THE ROUTLEDGE COMPANION TO CULTURAL PROPERTY

Edited by
Jane Anderson and Haidy Geismar

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

LONDON AND NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Contents

Contents

19

FRONTIERS OF CULTURAL PROPERTY IN THE GLOBAL SOUTH

Rosemary J. Coombe

Introduction: Political economies and political ecologies of cultural properties

This chapter delineates the features of a distinctive terrain – emerging political economies and political ecologies in which cultural property's futures in the Global South are likely to unfold and aspirations for alternative futures politically articulated in a culturally possessive fashion. The position is advanced by way of a contribution to the anthropological literature on "actually existing neoliberalism" (Clarke, 2008; Collier, 2006, 2012; Ferguson, 2009; Hilgers, 2010, 2012; Gershon, 2011; Goldstein, 2012) as an uneven or variegated field of market-oriented regulatory restructuring (Brenner, Peck & Theodore, 2010), with special emphasis on informational capitalism and new forms of cultural governmentality. These include extensions of trade-based intellectual property (IP), *in situ* means for protecting genetic resources and traditional knowledge (TK), regimes for safeguarding intangible cultural heritage, and new forms of conservation management.

Although the growth and spread of IP, heritage, and biodiversity regimes might be seen primarily as spreading commodified relationships throughout the Global South (e.g. Cutler, 2011; Farhat, 2008; Fernando, 2003), we suggest that attempts to embed allegedly universal market-based exchange relations are met with assertions of local specificities and desires for autonomy in what Polanyi (1944) recognized as the "double movement" of the commodity – and anthropologists have historically understood as the dialectical relationship between property and personhood. Under new forms of neoliberal governmentality, collective attachments to cultural goods are cultivated and communities identified as subjects by diverse legal instruments, transnational agencies, corporate attentions, and global policy norms that focus on local cultural assets as significant goods and capacities. Cultural assets, however, may also figure as political resources under conditions in which occupying the subject position of an indigenous, local, or traditional community is a means to seek transnational support, development aid, recognition, political alliances, and distinctive forms of citizenship. Cultural properties are thus increasingly integral to the assertion of new governmentalities, autonomies, and sovereignties.

This chapter will delineate some of the changing social and institutional conditions under which cultural properties are configured as economic and political resources in struggles that are likely to become more evident in the political economies of informational capitalism. I also show how hybridized natural and cultural landscapes – socionatures – emerge in contemporary political ecologies; the biocultural turn in conservation discourse and practice has encouraged new forms of environmental governmentality that emphasize customary community norms for managing biodiversity and genetic resources in plants, or both, in "cultural landscapes." This has encouraged communities to assert revitalized forms of customary, traditional, or living law in a nascent "ontological" turn in heritage and cultural property management which suggests that legal pluralism may be the new frontier on which property's cultures multiply.

Neoliberal governmentalities and cultural communities

Many critical scholars of global political economy understand neoliberalism not as an ideology, and not as a withdrawal of the state, but as a reconfiguration of the state through processes of uneven regulatory restructuring in which a wide range of actors and authorities now exercise governmental powers over individuals and groups (Braithwaite, 2008; Drahos, 2014; Grabosky, 2013; Himley, 2012) which tends to intensify the "uneven development of regulatory forms across places, territories and scales" (Brenner, Peck & Theodore, 2010: 184). Such "variegated neoliberalism" emphasizes market-based relationships focused on property and contract, as well as new technologies of certification and audit, through which local goods and local governance are rendered legible and "effective governance is measured with reference to asset management … and the capacity to foster accumulation" (Comaroff, 2011: 45). Neoliberal governmentalities constitute collectivities as responsible community subjects through intervention, auditing, and monitoring (Brenner, Peck, & Theodore, 2010; Coombe, 2011a, 2011b; Creed, 2006; Rose & Miller, 2010) in development projects in which they must make their cultural or "traditional" assets legible for new forms of investment (Bennett, 1998, 2000; e.g. Coffey, 2003; Coombe & Weiss, 2015; Wilson, 2008).

Recent work on heritage management explores a new distribution of governmental powers in which nations, sovereignties, territories, and rights are reconfigured. Rather than a simple abandonment of heritage management to local authorities, we witness a multiplication of authority in new coalitions of agencies, joint partnerships, public–private alliances, and multiscalar assemblages of NGOs, international authorities, and multilateral institutions (Coombe, 2012: 378). An interpenetration of civil society, state, and market forces is increasingly the norm. Exploring heritage governance in the Caribbean, for example, Philip Scher (2011, 2014) shows how the reconfigured neoliberal state operates through dispersed interventions. These include the transnational and decentralized institutional oversight made necessary by the diversification of cultural markets to encourage tourism, foster foreign direct investment, promote product differentiation, and otherwise capitalize upon cultural resources for sustainable development. This involves the use of IP such as geographical indications to mark local cultural goods and new practices of nation and place-branding, in which collective cultural distinctions are resources to be managed in accordance with "best practices" in fields of expertise that may also implement novel forms of social control.

Anthropologists have long recognized that neoliberal government operates via technologies of subjectification (Hilgers, 2010; Ong, 2007) that cultivate new responsibilities and autonomies. The moulding of new subjectivities is crucial to harnessing cultural goods and practices as heritage resources, optimizing agents to maximize their advantages as autonomized entities in a process that instills social agents with possessive attitudes and proprietary rights to engage in

extended market relations. Neoliberal government operates not so much by controlling or limiting activities but by relying upon the "empowerment" of capacitated citizens and self-organized communities "capable of bearing a kind of regulated freedom" (Rose & Miller, 2010: 272). Through the use of archives and cultural inventories, TK registers, mappings and countermappings, for example, cultural resources are rendered legible in ways that promise to maximize local autonomy even as they subject communities to new forms of discipline and surveillance.

Neoliberal government is supported by globalizing processes driven by information technologies in which culture is not only drawn into relations of economic exchange but becomes a force of production in its own right (Long & Labadi, 2010). In a political economy of capital accumulation that privileges informational goods, the use of local cultural specificity as a means of capturing monopoly rents has accelerated (Harvey, 2001). Ironically, this is a strategy proffered in response to global capitalist forces that are understood to be culturally homogenizing (Ray, 2003); investments in local cultural resources for endogenous development are perceived to counter resulting "losses" of cultural diversity. Such investments in locality, culture, and tradition may also, paradoxically, afford unique resources and opportunities for political creativity which Harvey marks as "one of the key spaces of hope" (2001: 109).

We have elsewhere explored the centrality of trade-based IP and digital and genetic technologies to new forms of capital accumulation in so-called knowledge economies (Coombe, 2016; Coombe & Turcotte, 2012; Turcotte, 2016), which have extended commodified exchange relations into new zones of life and livelihood. Simultaneously, the imposition of IP has triggered widespread resistance in new social movements that demand recognition for other forms of human inscription, creativity, and innovation. For example, in opposition to the TRIPS Agreement, indigenous women in the Philippines forged farmers' movements to assert their rights to cultivate and save seed, actively resist patents, and exercise plant breeder's rights while forging seed exchange networks they characterized as a form of intercultural dialogue (Wright, 2008a, 2008b). They also rejected public domain and common heritage arguments, describing their agricultural stewardship as a locally significant tradition on which they based rights, not via possession, but through inalienable responsibilities of nurture. Such food security coalitions have scaled up into new social movements that project the need to protect culturally based food sovereignties that exceed the calculus of market economies (for examples, see Counhihan & Siniscalchi, 2014).

Even within international institutions, the propriety of trade-based IP's commodity logic for cultural goods has been challenged in conversations in which anthropologists have been active interlocutors. Take the "safeguarding" of intangible cultural heritage under UNESCO's 2003 Convention. The concept was developed specifically to avoid the use of the word "protection," which had negative connotations resulting from earlier negotiations about how "folklore" could or should be protected as IP. "Cultural heritage" was considered a more appropriate term because of its acceptance by delegates in deliberations on the content of international indigenous rights (Coombe & Turcotte, 2015). Negotiators sought to recognize the dynamism of "traditions" and find "capacitating" mechanisms to maintain their vitality as vehicles for social reproduction (Blake, 2009, 2014). The implementation of the regime inevitably created new forms of government through regulatory intervention, and lent itself to new forms of cultural marketing and merchandizing (Bendix, 2009).

Means of safeguarding were ideally to be designed to respect the values, practices, and norms of local communities in activities such as community management of cultural landscapes (Albert, Richon, Vinals & Witcomb, 2012; Disko, 2012; Kuutma, 2012a, 2012b; Rössler,

2006, 2012) and the use of TK and local cultural institutions to manage threats posed by climate change (Rodriguez-Navarro, 2015; Tano, 2015). The new regime was intended "to hold safe" the attachment of social collectives to practices, forms, and expressions significant to them and to maintain the social bonds that constitute this significance. Despite the considerable controversy these requirements have provoked, the principle of community participation is now operative in all areas of UNESCO activity (De Cesari, 2012). Given that communities have no natural boundaries and, in many jurisdictions, no juridical stature, we might anticipate that such norms will invite instrumental behaviour, be challenged by states (Meskell, 2013) and entrenched elites (Brumann, 2015) – or captured to buttress their own powers (Hertz, 2015), demand unwarranted social sacrifice (Meskell, 2009), and/or put excessive pressure on under-resourced residents (Lafrenz-Samuels, 2010). They may also enjoin more ethical orientations in new forms of public–private partnership (Di Giovane, 2015), provide points of political leverage for community claims (e.g. Leblon, 2012; Lydon, 2009), and platforms to assert cultural rights (Coombe & Weiss, 2015).

Community relations to heritage governance are not, however, limited to UNESCO auspices; it is more appropriate to think about "assemblages of different patrimonial paradigms . . . creative contact zones between different heritage logics that compete against one another or that are combined in synergistic ways" (Tauschek, 2012: 196). The newly "responsibilized" community that stewards local cultural resources is a global subject position with diverse policy provenance; communities are intervened in through a number of regulatory regimes. Global environmental norms of preserving and maintaining TK, international IP policies for the protection of traditional cultural expressions (TCEs), and NGO promotion of cultural industries to further sustainable development all confront "communities" with diverse, overlapping demands and incentives to register, map, create inventories of, and devise new plans for the valuation of their cultural resources (Forsyth, 2012: 1).

Heritage as a resource is mobilized through the energies of states and corporations, NGOs and regional associations, UN bodies and civil society movements, all of which have particular interests in empowering communities as entrepreneurs, owners, stewards, custodians, or guardians of scarce and endangered forms of knowledge, difference, and distinction. While governmental practices may attempt to identify and attach groups to the kinds of heritage most easily managed as commodifiable resources, they do not necessarily succeed. It is "important to look not just at the forms of collective and individual identity promoted by practices of government, but also at how particular agents negotiate these forms – at how they embrace, adapt, or refuse them" (Inda, 2005: 11) and the "forms of political possibility" that neoliberalism's freedoms and autonomies afford (Ferguson, 2009). Elsewhere (Coombe, 2016; Coombe & Weiss, 2015), we have suggested that the "congenitally failing" quality of neoliberal government also marks the point of entry for imaginative assertions of propriety – proprietary rights framed in terms of community values, well-being, *bien vivr* ("good life"), or *Sumak Kawsay* ("living well"), to name but a few local articulations. The forms of autonomy people assert may not necessarily accord with those that authorities demand, and authorities may sometimes reshape practices to better align with the politics of the governed.

Property and personhood at the intersection of globalization and autonomy

Political economists understand the globalization of international law as privileging the commodity form in governance regimes dominated by a limited form of exclusive property rights serving market interests in a "new constitutionalism" (Cutler, 2011; Cutler & Gill,

2015). The TRIPS Agreement (and bilateral successor regimes) is seen as a central pillar in this architecture, with IP being a form of enclosure that encourages proprietary conceptions of sovereignty, identity, and autonomy (Cutler, 2011: 29). So-called minimum standards for IP "purport to create an equal playing field for all" (49), but operate as hard law sanctions enabling dispossession of intangible goods and protecting private regimes of accumulation. Meanwhile, soft law, which entails more diverse parties articulating different norms and values, proliferates in the margins (Anderson, 2012). From this perspective, IP is one of the most powerful forces disembedding elements of human lifeworlds from social and ecological contexts.

