Rights, a Route for the Construction of Peace*[42]. Three fundamental elements were claimed at this Congress: 1) Recognition of the peasantry as a political subject of rights; 2) Reordering of OAT for the entire country; 3) Recognition of the peasantry as conservation subjects. In relation to these elements and the claim for OT they demanded that peasant communities should also have prior, free and informed consent as a right as it is granted by the National Constitution of 1991 to indigenous and Afro-Colombian communities in relation to interventions that affect the territory in social, cultural and/or environmental terms. They also demanded respect for the mechanisms of territorial autonomy that peasant communities have developed, due to state abandonment and a lack of recognition of the peasantry. From results of this study, features of how these claims were constructed are shown below.

[42] Author´s translation of the original title: *Ordenamiento Ambiental, Derechos Campesinos, Una Ruta para la Construcción de la Paz.*

'The Environmental'.

Governance, manifested through autonomy and self-management, continues in these testimonies when peasant representatives were asked what OAT is. Peasants who colonized the Amazon (Guaviare) and the Andean-Amazon (Caquetá, Putumayo) regions during the 1980s and 90s, mainly for coca production, refer to the "environmental component" as what they have been negotiating since they proposed to the government to do a gradual, manual and concerted eradication of the coca crops. This environmental component has been proposed as:

> Regulating what is agrarian production, but also conservation, territory for conservation. Everything that has to do with the environmental... This proposal has always been about recovering the native species of commercial timber, because most of them are going extinct. It also had to do with sources of water because with the coca boom, almost everything was deforested, so it is about recovering the water sources, creeks, swamps, and forests. When the creation of the ZRC was achieved we had already been working with the communities on models of how that conservation part would be, for the environmental. Each family already had its own idea of how they would distribute their terrain... This was done by ourselves as a way to recover our identity as peasants (Interview 18, ANZORC peasant leader, August 2014)

This testimony shows how 'the environmental' is also identified as a specific sphere of activities. It begins with a family decision of distribution within their terrain of land uses (zoning agriculture, conservation, infrastructure within their farm), a micro-scale land planning, but it also involves elements that exceed private or individual management decisions like water and timber species management. At least for this ZRC there is a mixture of individual property arrangements of OT and common use resource management arrangements (hunting) and these environmental decisions are portrayed as a trait of peasant identity. These autonomous regulations are proposed with its own OT alternative plan:

> Within this plan, there is all that has to do with the environmental. We have some norms that have been created in our assemblies and for example one of the norms is to not allow hunting for two years. The communities committed to this, and the

> heads of the *Junta de Acción Comunal* had to inform everyone of this agreement as well as that everyone has to leave 20% of their territory for conservation. We can't leave more, because as I was telling you, the size of the terrain each peasant has, is low and leaving more for conservation would imply more limitations to agriculture... we are going to have our own surveys registering in each farm all the water sources (interview 18, ANZORC peasant leader, August 2014).

Although a relation between agrarian production and environmental protection is mentioned, it still seems as if the disembeddedness of the environment as a separate component from production activities, is driving decisions. As if these decisions were not related to other territorial issues, such as decisions on where and how to produce for agriculture. Also, the conservation zone within each farm seems to be conceived separately of the agricultural zone. This sheds light on the type of agricultural model that is either happening or planned for. Proposing a percentage of land for conservation is also an interesting feature. It calls to question how it was decided within an autonomous peasant planning process of territorial self-management that a rigid measure like a percentage of total land for natural cover conservation is required. Why do peasants want to use instruments, such as surveys, for keeping track of water source availability? In general, these answers shed light on how environmental governance has been built by the peasants with a similar OT planning language than the one proposed by the state, even when not necessarily all information and regulation results need/want to be shared with the state, but correspond to their expressions of self-regulation, of governance.

State Surveillance of Environmental Projects.

The relation of ZRC with regional environmental authorities (called *Corporación Autónoma Regional* - CAR) seems limited. For the Amazon region, ZRC representatives say they had invited "the institutionality" since the creation of the ZRC, but at that time (late 1990s, early 2000s), no state institution took the time to get to know what the ZRC were about and much less

to support them. Now, one of the Amazon ZRC representatives considers they have a "work relation" with the regional environmental authority (a CAR) based on some agroforestry projects that the ZRC proposed. The ZRC representative mentions how challenging the project implementation has been represented in care time for the trees, and the CAR's insistence on knowing the exact number and georeferenced location of trees. The peasant beneficiaries of the project question the purpose of this type of state surveillance. Although not mentioned as an issue of autonomy by the interviewee, questioning state surveillance and welcoming state support for development projects can be interpreted as a way of 'countering' (cf. Gow 2005) and 'reencountering' (cf. Bebbington 2000) development in the sense of not rejecting but using the development schemes, trying to negotiate or change the terms of relation imposed. The analysis of how peasants in the ZRC respond to development planning with this sort of project scheme, will be further analyzed in chapter four. In that chapter I use the ideas of 'countering' (cf. Gow 2005), 'encountering' (Escobar 1995) and 'reencountering' development (Bebbington 2000) and how they are used, to help explain how environmentality is constructed in the ZRC through development planning.

Yellow strip.

In a video about the ZRC-Valle del Rio Cimitarra[43], the peasants of this ZRC talk about their proposal of the "yellow strip." It refers to a "protection zone" that the community decided to create to protect the regional forests. In this video, peasants are also claiming state attention and protection of their rights. The claims for state attention are in topics that are not mentioned as related to environmental issues such as education, health or demilitarization of the zone.

[43] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3YTyN8gYATI (ACVC and PBI Colombia, 2010)

Although Valle del Rio Cimitarra is known for gold mining, there is no mention of aspects of mining related to the environment, just to health and military presence.

Buffer zones.

Representatives of more than one state agency (UPRA, NP) mentioned in interviews the appropriateness of the ZRC designation as buffers for national protected areas. These protected areas (usually National Parks) also have an *Ordenamiento Territorial* instrument called the 'buffer zones' (Ospina 2008). Buffer zones are a recommendation from the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (UICN) to the signatory countries of the Convention on Biodiversity Conservation of 1992. That international agreement was adopted by Colombia as Law 165 of 1994. Buffer zones have had slightly different definitions[44] and one of them is:

> A zone, peripheral to a national park or equivalent reserve, where restrictions are placed upon resource use or special development measures are undertaken to enhance the conservation value of the area
> (Sayer 1991: 2.)

National Parks, as a national level environmental authority, has called for the coordination of the delimitation, zoning, regulation and *gestión* of the buffer zones with different local actors, including peasant organizations. A buffer zone for a national protected area does not necessarily imply another OT designation, but rather suggests OT guidelines focused on supporting the conservation objectives of the protected area. It is noteworthy that state agencies see in the ZRC an adequate OT designation surrounding national protected areas. Perhaps, it is based on a belief that peasant landscape arrangements are not seen as potentially impacting protected area conservation objectives, in comparison to other land uses, such as urban or industrial uses, or perhaps because for the state institutions related to conservation objectives (e.g., National Parks)

[44] "areas peripheral to national parks or reserves which have restrictions placed on their use to give an added layer of protection to the nature reserve itself and to compensate villagers for the loss of access to strict reserve areas" (MacKinnon 1981 in Sayer 1991)

it is easier to negotiate with the peasants than with other actors with stronger political and economic power, such as the agro-industrial, mining or hydrocarbons sector.

Gestión Ambiental Territorial.

As an example of a recent logic of environment conceptualization from the state, we can analyze an introductory text in a book written by a regional environmental authority on environmental territorial management *(gestión ambiental territorial*). The introduction refers to the importance of citizen participation in environmental topics for the formulation of policies. It also suggests that *gestión ambiental territorial* is projected through forms of territorial governance understood as "a practice/process of organization of the multiple relations that characterize the interactions between actors and diverse interests in the territory[45]" (Pérez Martínez et al. 2014: 37). What I mean to argue is not that participation is not important, and an essential part of a democratic political system, but rather to question the effectiveness of democracy. I question the effectiveness of participation in neatly packaged sectors. The delimitation of 'the environment' generates expectations on the people participating in environmental decisions and policy making on solving issues that can be separated from other issues that determine them. Since other aspects of social life are also ordered and arranged within the state apparatus, citizens as state subjects are expected to participate in other thematic compartments that impact life in a territory. In this way, they are called to participate in the 'education sector', the 'environmental sector', the 'economic sector', the 'cultural sector', the 'women's sector' and more, all as neatly separate aspects of social life, managed through separate agencies of the state apparatus or by the citizens' own initiative to interact with these public or private sectors. This participation -as will be seen in chapter four about planning- is more of an exhausting effort to get their message through, than

[45] Author's translation of the original text in Spanish.

a useful and impactful mechanism to solve livelihood needs. Participation is wearing and provokes more of a distrust and resistance to relating to the state than an effective dialogue to achieve material results.

***Veredas* and *Juntas de Acción Comunal* in Environmental Governance and OAT.**

Interestingly, in territorial and organizational terms, at the 2nd National Congress for Protected Areas, with an audience composed mainly of environmental authorities and organizations, ANZORC requested in their presentation to consider the *vereda* as the minimum unit for territorial and environmental planning, instead of each privately held parcel or farm. They also proposed Environmental Peasant Units (UACA for the acronym in Spanish) instead of the institutionally existing Family Agricultural Unit [46] (UAF for the acronym in Spanish) as the designation for the maximum land size distribution to a family[47]. In this designation they argue "the environmental is primordial in land tenure...Environmental and productive *ordenamiento* requires advancing in the identification of the productive and ecological potentialities of territories so within them, the productive zones of each *vereda* can be defined through a planned environmental zoning process" (ANZORC representative, July 2014). Although the statement calls for the coherence of different scales of spatial planning, it risks an overlap of designations and planning exercises. As will be seen in chapter four, this overlap is already occurring and can continue with more complexity not necessarily helping to solve territorial conflicts or achieving effective local participation in OT and OAT. This publicly presented statement also seems to

[46] UAF is a reference area size for Family Agricultural Unit (*Unidad Agrícola Familiar*). It is defined as a "basic enterprise" of agricultural, livestock, forestry or aquaculture production. Its area extension is to allow with a productive project and adequate technology, the generation of a minimum of two legal, monthly salaries. It should also allow a family to remunerate its work and dispose of capital to contribute to the formation of its patrimony. The UAF began to operate with the Law 041 of 1996, when its size for some municipalities was established.
http://www.incoder.gov.co/contenido/contenido.aspx?catID=2195&conID=1663

[47] From a feminist perspective it would be interesting to study how 'family' is defined and conceived as well as land distribution implications from a gender perspective. However, this study will not approach this topic.

show a commitment to what is commonly known as environmental protection (ecosystem conservation, water shed protection) but also an implicit call to reconsider as a whole, the current land uses of all the country. This is a topic that exceeds the neatly formatted 'environmental' scope and extents over to fields of agrarian reform and politics, although taking the basic criteria of soil characteristics that can be considered essentially an environmental matter, at least in the initial sense of the word: the environs, the physical setting and conditions of a social situation. On a territorial-political-economic perspective, the statement illustrates how the peasants are not proposing individual private property as the basic unit of OT. This seemingly contradicts the statement of a previously analyzed interview that mentions specific environmental self-management regulations for each farm but, taking a closer look at the proposal, it can be understood as the same environmental governance mechanism but in different scales. For a local *vereda* to carry out its planned environmental zoning process requires a prior and internal OT agreement on a farm level. From the individual or family farm level, to the next organizational level (the JAC that will be explained below), there is an OAT environmental governance example.

A liberal or neoliberal tactic would begin by establishing private property as a basic unit, considered as a foundation of individual freedom. In contrast, a territorial planning proposal that sets the *vereda* as the minimum scale planning space, instead of the individual private property, sheds light on a shared responsibility for OT, and diminishes the importance of the individual as the basic political character calling for a collective decision-making process on territorial matters. This spatial-political (territorial) proposal is not prioritizing the relation individual-state, or individual-market, but the relation individual-community-state seeking for a communal relation with the state and prioritizing communal decision making over individual private-

property decisions. As such, it is strengthening the environmental governance mechanisms for OAT but seeking first a communal relation with the state that can help buffer the direct relation with the market.

Accompanying the territorial delimitation of the *vereda*, is the community's organizational unit, the *Junta de Acción Comunal* (JAC) that each *vereda* has and that relates with the municipal administration directly. Although Zamosc (1986:38) considers the beginning of the communal action committees in 1958 as a "massive organizational drive at the grass-roots level after the *Violencia*[48]... undertaken by the government itself [and] as paternalist tools of Liberal and Conservative *gamonales*[49]" (italics added), Londoño (1997:90) illustrates them more as an expression of association comparable to urban unions in the sense of a way to solve their basic needs and try to reach the aspirations generated by modern life. For Londoño, this form of association responds mainly to needs of subsistence. The author traces their appearance to the presidency of Alberto Lleras Camargo, supported by the Alliance for Progress in the ideology of participation, the "war against poverty" and under the idea of "helping individuals to help themselves" (Londoño 1997:92). Nonetheless, she recognizes that to the date of her article, *Acción Comunal* is the most stable organization in rural areas and argues against an analysis of them as an apparatus of state control and traditional political party patronage (1997: 93). She analyses their double character of both communitarian and institutional associative character as important for the reconstruction of rural communities after the period of *La Violencia,* and links the importance of the *vereda* as the basic grassroots rural organizational structure that has facilitated a direct relation between the specific demands of rural inhabitants, and the resources and programs from the state. She understands them as a relatively efficient intermediary between

[48] As was mentioned earlier in this chapter *Violencia* or *La Violencia* refers to a period of political violence between the Liberal and Conservative parties in Colombia especially suffered in rural areas.
[49] *Gamonales* and *hacendados* refers to big landowners.

rural communities and the state (Londoño 1997: 93). I agree with Londoño's analysis because my own research results suggest that the JAC remains a key organizational instrument for the peasants to relate with the state and to set a base for larger scale organizational structures. In terms of turning in organizational scales of OAT from individual/family farm to *vereda* and from *vereda* to municipality or to other state institutions either of regional (e.g. CARs) or national (ministerial) character, JACs play an essential role as an organizational and political grassroots structure. In this sense, JACs are also an expression of governance as a way of communal self-organization but are also a call for government (state) structures to recognize and protect these organizational structures. This shows that the limit between constructing governance and calling for government is not always a neat distinction. I sense that the ZRC peasants seek forms of autonomous governance to organize the territory and within it environmental aspects, but also call for the state to regulate and protect them from an arbitrary and powerful entrance from the market. The following quote in relation to how ANZORC representatives perceive the REDD+ mechanisms, reinforces my argument.

