

The Indigenous Voice

A Qualitative Study on Indigenous Worldmaking in the Global Infrastructure of Environmental Politics



Thesis
Andrea Maria Knotter
Student nr. 625856
Supervisor: Dr. Jess Bier
Second reader: Dr. Bonnie French
Wordcount: 9800
Date: June 17, 2022

Abstract

In this study, I explored how Indigenous worldmakings of the environment respond to the Global Political Sphere. By means of multiple document analysis, this thesis analyzes the perspective of COICA's Indigenous leaders with respect to the presence of the Indigenous Amazonian alliance group, COICA, during the global political event on climate change, namely COP26. I argued that Indigenous environmental worldmakings respond to Western governance by presenting and forming the Indigenous Voice, in which territorial worldmaking concepts are integral. Moreover, I revealed how Indigenous worldmakings form and reform through experiences and how Indigenous and Western worldmaking concepts of the environment can co-govern to ensure vitality on the planet Mother Earth. Scholars have argued that the global political sphere continuously fails to protect environmental- and Indigenous rights from the knowledge and understanding of Indigenous peoples. Therefore, through a combined decolonial and post-colonial approach, this study exposed how Indigenous leaders perceive their position as 'otherness' in the neo-liberal climate; it examines Indigenous worldmaking concepts of the environment and how these encounter the global infrastructure of environmental politics.

Keywords: *COICA, Global Environmental Politics, Indigenous Amazonian Worldmakings, Indigenous knowledge, Decolonial, Relational Ontologies*



Speech Txai Suruí during COP26

Table of Contents

Abstract	2
Introduction	5
Thesis outline	7
1. Conceptualizing Indigenous Worldmaking in the Global Political Sphere	8
1.1 Decoloniality and Indigenous Politics	9
1.2 Indigenous peoples in the global political sphere	10
1.3 Indigenous Worldmakings	12
2. Research Methods	13
2.1 Documents as Data	14
2.1.1 Data gathering	14
2.2 Operationalization	15
2.3 Limitations and Ethics	16
3. Results	18
3.1 COICA's Indigenous Voice in the Global Political Sphere	18
3.2 Indigenous Environmental Worldmakings	21
3.2.1 Territories and Environmentalism	21
3.2.2 Our Mother Earth	22
3.2.3 Cry of the Jungle	23
Conclusion	24
References	27
Appendix I. Table 1	30
Appendix II. Ethics & Privacy	31

Introduction

“Without our territories, there are no guarantees for the survival of all species that inhabit the planet, we are the protectors of the Forest, and we understand the priorities and urgency to avoid its destruction.” (“COP26: “There Will Be No Solution for Humanity Without Us”) - Statement by COICA after COP26

During the United Nations Conference on Climate Change (COP26) in November 2021, the Coordinator of Indigenous Organizations of the Amazon River Basin (COICA) released the above statement. COICA represents nine national Indigenous Amazonian organizations, and they aim to defend the land and rights of Indigenous Amazonian peoples on an international level.

COICA and other alliance groups emerged as a reaction to global capitalistic policies that continue to harm Indigenous communities and sacred lands. By performing the Indigenous Voice, Indigenous leaders have engaged in the global discourse of Indigenous and environmental justice with the aim to achieve their political goals to save their sacred lands from today's environmental challenges and those that are still to come (Vindal Odegaard & Rivera Andia, 2019; Tsing in Fabricant & Postero, 2018). According to COICA's leaders, Indigenous peoples are the original environmentalists; therefore, they argue that the 'modern' world needs Indigenous peoples to save the Amazon and the planet from destruction. To combat the emerging environmental challenges, the Western political sphere has turned to Indigenous knowledge and traditions as saviors as well. Consequently, the presence of Indigenous leaders in the global political sphere increased, and they are now [important] actors in the analysis of global environmental politics (Cifuentes, 2021). However, after participating in the COP26, the organization stated that the Indigenous Voice is not represented in such decision-making processes. It has also been suggested that the global political leaders fail to approach environmental decisions from the worldview of Indigenous peoples (COICA, 2021).

Following this argument, in this study I focused on COICA's presence at COP26 to expose how Indigenous leaders perceive their position and how they are positioned in the global political sphere as radical other and savior of the environment and adapt to the neo-liberal climate as a mode of survival. Moreover, in line with the argument of COICA, I was interested in how the worldview of Indigenous peoples responds to the global political sphere and how they are formed through these responses. In this thesis the performance of the Indigenous voice in the global political

spheres is demonstrated. I examined Indigenous worldmakings of environmentalism from the perspective of COICA's Indigenous leaders and clarified how this becomes present in the global political sphere by the Indigenous Voice.