The anthropological study of IP has added considerable nuance to this position, prompting a revitalization of the anthropology of property that has focused on the conditions under which culture becomes proprietary and properties become cultural. IP protects the intangible dimensions of significant forms through material means of enforcement in market economies. Symbolic or signifying media are inscribed in material forms that are publicly accessible, if not freely available, cultural goods around which capital interests, public affect, social identification, group identities, and material needs cathect (Coombe, 1998).

Early anthropological inquiry was preoccupied with liberal distinctions between public and private goods and concomitant distinctions between a commons and its commodification, emphasizing how IP restricted cultural expression, the flow of genetic resources, and access to necessary goods (e.g. Brown, 1998; Brush, 1998; Handler, 1991; Napier, 1994). Later work complicated these simple distinctions, and critically explored their history and political consequence in colonial and postcolonial contexts (Bowrey & Anderson, 2009; Sunder & Chander, 2004). The expansion of IP to new subject matter and new areas of the world along with proliferating forms and norms of heritage have revitalized anthropological interest in the interrelationships between property, personhood, and propriety (e.g. Brown, 2010; Comaroff & Comaroff, 2009; Coombe, 2009; Hirsch, 2010; Humphrey & Verderey, 2004; Meurer & Perry, 2003; Strathern, 2001; Strathern & Hirsch, 2004).

> Attempts to spread capitalist market relationships into new geographical, cultural, and informational fields inevitably encounter resistance because they intervene in existing social relations that shape the way these new commodity relations are interpreted, reconfigured or refused … The result is not uniformity but rather a proliferation of institutional, discursive, cultural and material "frontiers" in the power-laden crucible of making and remaking property relations. And in this remaking, universals are actively reshaped, taking particular hybrid forms . . . as the grip of the universal meets the ways of being, knowing and living in a particular place.
> (*Prudham & Coleman, 2011: 12*)

Indeed, property refers to a set of social relationships between people that allocate rights and responsibilities. Capitalist market economies continue to spread, but property is not and has never exclusively entailed absolute rights or monopolies of use. Rather, property is relational, specific, bounded, and limited. Identities are often attached to fields of obligation and entitlement, and the introduction of new forms of commodification often undermines such attachments. People may resist such disruptions by reviving and politicizing old patterns of economic relationship, informal rights and norms, and moral economies (expressed as "traditional" or "customary") in what Polanyi (1944) describes as the commodity's "double movement." This process may be intensified when formal property rights are extended to include TK, traditional cultural expressions (TCEs), or forms of intangible heritage designated

as especially important to group identity. These are significant sites for struggle, knowledge mobilization, and identity formation since they are "more than rights to assets: they are constitutive of the production of subjectivities – individual and collective – among rights holders" (Prudham & Coleman, 2011: 14). New forms of property emerge at the nexus of capitalist globalization and struggles for autonomy.

Legal anthropologists have long considered issues of property and personhood to be dialectically related (Meurer & Schwab, 2006; Napier, 2002; Strathern, 1999, 2001); the forms of subjectivity that IP imagines, constructs, and projects into social worlds have been a fruitful area of inquiry. The early anthropological study of IP turned to those whose creative activities were not historically covered by IP, did not conceive of their lifeworlds and livelihood resources within Western proprietary terms, encountered and appropriated forms of cultural governance alien to them, consciously resisted or refused these legal mandates, or learned to interpret IP "otherwise" (e.g. see overview in Coombe, 2018; Geismar, 2013). Anthropological preoccupations with the lack of propriety in using IP rights to "protect" the intangible cultural resources of others (e.g. Brush, 1998; Brush & Stabinsky, 1996; Dove, 1996) soon evolved into a broader inquiry into the ethics of cultural appropriation and cultural research in an era in which community relationships to knowledge were subjects of both IP and human rights deliberation (Coombe, 2009).

The extension of the commodity form to more intangible cultural goods was also resisted; social counter-movements emerged at the turn of the century to insist that IP should not be governed entirely by market-based economic considerations (Halbert, 2005). Developing country governments, other UN bodies, and NGOs put new pressure on the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) to forge IP norms and practices that fulfilled a wider range of human rights and development objectives more relevant to the communities whose collective creative work had been outside its purview. WIPO addressed the need to protect TK and ensure "access and benefit sharing" under the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD), while reaching out to "new beneficiaries" to consider their customary means of managing knowledge-based resources in complementary strategies of cultural governmentality. Most early WIPO efforts seemed dedicated to ensuring that CBD objectives were operationalized in contractual terms that privileged market-based exchanges between corporations, state institutions, and communities, but the organization also became more transnational, sending out regional "fact-finding missions" in 1999 to ascertain the needs and values of collective holders of TK assets. Founded in 2000, the Intergovernmental Committee on Intellectual Property, Genetic Resources, Traditional Knowledge and Traditional Cultural Expressions (IGC) began to actively engage communities as holders of IP in TK, as well as TCEs (formerly the domain of UNESCO under the rubric of folklore). WIPO's new programs served to build "capacity" or "empower" local communities, while creating new non-state markets for WIPO expertise. A new institutional logic of "governing from a distance" becomes apparent.

The IGC was accused of encouraging "tribal entrepreneurialism" amongst "premoderns" forced to assert rights to genetic resources and TK within "the framework of privatized and alienable assets" (Farhat, 2008: 216). Certainly the interpellation of collective entrepreneurial subjects is one aspect of IGC efforts, but it also acknowledges the specificity of sacred forms of knowledge, outlines non-proprietary means through which cultural rights may be protected, stresses the need for free, prior, and informed consent (FPIC) with respect to the use of indigenous TK and genetic resources in contested ancestral territories, advises against the freezing of dynamic traditions, and increasingly recognizes customary laws as potential *sui generis* regimes for protection to be made legible to external actors by way of new databases,

TK Labels, and digital libraries. In so doing, it acknowledges that issues of cultural property are imbricated in regulatory restructurings in which development, conservation, heritage concepts, and community identities are being mutually reconfigured. It also indexes the human rights context in which WIPO, as a UN organization, must legitimate its activities. Indigenous Peoples have long intervened in these deliberations, moreover, in attempts to make commodity considerations subservient to the realization of indigenous rights of self-determination.

Emerging fields of IP involving genetic resources, TK, and TCE have fostered the articulation of new forms of collective identity, conflict, and contestation. Many of the earliest anthropological studies addressed how these new policy objectives were implemented, adopting a simple social constructionism in which "communities" were shown to be the romanticized projections of outside groups, instrumentally forged for gain, impossible fictions, or vested with "invented" traditions by foreign NGOs which thereby created new forms of local inequality based on spurious cultural grounds (e.g. Li, 2000). Cory Hayden's (2003a, 2003b) work on Mexican bioprospecting and Shane Green's allegations about the "incorporation" of "the Aguaruna" people in the Peruvian Amazon by virtue of the recognition of their TK of local plant resources (Green, 2004) were widely cited examples. The latter narrative addressed shifting indigenous identities, the need to organize on ever-higher scales of legibility to negotiate with transnational actors, and the international alliances that resulted in the world's first indigenous "know-how agreement," providing shared benefits in the form of royalties from resulting patents. The process clearly necessitated new forms of community definition, incorporation, and deliberation, resulting in great hopes, dashed expectations, and ultimately, division and disillusionment. Critics read it as a great tragicomedy that, unsurprisingly, illustrated the constructed nature of cultural identity and the artefactuality of both tradition and community.

In later work Green (2009) provides a more empathetic reflection on the painful process of entrepreneurial ethnogenesis in the region that few of bioprospecting's early anthropological critics seem to consider. He investigated how Aguaruna leaders "customized" the indigenous and environmentalist subject positions offered to them through their rights-based political work in the region. Avoiding the simple readings of collective self-essentialism and corporate victimization to which his earlier work lent itself, he explored how new forms of inclusive citizenship and transnational solidarities were forged in these endeavors. Revitalizations of traditional institutions (such as the *ipaamamu*) helped leaders create greater economic and political security for regional groups in neoliberal governmental activities of biodiversity conservation through which they decided which market values to accept, how, and to what ends.

Many anthropologists rejected the new emphasis upon "tradition" and "community" in the areas and subject matter to which rights might extend to "new beneficiaries" (traditional agriculture and handicrafts, traditional environmental knowledge (TEK), traditional medicine, etc.) as constructed and reified, romanticized, and rhetorically exaggerated (Agrawal, 1995; Agrawal & Gibson, 1999; Gupta, 1998; Li, 2002). Others countered that critics' apolitical positioning failed to consider the aspirations of people dependent upon subsistence resources in the Global South and the transnational political economies and political ecologies in which they were inevitably immersed (Affif & Lowe, 2007; Briggs, 1996; Brosius, Tsing & Zerner, 1998, 2005; Tsing, 1999, 2003, 2005). Later work explored the processes and practices of translation by which "traditions" came to be articulated for modern science, commerce, and other fields of knowledge and power (de la Cadena, 2004; Dove, 2007; Fish, 2006; Gatmaytan, 2003; Nadasdy, 2005, 2007; Reddy, 2006; West, 2005) as people made their communities, identities, and assets legible to new authorities, new auditors, new investors, and new political allies.

Indigenous Peoples figure prominently in anthropological debates about the propriety of extending property rights on cultural grounds and anxieties about culturally possessive claims (e.g. Brown, 1998, 2003, 2005). They were historically compelled to assert rights claims on cultural grounds in international fora structured by the hegemony of modern nation state polities and liberal political principles. As non-state parties who did not understand themselves as minorities – and whose very claims were based on refusing the stigmatized status that made their assimilation a modern state priority – they could claim the protection of international human rights laws only through the cultural rights provisions of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (Cutler, 2011: 41). Although such protections historically applied only to individuals, indigenous leaders were allowed to submit early cases against state violations of obligations to protect minority cultural rights on behalf of larger collectives. Deprived of the capacity to assert self-determination in "national" terms, claims to autonomy were increasingly framed as rights to protect ways of life rooted in cultural attachments to territory (Gibbs, 2005). These were eventually recognized as the first human rights held by collectives.

New forms of collective cultural property are increasingly based on cultural rights principles, grounded in the larger field of human rights (Shaheed, 2011) which compel peoples to represent their traditions within liberal political frameworks – engendering diverse projects of traditional revitalization (Clifford, 2013; Hirtz, 2003). These projects must inevitably be locally interpreted; they must be rendered "in the vernacular" (Levett & Merry, 2009; Merry, 2009; Preis, 2009). The culture thereby discerned is thus never "traditional" in a primordial sense, but an articulation of how people interpret their histories and desired futures in contexts in which they encounter new values. As Anna Tsing recounts, people in Kalimantan had to engage with the concept of gender equity when they started considering themselves as indigenous or customary communities (2005). Similar patterns of articulation have been explored at the conjuncture of neoliberal government, liberal equality norms, and indigenous identifications in southern Mexico (Altamirano-Jimenez, 2013; Hernandez-Castillo, 2002; Speed, 2007; Speed, Hernandez-Castillo & Stephen, 2006; Speed et al., 2009).

The longstanding need to articulate indigenous rights within the prism of cultural rights may have been designed to depoliticize the former, but it has succeeded in politicizing the latter, particularly as the concept of heritage has been operationalized across UN organizations in a rights-based, rather than an exclusively proprietary framework. Indigenous Peoples and their rights, however, are not recognized exclusively by state legislatures or international Conventions, but in transnational networks that involve multilateral institutions, development banks, environmental and development NGOs, corporate social responsibility platforms, and new social movements (Coombe, Malik & Griebel, forthcoming). The anthropological and aesthetic understandings of culture that oriented international law (Holder, 2008) enabled some Indigenous Peoples to protect rights of access to ancestral lands and resources, but did not adequately accommodate issues of environmental sustainability, communal provisioning, or meaningful forms of governance significant to indigenous aspirations for autonomy (Corntassel, 2008). Indigenous Peoples' movements adopted the culturalized principle of "development with identity" to combine claims for the protection of land-based livelihoods with development projects congruent with local values (Tauli-Corpuz, 2008).