Conclusions.

"Ambiguous If Not Naive"

In a search to answer why the peasants demonstrate their own environmental governance mechanisms while they also call for state government mechanisms for OAT, I find this argument of payment for ecosystem services or REDD+ mechanisms relevant.

> The main problem with payment for ecosystem services is that these proposals are regulated by the market. There is nothing further away from protection and OAT than the interests of capital... the concrete risk of those proposals is the market. Ecosystem services must have a sovereign regulation, with planning, with an institutional body that can gather the proposals of the people from the grassroots

> and with state investment... To pretend that the market logic will solve even environmental conflicts and crisis and climate change problems is -at least- ambiguous if not naive. (Interview 16, ANZORC representative, August 2014)

This statement demonstrates there is a mistrust of market regulation. This is the reason why there is a call for the state because it is seen as the appropriate establishment to regulate the risks started by the market. Since the market has permeated 'the environment', it is necessary to call for the state's attention and protection.

This chapter has also shown how both actors, the state and the peasants, agree on the need for *Ordenamiento Territorial*, specifically on *Ordenamiento Ambiental Territorial.* Economic reasons are an important part of the need for OT, but OAT is not being explicitly linked by either actor, to economic, political or territorial matters as though it was a separate sector that can be dealt with, disembedded from its causal relations and impacts. There seems to be no seeking for integration, neither from the state nor from the peasantry, in their practical approaches to environmental issues. Particularly, the causal relations related to negative effects due to capitalist uses of nature that generate deterioration, are not easily identified in the results.

My concern is on how environmental aspects can be neatly presented as some *thing* related to, but not determined by, other 'variables' of social, political, economic and cultural order. Precisely, just as these other 'orders' have been neatly delimited before, and disembedded of its other determinants, the invention of the environment as another order is rather recent, and it is problematic, as are other divided human dynamics because of the causal alienation implied. It is problematic because it pretends to solve 'environmental issues' through specific political technologies, separated from other political technologies of other 'sectors'. Just as now 'economy' is understood as capitalism, 'environment' is understood as capitalist nature or more

as a neoliberal nature. In this way the problems related to the environment can be solved through the market or through capitalist transactions.

This argument is also not about denying 'environmental' problems. Water pollution, soil degradation, deforestation, loss of species and climate change exist. I do not question their existence. What I want to stress is how politically they are currently treated. I examine how ordering and planning the environmental problems and solutions, in something called the peasant reserve zones (ZRC), helps or makes more difficult the treatment of these situations for the peasants as citizens in a search of constructing a territory and exercising territoriality.

With this chapter I began using Agrawal's (2005) concept of environmentality to explore what *Ordenamiento Ambiental Territorial* (OAT) means for the peasants and for the state in terms of "the mutual constitution of fields of action related to regulation and practice" (Agrawal 2005: 226). I began exploring the knowledges and subjectivities related to "the emergence of the environment as a domain that requires regulation and protection" (Agrawal 2005: 226) but there is still further to explore about environmentality in terms of the governmentality part of it, which refers more to the political technologies involved in the particular expression of environmentality in the ZRC. This approach will be the main subject of the next chapter where through the analysis of development planning in the ZRC, I will shed light on the manifestations of governmentality. Aspects touched on this chapter such as participation and community; *gestión ambiental territorial*; or the relation between environmental authorities and peasants will be resumed but looked through the lens of planning as a political technology of governmentality.

CHAPTER 4.

Planning in the Peasant Reserve Zones and for *Ordenamiento Ambiental Territorial.* Encountering, countering or reencountering development?

In this study, the examination of *Ordenamiento Ambiental Territorial* (OAT) in the Peasant Reserve Zones of Colombia began with a Marxist perspective, situating the ZRC as part of the contemporary Colombian agrarian question. To this frame I added a geographical perspective that questioned how the ZRCs are not only about a political-economy question of access to land, but also a territorial question of how to exercise territorial power as peasants. This is relevant not only in relation to the political-territorial claims of peasants in the current Colombian context, but also in relation to *Ordenamiento Territorial* as an important concept, a political tool, in the country. Chapter three dissected the concept of *Ordenamiento Ambiental Territorial* with a poststructural lens that questions how the idea of nature is discursively transformed into environment. It also shows how the idea of environment is *disembedded* from other relations both by the peasants and by the state. Continuing with an analysis of how environment *works*, in this chapter I explore how planning is enacted as the way to achieve rural development in the ZRC and as a way of accomplishing *Ordenamiento Territorial* and *Ordenamiento Ambiental Territorial*. I do not focus on what types of economic theories can be elucidated from the development projects such as the World Bank financed Pilot Project for the ZRC. Instead, using the Foucauldian lens of governmentality, I explore how planning is a political technology that addresses agrarian politics and environmental issues in the case study of the ZRC. My specific concern in this chapter is how a political demand over territory such as the ZRC can get lost in technical demands for assistance through rural development schemes. I take three perspectives

on development to discuss some impacts that planning has on the ZRC. The three perspectives on development are Arturo Escobar's poststructural view of "encountering development", David Gow's ethnography of development by "countering development" and Anthony Bebbington's critique of both poststructuralists and neoliberals, called "reencountering development". With these viewpoints, I explore how beyond the participatory mechanism and the organizational schemes, what remains implicit is how development is translated and written in the language of planning providing and everlasting stage of state promises for its people. An example of how this operates is through local-level development plans (for instance municipal *Planes de Ordenamiento Territorial* and ZRC Sustainable Development Plans). As part of the development praxis the process of development planning and the resulting document plans aid in understanding how the *subjects of development*, counter, encounter or reencounter the development that arrives to their territory through state institutions or other actors.

A discussion that is also presented is on how these development *situations* (project implementation activities and participation spaces such as workshops) are also about what the peasants have generated through their social and political movements. Through their mobilization they have also shaped how they understand, demand, receive and use development. In this way I put in conversation with one another these three perspectives of development.

Finally, I argue that the importance of analyzing planning relies on the possibility of understanding planning as a stage of political relations where political actors get stuck. In this sense, planning more than a stage in a process is an objective in itself. It allows the state to postpone deeper political situations such as why land reforms and not accomplished within the agrarian frontier, in fertile lands that have extensive cattle ranching rather than agriculture and that are owned by the political and economic elite when a large amount of the population lives in

poverty or is pushed to colonize fragile, infertile or infrastructurally disconnected lands. Similar to Auyero´s (2012) reflection on *waiting* for state attention, planning can also be understood as "a silent recreation of political domination, which masks itself as an exercise of power and secures poor people's subjugation by constraining their use of time and by preventing conflict from arising" (Auyero 2012:35).

The Peasant Reserve Zones as development and planning.

> Basically, those of us who worked in the technical committee know more about the importance [of the ZRC]. We began with a pilot project where INCODER supported us with some projects. In every *vereda* at least one project was supported. At San Cayetano[50] a school classroom was built, the apartment for teachers, and a bathroom with 70% of the resources from the project. Some deep bridges were built; cattle ranching classes were given; inputs, seeds and vaccines were distributed; dance classes were given. Here, when the project was going to end, our organization, INCODER and the project staff, we organized a Christmas party, got Christmas lights for the town. Even a mayor tried to take hold of the project when it was *us* that brought the materials and the workers to do the job. With the project we brought chicken sheds and pig sheds. The project boosted the creation of Rural Women's Committees –I was one of the *gestoras*[51] of this. We created like 16 of these committees, but to date, only 3 are still functioning. (Interview 8, woman peasant leader. ZRC of Cabrera - July 2014)

This segment of an interview with one of the local participants of the World Bank financed Pilot Project for the ZRC (sometimes referred to as WB-PP in this document), gives an insider's view of the types of results a development project brings. The statement has a rather positive tone of the results accomplished. When asked what the government is proposing now to reactive the ZRC, the same interviewee answers: "To begin again with these projects and bring more progress to the region" (Interview 8, woman peasant leader. ZRC of Cabrera - July 2014). This view of a development project focuses on the results but not about the process. It comes from a

[50] The name of the *veredas* and people's proper names have been changed for this document.

[51] This word can be glossed as "manager", but for a more precise discussion of its meaning and translation, see the term *gestión* and how I describe its meaning in the Introduction of this thesis.

local peasant leader, a woman, who has actively participated in the organizational structure of these sorts of projects. The description of development project results range from materials for small infrastructure to organizational enhancement. In this sense it shows development as a means for making a better life for everyone (Peet and Hartwick, 2009: 1). As will be seen later on in this chapter, not all peasants in a same ZRC have the same view of the development projects. Some consider that development project activities come and go without leaving any particular benefit for the people. These different views of a same project in the same ZRC imply that not everyone participates in the same way or perceives the same results. It also suggests that development is relational to one's political and perhaps geographical standpoints as well as other factors like economic possibilities that determine the access to development activities. The importance of analyzing this for the purposes of this study lies in the possibility of understanding the ZRC designation and the manifestations of OT and OAT in these territories not as static technologies but as relational and fluid instruments that are imagined and used in different ways according to the position of the viewer.

Encountering development.

Arturo Escobar (1995: 14) builds the argument of "encountering development" drawing on anthropology's encounter with colonialism. He draws on Talal Asad (1973 in Escobar 1995: 14) who had raised the question of how anthropology had been complicit with colonialism and asks if now the discipline was passing in the same way to be complicit with a new form of colonialism: development. On this idea, Escobar begins:

> If during the colonial period 'the general drift of anthropological understanding did not constitute a basic challenge to the unequal world represented by the colonial system' [Asad 1973: 18 in Escobar 1995: 14], is this not also the case with the development system? In sum, can we not speak with equal pertinence of 'anthropology and the development encounter'? (Escobar 1995: 15)

Escobar finds it problematic how:

> The absence of anthropologists from discussions of development as a regime of representation is regrettable because, it is true that many aspects of colonialism have been superseded, representations of the Third World through development are no less pervasive and effective than their colonial counterparts (Escobar 1995: 15)

In this way, his message of encountering development is a call for academics in general –and anthropologists as his direct audience- to closely examine the ways in which the academy has been implicated in the modernity project in general and where development is a particular expression of this problematic project. Stressing how encountering development "is an important step in the direction of a more autonomous regime of representation" where anthropologists and other scholars can "delve into the strategies people in the Third World pursue to resignify and transform their reality through their collective political practice" (Escobar 1995: 17). He calls for an "interpretative social science" where the researcher "has to take into account people's own descriptions as the starting point of theory" (Escobar 1995: 101). For the purposes of this study, this is how I use in Escobar's concept to deconstruct how development planning has been applied to the ZRC. By attempting to encounter development in this case study, I hope to explicitly signal the ways in which development planning is a political technology laid out by state and international development agencies. I also seek what strategies, if any, development subjects -who in this case are peasants- use to challenge development in order to "resignify and transform their reality through their collective political practice" (Escobar 1995: 17). This search leads to another perspective of how to critically approach development. The perspective refers to "countering development", a concept developed by David Gow's (2008) to explain how the Nasa indigenous people of Cauca, Colombia redefine the development schemes.

Countering development.

For David Gow (2008) "countering development" is about examining how development subjects (in his case by the Nasa indigenous people of Colombia) redefine development. He claims that this *refocusing* of development is a way of counterdevelopment. His approach is about "thinking through how cultural difference can provide an indispensable hinge for constructing a new indigenous but critical modernity" (2008:2). I understand critical modernity drawing on Peet and Hartwick (2009: 275) who claim that "critical modernism should focus on questions of development -understood as the social use of economic progress-[and where] … '[d]evelopment' has to be transformed -as a term with meaning, as a belief in better things, as a practice employing millions of altruistic people, and as the main hope for a saner world" (Peet and Hartwick 2009: 275). In this way, I think people currently welcome development schemes but are skeptical of how it is laid out for them and will try to transform it while using the resources it offers for this transformation. This transformation involves changing decision-making schemes and the use of resources for enhancing livelihoods in creative ways.

Returning to Gow's work, the main question in his countering development view is: "To what extent can they refocus the existing development discourses at their disposal, so that they enhance, rather than constrain, their priorities?" (2008: 3). I take as particularly important his claim that "[t]his resistance to the state is not in opposition to it" (2008:3) but rather about being

> treated as citizens to become a vital part of the nation. It is more than just a demand for redistribution, for a greater share of the country's resources… Their quest for justice is a demand that the state be more inclusive, more democratic, encouraging a more active participation (Gow 2008:3).

Gow borrows this last statement from Ramirez (2001 in Gow 2008:3) who initially refers to the *cocalero* peasants of Putumayo[52]. Gow observed the increased importance given to participation and empowerment in conventional development discourse, "planning opens a potential Pandora's Box, since it provides a window of opportunity previously closed to all but the politically powerful" (2005: 243). In this sense, the outcomes of development are unexpected and I consider it is the job of the researcher to highlight these unexpected results so they can be analyzed and discussed both within the social sciences and with the people who participate in the development dynamics from different positions.

In relation to planning Gow considers it "is often regarded as the primal act in development", suggesting that studying the local-level plans as a recent innovation on the development landscape, is "perhaps more important than development itself" (Gow 2008: 6). In his study, he recognized different local attitudes towards development. Participants such as local community members, view the plans with skepticism while local community leaders see them as an opportunity and

> A way of legitimating their relationship with the state and other institutions. A plan is an indication of a community's 'seriousness', proof of a certain level of organizational capacity. As a form of discourse, a development plan offers some insight into how a community sees itself and its place in the larger society. More important, however, is how it wishes to represent itself (Gow 2008: 96)

For the purposes of this study, adopting Gow's concept of countering development is helpful in not only questioning how the researcher approaches development, perhaps as an ethnography of development and a self-reflection of one's position to it[53], but on how the development subjects

---

[52] The struggle of the coca growers (*cocaleros*) and harvesters (*raspachines*) of Putumayo is also related to the claim of the Peasant Reserve Zones (ZRC) as a way to get state presence and generate alternatives to the lucrative production of coca leaf and base and its devastating environmental and social effects.

[53] Reminding us of Escobar's "encountering development" call for academics to reflect upon what position the researcher has in relation to the development project as another colonial project.

use development in ways that have not been previously planned by the developers, or considered by the scholars who study the effects of development.