Environmental conservation and the "biocultural turn" in heritage management

Environmental politics increasingly provide the values, rhetorical vehicles, and practices through which cultural goods are identified and embraced. In rights-based conservation and

development practice, biological and cultural diversity have been so continuously interwoven over the past 25 years that the hybridized "biocultural diversity" is now a common noun and a new norm (Coombe, 2016). The biocultural turn in environmental and development policy discourses since the 1990s reflects a growth in concern with sustaining livelihood resources, respecting minority identities, and facilitating the participatory rights of local residents in conservation management – often in opposition to national interests in economic modernization or globally uniform models for nature conservation (Buergin, 2015: 2028).

Efforts to value, protect, or safeguard TK have taken place in diverse fora but their early evolution in a culturalized indigenous rights framework continues to be referenced in the rhetoric of UN bodies and new social movements alongside the political principles of free, prior, and informed consent (FPIC), and, increasingly, community protocols that prioritize indigenous self-determination. Even in regions where indigeneity is politically contested as a relevant form of identification, local communities are engaged as potential partners in protecting forests, mitigating climate change, and providing environmental services. Environmental NGOs consider such *in situ* approaches as superior to IP for "protecting" TK while securing sustainable livelihoods in more "resilient" cultural landscapes (Ruiz-Mallen & Corbera, 2013). Community-conserved area management principles, codes of conduct for research, culturally appropriate forms of biodiversity and knowledge documentation, criteria for environmental and cultural impact assessments, *sui generis* regimes drawing upon customary law, and women's capacity-building describe some emerging cultural proprieties.

When taking possession of such projects, many peoples assert not their rights, but their historical obligations to steward biocultural heritage. Natural Justice, for example, is an NGO that now evokes the "right to responsibility" as empowering communities to use TEK to maintain and develop resilient landscapes and sustainable livelihoods (Jonas & Jonas, 2013). The responsibilities that communities assert may be rather different than the responsibilizations that regulatory restructurings impose. Local socioecological actions, events, and identifications are not merely derivative of extra-local economic and political structurations (West, 2005: 233), but activities in which legal discourse, regulatory technologies, and rights norms are taken up in new political articulations that combine normative rhetorical resources from indigenous, environmental, conservation, heritage, and human rights regimes in culturalized management and enterprise (Pretty et al., 2009). Culturalized claims articulated in possessive relationships to traditions have long surpassed the early models provided by trade-related IP and bioprospecting contracts under neoliberal government and informational capital. Those simple proprietary models are often rejected in favor of more flexible assemblages or "regulatory toolkits" to achieve multiple objectives (Forsyth, 2013; Forsyth & Farran, 2015). People encounter concepts of IP, TEK, biodiversity, and heritage through global investments, development projects, new social movements, NGO attentions, environmental lawyers, and engaged anthropologists and thereby find new ways to position themselves in global policy articulations.

Latin America was host to some of the earliest biodiversity projects, particularly in "megabiodiverse" Colombia. In the early 1990s, grassroots preparation for negotiations of global environmental governance under the CBD coincided with constitutional recognition of the country's multiethnic character. Critical ethnographic studies (Asher, 2009; Asher & Ojeda, 2009; Escobar, 1998; 2008; Ulloa, 2005; Wilshusen, 2006) illustrate how early biodiversity government gave rise to place-based movements in Latin America popularizing rights-based rhetorical frames for expressing identities through cultural attachments to territories. These expressly rejected Western IP models that separated knowledge from nature and failed to recognize biodiversity as itself a vernacular technology (e.g. Hurtado, 1999).

Neoliberalization produces new socionatures at the conjuncture of policy landscapes, multiscalar regulatory restructuring, and local political dynamics. Markets and market proxies are used as tools for environmental governance, including biotechnological innovation, patent expansion, and certifications of origin in extended commodity chains (Coombe, 2016; Coombe, Ives & Huizenga, 2014). Anthropologists report possessive attachments to and heightened reflexivity about biocultural knowledge throughout Latin America, where rural peoples are familiar with biodiversity as a global asset, global valorizations of ethnobotanical knowledge, and corporate holdings of IP in bioengineered seeds derived from traditional landraces (Fitting, 2011; Rhoades, 2013). In both Amazonian and Andean regions the bio-diverse properties of ecosystems came to be understood locally as heritage goods in territories toward which new ethics of care and affective connection were expressed (Yates & Bakker, 2013) in movements which stressed alternative ontologies or traditional cosmologies as the grounds for new rights (de la Cadena, 2010; Tsing, 2009). From 2000 to 2005, Robert Rhoades directed an ethnographic research project in which anthropologists and other specialists worked with Quechua-speaking communities in the Cotacachi Canton, Ecuador, to understand their territories, agricultural practices, resources, and TK (Rhoades, 2006). In the process, Indigenous Peoples began to consider these as aspects of cultural heritage they should recover and repatriate. Other nearby biodiversity projects used ethnicity as a marketing tool to promote cultural tourism to ethnic gardens and eco-hostels. For Rhoades (2013), such projects were suspect – not, it seems, because they marketed cultural properties, but because they did not give priority to local needs, values, and interests.

There is a longer history and a transnational context in which these activities should be positioned. Neoliberal investments in indigenous social capital in the region go back to the early 1990s and World Bank financing of Prodepine in Ecuador (which deposited Bank funds directly to an institution run by indigenous organizations). Such attentions involved extensive practices of community-based governmentality – tenure regularization, cultural mappings of significant resources, identifications of traditional goods, and the marking of these as typical products – coupled with capacity building (training in ethnography, participatory planning, and project management). Such early "ethnodevelopment" projects were considered depoliticizing because they focused on cultural assets to be developed by entrepreneurial subjects and failed to address structural racism or acknowledge indigenous agency (Andolina, Radcliffe & Laurie, 2005). Such criticism gave way to a closer exploration of how communities adopted these subject positions to assert more concrete forms of autonomy (Andolina, Radcliffe & Laurie, 2009), which corresponded with the articulation of "development with identity" (Rhoades, 2006) as a substantive form of collective self-determination globally endorsed by the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues in 2010 (Sena, 2010).

Anthropologists are divided in their assessments of Latin American ethnic marketing and cultural rights assertions. Some consider these primarily as by-products of neoliberal govern-mentality under the generic term "neoliberal multiculturalism" (e.g. Colloredo-Mansfeld, 1998; De Hart, 2010; Hale, 2002, 2004; Wilson, 2008). Others claim that neoliberalism has been "interrupted" since the turn of the century (Goodale & Postero, 2013) via "post-multicultural" projects committed to decolonizing agendas, resulting in "postdevelopment" or even a nascent "postneoliberalism" (Escobar, 2010; Gustafson & Fabricant, 2011; Natera, 2013; Postero, 2007; Ramirez, 2011). Geographers Yates and Bakker (2013) view Latin American postneoliberalism as encompassing a diverse set of political projects that attempt to reorient the market economy towards social needs in a political ethics of local participation. This involves cultural self-determination at a variety of scales, often revitalizing "traditional" political norms and institutions, such as the *ayllu* in land reform, traditional models of

communal labor and provisioning in economics, pluricultural relationships in national constitutions, intercultural communication in citizenship, and new knowledge networks for community governance. Anthropologists working in Peru, Bolivia, Colombia, and Ecuador argue that the pluricultural imaginaries now projected in the region are creative articulations that do not wholly align with neoliberal cultural governmentalities (Erazo, 2010, 2013; Gustafson & Fabricant, 2011; Postero, 2007; Rappaport, 2005).

When, with transnational support and international funding, indigenous leaders in Latin America made the revitalization of cultural identity the centerpiece of development efforts in the 2000s, the loss of traditional crops and TEK become a rationale both for attracting investments and claiming territorial rights. Villagers in Cotacachi, Ecuador worked with anthropologists to document and preserve knowledge of plants, establish community seed farms and cultivate biodiversity gardens "symbolic of the recovery of our traditions" (Fueres, Flores & Ramos, 2013: 111) in weekly *mingas* (communal labor parties). Communities share their cosmovisions and socionatural lives in *Pachamama* ("Mother Earth," recently given national constitutional stature) through the Farm of the Ancestral Future and the new tourism certification "Runa Tupari" ("meet indigenous people" in Quechua). Anthropologist Virginia Nazarea found that there was no local linguistic term for "nature" or "conservation," but community members easily expressed affective attachments to plant genetic resources as cultural traditions. The relationships of equality and anti-paternalism that researchers wanted to forge with the community, the community considered as ethically relevant to their relationships with plants. Nurturing biodiversity assumed literal terms as an "expanding web of emotional attachment to the land, to rural places, mindful lifestyles, and wholesome food" (Nazarea, 2013: x).

In situ conservation techniques are increasingly understood by those seeking to steward them in the Andes as a form of cultural repatriation – from modern institutions such as genetic resource banks where these are treated as inert resources to living local landscapes where they will continue to reciprocally evolve with peoples and their traditional institutions (Graddy, 2013). "Development with identity" includes place-based techniques for agrobiodiversity conservation and Indigenous Peoples have incorporated these into their agendas for self-determination and food sovereignty, leveraging global environmental policy norms to protect, maintain, and encourage indigenous agricultural knowledge systems. Aymara scholar Tirso Gonzales (2013) argues that indigenous socionatures are founded on language, territory, spirituality, and worldview. If for some anthropologists this must be considered an "essentialist" claim based upon "romantic" notions, its proponents view it as based upon scientifically validated evidence of internationally affirmed correlations between language, distinctive worldviews, and biodiversity (a process summarized in Coombe, 2016).

Biodiversity and TEK now assemble universities, international agencies, NGOs, scientists, biotechnology researchers, and corporations in new social movements with indigenous, *campesino*, or other "local" communities. The latter have come to nominate their knowledge of plant properties as cultural heritage, grounds of identity, a rationale for territorial defense, and the justification for new autonomies. Stewardship of local biocultural diversity, therefore, might be considered a "not-quite-neoliberal" subject position (Anthias & Radcliffe, 2013) embraced as a space of opportunity and responsibility. Cultural diversity and community distinctions are expressed through biological diversity and practices for its care. Municipal food fairs feature the "food of our ancestors" and seed exchanges are ritually celebrated as means to increase socioecological resilience. In Bolivia, traditional landraces animate festive ritual exchanges between communities and their cultural preservation informs climate change justice movements, food security policy, agricultural education, and crop research priorities (Zimmerer, 2013).

Chris Shepherd's ethnographic study of community sustainability efforts in three regions of the Peruvian Andes (2010) shows how identifying and locating *in situ* biodiversity conservation measures put a new face on Andean culture. These activities made TEK more visible and indigenous communities more legible for investments in their development and their own participatory government. Coincident with the emergence of thousands of Latin American NGOs in the 1980s, a pro-Andean movement focused on the *campesino* and later the indigenous community as an autonomous expression and agent of Andean cultural revival. Coalitions of middle class urban dissenters, indigenous intellectuals, scientists, anthropologists, and local universities mobilized around bilingual education, health, and agriculture to integrate TK, indigenous technologies, and languages into more autonomous development projects. Thousands of Andean technologies were documented as forms of viable TK for conservation purposes.

In the 1990s, the movement became more overtly culturalized, linking agroecology to revitalized Andean cosmologies, to assert that Andean peoples held *in situ* practices and resources not only relevant, but crucial to the conservation of global biodiversity (Brush, 2000; Gonzales, 2000). These movements took advantage of CBD and WIPO policies in globally recognized hotspots of agrobiodiversity (in tubers, maize, and quinoa), and garnered the support of anthropologists, ethnobotanists, local NGOs, and development funding agencies. Alongside regional social movements, scientists and activists cultivated opportunities with and for resident *campesino* communities to revive and capitalize upon their own TK. Such *in situ* conservation programs revitalized pride in an Andean identity – long denigrated under modern agricultural paradigms as the economic, intellectual, and moral basis for rural poverty.

> However, this local knowledge-practice was not "just there." Actors framed it according to what many anthropologists would now recognize as "cultural essentialism" – that is to specify and restrict the qualities, knowledges, and practices that are claimed to belong to a particular "culture." This essentialism was not wrong. Rather it was selective. The particular modus of "cultural selection" was, however, consistent with the conditions for the success of agrobiodiversity as it was still cultivated by many campesinos in the fields. The principal marker of cultural authenticity was, for these actors, ritualized agrocentric life, the existence of particular forms of community organization (based on traditional authorities), and innumerable farming practices that were construed as revolving around and nurturing the chacra and its all-animate contents. . . .
>
> *(Shepherd, 2010: 634–635).*

Many *campesinos* were ambivalent and had to be convinced to revive long neglected social relations based on the *ayllu*, the collective spirit of communal work, ritualized seed exchange and systems of traditional authority. Few abandoned modern forms of agriculture entirely. Andean social movement actors worked to instill solidarity with an Andean regional cultural identity, while situating these practices within cosmologies that expressed ideal human and nonhuman relations and ultimately, they learned to argue, made a larger contribution to a global humanity that needed Andean agrobiodiversity to redress the problems facing modern forms of agriculture.

In areas where the Green Revolution had made few inroads, villages long characterized as sites of abject poverty were now privileged sites for investment. This was precisely because crop diversity and TK was more recently integral to community survival. Some elderly

residents, working precariously in seasonal wage employment, still remembered the hundreds of native varieties of potato, corn, and other crops that grew in the *chacras* where they received their primary education. Many of them were willing to fuse these old memories with new project goals when *in situ* projects were operationalized after 2000. In some areas, over seven years, "agrobiodiversity had increased tenfold in potato, sixfold in maize, and substantially in the other seven crops that the project targeted" (Shepherd, 2010: 638). Such biodiversity cultivation efforts were also harnessed in community park management, tourist services, and product development, providing new sources of employment for Andean peoples (Coombe & Griebel, 2014; Coombe & Weiss, 2015).

Proponents of these activities describe them as an "agroecological revolution" actively blending advances in agroecological science with indigenous knowledge systems to enhance food security, conserve natural resources, empower peasant organizations, and bring new benefits to small farmers (e.g. Altieri & Toledo, 2011). They do so through energy-efficient, biodiverse, resilient, and sustainable agricultural systems in a transition away from fossil fuel and monocultural, chemically based, export-oriented production. Agroecology is now incorporated into the vision of *La Via Campesina*, a transnational agrarian movement that works in synergy with organized Indigenous Peoples.

It is beyond the scope of this chapter to survey the numerous scientific arguments offered in favor of such approaches to global conservation, food sovereignty, and rural security in the face of climate change and acknowledgments of the anthropocene. Nor do I have the capacity to evaluate claims that "traditional agroecosystems have the potential to bring solutions to many uncertainties facing humanity in a peak oil era of global climate change and financial crisis" (Altieri & Toledo, 2011: 591). I would, however, caution against seeing such efforts in purely local terms. Such agroecological movements forge relationships of reciprocity and communication between farming communities across transnationally linked social movements, in which TK and TK innovations scale up for widespread distribution and adaptation to new contexts – even when they are grounded in traditional cosmovisions. It is probably stretching the concept too far to regard these as cultural properties. Nonetheless, other autonomies and ontologies articulated in culturally possessive terms are clearly emergent in such practices and ideals.

Like proponents of Andean culture, Amazonian indigenous movements have more successfully projected conceptions of territory, TK, and biodiversity within a broader cultural rights framework (Vadjunec, Schmink & Greiner, 2011). Ancestral histories are woven into forests which are sources for traditional medicines and their integration into health care systems, protection of TK attracts support for bilingual education, and management of archaeological sites may provide sustainable employment positions from which to steward cultural landscapes (Caruso, 2014; Cepek, 2011a, 2011b, 2012; Hutchins & Wilson, 2010). Here too, community-based cultural enterprises that might have originated in neoliberal governmentalities have been adopted, adapted, or appropriated for other ends.

Since the early 1990s, community-based cultural development projects initiated by international and Quito-based NGOs in Napo Province, Ecuador, have enabled indigenous leaders to shape people into a new and distinctive citizenry (Erazo 2010: 1032). Although international NGOs sought to provide new forms of income generation less environmentally destructive than cattle ranching or the cultivation of local cash crops, Kichwa leaders have encouraged these local cultural industries (e.g. agricultural cooperatives, ecocultural tourism, and traditional ceramics) as collective projects to assert traditional indigenous cosmologies and emergent political identities.

People in this region historically lived in extended networks of biological and ritual kin-groups rather than in bounded communities, but their leaders reinterpreted their histories to

make new futures possible. Communities, anthropologist Julia Erazo argues, were forms of social organization strategically structured in the latter half of the twentieth century to defend lands, resources and ways of life from colonial aggression; they have become the social basis for indigenous national participation. Communal market-based enterprises do not have a history of sustained viability, but indigenous optimism about them may not be primarily focused on profit. Ethnographically observing such projects in the Ecuadorian Amazon over fifteen years, Erazo became convinced that such cultural industries served political rather than economic objectives. Even in the absence of NGO support, leaders continued to promote these collective activities because they shaped indigenous citizens, "actively engaged with the larger community rather than simply their patrilineal kinship groups" (Erazo, 2010: 1020), providing the social empowerment necessary for long-term land use planning and livelihood strategies.

Greater autonomy for ethnic minorities in Latin America is a political project of government in which peoples actively constitute themselves as culturally distinct groups that express "not an unchanging cultural essence, but a utopian project rooted in their reflections on indigenous culture" (Erazo, 2010: 1022) which are transmitted to other Indigenous People recognized as having their own cultural properties in new forms of pluricultural citizenship (for example, Erazo, 2013; Escobar, 2008; Gow, 2008; Osco, 2010; Natera, 2013; Rappaport, 2005; Shepherd, 2015; Walsh, 2010; Yates, 2014). Indigenous rights organizations have become indigenous governing organizations that inculcate greater public engagement. From obtaining bilingual secondary schools to campaigns against oil drilling, co-operatives, peasants' unions, and collectives of various kinds have used community cultural enterprise to achieve political objectives. Cultural governmentality, in short, takes place on diverse scales, by diverse agents, for diverse ends.

Protecting possessive attachments: Legal pluralism and new ontologies of property

Meaningful challenges to neoliberalism are emerging in a fashion that rhetorically combines resources from cultural, environmental, and collective rights traditions to "agitate for fundamental ruptures with the symbolic organization of colonial modernity" (Goodale & Postero, 2013; Natera, 2013: 254). For those who consider the modern predominantly to be a colonial power matrix, the category of the "cultural" as it is evolving in rights-based discourses (Appadurai, 2013; Rajagopal, 2003) offers affordances other than those provided by neoliberal governmentalities under conditions of informational capitalism. Cosmologies increasingly ground and shape rights claims (for example, Osco, 2010; Tsing, 2009). Certainly, the "modern constitution" (Latour, 1993, 2004) – in which culture was conceived either as national state patrimony or a limited basis for state recognition of minorities – has been fundamentally disrupted by others seeking to stake alternative claims and responsibilities, overcome colonial forms of dispossession, and aspire to "amodern" futures.

Divisions between natural and cultural properties are breaking down in numerous policy domains. Postcolonial or postdevelopment perspectives emphasize the way that this nature/culture dualism is received and opposed by marginalized groups who reject the dominance of this dualism in Western ontologies in the service of decolonization. As an "epistemological device" it dates back only to the last third of the nineteenth century in Europe (Descola, 2013). Although it may have no exact counterparts in other social traditions, there are now specialized fields of archaeology, heritage practice, biology, and ecology with bodies or experts dedicated to conservation in one domain or the other, holding global influence:

> We can see that culture–nature dualism need not have been "natural" to the Global South in order for it to have powerfully framed modern environmental policy and programs there, any more than the classic "authorized" heritage discourse needed to have roots in the cultures of the South in order to embed itself in modern heritage systems and to take on an aura of naturalness there.
>
> *(Byrne & Ween, 2015: 96).*

Scholars and activists increasingly reject this basis for dividing conservation and safeguarding activities, with Indigenous Peoples particularly insisting that their own ontologies are better suited for local governance of meaningful places and landscapes. Science and technology scholars assert that "[t]raditional societies do not live in harmony with nature; they are unacquainted with it" (Latour, 2004: 232). Agrarian groups may inhabit terrain in which ancient agricultural infrastructure, for example, is so intrinsic to the landscape that the "nature" they recognize is inextricably cultural. Anthropologists have long recognized indigenous socionatures, in which the kinship between human and other species creates social worlds of mutual responsibility. As Byrne and Ween remind us, heritage practice is evolving, particularly in Australia and Southeast Asia (e.g. Brockwell, O'Connor & Byrne, 2013), to incorporate such ontologies in heritage management practice; often "precolonial archaeological sites and artifacts can become 'catalysts' for the reproduction in contemporary indigenous society of the knowledge systems they represent" (Byrne & Ween, 2015: 97).

Recognition of the Western bias in the World Heritage Convention has prompted a revisiting of the ways in which the culture/nature divide tended to replicate a division between the West and the rest, or Europe and its others, with respect to the selection of cultural and natural sites. Since the early 1990s, a greater acknowledgment of how humans have shaped so-called natural environments and Indigenous Peoples' dynamic living relationships with World Heritage landscapes has impelled new hybrid categories, such as cultural landscapes, for nominations (Lennon, 2012; Rössler, 2012, 2006), resulting in a slow movement towards establishing indigenous co-management of protected areas in regions of the world where Indigenous Peoples and their rights are recognized.

Critics suggest that the ways in which "management" has been historically understood in such contexts tends to depoliticize relationships of inequality (Nadasdy, 2005) and continues to disadvantage Indigenous Peoples who are constrained by systems incompatible with their knowledge practices and custodial obligations (Baird, 2012). Even where TK is supposed to guide management decisions, local engagement may be largely encouraged only with respect to activities such as providing tourist goods and visitor education, rather than made integral to natural resource management (Ween & Columbi, 2013). If this is the case in countries where indigenous rights *are* recognized, most states have little interest in recognizing Indigenous Peoples as such – let alone their custodial rights with respect to heritage sites – and international rights norms are still largely unrecognized in most levels of state civil service and bureaucratic practice.

International recognition of the role of local communities, however, is evident in new practices such as collaborative management of protected areas (CMCPs), and new territories called indigenous community conserved areas (ICCAs). Thousands of globally protected areas are home to peoples dispossessed of livelihood resources under modern conservation paradigms which are now understood to violate human rights (Kothari, 2008). These areas may well evolve into relatively autonomous zones in which indigenous cultural norms have stature (Kothari, Camille & Brown, 2013). Indeed, they are key frontiers for articulating customary or "living law" (Stevens, 2014; Tobin, 2014), claiming indigenous identities,

valuing TK, and asserting heritage rights. The International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN), which has responsibilities for UNESCO World Heritage sites, recently adopted biocultural diversity as a policy principle with concomitant commitments to indigenous rights, FPIC, and community governance (Hill et al., 2011; Oviedo & Puschkarsky, 2012). This will inevitably raise issues of how to respect customary law (IUCN & CEESP, 2010) and the prospect of new fields of legal pluralism in cultural landscape governance. The IUCN, like other UN bodies, functions in a global policy arena where "cultural heritage" includes biocultural resources as well as *in situ* protections for TK (Shaheed, 2011: 9), and human rights norms oblige social actors to obtain community FPIC before engaging in development activities that put community cultural resources at risk.

Even if we are skeptical about the capacities of rights-oriented organizations to impose their ideals on states and corporations, we must acknowledge that there are significant incentives for peoples to represent and recognize themselves as culturally constituted collectives when their lands and livelihoods are at stake. We should indeed be ambivalent, if not outraged, when the cultural rights claims of communities provide the primary political leverage for ethnically distinct marginalized peoples facing displacement, dispossession, food insecurity, and loss of subsistence resources. Hundreds of thousands of peasants in Southeast Asia practicing what has historically been called "swidden" or more pejoratively, "slash and burn" agriculture experience their traditional way of life disappearing in the face of state-supported investments in rubber and palm oil plantations that promise to turn them into a landless precariat without social security (Coombe & Malik, 2017; Li, 2014). Declarations that shifting agriculture is the cultural heritage of Southeast Asia's Indigenous Peoples, essential to the preservation of global biodiversity, and the source of valuable local knowledge and innovation for engaging climate change seem obvious, trite, and despairing; they express grossly limited but still absolutely necessary points of leverage in struggles we seem to have lost other vocabularies to wager.