> While the practice of conventional development is questioned and criticized, the proposed alternatives do not call for unrealistic radical transformations. Rather they offer proposals for countering development, for thinking about it in a different, more human, more constructive, and more sustainable way (Gow 2008: 17)

I therefore understand countering development as recognizing that people want modernity through development, but will shape it to their necessities. Modernity is welcomed for example, in the shape of certain technologies, democratic schemes or access to media. The possibility of unexpected outcomes of development due to the importance of human agency is what Anthony Bebbington (2000) calls for with his perspective of "reencountering development."

Reencountering development.

Anthony Bebbington (2000) suggests another way of understanding development outcomes. Critiquing both the conventional neoliberal and the nonconventional poststructuralist positions around development where the state is a problem for both, he calls his standpoint "reencountering development." Rather than framing development just as a continuation of colonialism (Escobar's poststructural belief), or saying that the peasantry is a non-viable economic subject (neoliberal view), his argument is based on paying more attention to the agency development subjects have in shaping the outcomes of development interventions. He argues that development subjects

> [a]lso act individually and collectively, creating their own room for maneuver within and beyond any constraints these categories ['poor' people, objects of development, subaltern subjects of resistance] may place on them. As Escobar suggests, the seeds of alternatives are most likely to be found in those actions (Bebbington 2000: 499).

Bebbington argues for a perspective of reencountering development where: 1) the notion of the viability (in this case of the peasantry) is rejected for a notion that focuses on livelihood and place "and the ways people struggle to keep rural localities alive by somehow generating incomes that will allow the reproduction of these places" (2000:500); 2) challenge the notions of development as destructive and markets as anathema to an analysis that sees how people engage with institutions of development making part of modernizing processes "and a range of product and labor markets"; and 3) to challenge notions of resistance and politics in relation to development by constantly being informed by empirical results instead of "a naïve romance of the real" (Keith 1997 in Bebbington 2000: 500).

Bebbington argues that the ways people encounter development interventions can be interpreted by the researcher "sometimes as resistance, sometimes as accommodation, and sometimes as instrumental" (2000: 501). With a reencountering development discussion he calls for "illuminating the idea of development as lived, rather than invoked" (2000: 501). Reencountering development seems then a pragmatic midpoint to analyze the fact that development programs, projects and plans still exist and continue to expand and that people even welcome them, even though radical scholars would love for development to disappear as a sign of the winning of resistance of grassroots movements against imperialism.

The results of this study that I present below will be analyzed through these three approaches or discussions about development, specifically through the manifestation of planning as one of the instruments of development. At the conclusion of this chapter, these views will be resumed and put in conversation seeking for explanative tools to understand how planning unfolds in the ZRC.

Development planning as governmentality.

> One has to present projects. When one presents a project and it is approved, then they [the state, its institutions] see that the people are organized, and then they give (Interview 8, Peasant leader, ZRC of Cabrera - July 2014).

When analyzing power, and particularly state power from the social sciences, Michel Foucault's (1991: 102) idea of *governmentality* is a useful analytic tool. With this term he meant how institutions, procedures, analyses, reflections, calculations and tactics allow the exercise of a complex form of power –state power- whose target is the population. Governmentality is also a tendency to form specific governmental apparatuses and complex *savoirs*. Due to governmentality -he continued- has this modern conception of the state survived, as has the general acceptance of its status. Its tactics of government permits the "continual definition and redefinition of what is within the competence of the state and what is not, the public versus the private" (Foucault 1991: 103). Lastly, he included the way in which the administrative state is installed to finally generate the *governmentalization* of the state (Foucault 1991: 103).

In this Foucauldian sense, planning can be interpreted as one of the procedures, calculations and tactics to exercise power over the population. It can be interpreted as an example of the complex *savoirs* that permit this way of understanding the territory to be normalized and its techniques the only possible way of functioning. In this way, it imposes the *right* and only mechanisms to understand the territory. It is a procedure to achieve something and calls for a specific sort of language coded in objectives, goals, scores, categories, results, tables, charts, activities and budgets. These codes of the planning language are the basic form of this case study's document plans. The diverse development plans that will be exposed have been established as the assertive way through which the population can access the state for specific demands. In this case they are seen as ways to develop and territorialize the idea of the Peasant

Reserve Zones. These development plans have become a language through which the Colombian state exercises power and aims to shape territoriality. Yet to know and access the state's planning language, previous requirements are to be met. Scoring as a possible beneficiary of development projects understood as becoming a development subject, participating in workshops, or doing demonstration field projects are some of the ways the population can access state led development. Before going in detail about how to access development, I will examine Arturo Escobar's postructural viewpoint on why planning must be dissected as an aspect in itself within the development machinery.

The history of planning.

> "[T]he concept of planning embodies the belief that social change can be engineered and directed, produced at will."
> (Escobar 1992: 133)

Arturo Escobar (1995) situated "the rise of planning as the practical side of development economics" (Escobar 1995: 58) and as an "instrument … linked in a direct fashion to policy and the state" (Escobar 1995: 86). Complementarily, Donald Moore describes "The plan as fetish, seen as itself a powerful object authorizing land use" (Moore 2005: 76). He had noted that, "[o]fficial discourses of policy frequently elide political struggles over the interpretation of needs enabling government to shape not only the field of social interventions but also the kinds of subjects deemed worthy of receiving welfare" (Moore 2005: 78). In this sense, the state language of planning, "renders technical" (Li, 2007) political issues without the intention of fully addressing the political situations that gave rise to those political issues.

Each actor shaping territorial claims (military, corporations, urban dwellers, road authorities, miners, oil companies) imposes its own system of territorial representation through a

plan document. As will be shown, the situation of each state institution imposing its own system of representation through a plan document results in an entangled overlapping of planning documents, each with its own political intentions. This is also related to what Escobar considers regarding how planning is dependent on "making people forget the origins of its historical mediation… Planning relies upon, and proceeds through, various practices regarded as rational or objective, but which are in fact highly ideological and political" (Escobar 1992: 140).

The problem of this entangling of plan documents and of political intentions is on how although there is a search to eventually relate to the other actors that have produced equivalently important planning documents and exercises through the same planning language, it is implicitly acknowledged that a document plan is a weak weapon against the power of other economic and territorial sectors. This will be seen later on in this chapter in interview 2 with a public official of the environmental authorities in relation to the project of the *Marginal de la Selva* transnational highway. The public official admits that the power of environmental institutions in the face of other state development initiatives such as transnational infrastructure, large scale mining or hydrocarbon exploration and exploitation is considerably limited. In my opinion this is due to the financial differences between the state environmental authorities and these entrepreneurial initiatives (which can be public, private or a mixture of both.) This represents differences of the *gestión* levels that each sector can achieve. As a political *way out* of the entanglement of plans there is a new term to refer to how state institutions, economic sectors and local processes negotiate their interests*, putting on the table* their own planning documents, finding coincidences, linking activities and negotiating differences. An example of this situation of linking planning documents related with Ordenamiento Territorial will be seen further on in this chapter when referring to the *Marginal de la Selva* transnational highway.

While plans are *linked*, territories continue to be transformed in unplanned ways. Meanwhile, planning is a comfortable possibility for the state's power because it gives its subjects a sense of advancing, progressing or developing which gives the government and its institutions credibility. Simultaneously, planning allows restricting the possibilities of action with excuses beyond the planning scheme. Legislative, administrative, technical, financial, logistic, cultural and physical obstacles might make completion difficult, yet this does not limit the possibilities of the paper, of committing to an action in a plan document. This reminds us of how Donald Moore described planning "as a discursive practice and labor process, produc[ing] an articulated fetish, enunciating and joining space and plan, each conceived as authoring regimes to discipline subjects" (Moore 2005:75). Adding to Escobar's view of planning as "inevitably requir[ing] the normalization and standardization of reality" (Escobar 1992: 133) it also allows the simplification of complex political negotiations and the erasure of different levels of power over the territory. In this way, planning beyond being a stage in the development of something is an object in itself, a purpose of the state to prevent the social protests against these unequal powers. It is a truth that speaks for itself (Escobar 1995: 86) or as Donald Moore suggested for the case of Zimbabwe "Planning produce[s] a regime of truth" (Moore 2005: 76).

In this way, planning becomes an eternal waiting, and when the possibilities of action seem close, it is always good to revise the plan document, that is, to update it, which requires participation as stated in the National Constitution of 1991. Participation requires time and funds, a coordinating instance, and the need to systematize new agreements, new realities, and new demands. Participation can then be understood as another phase (or farce?) of planning and therefore deserves scrutiny for the purposes of this study.

Notions of Participation and Community.

> "For the modern construct of participation, a person should be part of a predefined project… in order to qualify as a participant."
> (Rahnema 1992: 120)

Rahnema (1992: 120) raises several points to question participation as part of democracy and development planning, but is short on analyzing how those who are meant to participate define, approach and use the participation mechanism. Literature analyzing participation within development schemes, questions the types of participation and its utility in social processes. For instances, there is work on the paradoxes of participation (e.g. Cleaver 1999); its scalar approaches (e.g. Mohan and Stokke 2000); its exclusions (Agarwal 2001); its engagement with political struggles (Williams 2004); or its uses in processes of social change (e.g. Hickey and Mohan 2005). The notion of community has been frequently paired with the participation paradigm in the literature on development analysis (e.g. Mohan and Stokke 2000; Nelson and Wright 1995 in Mohan and Stokke 2000; Williams 2004). , Williams identifies the "tendency to treat communities as singular and unproblematic in their spatial boundaries [perpetuating] the blindness to the fact that 'the community' is often a thing of development projects' own making" (2004: 561). Nelson and Wright (in Mohan and Stokke 2000: 253) claim" 'community is a concept often used by state and other organizations, rather than the people themselves, and it carries connotations of consensus and 'needs' determined within parameters set by outsiders'". Cleaver (1999) identifies as paradoxes of participation several myths about the notion of community. These refer to: 1) the unitary community referring to the assumption of one identifiable community; 2) power and process related to assumptions of solidarity, erasures of conflict, shifting alliances, power and social structure; 3) the *resourceful* community when development practitioners want to portray that communities are capable of accomplishing

anything such as sufficient mobilization; 4) culture and foundationalism used for example as a constraint for the participation of women or as the glue that holds together the community. Williams (2004) answers to these accusations of participation and community by arguing "Participation may indeed be a form of 'subjectification', but it can also provide its subjects with new opportunities for voice, and its consequences are far from pre-determined" (Williams 2004: 559). This author proposes to see the new spaces of political action that participatory development can have.

Using some responses of this study's interviews with peasants and with representatives of the national peasant organization of the ZRC, ANZORC, I explore the dimension of how the participators, in this case the ZRC peasants, understand participation. For instance, one suggests:

> What the ZRC propose is the inclusion of excluded social sectors, marginalized people of rural areas in the development processes and political participation. The people are marginalized of those logics of political participation and formal administration of the territories, and conflicts arise from this situation. That is why recognition and rights are claimed (Interview 16, ANZORC representative, August 2014).

> We are not married to the term 'sustainable development' but that is the way it was called in regulations, in the law. The importance of those processes is in the participation, inclusion, autonomy and peasant economy (Interview 16, ANZORC representative, August 2014).

When asked how would an ideal state support look like for the ZRC:

> The primary thing is that the *Ordenamiento* of the country, of its territories, is drafted in a participatory and concerted manner. (Interview 16, ANZORC representative, August 2014)

As these quotes expose, there is on the national level of organization with its political positioning process, a call for political participation as a claim to contribute and be recognized in presence

and with voice in the nation-state project of *Ordenamiento*. Participation at this national level is then seen as an exercise of democracy.

A similar perspective on participation is given from multi-lateral agencies. The World Bank official interviewed for this study defines the ZRC Pilot Project in terms of "a decentralized participatory process of social and environmental *Ordenamiento* of the territory" (Interview 12, World Bank –Colombia office representative, July 2014). Likewise in terms of participation as a principle, an OAT expert situates local participation in the same level of importance as integrity[54] for the achievement of *Ordenamiento Ambiental del Territorio*.

Participation in workshops is usually one of the requirements to be able to access benefits from a ZRC project. Workshop results are coded as objectives, results, goals and activities, where complex realities are simplified to be portrayed as planning documents where state intervention is required. Surveys are another requirement. They lead to scores[55] and scores help identify needy subjects that should benefit from the ZRC. It is important to stress that this sort of participation (in workshops, in surveys) is understood for the state as the accepted and preferred way of relating to its subjects. This is because this sort of state simplification allows framing "only those aspects of social life that are of official interest" (Scott 1998: 80). Additionally this simplification is, "nearly always written (verbal or numerical) *documentary* facts" (Scott 1998: 80). The planning documents examined in this study are meant to be this sort of simplification.

The workshop is the participative space par excellence. It can also be understood as a political arena for participants to express their demands and questions to the state, and for the

[54] Although not precisely defined in the interview, integrity is meant as putting on the same level of importance cultural, environmental, economic, and physical characteristics to build an OT proposal.
[55] Articles 11 and 12 of the Agreement (024 of 1996) that establishes the mechanisms to select and delimit ZRC, states that qualification scores will be part of the conditions to determine who can benefit of land dotation. Basically they are men and women over 16 years of age, of scarce resources and no previous allocation of land and who derives from agricultural activities her's/his' main economic income.

state to pass on its decisions and techniques. The workshop results are generally composed of a report, systematization with some photos and the expense bill. These are administrative and institutional evidence of how the state institution has played out its role with its subjects. Gow (2008) notes how workshop results are transformed, recorded, interpreted and shown according to what the state needs to show. For instance, in his analysis of the resulting documents (the development plans), there is an evident difference between what the theme discussions were about in the workshops and how the consultant includes the results of these discussions in the document. There is also a dilemma in the long-term views of the community and the short-term demands exposed in the plans. When he goes back to see what was implemented of the short-term activities proposed in the plans, "those actually implemented bore little relationship to the ones planned. In other words, planning on paper and planning in practice diverged considerably" (Gow 2008: 103). The planning documents resemble wish lists more than commitments.

Going back to some of the debates around participation and community within the development literature, what I perceive from these organizational and institutional perspectives, is that participation seems to be a tool for the achievement of *Ordenamiento* as a way of development. The achievement of *Ordenamiento* as a form of development is understood as a sort of fixed and attainable objective. By contrast, when asking peasants about their experiences with participation, other perspectives of participation are elucidated. These other perspectives align more with the discussions of the paradoxes of participation (Cleaver 1999) in the sense of how the notion of community is actually lived and enacted.

Participation and planning as seen from the peasants.