Still, critical heritage scholars are cautiously optimistic that the hegemonic global extension of Western ontological dualisms in heritage and nature conservation is waning:

> in the early twenty-first century we witness a counter-trend, manifest in a plurality of heritage practices and a plurality of "heritages" (i.e. alternative conceptions of heritage), which accompanies the growing assertiveness of countries in Asia, Latin America, and Africa, and of indigenous peoples globally . . . working within and against the global machinery of World Heritage to create new models of environmental management framed in terms of a pluriverse, acknowledging the co-existence of multiple lifeworlds and different, co-existing, attributions of subjectivity and agency.
> *(Byrne & Ween, 2015: 106)*

Such pluralities emerge partly from a decline in the power of Western global models and ontologies, but also by virtue of "the reworking of conservation ideas and practices that indigenous and Southern societies have taken from the North," interpreting and adapting these for new ends. Revisiting Nadasdy's thesis of indigenous dispossession in a recent study of Ashaninka community co-management of ancestral territories as protected areas in Amazonian Peru, Emily Caruso concluded that such projects were neither inherently "empowering nor disempowering, but the fruit of constant negotiations" (2011: 610), in which new autonomies might emerge in assertions of agency based on indigenous ontologies.

The management of cultural properties in authorized zones of autonomy guarantees neither emancipation nor sustainability. By this point it should be apparent that the concept of autonomy is itself paradoxical under conditions of neoliberal governmentality; it does not

function normatively in any self-evident way in programs for the management of cultural property. The "right" to autonomously manage goods significant to a community's cultural identity is one that is simultaneously advanced as a strategy of neoliberal government and as a rubric for political self-determination. Determining when this is a matter of political subjugation and when it is a tactic of collective subject formation requires ethnographic study attentive to regimes of power, negotiation, and interlocution at multiple scales where issues of recognition and redistribution demand scrutiny. Assertions of cultural properties lend themselves to diverse projects of "empowerment".

If norms of community autonomy are sometimes linked to new agencies of self-determination, being recognized as responsible for safeguarding cultural resources may also invest communities in "economies of abandonment" (Povinelli, 2011). The mapping of community cultural resources in twenty-first-century Japan, for example, enrolls residents in participatory projects of cataloguing significant local attributes (Love, 2013). This governmental project "activates" rural residents in "treasure hunts" in which they come to see the areas in which they live as places rich in unique goods. Designed to spur local sustainability in the face of economic decline, these projects of community mapping emphasize "self-propelled" stewardship as residents are collectively motivated to preserve territories holding resources of cultural value. "Treasure hunts" are responses to processes of neoliberal decentralization in recessionary Japan and the withdrawal of tax subsidies from a depopulating countryside. This devolution of responsibility "organizes rural inhabitants to participate in acts of self-recognition – to generate a distinctive and reaffirming notion of their collective identity" (Love, 2013: 114) based in the localities they steward. Experts tutor them in locating and inscribing things "important to an area's way of life" (116), encouraging residents to take up enterprises such as renewed marketing of rural heritage foods and revival of ancestral industries through which community competition will "diminish needs for central government supports" (120).

In neoliberal governmental conditions – in which powers are decentralized and devolved and entrepreneurial and independent cultural communities are promoted by state and international agencies – territorial autonomy may no longer serve as the horizon for transformative politics (Hale, 2011: 204). If some indigenous communities have been targeted for ethno-developmental investment, others find that territorial recognition and autonomy is a state mapping of and for enclosure and economic neglect. Securing territory may provide a resource base, limited rights, but extensive responsibilities, new procedures, endless meetings and modest employment prospects, but few means "to challenge either the market-based disciplines of the global economy or persisting state authority as the ultimate arbiter of communities' political affairs" (205). Hale's work with communities engaged in participatory mapping suggested the need to shift emphasis from devolutions of authority to self-sustaining forms of production. Such forms of autonomy, moreover, appear to be most successful under conditions where communities are transnationally linked to others and to transnational social movements, as our considerations of Andean and Amazonian community cultural heritage projects made apparent.

Eric Hirsch (2016) offers a recent instance of heritage project work in the Colca Valley in Peru, where communities are allegedly subject to competitive projects of "development with identity" implemented by international agencies invested in a revalorization of indigeneity vested in intangible cultural goods. Sierra Sur is a project co-financed by the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). According to Hirsch, its mission statement insists "that development is no longer about imposing improvements and offering handouts, but now entails 'facilitating' growth for Andean 'citizens, agents of their own development through competitively awarded investments'" (103) in indigenous human capital. As one

coordinator of the project explained, development is not an imposition, but merely incentivizes "the freedom to seek these traditions." To receive assistance (one of the few forms of welfare locally available) it is "imperative to identify with and display a recognizable Colcan indigeneity" (104). As Hirsch describes them, such competitions designate the most worthy indigenous entrepreneurs in pedagogical practices through which local communities are encouraged to valorize "what they have" (104) by marketing products to augment rural incomes. Such projects "place the burdens of development on its participants" through territorial investments in "sustainable land use and recuperated indigenous practice" (105). Hirsch sees such activities as externally initiated forms of neoliberal cultural governmentality that actively construct indigenous subjects who internalize these valorizations to their detriment.

In the absence of any understanding of the global policy contexts framing these projects or the rights norms which inform international organizations like IFAD, without consideration of the historical agencies, social movements, and aspirations of Andean Indigenous Peoples, any acknowledgment of how regional agroecology movements have attracted investments into the region, or the political projects of decolonization through which "development with identity" is locally configured, it is all too easy to dismiss such enterprises and presume that neoliberal cultural governmentality instills autonomy only as a recipe for social abandonment. Such limited inquiries rule out of order the exploration of if and how international development projects are customized for local exigencies and/or respond to community objectives as expressed in local participatory deliberations. The political economies and political ecologies in which cultural properties become legible for investment, intervention, and insurgency however, are too complex to justify such simplistic local analyses. Neoliberal cultural governmentalities figure at the nexus of social change in topographies of emergent political articulation and agency that must be explored as complex, multiscalar assemblages.

Conclusion

Globalization, informational capitalism, and neoliberal governmentalities position anthropologists within increasingly distributed and dispersed legal and policy frameworks and institutional circuits of power, knowledge, and normative discourse, in which the sites and stakes of cultural claims have proliferated and expanded. In international rights norms, cultural heritage rights are now tied to membership in specific communities rather than to national citizenship (Shaheed, 2011). International NGOs assert heritage protections once limited to globally recognized Indigenous Peoples to forest-dwelling, pastoralist, and other "communities" whose livelihood resources are at risk (Coombe, Malik & Griebel, forthcoming, 2018). Domestic courts extend principles of aboriginal rights based on cultural attachments to communal properties to rural minorities more generally (Huizenga, n.d.). Regional development banks and transnational environmental organizations are increasingly proactive in naming, blaming, and shaming states and corporate actors whose activities and development projects affect livelihood resources of rural peoples represented as communities holding rights premised upon collectively held cultural heritage.

Culturalized identities, indigenous resurgence, and new attachments to cultural properties are not merely derivative by-products of neoliberal governmentality and informational capital, but tenuous accomplishments of political articulation under new conditions of globalizing power, diverse market measures, and new forms of governmentality in which disciplines are imposed and responsibilities asserted and distinctive fields for political articulation are afforded. If the vocabularies of political indigeneity now extend to embrace a greater range of the

world's most marginalized peoples (Coombe, Malik & Griebel, 2017), this may be because they enable traditions to serve as dynamic resources for imagining alternative futures. As James Clifford puts it, if neoliberalism opens possibilities for culturally based movements, channeling diversity in particular ways, the politics of the possible is not thereby exhausted: "spaces opened from above are also being [re]created from below" (2013: 39). The regulatory fields of power, knowledge, and recognition in which contingent assemblages of identity are forged are charged with contradictions, shaped by diverse rhetorical frames, and governed through technologies which offer their own affordances. Numerous transnational regimes animate and provide incentives for cultural collectivities to assemble, multiplying their needs, resources, and capacities to assert themselves as political subjects of various kinds. Mapping this shifting terrain and the ethical and epistemological questions it poses will be a major challenge facing scholars exploring cultural properties in (not quite) neoliberal futures.

Acknowledgments

Bibliography

Affif, S. & Lowe, C. (2007). Claiming indigenous community: Political discourse and natural resource rights in Indonesia. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 32 (1), 73–97.

Agrawal, A. (1995). Dismantling the divide between indigenous and scientific knowledge. *Development and Change* 26 (3), 413–439.

Agrawal, A. & Gibson, C. (1999). Enchantment and disenchantment: The role of community in natural resource conservation. *Word Development* 27 (4), 629–649.

Albert, M. T., Richon, M., Vinals, N. & Witcomb, A. (Eds.). (2012). *Community Development through World Heritage*. Valencia: UNESCO.

Altamirano-Jimenez, I. (2013). *Indigenous Encounters with Neoliberalism: Place, Women and the Environment in Canada and Mexico*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Altieri, M. A. & Toledo, M. (2011). The agroecological revolution in Latin America: Rescuing nature, ensuring food sovereignty and empowering peasants. *Journal of Peasant Studies* 38 (3), 587–612.

Anderson, G. (2012). Beyond "constitutionalism beyond the state," *Journal of Law and Society* 39 (3), 359–383.

Andolina, R., Laurie, N. & Radcliffe, S. (2005). Ethnodevelopment: Social movements, creating experts and professionalising indigenous knowledge in Ecuador. *Antipode* 37 (3), 470–496.

Andolina, R., Laurie, N. & Radcliffe, S. (2009). *Indigenous Development in the Andes: Culture, Power, and Transnationalism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Anthias, P. & Radcliffe, S. (2013). The ethno-environmental fix and its limits: Indigenous land titling and the production of not-quite-neoliberal natures in Bolivia. *Geoforum* 64, doi:10.1016/j.geoforum.2013.06.007.

Appadurai, A. (2013). *The Future as Cultural Fact: Essays on the Global Condition*. London: Verso.

Asher, K. (2009). *Black and Green: Afro-Colombians, Development, and Nature in the Pacific Lowlands*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Asher, K., & Ojeda, D. (2009). Producing nature and making the state: Ordenamiento territorial in the Pacific lowlands of Colombia. *Geoforum* 40, 292–302.

Baird, M. (2012). The breath of the mountain is my heart: Indigenous cultural landscapes and the politics of heritage. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 19 (4), 327–340.

Bakker, K. (2010). The limits of "neoliberal natures": Debating green neoliberalism. *Progress in Human Geography* 34 (6), 715–735.

Bendix, R. (2009). Heritage between economy and politics: An assessment from the perspective of cultural anthropology. In L. Smith & N. Akagawa (Eds.), *Intangible Heritage* (253–269). London: Routledge.

Bennett, T. (1998). *Culture: A Reformer's Science*. London: Sage.

Bennett, T. (2000). Acting on the social: Art, culture and government. *American Behavioral Scientist* 43 (9), 1412–1428.

Blake, J. (2009). UNESCO's 2003 Convention on Intangible Cultural Heritage: The implications of community involvement in "safeguarding." In L. Smith & N. Akagawa (Eds.), *Intangible Heritage* (45–73). New York: Routledge.

Blake, J. (2014). Seven years of implementing UNESCO's intangible heritage convention: Honeymoon period or the "seven-year itch?" *International Journal of Cultural Property* 21, 291–304.

Bowrey, K. & Anderson, J. (2009). The politics of global information sharing: Whose agendas are being advanced? *Social and Legal Studies* 18 (4), 479–504.

Braithwaite, J. (2008). *Regulatory Capitalism: How it Works, Ideas for Making it Work Better*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Brenner, N., Peck, J. & Theodore, N. (2010). Variegated neoliberalization: Geographies, modalities, pathways. *Global Networks* 10 (2), 182–222.

Briggs, C. L. (1996). The politics of discursive authority in research on the "invention of tradition." *Cultural Anthropology* 11 (4), 435–446.

Brockwell, S., O'Connor, S. & Byrne, D. (Eds.). (2013). *Transcending the Culture–Nature Divide in Cultural Heritage: Views from the Asia-Pacific Region*. Terra Australia 36. Canberra: ANU E-Press.

Brosius, P., Tsing, A. & Zerner, C. (1998). Representing communities: History and politics of community-based natural resource management. *Society and Natural Resources* 11 (2), 157–168.

Brosius, P., Tsing, A. & Zerner, C. (Eds.). (2005). *Communities and Conservation: Histories and Politics of Community-Based Natural Resource Management*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Brown, M. (1998). Can culture be copyrighted? *Current Anthropology* 39 (2), 193–222. [The article is followed by comments from several other anthropologists.]

Brown, M. (2003). Cultures and copyrights. In M. Brown (Ed.), *Who Owns Native Culture?* (43–68). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Brown, M. (2005). Heritage trouble: Recent work on the protection of intangible cultural property. *International Journal of Cultural Property* 12 (1), 40–61.

Brown, Michael F. (2010). Culture, property, and peoplehood: A comment on Carpenter, Katyal, and Riley's "In Defense of Property." *International Journal of Cultural Property* 17, 569–579.

Brumann, C. (2015). Community as Myth and Reality in the UNESCO World Heritage Convention. In N. Adell, R. F. Bendix, C. Bortolotto & M. Tauschek (Eds.), *Between Imagined Communities and Communities of Practice: Participation, Territory and the Making of Heritage* (273–290). Göttingen: Göttingen University Press.

Brush, S. (1999). Bioprospecting the public domain. *Cultural Anthropology* 14 (4), 535–555.

Brush, S. (2000). The issues of in situ conservation of crop genetic resources. In S. B. Brush (Ed.), *Genes in the Field: On-farm Conservation of Crop Diversity* (3–26). Rome: International Plant Genetic Resources Institute.

Brush, S. B. & Stabinsky, D. (Eds.). (1996). *Valuing Local Knowledge: Indigenous People and Intellectual Property Rights*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Buergin, R. (2015). Contested rights of local communities and indigenous peoples in the context of the biocultural turn in environmental and development discourses. *Modern Asian Studies* 49, 2022–2062.

Byrne, D. & Ween, G. B. (2015). Bridging cultural and natural heritage. In Lynn Meskell (Ed.), *Global Heritage: A Reader* (94–111). New York: Wiley-Blackwell.

Caruso, E. (2011). Co-management redux: Anti-politics and transformation in the Ashaninka Communal Reserve, Peru. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 17 (6), 608–628.

Caruso, E. (2014). State governmentality or indigenous sovereignty? Protected area comanagement in the Ashaninka Communal Reserve in Peru. In S. Stevens (Ed.), *Indigenous Peoples, National Parks, and Protected Areas: A New Paradigm Linking Conservation, Culture and Rights* (150–171). Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Cepek, M. (2011a). Expression, instrument and obstacle: The social life of Indigenous rights discourse in Cofan political practice. Montreal: Paper presented at the annual meeting for the American Anthropological Association.

Cepek, M. (2011b). Foucault in the forest: Questioning environmentality in Amazonia. *American Ethnologist* 38 (3), 501–515.

Cepek, M. (2012). *A Future for Amazonia: Randy Borman and Cofán Environmental Politics*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Clarke, John. (2008). Living with/in and without neoliberalism. *Focaal—European Journal of Anthropology* 51, 135–147.

Clifford, J. (2013). *Returns: Becoming Indigenous in the Twenty-First Century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Coffey, M. K. (2003). From nation to community: Museums and the reconfiguration of Mexican society under neoliberalism. In J. Bratich, J. Packer, & C. Macarthy (Eds.), *Foucault, Cultural Studies and Governmentality* (207–242). Albany: SUNY Press.

Collier, S. J. (2006) Global assemblages. *Theory, Culture and Society* 23 (2–3), 399–401.

Collier, S. J. (2012). Neoliberalism as big leviathan, or … ? A response to Wacquant and Hilgiers. *Social Anthropology* 20 (2), 186–195.

Colloredo-Mansfeld, R. (1998). Dirty Indians, radical Indigenas, and the political economy of social difference in modern Ecuador. *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 17 (2), 185–205.

Comaroff, J. (2011). The end of neoliberalism? What is left of the Left. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 637 (1), 141–147.

Comaroff, J. L. & Comaroff, J. (2009). *Ethnicity, Inc*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Coombe, R. J. (1998). *The Cultural Life of Intellectual Properties: Authorship, Alterity and the Law*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Coombe, R. J. (2005). Protecting traditional environmental knowledge and new social movements in the Americas: Intellectual property, human right or claims to an alternative form of sustainable development? *Florida Journal of International Law* 17 (1), 115–136.

Coombe, R. J. (2009). The expanding purview of cultural properties and their politics. *Annual Review of Law and Social Sciences* 5, 393–412.

Coombe, R. J. (2011a). Possessing culture: Political economies of community subjects and their properties. In M. Busse & V. Strang (Eds.), *Ownership and Appropriation* (105–127). London: Berg Publishers.

Coombe, R. J. (2011b). Cultural agencies: "Constructing" community subjects and their rights. In M. Biagioli, P. Jaszi & M. Woodmansee (Eds.), *Making and Unmaking Intellectual Property* (79–98). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Coombe, R. J. (2012). Managing cultural heritage as neoliberal governmentality. In R. Bendix, A. Eggert, A. Peselmann & S. Mißling (Eds.), *Heritage Regimes and the State* (375–389). Göttingen: Göttingen University Press.

Coombe, R. J. (2016). The knowledge economy and its cultures: Neoliberalism and Latin American reterritorializations. *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 6 (3), 247–275.

Coombe, R. J. (forthcoming, 2018). Intellectual property. In C. Greenhouse (Ed.), *The Anthropology of Politics, Law and Power*. A volume in H. Callon (Ed.), *International Encyclopedia of Anthropology*, 12 volumes. London: Wiley Blackwell.

Coombe, R. J. & Griebel, M. (2014). An amodern territory: Working potatoes and properties in an era of informational capital. Paper presented at the Alternative Property Practices Symposium, International Institute for the Sociology of Law, Onati, Spain, April 4. Available at: http://rcoombe.blog.yorku.ca/presentation/an-amodern-territory-working-potatoes-and-properties-in-an-era-of-informational-capital/.

Coombe, R. J., Ives, S. & Huizenga, D. (2014). Geographical indications: the promise, perils and politics of protecting place-based products. In M. David & D. Halbert (Eds.), *Sage Handbook on Intellectual Property* (207–223). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Coombe, R. J. & Malik, S. A. (2017). Rethinking the work of geographical indications in Asia: Addressing hidden geographies of race and gendered labour. In I. Calboli & N. L. W. Loon (Eds.), *Geographic Indications at the Crossroads of Trade and Development in Asia* (87–121). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Coombe, R. J., Malik, S. A. & Griebel, M. (forthcoming, 2018). Culturalised properties in neoliberal futures: Frontiers of dispossession and indigenous assertion. In C. Antons & W. Logan (Eds.), *Intellectual Property, Cultural Property and Intangible Cultural Heritage*. London: Routledge.

Coombe, R. J. & Turcotte, J. F. (2012). Cultural, political, and social implications of intellectual property laws in an informational economy. In UNESCO-EOLSS Joint Committee (Eds.), Culture, Civilization and Human Society, in *Encyclopedia of Life Support Systems (EOLSS)*, Oxford, UK.

Coombe, R. J. & Turcotte, J. F. (2015). Indigenous cultural heritage in development and trade: Perspectives from the dynamics of cultural heritage law and policy. In A. Connolly (Ed.), *Cultural Heritage Rights: A Reader* (275–310). Dartmouth, UK: Ashgate Publishing.

Coombe, R. J. & Weiss, L. (2015). Neoliberalism, heritage regimes and cultural rights: Politics in assemblage. In Lynn Meskell (Ed.), *Global Heritage: A Reader* (42–68). New York: Wiley-Blackwell.

Corntassel, J. (2008). Toward sustainable self-determination: Rethinking the contemporary indigenous-rights discourse. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 33 (1), 105–132.

Creed, G. W. (2006). The seductions of community: Reconsidering community. In G. W. Creed (Ed.), *The Seductions of Community: Emancipations, Oppressions, Quandaries* (1–20). Santa Fe, NM: SAR Press.

Cutler, A. C. (2011). The globalization of international law, indigenous identity, and the new constitutionalism. In W. Coleman (Ed.), *Property, Territory, Globalization* (29–45). Vancouver: UBC Press.

Cutler, A. C. & Gill, S. (Eds.). (2015). *New Constitutionalism and World Order*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

De Cesari, C. (2012). Thinking through heritage regimes. In R. Bendix, A. Eggert & A. Peselman (Eds.), *Heritage Regimes and the State* (399–413). Göttingen: Göttingen University Press.

De Hart, M. C. (2010). *Ethnic Entrepreneurs: Identity and Development Politics in Latin America*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

De la Cadena, M. (2004). Commentary on "Agricultural hybridity and the 'pathology' of traditional ways …": the challenges of translation analysis for the ethnography of "development." *Journal of Latin American Anthropology* 9 (2), 278–283.

De la Cadena, M. (2010). Indigenous cosmopolitics in the Andes: Conceptual reflections beyond "politics." *Cultural Anthropology* 25 (2), 334–370.

Descola, P. (2013). *Beyond Nature and Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Di Giovane, M. (2015). The ethics of participation, community formation and governmentality in Unesco's World Heritage Program. In N. Adell, R. Bendix, C. Bortolotto & M. Tauschek (Eds.), *Between Imagined Communities and Communities of Practice: Participation, Territory and the Making of Heritage* (83–110). Göttingen: Göttingen University Press.

Disko, S. (2012). World heritage sites and indigenous communities: The importance of adopting a human rights-based approach. In M. T. Albert, M. Richon, N. Vinals & A. Witcomb (Eds.), *Community Development through World Heritage* (16–27). Valencia: UNESCO.

Dove, M. (1996). Center, periphery and bio-diversity: A paradox of governance and a developmental challenge. In S. Brush and D. Stabinsky (Eds.), *Valuing Local Knowledge: Indigenous People and Intellectual Property Rights* (41–67). Washington, DC: Island Press.

Dove, M. (2007). Perceptions of local knowledge and adaptation on Mount Merapi, central Java. In R. Ellen (Ed.), *Modern Crises and Traditional Strategies: Local Ecological Knowledge in Island Southeast Asia* (238–262). New York and London: Berghahn Books.

Drahos, P. (2014). Regulatory capitalism, globalization and the end of history. *Intellectual Property Law and Policy Journal* 1, 1–23.

Erazo, J. (2010). Constructing Indigenous subjectivities: Economic collectivism and identity in the upper Amazon. *Development and Change* 41 (6), 1017–1039.

Erazo, J. (2013). *Governing Indigenous Territories: Enacting Sovereignty in the Ecuadorian Amazon*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Escobar, A. (1998). Whose knowledge, whose nature? Biodiversity, conservation, and the political ecology of social movements. *Journal of Political Ecology* 5, 53–82.

Escobar, A. (2008). *Territories of Difference: Place, Movements, Life, Redes*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Escobar, A. (2010). Latin America at a crossroads: Alternative modernizations, post-liberalism, or post-development? *Cultural Studies* 24 (1), 1–65.

Farhat, R. (2008). Neotribal entrepreneurialism and the commodification of biodiversity: WIPO's displacement of development for private property rights. *Review of International Political Economy* 15 (2), 206–233.

Ferguson, B. G. & Morales, H. (2010). Latin American agroecologists build a powerful scientific and social movement. *Journal of Sustainable Agriculture* 34 (4), 339–341.

Ferguson, J. (2009). The uses of neoliberalism. *Antipode* 41, 166–184.

Fernando, J. (2003). NGOs and production of Indigenous knowledge under the condition of postmodernity. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 590 (1), 54–72.

Fish, A. (2006). The commodification and exchange of knowledge in the case of transnational commercial yoga. *International Journal of Cultural Property* 13 (2), 189–206.