After years of different ways of peasant mobilizations through land occupations, strikes, political participation, armed conflict or peace treaties amongst others actions for approaching the state in relation to territorial claims, a recent way for local actors -such as the peasant inhabitants of the ZRC- to express their political and territorial expectations is in terms of development plans such as the ZRC sustainable development plans. These plans are accomplished through the participation in state led processes such as the ZRC projects. A similar achievement has been to try to include their demands in other existing plans: *Ordenamiento Territorial* (OT) plans, management plans, government plans, project plans, budget plans, etc. This way of relating with the state is reconfiguring the ways in which politics are made and territories are negotiated.

In the life of an Andean peasant in a Colombian *vereda*[56] who does not actively or permanently participate in workshops of development projects, or who already has land titled, it seems like all plans and projects come and go like circuses. There was the pilot plan, the Woman Savers Project, later the Family Forest guards Project[57], then the people who teach compost techniques, as well as the oil people, the hydroelectric project technicians, etc. They come and go, each with their promises and usually they do not come back. "They make you waste time in workshops" (Interview 10, peasant from ZRC-Cabrera, July 2014).

For other peasants who participate more actively in the process as JAC or local organization representatives, or those who try to *gestionar* the attainment of a plot of land

---

[56] *Vereda* in Colombia refers to a rural neighborhood. It can be determined by a small river basin (microcuenca), a common access road or other physical landscape characteristics. They usually have a small primary school and have a local organizational structure of a *Junta de Accion Comunal* (JAC).

[57] Women Savers in Action and Family Forest guards are translations of projects from the Presidential Agency for Social Action of Colombia: *Mujeres Ahorradoras* and *Familias Guardabosques*. They are translated as such in official documents: http://www.iica.int/Esp/dg/Documentos%20Institucionales/B1642i.pdf

through filling surveys and getting scores, these initiatives function like a machine. These development projects *reactivate* when money is *injected* into the system. A peasant interviewee mentions how the ZRC was *inactive*, and then it was again *reactivated*. What fuels this reactivation is the funding but there seems to be no difference if a project activity is brought by a multilateral agency, a state institution or a local organization. What seems of more interest is the viability of the activities proposed by the project and the usefulness of what is being offered by the project. In this sense, it reminds us of reencountering development as it helps to grasp the "notions of improvement implicit in popular strategies" and on how the idea of development is lived (Bebbington 2000: 501).

"Not everyone got enough score to be apt for land" (Interview 10, peasant from ZRC-Cabrera, July 2014). Obtaining land titles also required previously participating in workshops about human rights in the ZRC or in technical activities such as learning how to prepare organic fertilizers. Surveys had to be filled out in order to be candidate for receiving a parcel. After participating in the workshops and having earned a high enough score to be a beneficiary, came the opportunity to have a demonstration project. In Cabrera, those who obediently participated in all the workshops and whose score was high enough to be selected to benefit from the project, receive materials (seeds, tools, agrochemicals) and technical assistance to develop the productive scheme of their choice (fruit orchards, poultry or pork sheds, among others). They must sustain this productive project for two years. According to one interviewee who was a beneficiary of one of these development projects:

> If you are able to show in two years that you have sustained the productive project, more funds will be injected and other families can benefit. If we fail to sustain it, others won't benefit because we were unable to benefit from this help, from this support that was given to us. We are the face of the municipality for more funds to come. (Interview 7, peasant of ZRC-Cabrera, July 2014)

Peasants who have participated in the local technical committees, have a different view of the ZRC. They acknowledge that mainly those who participated in this committee know the *importance* of the ZRC. As was mentioned earlier, a woman peasant leader in this position can describe all the projects that were financed by the World Bank Pilot Project for the ZRC. They are mainly small infrastructure and materials for agricultural productivity. She helped create the women's rural committees which she describes as consisting of "formulating projects in benefit of the communities. Infrastructure for pig or chicken raising, bridges in small roads, a school cafeteria...Some projects are still there" (Interview 8, peasant leader of ZRC-Cabrera, July 2014). When asked what the government is proposing now for the ZRC, she says: "Resume projects and bring more progress to the region." Aspects related to protecting water sources or preventing deforestation are not mentioned as related to projects. Land titling she claims, has been achieved through the *gestión* of the local organization, not through the ZRC process. Actions related to taking care of each one's "piece of land" or "protecting the environment" are not mentioned explicitly as related to the ZRC process. For her the usefulness of the ZRC is to prioritize projects of any sort presented by the JAC or communities and for them to be funded. This utilitarian definition of the ZRC and its disconnection with policies sheds light on how the ZRC is basically an opportunity to relate with the state and demand funds through projects. It is a clear example of *speaking* the language of planning. This way of using the opportunity that development projects offer, reminds us of Bebbington's reencountering development arguing how through people's agency "Power, meaning and institutions are constantly being negotiated, and these negotiations open up spaces for potentially profound social and institutional change" (2000: 497). For the peasant leader in this section, the ZRC seems to be about funding opportunities for projects needed in Cabrera, either of general interest (roads), or more individual

opportunities to enhance the farm and agricultural production. Similarly, as Gow (2008: 96) had identified with countering development, community leaders take the projects as an opportunity to legitimate the relationship with the state and other institutions in order to show the community's seriousness and organizational capacity.

The notion of 'community' can be considered another phase (or farce?) of planning. "State funds are given to us dependent on if we are organized and we have to work united" (Interview 10, peasant in ZRC-Cabrera); "when they see that people are united, well then they give" (Interview 6, peasant in ZRC-Cabrera, July 2014). This might mean that what for a donor or for the state is a community that has one voice in a project, for peasants is a requirement of participation that involves micro-politics at the level of a *vereda*. The social details involving variables related to age, gender, family and personal history in political participation are beyond the scope of this research. What can be mentioned though from interviews with peasants of different places, ages and gender are the different reasons given to who participates or benefits from ZRC projects and why. "They have to be part of the union to participate, or else how can I know what they need?" (Interview 8, peasant leader of ZRC-Cabrera, July 2014). Participation seems to end in planning. One is allowed to participate in defining plans, but the accomplishment of the plans seems to get entangled if it becomes more participatory. "After planning, participation gets stuck. It doesn´t end there, it just gets stuck" (Interview 6, peasant in ZRC-Cabrera, July 2014).

Participating in development projects by going to workshops, being subjects of surveys, or being part of the technical team through the local organization can be understood as ways of countering and reencountering development because although there is little credibility to the planning process, the role of the participant is performed in order to get the resources that can be

used to enhance livelihoods or invest in local needs of infrastructure in ways not necessarily recorded in the planning process. This idea of performing participation is also developed by Perreault (forthcoming) who suggests that through the processes of prior consultation (in Bolivia) state power is performed to produce or reinforce certain social orders and enroll citizen subjects in them, obscuring the uneven relations of social power.

Another issue of the participation dynamic that development subjects face is the negotiation of different time rhythms between them and the institutions. This situation can be exemplified as a space-time dilemma with an account found in the book about 'environmental territorial management' (*Gestión ambiental territorial*) of Cundinamarca´s environmental authority when describing how local environmental organizations view their relation with the public sector.

> We depend on the times of the officials, the budget times, the decision-making time, the *trámite* [58] time, the times of communications, the mobilization-transportation times, and when these times are past only momentary actions are achieved. We end up with no real impact. Meanwhile, what surrounds us here, nature degrades, is lost, polluted and disappears. (Testimony of a local organization in Pérez Martínez et al. 2014: 20).

This situation of the times imposed by the state or by the implementing agencies to 'spatialize' social changes in a territory, is another aspect that renders the subject of planning relevant for a geographic analysis. The institutional times ignore the ways of inhabiting space by those who usually do not have access to influential political arenas. This shows us how there are contrasting notions of space and time that are also struggled in the construction of these territories.

[58] I use the original word in Spanish when I feel the English translations do not include the whole meaning of the term. In this case, *trámite*, translated as application, procedure, paperwork or process, but here it refers to the procedural times of any governmental paperwork process. In this sense it is closer to the notion of "red tape" in the Anglophone societies.

On the other analysis of time and the state, Javier Auyero (2012) has shown the workings of relating with the state as the workings of political domination among urban poor in Argentina. His case concentrates on the micro-level of the state practice through its institutions and how the urban poor have to interact with them. Auyero argues that "[i]n their apparent ordinariness, state practices provide the poor with political education or daily crash courses on the workings of power" (Auyero 2012: 7). The author finds that the politics of creating patient subjects of the state is an act of recognition of the established political order. The 'patients' will wait and 'be patient' in order to achieve getting state attention. What Auyero finds important of doing this political ethnography is on observing how "[t]hese processes are thus an integral part of the daily and silent recreation of political domination, which masks itself as an exercise of power and secures people's subjugation by constraining their use of time and by preventing conflict from arising" (Auyero 2012: 35). The importance of Auyero's analysis for this study is on how state times are imposed on peasant times. Either speeding up (like in accomplishing planned activities for development projects) or in slowing down process until the all the plans have been linked (*articulados*), the power of the state is exercised also through the management of time.

The state as Medusa.

Think of the image of the mythical Medusa. She is both a unity and is composed of other unitary beings, the serpents that make part of her as a character. This image of a simultaneous unity and multiplicity situation is important for this analysis. The image of the serpents devouring each other is also crucial. I understand the state as her head, and the serpents as the diverse institutions composing that state and fighting each other, not working as a team, but in an individualistic way to accomplish their institutional objectives.

Colombia has defined all its planning process in Law 152 of 1994. Planning authorities stated in this law (Art. 8) include: the president of the republic; the National Council for Planning; the National Council for Social and Economic Policies (CONPES); the National Department of Planning; the ministry of treasury and public credit; as well as all ministries and administrative departments in their duties. Locally, each municipality has a secretariat, administrative department or office of planning and Territorial Planning Councils at the municipal or departmental level. This law states that in addition to a departmental and local development plan -valid for the period of government of each democratically elected governor and major- each municipality must have an *Ordenamiento Territorial* plan (Art.41). Additionally, Law 152 of 1994 establishes the "process of planning" as a principle. In that law, planning is understood as a continuous activity, considering formulation, approval, execution, monitoring and evaluation.

Besides these institutions, designations and instruments related to land, territorial, environmental and agricultural planning, other state agencies present in the region have their own planning schemes. The ministries of defense, education, transportation, health, have their own planning agendas. These have to be coordinated with municipal administrations as well as with "the community" through the Community Action Committees or *Juntas de Accion Comunal*[59] (JAC) or other grassroots organizational structures such as agricultural production associations, women' groups, or indigenous authorities. They are all meant to participate in the planning process as part of a Constitutional mandate.

Linking the institutional arrangements of planning and the participation mandated, provided below is an example on how planning and *Ordenamiento Ambiental Territorial* (OAT)

[59] JAC refers to *Junta de Acción Comunal*. It is a local organizational structure for each *vereda* that corresponds to the basic rural neighborhood for various representational purposes (for state funds, participatory schemes, cultural activities).

are played out and how the state as Medusa is exemplified. The case also portrays the different power dynamics over territory not only on the part of the state and of peasants, but also in relation to other powerful forces that are not treated in detail in this study such as the economic sector of hydrocarbon exploitation.

Medusa in action through *Ordenamiento Ambiental Territorial.*

For regional environmental authorities, saving the forests that biogeographically connect the Amazon with the Andes and the Orinoco region is of ecological importance and institutional mandate. The Integrated Management District (DMI) of Natural Resources of Ariari Guayabero[60] created in 1989 partly overlaps the ZRC of Calamar created in 1997. In the environmental authorities' perspective, it should be the Integrated Management Plan of the DMI that should guide the whole management of the ZRC. The preservation of these biogeographically important ecosystems present in this area requires that peasant economies of this area to be based on conservation schemes such as sustainable forestry, Amazonian fruits or ecotourism. A state official of an environmental institution recognizes:

> It is the project logic that has spoiled the possibility of doing good works there. The regional environmental authorities do not have enough resources to do well their job. A bottom-to-top structured Management Plan of a DMI should take at least two years in its construction and should then be included in the Triennial Action Plan of the environmental authority. Instead, there is for example an opportunity with some funds from INCODER, then some other funds from the regional environmental authority and a study of six months is contracted to an expert where this person can only answer to terms of reference of the contract. The local construction process is then very undervalued in the structure of the process. Then, when it is time to socialize the results of the management plan; on one hand, not all of those affected by the designation go to these meetings, just representatives of those who live close and are associated as a productive sector or those who happen to live in town but have a farm where the plan has designated a preservation zone in the seasonally flooding forests by the river. (Interview 2, environmental authority representative, July 2014)

[60] Law Decree 1989, 1st of September of 1989 declared the Special Management Area of La Macarena (AMEM) and within it, three DMI and delimits the National Natural Park of *Serranía La Macarena created in 1971.*

The presence of several state agencies only seems to entangle the planning scenario more. The Colombian Amazon, where the ZRCs of Calamar in the department of Guaviare and Pato-Balsillas in Caquetá are located has several overlapping land planning designations and a diverse set of planning instruments. An illustrative but not necessarily exhaustive list of this situation is exposed in the following table:

Table II. Territorial planning instruments and designations in the colombian amazon.

Land planning designation	**Planning instrument**	**State agency in charge**	**Time frame for planning instrument**
Municipality	*Ordenamiento Territorial* scheme (EOT), basic plan (PBOT) or plan (POT), according to population size.	Municipal administration	Flexible, according to topic within the plan. Long-term is considered as 3 constitutional mandates (12 years)[61].
Department	Departmental Development Plan	Departmental government	4 years. Changes with every election of new governor.
DMI: Integral Management District	Strategic plan	Regional Environmental Authorities (CAR)	Not determined.
National Natural Park	Management Plan	National Natural Parks authority	Not determined.
Regional Environmental Authority jurisdiction	Triennial action plan	Regional Environmental Authorities (CAR)	3 years.
Forestry Reserve of 1959	Forestry *Ordenamiento* Plan	Ministry of Environment	Not determined[62].
Resguardo	Plan de Vida	Indigenous *Cabildo*	Not determined[63].
River basin	Ordering and Management Plan of a River Basin (POMCA)	Regional Environmental Authorities (CAR)	Not determined[64].
Peasant Reserve Zone (ZRC)	Sustainable Development Plan	INCODER and local peasant organization	Not determined[65].

[61] http://www.minvivienda.gov.co/POTPresentacionesGuias/Competencias%20en%20la%20Revisión%20y%20Ajuste%20de%20POT.pdf

[62] Republic of Colombia. 2nd Law of 1959.

[63] Republic of Colombia. Law 152 of 1994. Article 31. The law does not state that indigenous groups are obliged to do a Plan de Vida. They recommend they do development plans. The recommendation of naming them Life Plans came from the 10th Congress of the Regional Indigenous Council of Cauca –CRIC (Rosero and Sanchez, 2009). See also Gow (2008: 98)

[64] Republic of Colombia. Decree 1729 of 2002.