Fitting, E. (2011). *The Struggle for Maize: Campesinos, Workers, and Transgenic Corn in the Mexican Countryside*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Forsyth, M. (2012). Lifting the lid on the community: Who has the right to control access to traditional knowledge and expressions of culture? *International Journal of Cultural Property* 19 (1), 1–31.

Forsyth, M. (2013). How can traditional knowledge best be regulated? Comparing a proprietary rights approach with a regulatory toolbox approach. *Contemporary Pacific* 25 (1), 1–31.

Forsyth, M. & Farran, S. (2015). *Weaving Intellectual Property Policy in Small Island Developing States*. Cambridge: Intersentia.

Fueres, M., Flores, R. & Ramos, R. (2013). Saving our seeds: An indigenous perspective from Cotachachi, Ecuador. In V. Nazarea, R. Rhoades & J. E. Andrews-Swann (Eds.), *Seeds of Resistance, Seeds of Hope* (107–114). Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Gatmaytan, A. B. (2003). Advocacy as translation: Notes on the Philippine experience. In P. Brosius, A. L. Tsing, & C. Zerner (Eds.), *Communities and Conservation: Histories and Politics of Community-Based Natural Resource Management* (459–476). Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Geismar, H. (2013). *Treasured Possessions: Indigenous Interventions into Cultural and Intellectual Property*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Gershon, I. (2011). Neoliberal agency. *Current Anthropology* 52 (4), 537–555.

Gibbs, M. (2005). The right to development and indigenous peoples: Lessons from New Zealand. *World Development* 33 (8), 1365–1378.

Goodale, M. & N. Postero (Eds.) (2013). *Neoliberalism interrupted: Social change and contested governance in contemporary Latin America*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Goldstein, D. (2012). Decolonizing "actually existing neoliberalism." *Social Anthropology* 20 (3), 304–309.

Gonzales, T. (2013). Sense of place and Indigenous People's biodiversity conservation in the Americas. In V. D. Nazarea, R. Rhoades & J. E. Andrews-Swann (Eds.), *Seeds of Resistance, Seeds of Hope: Place and Agency in the Conservation of Biodiversity* (85–106). Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Gonzales, T. A. (2000). The cultures of seed in the Peruvian Andes. In S. B. Brush (Ed.), *Genes in the Field: On-farm Conservation of Crop Diversity* (193–216). London: Lewis.

Grabosky, P. (2013). Beyond responsive regulation: The expanding role of non-state actors in the regulatory process. *Regulation and Governance* 7 (1), 114–123.

Graddy, T. G. (2013). Regarding biocultural heritage: In situ political ecology in the Peruvian Andes. *Agriculture and Human Values* 30 (4), 587–604.

Green, S. (2004). Indigenous people incorporated? Culture as politics, culture as property in contemporary bioprospection deals. *Current Anthropology* 45 (2), 211–237.

Green, S. (2009). *Customising Indigeneity: Paths to a Visionary Politics in Peru*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Gupta, Akhil. (1998). *Postcolonial Developments: Agriculture in the Making of Modern India*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Gustafson, B. & Fabricant, N. (2011). Introduction: New cartographies of knowledge and struggle. In N. Fabricant & B. Gustafson (Eds.), *Remapping Bolivia: Resources, Territory, and Indigeneity in the Plurinational State* (1–29). Santa Fe, NM: School for American Research.

Halbert, D. J. (2005). *Resisting Intellectual Property*. London: Routledge.

Hale, C. (2002). Does multiculturalism menace? Governance, cultural rights and the politics of identity in Guatemala. *Journal of Latin American Studies* 34 (1), 485–524.

Hale, C. (2004). Rethinking Indigenous politics in the era of the "Indio Permitido". *Nacla Report on the Americas. Report on Race* (Part 1), 16–21.

Hale, C. (2005). Neoliberal multiculturalism: The remaking of cultural rights and racial dominance in Central America. *Political and Legal Anthropology Review* 28 (1), 10–19.

Hale, C. (2006). *Mas que un Indio (More than an Indian): Racial Ambivalence and Neoliberal Multiculturalism in Guatemala*. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.

Hale, C. (2011). Resistance, pur qui? Territory, autonomy and neoliberal entanglements in the empty spaces of Central America. *Economy and Society* 40 (2), 184–210.

Handler, R. (1991). Who owns the past? History, cultural property and the logic of possessive individualism. In B. Williams (Ed.), *The Politics of Culture* (63–74). Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Harvey, D. (2001). The art of rent: Globalization, monopoly and the commodification of culture. In L. Panitch & C. Leys (Eds.), *Socialist Register 2002: A World of Contradictions* (93–110). London: Merlin Press.

Hayden, C. (2003a). *When Nature Goes Public: The Making and Un-making of Bioprospecting in Mexico*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hayden, C. (2003b). From market to market: Bioprospecting's idioms of inclusion. *American Ethnologist* 30, 359–371.

Hernandez-Castillo, R. A. (2002). National law and indigenous customary law: The struggle for justice of Indigenous women in Chiapas, Mexico. In M. Molyneux & S. Razavi (Eds.), *Gender Justice, Development, and Rights* (384–412). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hertz, E. (2015). Bottoms, real and spurious. In N. Adell, R. Bendix, C. Bortolotto & M. Tauschek (Eds.), *Between Imagined Communities and Communities of Practice: Participation, Territory and Communities of Practice* (25–57). Göttingen: Göttingen University Press.

Hilgers, M. (2010). The three anthropological approaches to neoliberalism. *International Social Science Journal* 61 (202), 351–364.

Hilgers, M. (2012). The historicity of the neoliberal state. *Social Anthropology* 20 (1), 80–94.

Hill, R. et al. (2011). Empowering indigenous peoples' biocultural diversity through World Heritage cultural landscapes. *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 17 (6), 571–591.

Himley, M. (2012). Regularizing social extraction in Andean Peru: Mining and social mobilization in an era of corporate social responsibility. *Antipode* 42 (2), 394–416.

Hirsch, E. (2010). Property and persons: New forms and contests in the era of neoliberalism. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 39, 347–360.

Hirsch, E. (2016). Mediating indigeneity: Public space and the making of political identity in Andean Peru. *Political and Legal Anthropology Review* 39 (1), 95–109.

Hirtz, F. (2003). It takes modern means to be traditional: On recognizing indigenous cultural minorities in the Philippines. *Development Change* 34 (5), 887–917.

Holder, Cindy. (2008). Culture as an activity and human right: An important advance for indigenous peoples and international law. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 33, 7–28.

Huizenga, D. (n.d.) Articulations of aboriginal title, Indigenous rights and living customary law in South Africa. Winner of the 2016 Canadian Law and Society Association Roderick A. MacDonald Graduate Student Essay Prize.

Humphrey, C. & Verdery, K. (Eds.) (2004). *Property in Question: Value Transformation in the Global Economy*. Oxford: Berghahn.

Hurtado, L. M. (1999). Access to the resources of biodiversity and indigenous peoples. *Beyond Law*. Special Issue. Biological and Cultural Diversity Challenges and Proposals from Latin America 6 (18–19), 143–155.

Hutchins, F. & Wilson, P. C. (Eds.). (2010). *Editing Eden: A Reconsideration of Identity, Politics, and Place in Amazonia*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Inda, J. X. (2005). Analytics of modern: An introduction. In J. X. Inda (Ed.), *Anthropologies of Modernity: Foucault, Governmentality, and Life Politics* (1–20). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) & Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy (CEESP). (2010). Bio-cultural diversity conserved by Indigenous peoples and local communities – examples and analysis: Companion document to IUCN/CEESP Briefing Note No. 10. Tehran; London: IUCN, CEESP.

IUCN. (2011). Report submitted by IUCN to the Tenth Session of the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues. Document E/C.19/2011/CRP.8. 2. Retrieved from http://undesadspd.org/IndigenousPeoples/UNPFIISessions/Tenth.aspx.

Jonas, H. & Jonas, H. (2013). Reforming rights to support responsibilities. In H. Jonas, H. Jonas & S. M. Subramanian (Eds.), *The Right to Responsibility: Resisting and Engaging Development, Conservation and the Law in Asia* (206–229). Institute for Advanced Studies, Malaysia: Natural Justice and United Nations University.

Kingfisher, C. & Maskovsky, J. (2008). Introduction: The limits of neoliberalism. *Critique of Anthropology* 28 (2), 115–126.

Kothari, A. (2008). Protected areas and people: The future of the past. *Parks* 17, 23–34.

Kothari, A., Camille, P. & Brown, J. (2013). Conservation as if people also mattered: Policy and practice of community-based conservation. *Conservation & Society* 11 (1), 1–15.

Kuutma, K. (2012a). Communities and the contested representational politics of ownership. Final Report: The First ICH Researchers Forum: The Implementation of UNESCO's 2003 Convention (pp. 42–51). Retrieved from www.irci.jp/assets/files/2012_ICH_Forum.pdf.

Kuutma, K. (2012b). Between arbitration and engineering: Concepts and contingencies in the shaping of heritage regimes. In R. Bendix, A. Eggert & A. Peselman (Eds.), *Heritage Regimes and the State* (21–36). Göttingen: Göttingen University Press.

Lafrenz-Samuels, K. (2010). Material heritage and poverty reduction. In S. Labadi & C. Long (Eds.), *Heritage and Globalization* (202–217). London: Routledge.

Latour, B. (1993). *We Have Never Been Modern*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Latour, B. (2004). *Politics of Nature*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Leblon, A. (2012). A policy of intangible cultural heritage between local constraints and international standards. In R. Bendix, A. Eggert & A. Peselman (Eds.), *Heritage Regimes and the State* (97–120). Göttingen: Göttingen University Press.

Lennon, J. (2012). Cultural landscape management: International influences. In K. Taylor & J. Lennon (Eds.), *Managing Cultural Landscapes* (45–69). London and New York: Routledge.

Levett, P. & Merry, S. E. (2009). Vernacularization on the ground: Local uses of global women's rights in Peru, China, India and the United States. *Global Networks* 9 (4), 441–461.

Li, T. M. (1999). Marginality, power and production: Analysing upland transformations. In T. M. Li (Ed.), *Transforming the Indonesian Uplands: Marginality, Power and Production* (1–46). Amsterdam: Harwood Academic Publishers.

Li, T. M. (2000). Articulating Indigenous identity in Indonesia: Resource politics and the tribal slot. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 42 (1), 149–186.

Li, T. M. (2002). Engaging simplifications: Community-based resource management, market processes, and state agendas in upland Southeast Asia. *World Development* 30 (2), 265–283.

Li, T. M. (2014). *Social Impacts of Oil Palm in Indonesia: A Gendered Perspective from West Kalimantan*. Occasional Paper 124. Bogor, Indonesia: Center for International Forestry Research.

Long, C. & Labadi, S. (2010). Introduction. In S. Labadi & C. Long (Eds.), *Heritage and Globalization* (1–16). London: Routledge.

Love, B. (2013). Treasure hunts in rural Japan: Place making at the limits of sustainability. *American Anthropologist* 115 (1), 112–124.

Lydon, J. (2009). Young and free: The Australian past in a global future. In L. M. Meskell (Ed.), *Cosmopolitan Archaeologies* (28–47). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Merry, S. E. (2009). Legal transplants and cultural translation: Making human rights in the vernacular. In M. Goodale (Ed.), *Human Rights: An Anthropological Reader* (265–302). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Meskell, L. (2009). The nature of culture in Kruger National Park. In L. M. Meskell (Ed.), *Cosmopolitan Archaeologies* (89–112). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Meskell, L. (2013). UNESCO and the fate of the World Heritage Indigenous Peoples Council of Experts (WHIPCOE). *International Journal of Cultural Property* 20 (2), 155–174.

Meurer, B. & Perry, R.W. (Eds.). (2003). *Globalization Under Construction: Governmentality, Law and Identity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Meurer, B. & Schwab (Eds.). (2006). *Accelerating Possession: Global Futures of Property and Personhood*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Nadasdy, P. (2005). The anti-politics of TEK: The institutionalisation of co-management discourse and practice. *Anthropologica* 47 (2), 215–232.

Napier, A. D. (1994). Saving or enslaving: The paradox of intellectual property. *Journal of the Anthropological Society of Oxford* 25 (1), 49–58.

Napier, A. D. (2002). Our own way: On anthropology and intellectual property. In J. MacClancy (Ed.), *Exotic No More: Anthropology on the Front Lines* (287–318). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Natera, M. A. C. (2013). Postscript: Insurgent imaginaries and post-neoliberalism in Latin America. In M. Goodale & N. Postero (Eds.), *Neoliberalism Interrupted: Social Change and Contested Governance in Contemporary Latin America* (249–268). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Nazarea, V. D. (2006). Local knowledge and memory in biodiversity conservation. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 35, 317–335

Nazarea, V. D. (2013). Temptation to hope: From the "idea" to the milieu of biodiversity. In V. Nazarea, R. Rhoades & J. E. Andrews-Swan (Eds.), *Seeds of Resistance, Seeds of Hope* (19–41). Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Novellino, D. (2007). Talking about kultura and signing contracts: The bureaucratization of the environment on Palawan Island (the Philippines). In C. Maida (Ed.), *Sustainability and Communities of Place* (82–105). New York; Oxford: Berghahn.

Ong, A. (2007). Neoliberalism as a mobile technology. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 32 (1), 3–8.

Osco, M. F. (2010). Ayllu: Critical thinking and (an)other autonomy. In M. Blaser, R. De Costa, D. Mc Gregor, & W. Coleman (Eds.), *Indigenous Peoples and Autonomy* (27–48). Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Oviedo, G. & Puschkarsky, T. (2012). World heritage and rights–based approaches to nature conservation. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*. Special Issue. World Heritage and Human Rights: Preserving our Common Dignity through Rights-based Approaches 18 (1), 285–296.

Peck, J. & Theodore, N. (2012). Reanimating neoliberalism: Process geographies of neoliberalisation. *Social Anthropology* 20 (2), 177–185.

Polanyi, K. (2001 [1944]). *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Postero, N. (2007). *Now We Are Citizens: Indigenous Politics in Postmulticultural Bolivia*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Povinelli, E. A. (2011). *Economies of Abandonment: Social Belonging and Endurance in Late Liberalism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Preis, A. (2009) Human rights as cultural practice: An anthropological critique. In M. Goodale (Ed.), *Human Rights: An Anthropological Reader* (332–355). Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.

Pretty, J., Adams, B., Berkes, F., Ferreira de Athayde, S., Dudley, N., Hunn, E., Maffi, L., Milton, K., Rapport, D., Robbins, P., Sterling, E., Stolton, S., Tsing, A., Vintinnerk, E. & Pilgrim, S. (2009). The intersections of biological diversity and cultural diversity: Towards integration. *Conservation and Society* 7 (2), 100–112.

Prudham, S. & Coleman, W. D. (2011). Introduction: Property, territory and globalization. In W. D. Coleman (Ed.), *Property, Territory, Globalization: Struggles over Autonomy* (1–28). Vancouver: UBC Press.

Radcliffe, S. (2012). Development for a post–neoliberal era? Sumak Kawsay, living well and the limits of decolonization in Ecuador. *Geoforum* 43 (2), 240–249.

Rajagopal, B. (2003). *International Law from Below. Development, Social Movements and Third World Resistance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ramirez, P. M. (2011). Cartographies of Indigenous Power. In N. Fabricant & B. Gustafson (Eds.), *Remapping Bolivia: Resources, Territory, and Indigeneity in the Plurinational State* (30–45). Santa Fe, NM: School for American Research.

Rappaport, J. (2005). *Intercultural Utopias: Public Intellectuals, Cultural Experimentation and Ethnic Pluralism in Colombia*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Ray, C. (2003). *Culture Economies: A Perspective on Local Rural Development in Europe*. Centre for Rural Economy: University of Newcastle upon Tyne.

Reddy, S. (2006). Making heritage legible: Who owns traditional medical knowledge? *International Journal of Cultural Property* 13 (2), 161–188.

Rhoades, R. (Ed.) (2006). *Development with Identity: Community, Culture and Sustainability*. Boston: CABI Press.

Rhoades, R. E. (2013). When seeds are scarce: Globalization and the response of three cultures. In V. Nazarea, R. E. Rhoades & J. E. Andrews-Swann (Eds.), *Seeds of Resistance, Seeds of Hope: Place and Agency in the Conservation of Biodiversity* (262–286). Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Rodriguez-Navarro, G. E. (2015). Traditional knowledge: An innovative contribution to landscape management. In K. Taylor, A. St. Clair & N. J. Mitchell (Eds.), *Conserving Cultural Landscapes: Challenges and New Dimensions* (277–294). New York and London: Routledge.

Rose, N. (1999). *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rose, N. & Miller, P. (2010). Political power beyond the state: Problematics of government. *British Journal of Sociology* 61 (1), 271–303.

Rössler, M. (2006). World Heritage cultural landscapes: A UNESCO flagship programme. *Landscape Research* 31 (4), 333–353.

Rössler, M. (2012). Partners in site management, A shift in focus: Heritage and community involvement. In M. T. Albert, N. Richon, M. J. Vinals & A. Whitcomb (Eds.), *Community Development Through World Heritage* (World Heritage Papers No. 31) (27–31). Paris: UNESCO World Heritage Centre.

Ruiz-Mallen, I. & Corbera, E. (2013). Community-based conservation and traditional ecological knowledge: Implications for social-ecological resilience. *Ecology and Society* 18 (4). Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.5751/ES-05867-180412. Accessed March 29, 2017.

Sena, K. (2010). Indigenous peoples: Development with culture and identity articles 3 and 32 of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (PFII/2010/EGM). Department of Economic

and Social Affairs. Division for Social Policy and Development Secretariat of the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues. New York: United Nations. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/Paper%20submitted%20by%20Kanyinke%20Sena.doc. Accessed March 29, 2017.

Scher, P. (2011). Heritage tourism in the Caribbean: The politics of culture after neoliberalism. *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 30 (1), 7–20.

Scher, P. (2014). The right to remain cultural: Is culture a right in the neoliberal Caribbean? In D. Kapchan (Ed.), *Cultural Heritage in Transit: Intangible Rights as Human Rights* (87–112). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Shaheed, F. (2011). Report of the independent expert in the field of Cultural Rights. United Nations General Assembly, Human Rights Council, Seventeenth Session. Doc A/HRC/17/38, 2011. Retrieved from http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CLT/images/Report%20of%20Farida%20Shaheed.pdf. Accessed March 29, 2017.

Shepherd, C. J. (2010). Mobilizing local knowledge and asserting culture. *Current Anthropology* 51 (5), 629–654.

Speed, S. (2007). *Rights in Rebellion: Indigenous Struggle and Human Rights in Chiapas*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Speed, S., Hernandez-Castillo, R. A. & Stephen, L. eds. (2006). *Dissident Women: Gender and Cultural Politics in Chiapas*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Speed, S., Blackwell, M., Hernandez-Castillo, R. A., Sieder, R., Sierra, M. T., Ramirez, R., Macleod, M. & Herrera, J. (2009). Remapping gender, justice, and rights in the Indigenous Americas: Toward a comparative analysis and collaborative methodology. *Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Anthropology* 14 (2), 300–331.

Stevens, S. (2014). Advancing the new paradigm: Implementation, challenges and potential. In S. Stevens (Ed.), *Indigenous Peoples, National Parks, and Protected Areas: A New Paradigm Linking Conservation, Culture and Rights* (283–312). Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Strathern, M. (1999). Potential property: Intellectual rights and property in persons. In M. Strathern (Ed.), *Property, Substance and Effect: Anthropological Essays on Persons and Things* (161–178). London: Athlone Press.

Strathern, M. (2000). Multiple perspectives on intellectual property. In K. Whimp & M. Busse (Eds.), *Protection of Intellectual, Biological and Culture Property in Papua New Guinea* (47–61). Canberra: Asia Pacific Press; Port Moresby: Conservation Melanesia.

Strathern, M. & Hirsch, E. (Eds.). (2004). *Transactions and Creations: Property Debates and the Stimulus of Melanesia*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Sunder, M. & Chander, A. (2004). The romance of the public domain. *California Law Review* 92 (5), 1331–1374.

Tano, M. (2015). Climate and the transformation of landscapes: Building and strengthening Indigenous knowledge systems and institutions to manage threats to cultural landscapes. In K. Taylor, A. St. Clair & N. Mitchell (Eds.), *Conserving Cultural Landscapes: Challenges and New Directions* (325–340). New York: Routledge.

Tauli-Corpuz, V. (2008). The concept of indigenous people's self-determined identity or development with identity and culture: Challenges and trajectories. Tebtebba Foundation on behalf of UNESCO. CLT/CPD/CPO/2008/IPS/02. Retrieved from http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/files/37745/12197591975Concept_paper_Indigenous_Peoples__Development_with_Identity.pdf/Concept%2Bpaper%2BIndigenous%2BPeoples%2B%2BDevelopment%2Bwith%2BIdentity.pdf. Accessed March 29, 2017.

Tauschek, M. (2012). The bureaucratic texture of national patrimonial politics. In R. Bendix, A. Eggert & A. Peselmann (Eds.), *Heritage Regimes and the State* (195–212). Göttingen: Göttingen University Press.

Tobin, B. (2014). *Indigenous Peoples, Customary Law and Human Rights: Why Living Law Matters*. New York: Routledge.

Tsing, A. L. (1999). Becoming a tribal elder and other green development fantasies. In T. M. Li (Ed.), *Transforming the Indonesian Uplands: Marginality, Power and Production* (159–202). Amsterdam: Harwood Academic.

Tsing, A. L. (2003). Agrarian allegory and global futures. In P. Greenough & A. Tsing (Eds.), *Nature in the Global South* (124–166). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Tsing, A. L. (2005). *Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Tsing, A. L. (2009). Adat/Indigenous: Indigeneity in motion. In C. Gluck & A. L. Tsing (Eds.), *Words in Motion: Toward a Global Lexicon* (40–64). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Turcotte, J. F. (2016). Creative transformation and the knowledge-based economy: Intellectual property and access to knowledge under informational capitalism. PhD dissertation, York University, August 9, 2016.

Ulloa, A. (2005). *The Ecological Native: Indigenous Peoples' Movements and Eco-Governmentality in Colombia*. New York: Routledge.

UNESCO. (2003). Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. Retrieved from http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/en/convention

Vadjunec, J., Schmink, M. & Greiner, A. L. (2011). New Amazonian geographies: Emerging identities and landscapes. *Journal of Cultural Geography* 28 (1), 1–20.

Walsh, C. (2010). Development as buen vivir: Institutional arrangements and decolonial entanglements. *Development* 53 (1): 15–21.

Ween, G. B. & Colombi, B. (2013). Two rivers: The politics of wild salmon, indigenous rights and natural resource management. *Sustainability* 5 (1), 478–495.

West, P. (2005). Translation, value, and space: Theorizing an ethnographic and engaged environmental anthropology. *American Anthropologist* 107 (4), 632–642.

Wilshusen, P. (2006). Territory, nature, and culture: Negotiating the boundaries of biodiversity conservation in the Colombian Pacific Coast region. In S. Brechin, P. Wilshusen, C.L. Fortwangler, & P. West (Eds.), *Contested Nature: Promoting International Biodiversity with Social Justice in the Twenty-First Century* (73–88). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Wilson, P. (2008). Indigeneity, neoliberalism and social engineering in Ecuador's Amazon. *Critique of Anthropology* 28 (2), 127–144.

Wright, S. (2008a). Locating a politics of knowledge: Struggles over intellectual property in the Philippines. *Australian Geographer* 39 (4), 409–426.

Wright, S. (2008b). Globalizing governance: The case of intellectual property rights in the Philippines. *Political Geography* 27 (7), 721–737.

Yates, J. (2014). Historicizing ethno-development: Kamoyaq and political economic development across governance regimes in the Peruvian Andes. *Journal of Historical Geography* 46 (1): 53–65.

Yates, J. & Bakker, K. (2013). Debating the "post-neoliberal turn" in Latin America. *Progress in Human Geography* 38 (1), 62–90.

Zimmerer, K. S. (2013). Environmental governance through "speaking like an environmental state" and respatialising resources: Ethical livelihood concepts in Bolivia as versatility or verisimilitude? *Geoforum* 64, 314–324.