[65] Republic of Colombia. Agreement 024 of 1996.

State officials of the environmental sector agree that adjustments have to be made to plans so they can reflect realities more appropriately. For example, the strategic plan of the DMI of Guaviare, currently under construction, does not include the situation of land grabbing where actual possessions or titled lands are well beyond the referenced individual plot size for the region (UAF=140 hectares) reaching up to two *veredas* owned by a single person. It is not the responsibility of the environmental authorities that design the DMI strategic plan to regulate land titling since this is the responsibility of INCODER or national government programs such as the Land Restitution Program. Yet, if the land grabbing issue is not solved, the duties of environmental authorities with environmental land planning cannot be properly realized. For the state official, this issue is a dilemma. If the DMI strategic plan ignores the land grabbing situation it is not recognizing real problems that need to be addressed, yet including it in the plan, implies setting goals, aimed results and activities that are not going to be solved with the actors, resources and funds that the plan has.

The solution to this problematic implies a coordinated action between at least four state agencies (INCODER, Ministry of Agriculture, CDA the regional environmental authority and the Administrative Special Unit for Land Restitution). It is likely that to coordinate these four entities, another action plan would have to be constructed to agree how funding is distributed for the activities that need to be done to address the specific issue of land tenure in a place like Guaviare. A planning instrument would not only be a common language for coordinating actions but would ensure transparency in funding sources management, distribution and use, as well as an agreed timeline of actions to be monitored by the parts. A plan between state agencies cannot be constructed unless there is a previous memorandum of understanding between them. This implies convincing the legal offices of each institution to write and agree upon the legal terms for

each institution. The time for this step to be accomplished depends on the agenda of each juridical office. If the memorandum is finally signed by all parts, the technical offices of each institution can proceed to design and agree on the action plan to approach the common problem. The funds every institution can commit for this action plan, requires prior approval of the financial office and directive staff of each agency. This part is where *gestión* comes back as an important savoir, attitude or way of doing things that every state official needs to know how to perform or enact. This is what *gestionar* means. *Gestionar* is necessary so that the part of the plan that he is responsible for, can be at least included in the action plan document. Constructing the plan might require that some officials travel from Bogotá to Guaviare and this can only be done after financial and hierarchical approvals allow the functionary to buy plane tickets and travel expense have been administratively approved and disbursed. Signatures of directive staff will be needed to validate an action plan, therefore each official within their institution will need to *gestionar* these signatures. By the time an action plan is finally concluded as a document, months or years might have passed and then it might need updating, adjustments and a socialization process in order to begin operating. Agency funds might have expired or new personnel might be in place, with no knowledge of the process of the action plan.

On a broader scenario, for environmental authorities, the magnitude of negotiating land issues with cattle ranchers, spontaneous colonists, loggers, peasant families and negotiating individually to establish economic activities that can be environmentally sustainable, is not comparable with relating to other economic and territorial sectors. The greatest challenge is for them is to coordinate among state agencies the use of the territory and that all the planning instruments that have been constructed are respected by those other actors. These include the

highway authorities with the project of the transnational *Marginal de la Selva* highway from Venezuela to Ecuador through the Colombian Andean-Amazon piedmont; or coordinating with the ministry of defense that sees in the forests a defense threat because illegal armies hide in forests. "The communities will be those who suffer the decisions taken at the national level" (Interview 2, environmental authority representative, July 2014). So after all planning possibilities between environmental authorities and peasant inhabitants, the changing scenario is now with stronger economic and political interests that are rearranging the territory with roads, mining, hydrocarbon exploitation or entrance of agroindustry. The best-case scenario according to current *gestión* of environmental authorities is to include these previous or ongoing negotiations and plans between them and local inhabitants, in the Environmental Impact Assessment of the *Marginal de la Selva* highway.

This insider's view challenges the notion of the state as a solid structure that can exercise its power through its governmentality. It portrays the state more as Medusa with its internal contradictions and struggles between sectors of interest over the territory. The trick is that to hide these contradictions, the state uses governmentality to confuse its subjects in the maze of plans.

***Gestión Ambiental Territorial* as a management technique.**

Besides the planning process, there is a new trendy term that is being used to name how social actors and the 'environmental sector' must relate with economic sectors such as the hydrocarbon, mining, agroindustrial or transportation sectors. The term is 'strategic alliances', referring to how economic and social sectors have to sit together to work united in spite of their intrinsic differences on land use interests, territory construction and their unequal economic power. Not to mention their also unequal political power, particularly with the national level of lobbying in congress and ministries. In a recent publication by Cundinamarca's regional environmental

authority on *Gestión Ambiental Territorial* (Pérez Martínez et al. 2014: 3) the implied message is that it is important to have strategic alliances in order to get funds and access information that is otherwise too expensive to generate. Although never explicitly indicating with whom the alliance is to be made, the implied message is that it is important to have strategic alliances in order to get funds and access information that is otherwise too expensive to generate. This has heavy implications when thinking of the political power of 'citizens' in a neoliberal scenario and of the whole point of doing planning. On one hand it accepts that the money is not in the state but in the private sector, and it is a way of promoting from a state agency to seek funds elsewhere in order to "guarantee inclusion and wellbeing". On the other hand, it is suggesting that *gestión* and planning are useful as they generate programs and projects that can then be invested in. So *gestión* and planning become a recipe to have *pret-a-porter* programs and projects that whenever the opportunity comes, or the strategic alliance is materialized, the money will flow to materialize the programs and projects, more likely through the funds of the private than of the public sector. In this way, the state is suggesting a private-private relation, channeled through the state (in this case represented by the regional environmental authority) but negotiated and executed more outside its realm. The state becomes a facilitator, rather than an enforcer of territorial order. In this way, the book on *Gestión Ambiental Territorial* proceeds to suggest an "*environmental, multisector, and collaborative planning* that aims for the participation, integration and team-work of the diverse sectors…of a community to actively participate in its development." (Pérez Martínez et al. 2014: 35).

Similar to the *strategic alliances*, *innovative* and *integrative* are also new terms frequently found in the environmental management/*gestión* and planning literature. These terms also imply new ways that local inhabitants have to organize and interact with public agencies,

economic sectors, and other civil society initiatives to claim, struggle, protest, denounce, improve or whatever other situation needs to be changed. Recalling chapter two where the entrance of neoliberalism to Colombia was presented we can remember how peasants do not share the same starting point with other capitalists. They are not free to compete in the economy but have to *gestionar* their strategic alliances, be innovative in these alliances and integrate in order to survive in the market. As *gestión ambiental territorial* seems to suggest, this is not only real for economic possibilities but also for environmental matters. Castree's (2008) description of the construction of flanking mechanisms in civil society as typical characteristics of neoliberal trends may also be exemplified with this suggestion of how to relate with other relevant actors. To continue this exemplification of how the planning language includes social, political, environmental and economic relations framed in a neoliberal logic, below is an example of what *innovation* can mean, seen with the Escobarian scope of encountering development.

Encountering development with the World Bank ZRC pilot project.

A Learning and Innovation Loan (LIL) of $5 million from the World Bank (WB) was approved in 1998 for a Peasant Enterprise[66] Zones for Peace Project[67] (called WB-PP for the purposes of this study). The LIL programs in Colombia were meant to be pilot experiences in high-armed conflict areas. This project coincided with the peace dialogues between the Colombian government and the FARC that took place between 1998-2002.

For the WB, the recognition of Colombia as a country with an armed conflict that required a different scheme from the regular assistance began with these LIL projects. "War had to be understood as an obstacle for development, and conflict could no longer be ignored"(Interview 12, World Bank –Colombia office representative, July 2014) says a WB

[66] Notice the change in the translation of the term Zonas de Reserva Campesina. *Reserve* is changed for *Enterprise*.
[67] http://www.worldbank.org/projects/P053243/peasant-enterprise-zones-development-project?lang=en

official who was involved in this project. This recognition was a risk to traditional WB interventions because it implied seeking different ways of arrival to the territories, working with alternate actors such as grassroots organizations, in a decentralized manner, generating capacities in entities that are not necessarily public but searching for alliances with the public sphere. This was the innovative part of the LIL for the WB. Even the security codes impeded WB officials to be in terrain, therefore depending on civil society and local allies for monitoring and administration of WB funds. This required an intense debate within the WB hierarchical structure to accept these new mechanisms. Here the 'Learning' came in.

> More than what you wanted to achieve it was the how to achieve it. These deep transformations require accompanying in the field, daily comprehension, adjusting to local work rhythms and logics...we all knew these transformations would take more than three or five years. Changing corruption schemes, strengthening organizational structures, that locally, participation, citizen oversights[68] of funding resources, in general, building citizenship takes time. (Interview 12, World Bank-Colombia office representative, July 2014)

An aspect that stands out is how the 'learning and innovation' seems to be more directed to the WB than for the peasants. It is about the WB learning and innovating in its ways of doing things, in how it relates to the development subjects. This raises the question of what was so innovative for the peasants about this development project.

It was clear for the WB that this project was not only about environmental interventions, but also had a political importance of stabilizing colonist populations of these zones in economic, and political terms where the ZRC populations were expecting the arrival of the state apparatus after long requested interventions and presence. The goal of the project was to methodologically achieve what was in abstract terms in the Agrarian Law 160 of 1994. How to operate OT, materialize it and put it in practice. Each ZRC had one local organization to represent the zone's

[68] Translated from the word in Spanish *veeduría* that is a citizen participation scheme.

population for any effect of the project. Each organization should be able to guarantee democratic participation mechanisms and was in charge of administrative duties of the project's funds. Therefore, the organization had to have a valid juridical status. For ZRC Pato-Balsillas the organization was a committee of all municipal JAC, for Calamar it was a cooperative and for Cabrera it was a union. They all had to go through training or 'capacity building' to administer the funds of the WB PP. Local organizations used this training to present projects and gain some results similar to the ones described earlier.

This WB Pilot Project (WB PP) generated one General and five specific Zonal Operating Manuals (MOG and MOZ respectively). The MOZ should reflect and summarize procedures and techniques developed during the project; was meant to be discussed with the populations; and have a local, rather than a top-down approach. According to the MOG the project has concrete phases. Beginning with a prospective view that should emerge from a communitarian self-reflection and be reflected in the ZRC Sustainable Development Plan (SDP) thought of as a medium-term plan[69], achieved in a participatory way, and based on the communitarian results of social and environmental assessments. The project continues with the planning phase composed of Operative Annual Plans (POA) that include annual activities. Then, a set of criteria is established to select the subprojects. They have to be guided by principles of sustainability[70], equity and co-financing on behalf of the benefited community.

The working of the WB-PP in relation to the complex political situations of the ZRC sites recalls Escobar's reflection on planning: "As a system of representation, planning thus depends on making people forget the origins of its historical mediation… Planning relies upon, and

[69] The duration of medium-term is not defined in the MOG WB PP Manual.

[70] Principles of sustainability include minimum tillage, direct seeding, permanent soil cover, crop rotation, minimum movement of soil layers, and use of organic fertilizers. In the SDP that is examined for Cabrera, elaborated in 2013, 'sustainability' is never defined in the document.

proceeds through, various practices regarded as rational or objective, but which are in fact highly ideological and political" (Escobar 1992: 140). With the "Learning and Innovation" framework that the WB offered, the political reality of the ZRC sites could be neatly organized so as to plan those aspects of life which can be separated from a more complex reality, "embody[ing] the belief that social change can be engineered and directed, produced at will" (Escobar 1992: 133).

This analysis suggests that those who are learning and innovating with this WB-PP structure are not the peasants but the WB. This view complements Escobar's description of the World Bank in Chapter 5 of *Encountering Development* (1995). "If 'some of the experiments fail,' they will bow to the difficulties of life (in the Third World) and humbly start all over again. Quite a comfortable position, especially if we consider that it is not they who have to suffer the consequences of failure, because the loans are paid back by Third World people. This position allows the World Bank to maintain all options open; it certainly will not be driven out of business by repeated failure" (Escobar 1995: 160-161). Basically, the WB can 'afford' to innovate and learn. As was seen, the peasants do not particularly distinguish the activities of this project as particularly innovative. Neither are they learning about how to relate with institutions in different ways than with other types of projects. By contrast, for the WB normal functioning scheme, the idea of war as an obstacle for development is framed as an *innovative* way of looking at situations, as well as *learning* how not to ignore armed conflict in the places where they work. For peasants, living with armed conflict is no novelty and learning how to live with it might be paid with lives.

The expert's voice. ILSA and ZRC-Cabrera Sustainable Development Plan.

Sustainable Development Plans (SDP in this document) for each ZRC were mandated in Agreement 024 of 1996. Cabrera wrote its first one in 2000 as part of the WB-PP. In 2012, through an agreement between the state agrarian institution (INCODER), the Union of Small Agriculturalists of Cundinamarca (SINPEAGRICUN), and the Latin American Institute for Alternative Legal Services (ILSA) the updating of the SDP for Cabrera was contracted. The SPD was updated in 5 months and approved by the population of Cabrera in a public hearing. Only the last part of the SDP documents will be focused in this paper due to its direct relation to planning. This part is the 'Prospective Vision of the ZRC of Cabrera' where problems, projects and programs are identified and prioritized to be then organized in an Investment Plan 2012-2021. The document has as an annex the Environmental Management Plan for the ZRC.

The Prospective Vision chapter of the SPD strikes at first glance with the lens of the expert contracted to write it. ILSA, as an NGO specialized in legal services, establishes as the mission statement that the ZRC of Cabrera

> is a *juridical mechanism* of synthesis in the process of peasant mobilization … a tool for the construction of agrarian policies meant to achieve an agrarian reform, a reorganization of the rural territory and an environmental arrangement that are guarantors of economic, social, cultural and environmental *rights*[71].

Similar to the 'mission', the 'vision' statement of the SDP, the ZRC-C "will be constituted by the year 2021 as a tool for the enforceability of the fulfillment of the obligations of the state in relation to economic, social, cultural and environmental *rights*." The 'objective' of the SDP is to "Promote the protection, promotion and realization of *rights*." Of course, the voice of the expert should not be as explicit in the plan document, as it should only be a facilitator between the state

[71] Sinpeagricun, ILSA and INCODER. 2013. Plan de desarrollo sostenible, Zona de Reserva Campesina de Cabrera. P. 225. Emphasis added for the purposes of this paper.

and the peasants to rearrange, update or rewrite the SPD, yet it is an element for analysis how this expertise shapes not only the language but also the nature, objectives and aims of such a plan. What is to be highlighted is not whether centering the ZRC in the framework of human rights and legality is right or wrong, better or worse than another perspective (such as an environmental or an entrepreneurial framework) but rather the fact that in the process of planning of the ZRC, or to take it further, in the relational process of peasants and the state through the ZRC, the meaning and use of the term 'ZRC' changes according to who else intervenes in this relation as the 'facilitator'. If my research scope was not 'environment' but 'human rights', 'education access', 'gender equality' or 'public health' in the ZRC, focusing on how the scope is regarded (understood, negotiated and enacted) by the state and by the peasants, the conclusion when analyzing planning as a development tool might be similar. In geography or like fields, a ZRC can be understood as a *land planning designation*. For lawyers, it is understood as a *juridical mechanism* that guarantees rights. The language used and the definition of problems also questions the relevance and usefulness of the plan as an effective tool of relation between the state and the peasants. How does it change for the peasant that the ZRC are framed as a 'land planning designation' or as a 'juridical mechanism'? Does it change the outcomes, the state attention and its protection against the impacts of other sector interests in the territory that the ZRC are defined with any of these terms? As Mitchell puts it: "What strategies, structures, and silences transform the expert into a spokesperson for what appear as the forces of development?" (Mitchell 2002: 15). It is the explicit voice of the expert that questions the validity of the planning process.

This analysis of the process of planning leads to a question: Where is the voice of peasants and of the state in this plan? Would peasants define ZRC with terms such as *juridical*

mechanism or *land planning designation*? Does the state recognize its roles and responsibilities as stated in this plan? We can say that since the realization of this SDP was contracted by a state agency, the state as a whole is represented in this act. It is essential to acknowledge different views of the state. For those within the state apparatus as was seen with the environmental agencies officials, the state is like Medusa with inherent contradictions in its roles. Yet for those who are not part of its apparatus, like the great part of the peasant population, the state might be assumed to be a coordinated and united entity. If "the communities will finally be who suffer the consequences of the decisions taken at a national level" (Interview 2, environmental authority representative), is any of this planning useful?

Conclusions.

Encountering, countering and reencountering development in the ZRC-OAT case?

The position from which one finds development is different depending on whether one is a national leader or a peasant who sees from her/his *vereda* how development projects come and go. On a national level peasants seem to counter development by using the planning language to claim political participation although not fully believing in some of the government or institutional projects. On a local level, peasant beneficiaries reencounter development. They approach it with distrust but take the opportunities offered by the projects. Scholars then, are those who encounter development. It is easy from the 'ivory tower' to see the contradictions of the development discourse, yet this does not change that development projects continue to happen and to different extents to be welcomed. Although acknowledging disbelief in development as a discourse, the actual players of the development game (state and peasants in this case) do not seem to be troubled with the concept. The planning arena seems to be

comfortable enough to set game rules and negotiate interests at least to the level of development projects.

Escobar called for remaking development starting with the examinations of local institutions, "investigating how external forces –capital and modernity, generally speaking – are processed, expressed, and refashioned by local communities [who] bring their material and cultural resources to bear in their encounter with development and modernity" (1995: 98). By identifying the "local and hybrid models of the economy" the researcher can see the "cultural contestations that take place as capital attempts to transform the life of communities" (Escobar 1995: 99). As seen through this lens, the testimonies of ZRC peasants in relation to the WB-PP, was taken as beneficial in terms of progressing in securing access to land, receiving technical support and installing some needed infrastructure. The project did not solve however, problems of accessing the state in a clearer way where issues of the titling process, taxes, and subsidies for the strengthening of the peasant economies can be seen by them as solved or treated in a direct, transparent and comprehensive manner. People recognize the inconsistencies of development projects and state interventions. They seem to choose to take them as a good opportunity where some beneficial results may be obtained, but with distrust of their arrival as a strategy to solve long established claims to the state. This resembles what Bebbington identifies of reencountering development in the Andes, "People encounter development from their mundane, daily concerns to build and improve their livelihoods… to extend the degree to which they can exercise control over their conditions of existence" (2000: 513). In this sense, the peasants' voices in this case, seem to acknowledge that although their struggles with the state for attention in the shape of land rights and basic public services and infrastructure are not over, they will take each development project opportunity to be heard and advance in this call. They have learned the state language of

planning, are willing to "speak" it but also know that the state is not to be taken at its word. Relating with these institutions has "both closed and opened opportunities for creative forms of popular engagement with state and market" (Bebbington 2000: 215). Identifying these hybrid ways in which "intentions and actions both of people building livelihoods and places and of the actors involved in development interventions", Bebbington says, "is critical to a geography of development" (2000:215).

With this chapter the exploration of *Ordenamiento Ambiental Territorial* in the Peasant Reserve Zones might sometimes seem tenuous as the focus seems to shift almost exclusively to the analysis of planning. Yet, I find the scope of this chapter to be crucial for deconstructing what both terms (OAT and ZRC) can mean when analyzing how they are constructed and used by the actors of this study. I now proceed to conclude this study by wrapping up the conclusions that the different chapters allowed.

CHAPTER 5.

ZRC and environmental governance in the face of 21st Century.

Challenges and Conclusions.

I began this thesis by acknowledging a technical and uncritical approach to *Ordenamiento Ambiental Territorial* (OAT) in the Peasant Reserve Zones (ZRC). With my past experience as a conservationist I was seeking practical answers that could bring together the state and the peasants in organizing and planning territory for the sake of environmental conservation. The perspective that geography and political ecology offered me changed this initial scope and led me to discover new interpretations of territory, environment and the relations between state and peasants. The interviews I did for this study were rich in information to feed my new critical perspective and poor in the practical answers I initially set out to explore.

After a brief description of translation efforts, on the qualitative methods I used, and of my positionality for approaching this thesis' topics, I passed on to the dense chapter two to explain the links I was making with agrarian studies and territory for the purposes of my study.

Chapter two began by dissecting the terms in "Peasant Reserve Zone," attempting to establish two important concepts: space and economy. It was necessary to draw from the general agrarian question literature to situate how the ZRC could initially be about turning from a non-capitalist economy (extraction, production for domestic consumption) to immersing in a capitalist economy. Although not drawing on the history of ZRC populations, the idea was to show how colonists of public lands -as is the case of the initial colonizers of current ZRCs- far from the reach of the state (in terms of physical access and state presence through institutions and infrastructure), would eventually be immersed in the capitalist economy if the presence of

the state was ever to materialize. The ways in which non-capitalist populations get intentionally or unintentionally absorbed by capitalist economy is the core topic of the agrarian question. Yet my argument is that the ZRC are not only a peasant claim or the state's response to the immersion into capitalism, but are about claims of territoriality that go beyond a claim for private land rights and the economy (narrowly understood as capitalism) and are also about how to shape a territory and negotiate its uses with the state. The agrarian studies scope woven together with the geographic approach of territory proved to be useful to go beyond the mere economic significance and highlight the political importance of the peasant territorial claims. For instance claiming that the basic unit of OT is not the individual private property (UAF), but the *vereda* shows how territory is constructed as a communal, rather than an individual enterprise. This claim suggests territory as a political construction that has its base in neighboring relations rather than individual private property decisions.

Then, to continue to *Ordenamiento Ambiental Territorial* and how this is playing in the construction of territory, it was necessary to examine the intersection the territorial claims with the workings of the environmental discourse that has emerged since the 1990s as part of the neoliberal package. The brief mention of the arrival of neoliberal capitalism to Colombia, particularly in the 1990s, was an essential thematic link to the main topic of chapter three about 'environment' as a relatively new mode of conceptualizing nature in a form that can be planned and commodified in different ways. Although the public claims of ANZORC to an audience of environmental authorities calls for a re-ordering or re-arranging of OAT, chapter three offers a different insight into how *environment* is understood, used and managed at a local scale, and negotiated at a national scale.

This analysis in chapter three of nature *qua* environment offered new insights into how OAT can be interpreted. Using a political ecology perspective and mixing it with Karl Polanyi's idea of the *disembedding* of the economy, I aim to show how *environment* is being discursively constructed as a separate –disembedded- sector separate from political, social and territorial realms. This means that this new construction of nature as environment suggests a nature that can be planned, ordered, negotiated, agreed upon and zoned, as an entity in itself, disembedded from other relations such as historical transformations, economic trends, political forces and migrations, among other related issues. I suggest that, similar to how Polanyi argues that people do not make their economic decisions individually but due to social relations, they also have environmental criteria that are not individual but social. People value natural/environmental goods (clean water, good soils, natural surroundings such as forest vegetation and wildlife, clean air) for social reasons as well as for individual welfare. Responses in the interviews I conducted suggest that peasants would prefer to collectively -rather than individually- decide on environmental issues. This is exemplified with how they propose the Environmental Peasant Unit (*Unidad Ambiental Campesina* or UACA) as the basic environmental unit of OAT, or on the *vereda* as the basic territorial unit. Nonetheless, as a political group, they are currently 'speaking the language' of the disembedded environment in their relation with the state. My main conclusion with chapter three is that the environment is treated by both actors as a separate sector from other territorial situations and this is not necessarily helping to solve problems such as water pollution, land degradation, protected areas on peasant territories (or vice versa according to viewpoint) or others that both the peasants and the state frame as environmental problems. In this sense, an environmental OT (OAT) is not necessarily helping to solve problems that I would include as territorial, but is segregating them as a different sphere of

problems: environmental problems. This *sectorization* is facilitating the entrance of capitalist relations with nature (REDD+ and compensation schemes) rather than helping to link as wider social and political problems with territorial implications. Another aspect that points to the disembeddedness of the environment is the political technology of planning, worked in the following chapter.

Chapter four illustrated the workings of development planning and its effects around the state-peasants relation. Understanding development planning as a political technology through the Foucauldian lens of governmentality helped to elucidate these processes not as phases of development but rather as objectives in themselves that allow the state to maintain an inconclusive, interminable phase where planning documents need to be constantly updated, discussed and linked with other economic and interest sectors. Meanwhile, peasants speak the language of state planning participating both as individuals and as communities in development projects. They fill out surveys, participate in workshops, work on demonstration projects and organize committees, all in order to follow the planning rules and hoping to accessing state attention and to generate direct discussions on territorial and social situations. Trying to weave together planning-as-governmentality with environmental topics in order to find elements of environmental governance, what this chapter shows us is how more than planning for the environment, planning is a useful language in order to obtain funds that can eventually help enhance peasant livelihoods. Remembering Auyero's (2012) argument on *waiting* for the state, this "performing participation" (Perreault, forthcoming) does imply a waste of time through filling out surveys, grouping as a community, participating in workshops, experimenting with demonstration projects in their parcels, among other things, just to align to the present rules and

procedures, the convenient alignment of people and things (Foucault 1991) as another example of the Foucauldian workings of governmentality.

For the peasants, naming activities as *environmental* is not necessarily relevant to them. Rather, speaking the planning language might imply naming activities sometimes as environmental, sometimes as innovative, sometimes as gendered, sometimes as sustainable, sometimes as human rights, but just as part of speaking the planning language or what might be called playing the planning game. Similarly, it does not seem to matter that a development project or planning document is done with a state agency, a multi-lateral agency or an NGO (or what type of NGO). From a peasant's perspective, they all come and go with similar structures and requirements and leave little impact or promising changes. In this sense, what I found about *Ordenamiento Ambiental Territorial* in the Peasant Reserve Zones is that it is entangled in the planning jumble along with many other social and political concerns. Performing environmental planning is done anyway because it might be needed as a way to exercise territoriality and show the state that peasants know the planning language and therefore know how to do what the state wants them to do in OT and OAT terms. In this sense it might be a territorial strategy that especially in these days of hope for a new country (read as the expectations on the peace dialogues) might prove useful.

Chandra Mohanty (1991 in Escobar 1995:16) has suggested that the deconstruction of development and construction of new ways of seeing and acting need to be carried out simultaneously.

> This simultaneous project could focus strategically on the collective action of social movements: they struggle not only for goods and services but also for the definition for life, economy, nature, and society. They are in short, cultural struggles (Escobar 1995: 16).

This is the challenge of the ZRC as both a political-territorial project and an object of development. While the ZRC designation and support for its strengthening can challenge economic and political projects of land grabbing, they also play the development game that can force their struggles to fit into neatly constructed development discourses with reduced impacts and huge investments of time, energy and resources that seem to be lost somewhere in the development path. It is a tricky situation for peasants who receive development aid, such as those committed to develop the agroecological demonstration project mentioned in chapter four. It is also a problematic situation for peasant organization representatives who in order to maintain and finance organizational structures and show results to the other associates, might welcome development projects with their planning schemes, discourses, packaged activities and rigid timeframes. This is why the idea of reencountering development is apt to explain and describe how people use the development industry. This is why feminists call to "employ situated knowledges that listen to peoples' varied experiences, particular circumstances, and varied needs and desires to construct 'situated knowledges'" (Haraway in Peet and Hartwick 2009: 250). The use of interviews with peasants in this study and the site visits to the ZRC-Cabrera helped to build a situated knowledge of how environment and development are lived through the labels of *Ordenamiento Ambiental Territorial* (OAT) and *Zonas de Reserva Campesina* (ZRC).

Nonetheless, in the aspect of situated knowledges, I did not adequately analyze how these notions of peasants, the state, and territory might be gendered notions. It would have been interesting to explore with more detail the differences among peasants, their perceptions of their relation with the state, on issues within their social organization such as the micro-politics of peasant organization.

The future of the Peasant Reserve Zones.

> What we need here is cultural education so we won't lose ancestral traditions and to change the education system to avoid that the youth migrates to the city. Education is being currently focused for displacement to cities, to find a job, but not for staying here. That is the cause of why the country-side is being abandoned. The future will be horrible because the elders, we are now seriously getting old, at least in my case. (interview 8, woman peasant leader, ZRC-Cabrera, July 2014)

> The proposal we have with the youth is first of all an education proposal. It is about the youth focusing on studying to apply and stay in the same territory where they studied. We have a relation –or at least have tried to have a work relation- with agroecology. For example, we have sent some young people to study with the indigenous people at Cauca. Some of us [peasants] don't agree with that because some ZRC have a conflict with indigenous people, but we don't. We have even tried to support each other. (interview 18, woman peasant leader of ZRC-Perla Amazónica, August 2014)

> Unfortunately, day-by-day the countryside is being more depopulated because the countryside doesn't offer opportunities for our children. They seek for a better life. They finish their high school and they leave to the city. One has to let them do that because what can we do with our children here? What can one generate? What can they occupy themselves with here?... We instill a conscience to our children telling them to anyway try to see more options in the country-side because it has a healthier environment than the city but they always seek for a better future. (interview 7, peasant, ZRC Cabrera, July 2014)

A new question emerged as I conducted the interviews for this research. It is related to the future of peasant populations, the economic opportunities in peasant livelihoods and the global and site-specific situations of rural exodus. Although these aspects exceed the possibilities of this research they do call attention to the specific relevance of examining OAT when the population, distribution and land use configurations might be changing so rapidly. Yet, another circumstance adds to the uncertainty of the unfolding of the ZRC and OAT within them. It relates to the outcomes of the peace dialogues at La Havana. As I write this conclusion in April 2015, the peace dialogues at La Havana continue after more than two years and a half[72]. If a general agreement is signed between the Colombian government and the FARC-EP guerrilla,

[72] https://www.mesadeconversaciones.com.co/comunicados/comunicado-conjunto-hurdal-noruega-18-octubre-de-2012

Colombians expect some territories to end or reduce their histories of armed violence and many people -particularly young people of peasant origin who have been part of the *Ejército del Pueblo* (EP)- to get disarmed and have opportunities as civil/unarmed citizens. The construction of a post-agreement scenario would begin, and issues of land tenure, reinsertion to civil life, job creation and gendered situations (the high number of previously armed men entering the job market) are the order of the day. Perhaps the peace dialogues and the possible subsequent agreements will turn into another development planning exercise where the new trendy label from the development industry will be *post-conflict development*. Sustainable development is a thing of the past (of the 1990s), so is rural development (1990s to 2000s?) and maybe even gender and development (2000s?). This is not to say that these labels have been annihilated. They persist waiting for the time of a new performance. The trick is to change costume. *Post-conflict* promises to be the new flashy costume for Colombia.

The links between this new situation with ZRC and OAT can be constructed in different ways. Access to land, rural economy opportunities, changing land uses will enter the scene and generate new scenarios of territorial construction and new challenges for OT. As these interview segments show, peasants in the ZRC see little future for their descendants to continue a peasant livelihood. This takes us back to the early agrarian question discussions on the fate of the peasantry under capitalism and leads to question if sustainability is about longue term viability of a low environmental impact livelihood rather than merely sustaining ecologic conservation designations. The situation also leads to question if the ZRC are a one-generation project or if and how the ZRC peasants and their organizational structures are dealing with continuing this struggle and its legacy in the face of global and local rural exodus. This can be circled back to planning, environmental governance, the Colombian agrarian question and territoriality in light

of the rising post-conflict scenario that Colombia is discursively leading to. If young peasant populations are supported by the state and the development industry to begin, recreate or develop a rural livelihood, new discussions around *Ordenamiento Territorial* might appear, as well as new pressures for changing land-uses and perhaps new schemes of land tenure and distribution. The state and the development industry will also display all their planning apparatus and some of the results of this study can shed light on how that can unfold.

As we saw at the beginning of this thesis, the partial results of the peace dialogues portray the ZRC as a strategy of rural development and a post-conflict scenario. What is not acknowledged in the fragment of the peace agreement document is how the context of the 2010s is managing or not to position peasant economies in the face of increasingly neoliberal food markets. Such a question leads back to the initial agrarian question literature and Lenin's contribution as to why it is not in the interest of capitalists to totally destroy the small peasantry because it is this group that serves as a source of labor, and on how this is the reason why capitalists pass laws to artificially maintain the small peasantry as a form of maintaining the supply of labor power. Neil Smith (2008) had argued that uneven development is a result of the needs of capitalist maintenance and expansion. Engels back in the 19th century had also added to the question of the peasants in capitalism by posing the situation of how the expansion of resource exploitation in the world, referring specifically to "the emerging internationalization of the food system as a result of imperialism was undermining peasant livelihoods" (Akram-Lodhi and Kay 2010 [a]: 185). This reflection seems as relevant now as it was in the late 19th century for Engels since the corporate agro-industrial scheme is expanding and undermining peasant livelihoods in different ways from land grabbing to allying with governments in free trade agreements that inundate local economies with subsidized imported industrial foods.

Looking into the future.

In this neoliberal scenario, a next important step from a geographic perspective is to study whether and how the ZRC are contesting and countering neoliberal dynamics (peasant economies vs. corporate agroindustry, against land grabbing and accumulation). Also, on how far are they willing and able as a cohesive population or political group to agree on labor and nature relations that are not capitalist. For instance on proposing different land tenure schemes that are not private property, contesting the new commodifications of nature (such as several ecosystem services schemes); proposing collective and informal conservation agreements, communal land use and management, cooperative economic structures, labor sharing practices, agro-ecological practices, support for the peasant youth, rural women; and examining the heteropatriarchal and oppressive practices of peasant cultures, just to mention a few.

As I mentioned at the beginning of this thesis, besides the challenge of feeling comfortable with my new geographic dress, another great challenge was translation. With translation I do not only refer to expressing in a language that is not my native language, but in expressing meanings of concepts that are not easily translated. *Ordenamiento Territorial*, a concept common throughout Latin America and many parts of Europe is poorly translated in English as 'land planning'. A great task of this document was to give the Anglophone audience a sense of what the concept means in Colombia. Political, juridical and common language expressions were also a challenge to translate. Particularly the expressions and ways of talking of Colombian peasants, state officials and others interviewed might have been lost in translation.

Another challenge of translation was the translation of geographies. As a newcomer to the academic field I must confess I found that one of the main barriers in geography is not the national frontiers but the language barriers. During this research and searching for the adequate

literature to draw on for my research, I discovered that the Anglophone geography sometimes draws on literature in French (mainly to Foucault, Deleuze and Lefebvre), sometimes to the geographers of the Frankfurt School in German, but never to literature in Spanish or Portuguese. Usually, only when a text is translated to English is it discovered by Anglophone academia. And these are observations from the limits of my own language barriers, so not to mention Russian, Chinese and all the other literature that does not get translated to English as the hegemonic academic language. Or to all the other ways of doing geography that do not get expressed in any written language. The works of imperialism are encountered when someone like Milton Santos, so important for "other" geographies, is never cited in geography in English.

These topics are in different degrees mentioned in this study and open new research possibilities about the ZRC. As I conclude this thesis I am more aware of constantly re-examining my positionality with my research topics and within Anglophone academia to decide if and how to pursue these interests as further academic projects.

Bibliography.

Agarwal, B. 2001. Participatory Exclusions, Community Forestry, and Gender: An Analysis for South Asia and a Conceptual Framework. *World Development.* 29 (10) 1623-1648

Agrawal, Arun. 2005. Environmentality. Technologies of Government and the Making of Subjects. Durham and London. Duke University Press.

Akram-Lodhi, A. H. and C. Kay 2010a. Surveying the agrarian question (part 1): unearthing foundations, exploring diversity. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 37(1): 177-202.

Akram-Lodhi, A. H. and Critóbal Kay 2010b. Surveying the agrarian question (part 2): current debates and beyond. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 37(2): 255-284.

Alliés, P. 1980. L'invention du territoire. Presses Universitaires de Grenoble. Grenoble.

Allmendinger, P. and M. Tewdwr-Jones. 2006. Territory, identity and spatial planning. In: Allmendinger, P. and M. Tewdwr-Jones. (eds.) 2006. Territory, Identity and Spatial Planning. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group. London and New York.

Assies, Willem. Land tenure, land law and development: some thoughts on recent debates. *Journal of Peasant Studies*. Vol. 36, No. 3, July 2009, 573-589

Auyero, J. 2012. Patients of the State. The Politics of Waiting in Argentina. Duke University Press. London and Durham.

Bebbington, A. 1999. Capitals and capabilities: A framework for analyzing peasant viability, rural livelihoods and poverty. *World Development*, 27(12): 2021-2044.

Bebbington, A. 2000. Reencountering Development: Livelihood Transitions and Place Transformations in the Andes. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers,* 90(3): 495-520.

Bebbington, A. 2004. NGOs and uneven development: Geographies of development intervention. *Progress in Human Geography*, 28 (6): 725-745.

Bernstein, H. 1982. Notes on capital and peasantry. In Rural Development: Theories of Peasant Economy and Agrarian Change, pp. 160-177. London: Hutchinson University Library.

Borras, S. 2003. Questioning Market-Led Agrarian Reform: Experiences from Brazil, Colombia and South Africa. *Journal of Agrarian Change*. Vol.3, pp 367-394.

Brass, T. 1990. Peasant Essentialism and the Agrarian Question in the Colombian Andes. Review Article *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 17: 3, pp. 444-456.

Bridge, G. 2014. Resource geographies II: The resource-state nexus. *Progress in Human Geography*. 38:1. Pp. 118-130

Bridge, G. And Jonas. A. 2002. Governing nature: the reregulation of resource Access, production and consumption. Environment and Planning A. 34. Pp. 759-66.

Bridge, G. and T. Perreault 2009. Environmental governance. In A Companion to Environmental Geography. N. Castree, D. Demeritt, D. Liverman, and B. Rhoads (eds.), Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 475-497.

Buitrago Parra, J. 2006. *Guerrilleros, campesinos y política en el Sumapaz. El Frente Democrático de Liberación Nacional 1953-1957.* Aquelarre-Universidad del Tolima. Ibagué.

Cardoso Machado, N.M. 2011. Karl Polanyi and the New Economic Sociology: Notes on the Concept of (Dis)embeddedness. MPRA Paper No. 48957. RCCS Annual Review, 2. 119-140.

Castree, N. 2008. Neoliberalising nature: the logics of deregulation and reregulation. *Environment and Planning A*. v.40. pp.131-152.

Chayanov, A. 1991 [1927]. The Theory of Peasant Co-operatives. Ohio State University Press. Columbus.

Cleaver, F. 1999. Paradoxes of Participation: Questioning Participatory Approaches to Development. Journal of International Development. 11. 597-612.

Corrales, E. & J. Forero. 1993. La economía campesina y la sociedad rural en el modelo neoliberal de desarrollo en Colombia. In: Correa, A., González, I. & R.H. Mora (eds). Neoliberales y poblre, el debate continental por la justicia. CINEP, CRT, Centro Gumilla. México.

Elden, S. 2007. Governmentality, calculation, territory. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space.* 25. 562-580.

Elden, S. 2010.a. Land, terrain, territory. *Progress in Human Geography.* 34 (6) 799-817

Elden, S. 2010.b. Thinking Territory Historically. *Geopolitics.* 15. 757-761.

Elden, S. 2014.a. Necessary, but not sufficient: Geography, territory and the history of ideas. *Dialogues in Human Geography.* 4 (3) 320-323.

Elden, S. 2014.b. The Birth of Territory. University of Chicago Press. Chicago.

Escobar, A. 1992. Planning. In: Sachs, W. (ed). The Development Dictionary. Zed Books, London. Pp 132-145.

Escobar, A. 1995. Encountering Development. Princeton University Press. Princeton.

Escobar, A. 1996. Construction Nature. Elements for a post-structuralist political ecology. *Futures*. 28: 4, pp. 325-343

Fals-Borda, O. 1987.Historia de la Cuestión Agraria en Colombia. 4th edition, 2nd re-impression. Carlos Valencia Editores. Bogotá.

Fals-Borda, O. 1985. Marxian Categories and Colombian Realities. In: Banerjee, D. (ed) Marxian Theory and the Third World. Sage Publications. New Delhi.

Fajardo Montaña, D. 2010. El conflicto armado y su proyección en el campo. Bogotá. Accessed in: http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/bueros/kolumbien/01993/04.pdf

Fajardo Montaña, D. 2003. Tierra, Poder Politico y Reformas Agraria y Rural. Cuadernos Tierra y Justicia No. 1. ISBN: 958-9262-19-8

Fajardo Montaña, D. 2002. Para sembrar la paz, hay que aflojar la tierra: comunidades, tierras y territorios en la construcción de un país. Universidad nacional de Colombia. Bogotá-Colombia.

Fajardo Montaña, D. Las zonas de reserve campesina: ¿Estrategia de desarrollo regional y contra el desplazamiento?. From: Darío González (editor) 2000. Las claves territoriales de la guerra y la paz, Agenda ciudadana por la paz, la vida y la libertad. Bogotá-Colombia.

Fajardo Montaña, D. 1993. Espacio y sociedad. La formación de las regiones agrarias en Colombia. Corporación Araracuara. Bogotá-Colombia (Instituto Sinchi, 1996).

Fajardo Montaña, D., Sepúlveda, M. Las zonas de reserva campesina: ¿Un instrumento para el desarrollo humano sostenible? From: Desarrollo de la nueva reforma agraria, Seminario taller. 1995. Memorias. Revista Nacional de Agricultura. Bogotá-Colombia

Fajardo M, D.; Mondragón B., H., and Moreno A., O. 1997. Colonización y estrategias de desarrollo. IICA, MMA, IEPRI-Universidad Nacional de Colombia. Bogotá.

Fajardo Montaña, Darío, Mondragón, H., Arcila, O. 1998. Colonización y estrategias de desarrollo. Bogotá-Colombia

Falchetti, A.M and Plazas, C. 1973. El territorio de los muiscas a la llegada de los españoles. Uniandes. Accessed on November 2014 at: http://www.banrepcultural.org/blaavirtual/revistas/credencial/agosto1993/agosto2.htm

Ferro, J.G. and G. Uribe. 2002. Las marchas de los cocaleros del departamento de Caquetá, Colombia: contradicciones políticas y obstáculos a la emancipación social. *Cuadernos de Desarrollo Rural*. Pontifica Universidad Javeriana. (49) 59-. Bogotá.

Foucault, Michel 1991. "Governmentality" from Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller (eds), The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Franco, R. 2012. Cariba malo: episodios de resistencia de un pueblo indígena aislado del Amazonas. Documentos Históricos Imani, 2. Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Sede Amazonia. Leticia.

Gilhodes, P. 1970. Agrarian Struggles in Colombia. In: Stavenhagen, R. (ed.) 1970. Agrarian Problems & Peasant Movements in Latin America. Anchor Books, New York. Chapter 12.

Giraldo Poveda, Ramon. 1999. Las zonas de reserva campesina en ecosistemas estratégicos: posibilidades de aplicacion en un area piloto del Macizo Colombiano. Bogota. Pontificia Universidad Javeriana. Tesis de Magister en Desarrollo Rural.

Gonzales Arias, J. and Marulanda Álvarez, E. 1990. *Historias de Frontera, Colonización y guerras en el Sumapaz.* CINEP. Bogotá

González Posso, Darío, Múnera Calle, Javier. 1998. Zonas de reserva campesina: El Pato, una propuesta integral de la región campesina. In: Planificación ambiental y ordenamiento territorial. FESCOL. Bogotá-Colombia.

Gow, D.D. 2008. Countering Development. Indigenous Modernity and the Moral Imagination. Duke University Press. Durham and London.

Harvey, D. 2005. A Brief History of Neoliberalism. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hickey, S. And G. Mohan. 2005. Relocating Participation within a Radical Politics of Development. *Development and Change.* 36(2) 237-262

Instituto Colombiano de Cultura Hispánica. 2001. Geografía Humana de Colombia, Región Andina Central. Tomo IV, Vol.2. Bogotá. Accessed on November 2014 at: http://www.banrepcultural.org/blaavirtual/geografia/geohum2/muisca2.htm

Kautsky, K. 1988. The Agrarian Question. V1. Zwan Publications. London.

Lefebvre, H. 2003. Space and the state. State/space; a reader. 84-100.

Lenin, V.I. 1920. Preliminary draft theses on the agrarian question for the Second Congress of the Communist International. In: Lenin's Collected Works. 4th English Edition. Progress Publishers. Moscow 1965. Vol. 31. Pp-152-164. Translated by Julius Katzer. Internet archive source: www.marx.org. GNU Free Documentation License 2002.

Lenin, V. [1964] The development of Capitalism in Russia (Collected Works, Vol. 3), Moscow: Progress Publishers.

León Linares, G. 2011. Ordenamiento territorial en Colombia: reseña histórica de un desconcierto. Prensa Moderna. Bogotá.

Li, Tania Murray. 2007. The Will to Improve. Governmentality, Development, and the Practice of Politics. Durham and London. Duke University Press.

Londoño Botero, R. 1997. Los sindicatos y las juntas de acción comunal en Colombia. *América Latina Hoy.* 17. 87-102.

Machado, A. 1998. La cuestión agraria en Colombia a fines del milenio. El Áncora Editores. Bogotá. Pp.222

Machado, A. 1998. Pasado, Presente y Futuro de la Economía Campesina. In: *Revista de la Academia Colombiana de Ciencias Económicas*. Bogotá

Machado, A. 2009. La reforma rural, una deuda social y política. Bogotá. Universidad Nacional de Colombia.

MADR, WB, IICA, INCODER. 2003. Marco normativo de las Zonas de Reserva Campesina – Legislación vigente. Serie documentos - Proyecto piloto. Ministerio de Agricultura y Desarrollo Rural, Banco Mundial, IICA Oficina Colombia, Instituto Colombiano de Desarrollo Rural. Bogotá-Colombia.

MADR, WB, IICA, INCODER. 2003. Los manuales operativos: General – MOG; Zonales-MOG. Serie documentos - Proyecto piloto. Ministerio de Agricultura y Desarrollo Rural, Banco Mundial, I ICA Oficina Colombia, Instituto Colombiano de Desarrollo Rural. Bogotá-Colombia.

MADR, WB, IICA, INCODER. 2003. Evaluación socioeconómica y ambiental participativa – ESAP, Instrumento de diagnóstico para la caracterización socioeconómica y ambiental de las zonas rurales. Serie documentos - Proyecto piloto. Ministerio de Agricultura y Desarrollo Rural, Banco Mundial, IICA Oficina Colombia, Instituto Colombiano de Desarrollo Rural. Bogotá-Colombia.

MADR, WB, IICA, INCODER. 2003. Índice de Capacidad Organizacional –ICO, Instrumento de diagnóstico del estado organizativo de las comunidades campesinas locales. Serie documentos - Proyecto piloto. Ministerio de Agricultura y Desarrollo Rural, Banco Mundial, IICA Oficina Colombia, Instituto Colombiano de Desarrollo Rural. Bogotá-Colombia.

MADR, WB, IICA, INCODER. 2003. Sistema de Planeación, Seguimiento y Evaluación PS&E, Escenario de aprendizaje e innovación. Serie documentos - Proyecto piloto. Ministerio de Agricultura y Desarrollo Rural, Banco Mundial, IICA Oficina Colombia, Instituto Colombiano de Desarrollo Rural. Bogotá-Colombia.

Márquez, G. Conflictos ambientales, ecosistemas estratégicos y ordenamiento ambiental del territorio. Informe Ejecutivo - Ministerio del Medio Ambiente. Santafé de Bogotá, D.C., Octubre de 1997.

Marulanda Álvarez, E. 1991. *Colonización y Conflicto. Las lecciones del Sumapaz.* IEPRI-Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Tercer Mundo Editores. Bogotá.

Marx, K.1967. Capital. Volume 1. A Critical Analysis of Capitalist Production. New York: International Publishers.

McMichael, P. 2008. Peasants make their own history, but just not as they please… Journal of Agrarian Change, 8(2&3): 205-228.

Melgaço, L. 2013. Security and Surveillance in Times of Globalization: An Appraisal of Milton Santos' Theory. *International Jounral of E-Planning Research,* 2(4), 1-12.

Merrifield, A. 2006. Henri Lefebvre: A Critical Introduction. Routledge. London.

Ministerio de Agricultura y Desarrollo Rural, Instituto Colombiano de Desarrollo Rural. 2013. Resolución 1132 del 21 de junio de 2013 ¨Por la cual se fijan los patrones constitutivos de

Unidades Agrícolas Familiares minima ponderado a nivel predial, para los fines de la Convocatoria de Incentivo de Asistencia Técnica Rural". Bogotá.

Ministerio del Medio Ambiente. 1998. Lineamientos para la Política Nacional de Ordenamiento Ambiental del Territorio. Oficina Asesora de Ordenamiento Ambiental –Ministerio del Medio Ambiente. Bogotá.

Mitchell, Timothy. 2002. Rule of Experts. Egypt, Techno-Politics, Modernity. University of California Press. Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Mohan, G. And K. Stokke. 2000. Participatory Development and Empowerment: the Dangers of Localism. *Third World Quarterly.* 21(2) 247-268

Molano, Alfredo. 1989. Siguiendo el corte. Relatos de guerras y tierras. Ancora Editores. Bogotá.

Molano, A. & C. Ramirez. 1991. Resguardos Campesinos. In: *Ecológica*. No. 7. Bogotá. Pp. 34-38.

Moncayo, Hector Leon. 2008. La cuestion agraria hoy en Colombia: tierra sin campesinos. Bogota. Instituto Latinoamericano de Servicios Legales Alternativos.

Moore, Donald. 2005. Suffering for Territory. Race, Place, and Power in Zimbabwe. Durham and London. Duke University Press.

Ospina, M.A. 2008. Manual para la delimitación y zonificación de zonas amortiguadoras. Parques Nacionales Naturales de Colombia. Bogotá.

Ortiz C.E., Pérez, M.E., Castillo D., Muñoz, L.A.2004. Zonas de reserva campesina. Aprendizaje e innovación para el Desarrollo Rural. Pontificia Universidad Javeriana. Bogotá

OXFAM.2013. Divide y comprarás. Una nueva forma de concentrar tierras baldías en Colombia. Informes de investigación OXFAM. Oxford. www.oxfam.org

Parques Nacionales de Colombia.2001. Política de participación social en la conservación. UAESPNN. Bogotá.

Peck, J. and A. Tickell. 2002. Neoliberalizing Space. Antipode. Pp. 380-404.

Peet, R. and E. Hartwick. 2009. Theories of Development. Contentions, Arguments, Alternatives. The Guildford Press. New York.

Peluso, Nancy Lee and Michael Watts (eds). 2001. Violent Environments. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Pérez Martinez, M., Vargas Navarro, F. And J. Guerrero Pérez. 2014. Gestión Ambiental Territorial. Dinámicas y trayectorias de la participación ciudadana y sostenibilidad de los recursos naturales en la jurísdicción de la CAR de Cundinamarca. La voz de los actores locales. CAR, Editorial Pontificia Universidad Javeriana. Bogotá.

Perreault, T. 2015. Performing participation: Mining, power and the limits of public consultation in Bolivia. *Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Anthropology*. Forthcoming.

Polanyi, K. 2001. The Great Transformation. The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time. Beacon Press. Boston.

Procuraduría delegada para asuntos ambientales y agrarios, 2008. Panorama y Perspectivas sobre la Gestión Ambiental de los Ecosistemas de Páramo. Memorias. Bogotá.

Rahnema, M. 1992. Participation. In: Sachs, W. (ed). The Development Dictionary. Zed Books, London. Pp 132-145.

República de Colombia. 1992. Constitución Política de Colombia 1991. Departamento Administrativo del Servicio Civil, Escuela Superior de Administración Pública. Bogotá.

República de Colombia. Ley 200 de 1936.
República de Colombia. Ley 2da de 1959.
República de Colombia. Ley 135 de 1961.
República de Colombia. Ley 160 de 1994.
República de Colombia. Ley 165 de 1994.
República de Colombia. Ley 152 de 1994.
República de Colombia. Decreto 1777 de 1996.
República de Colombia. Acuerdo 024 de1996.
República de Colombia. Ley 388 de 1997.
República de Colombia. Decreto 1729 de 2002.

Reserva Natural Suma-paz. 1998. Poblamiento y cambio de paisaje en Sumapaz. Corporación Ecofondo, ICAN, Asociación Reserva Natural Sumapaz. Bogotá.

Revista Semana. 2013. ¿Campesinos en vía de extinction? Semana Sostenible.

Robbins, P. 2004. Political Ecology: A Critical Introduction. Oxford: Blackwell.

Rosero M. C. and J. Sánchez. 2009. Planes de vida y planes de etnodesarrollo. SENA-Tropenbos. Bogotá.

Sachs, W. (ed). 1992. The Development Dictionary. Zed Books, London.

Sánchez, Ricardo. Peregrinación por el Concepto de Desarrollo Sostenible. En Ministerio del Medio Ambiente - CIDER. El Ordenamiento Ambiental del Territorio. Panel de Expertos. Memorias. Sasaima, Agosto de 1996.

Santos, M. 2006. A Natureza do Espaço : Técnica e Tempo. Razão e Emoção: 4ed. Editora da Universidade de São Paulo. São Paulo.

Sayer, J. 1991. Rainforest Buffer Zones. Guidelines for Protected Area Managers. IUCN –The World Conservation Union. Berkshire

Scott, J. 1998. Seeing Like a State. How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed. Yale University Press. New Haven and London.

Stavenhagen, R. (ed.) 1970. Agrarian Problems & Peasant Movements in Latin America. Anchor Books, New York. (Introduction, Chapter 12)

SINPEAGRICUN, ILSA, INCODER. 2013. Plan de Desarrollo Sostenible, Zona de Reserva Campesina de Cabrera. Gente Nueva Editores. Bogotá.

Teubal, M. 2009. Agrarian Reform and Social Movements in the Age of Globalization. Latin America at the Dawn of the Twenty-first Century. Latin American Perspectives. Issue 167, Vol. 36, No. 4. Pp.9-20

Thiesenhusen, William. 1995. Broken Promises, Agrarian Reforms and the Latin American Campesino. Boulder. Westview Press.

Thiesenhusen, W.C. 1989. Searching for Agrarian Reform in Latin America. Unwin Hyman. Boston. Introduction. Pp. 1-41

Thomson, F. 2011. The Agrarian Question and Violence in Colombia: Conflict and Development. Journal of Agrarian Change, Vol. 11 No. 3, July 2011, pp. 321-356

UNODC, Government of Colombia. 2013. Colombia, Monitoreo de Cultivos de Coca 2012. Oficina de las Naciones Unidas contra la Droga y el Delito. Bogotá. http://www.unodc.org/documents/crop-monitoring/Colombia/Colombia_Monitoreo_de_Cultivos_de_Coca_2012_web.pdf

Vancura, M. 2011. Polanyi's Great Transformation and the Concpet of the Embedded Economy. IES Occasional Paper 2/2011. IES FSV. Charles University. Prague.

Vanegas, Deyanira. 2007. Hacia el ordenamiento ambiental de la Amazonia colombiana: primera aproximación a sus experiencias y procesos en curso. Instituto Amazónico de Investigaciones Científicas – SINCHI; Instituto de Investigación de Recursos Biológicos Alexander von Humboldt. Bogotá.

Wainwright, J. 2008. Decolonizing Development. Colonial Power and the Maya. Blackwell Publishing. Malden.

Williams, G. 2004. Evaluating Participatory Development: Tyranny, Power and (Re)politisation. *Third World Quarterly.* 25(3) 557-578.

Williams, J. 2001: Achieving local sustainability in rural communities. In Layard, A., Davoudi, S. and Batty, S., eds, Planning for a sustainable future. London: E.&F.N. Spon, 235-52.

Williams, R. 1983. Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society. Fontana. London

Wolford, Wendy. 2010. This Land Is Ours Now. Social Mobilization and the Meanings of Land in Brazil. Durham and London. Duke University Press.

Zamozc, L. 1986. The Agrarian Question and the Peasant Movement in Colombia. Struggles of the National Peasant Association 1967-1981. Cambridge University Press and United Nations Research Institute for Social Development.

Videos:

Citurna Producciones. 1989. La Ley del Monte. Documentary film. Bogota.

Web pages:

http://www.eltiempo.com/archivo/documento/CMS-12709742

http://www.sinchi.org.co/index.php/modelos/183-linea-estrategica-3-modelos-2015/1527-formulacion-del-plan-de-manejo-ambiental-integral-del-distrito-de-manejo-integrado-norte-del-area-de-manejo-especial-de-la-macarena

http://www.minvivienda.gov.co/POTPresentacionesGuias/Competencias%20en%20la%20Revisión%20y%20Ajuste%20de%20POT.pdf

http://www.un-redd.org/aboutredd

http://www.worldbank.org/projects/P053243/peasant-enterprise-zones-development-project?lang=en

Vita

Name of author

Manuela Ruiz Reyes

Date/Place of Birth

August 4, 1981; Bogotá, Colombia

Undergraduate School attended

Pontificia Universidad Javeriana, Bogotá – Colombia

Degrees awarded

Bachelor of Science in Ecology 2007
Pontificia Universidad Javeriana

Awards and Honors

Watson Fellowship 2013-2014

Roscoe-Martin Fund 2014

Beca Colombia Biodiversa 2014

Professional experience

Amazon Program Officer
Wildlife Conservation Society, Colombia Program 2010-2013

Professional –National System of Protected Areas
Parques Nacionales Naturales de Colombia 2007-2009