Scholars within the Indigenous Studies turn often describe Indigenous understandings of doing politics as radically different compared to Western politics. Escobar (2018) and Viveiros de Castro (2004), and other post-colonial scholars, describe Indigenous ways of doing politics as embedded in Indigenous knowledge traditions that convey a deeper understanding of the relationship between human and non-human entities. For example, later in this thesis becomes clear that for COICA's Indigenous leaders, territories represent more than land, these represent various spheres of life that ensure the vitality of the Earth. In this conceptualization, territories are fundamental to combat environmental challenges and integrated systems in Indigenous politics. However, similar to the statement by COICA, several scholars stated that the global political sphere continuously fails to protect environmental- and Indigenous rights from the knowledge and understanding of Indigenous peoples (McGregor et al., 2020; Mendoza, 2018; Viveiros de Castro, 2004). Another aspect discussed in this thesis is that when such understandings are communicated by the Indigenous Voice communicates in the global political sphere these may result in misunderstandings. However, it has been illustrated that such Indigenous differences are expected to correspond to Western models of governance (McGregor et al., 2020; Mendoza, 2018; Vindal Odegaard & Rivera Andia, 2019). As an explanation, Cifuentes (2021), Quijano (2007), and other Latin American decolonial scholars bring to light that contemporary capitalist societies remain the foundation of the political infrastructure of power and the geopolitical location of knowledge (McGregor et al., 2020; Maldonado-Torres, 2018).

Within Indigenous studies, the decolonial and post-colonial school contribute in complementary but diverging ways to the above understanding of the position of Indigenous peoples in the modern/colonial global order. Scholars in decolonial studies have analyzed this global paradigm shift of Indigenous knowledge and politics with the emerging presence of the Indigenous Voice in the political domain. They have centered the struggle over resources and Indigenous (land) rights and reveal how Indigeneity is subjected as the radical other in the global world order (Cifuentes, 2021; Quijano, 2007; Maldonado-Torres, 2018; Fabricant & Postero, 2018). With my research interest in mind, post-colonial literature within Indigenous studies builds

partly on decolonial work by describing the "coloniality of power" and how Indigeneity is subjected to the modern-day global political hierarchy (Quijano, 2007). However, this scholarship provides a deeper explanation of the different politics of worldmaking (Fabricant & Postero, 2018).

As Viveiros de Castro (2004) states, "equivocation" occurs when radically different ways of worldmaking collide. For this reason, the socio-political academic relevance of the interconnectedness of the emerging presence of Indigenous politics and the contemporary importance of environmental justice in the global political domain can no longer be ignored (Viveiros de Castro in Vindal Odegaard & Rivera Andia, 2018; Vindal Odegaard & Rivera Andia, 2018). However, literature fails to elaborate on how such worldmakings directly respond to today's Western models of development, such as global environmental/political events (Cifuentes, 2021). Therefore, analyzing COICA's global political presence through decolonial and post-colonial scholarship helped me to understand their vulnerable position in modern/colonial hierarchies through a lens of Indigenous worldmaking politics. By filling the above gap, I add to the sociological landscape within Indigenous studies and bring to light how Indigenous worldmakings form and reform within the modern world order.

The purpose of this thesis is to give the necessary academic focus on such worldmaking rather than approaching Indigenous knowledge from one [Western] point of view (Escobar in Fabricant & Postero, 2018; McGregor et al., 2020; Mendoza, 2018; Viveiros de Castro, 2004; Vindal Odegaard & Rivera Andia, 2019). Moreover, through the words of Indigenous peoples, this research delves deeper into Indigenous environmental worldmakings and how these are positioned in the global political sphere, how these form and reform through experiences in the global infrastructure of environmental politics, and how Indigenous and Western worldmaking concepts can co-govern in the fight for climate change. As a guide through my research, I address the following research- and sub-questions:

How do Indigenous Amazonian Environmental Worldmaking respond to the Global Infrastructure of Environmental Politics?

- 1. What are the main elements of Indigenous Amazonian worldmakings concerning the environment?*
- 2. How do Indigenous Amazonian peoples define their position in the Global Infrastructures of Environmental Politics?*
- 3. How do Indigenous Amazonian worldmakings become present in global environmental politics?*
- 4. In light of this presence, how do Indigenous Amazonian worldmakings form and reform when responding to global environmental politics?*

Thesis outline

To answer the research question, I conducted a multitude of document content analysis; namely, interviews and speeches by COICA, narratives from existing ethnographies in the Amazon as data, official reports from COICA, and global environmental agreements from the UN to determine how Amazonian worldmaking is encountered with global environmental politics. Chapter 2 (Research Methods) of this thesis elaborates on these methods, and Chapter 3 (Results) consists of the analysis of these documents. The following chapter (Chapter 1) discusses the fundamental theories and approaches that guided me through my research.

In addition to filling the described research gap, I wish to give a societal understanding of how Indigenous members of COICA perceive their worldmaking in the global political sphere as well. The research aims to provide clarity to not only people involved in the global infrastructure of environmental politics but also a clearer public understanding of the subject. In the attempt to fully appreciate Indigenous terms and understandings, I contribute to reducing these misunderstandings.

1. Conceptualizing Indigenous Worldmaking in the Global Political Sphere

In this theoretical framework chapter, I discuss decolonial and post-colonial theories within Indigenous studies that contribute in complementary but diverging ways to understanding Indigenous Amazonian leaders in the global political sphere. Decolonial theories focus on the globalized struggle for Indigenous rights. In contrast, post-colonial theories gave me an understanding of Indigenous worldmakings that are relevant to unraveling both Indigenous views of environmentalism and how these form and reform in the infrastructure of global environmental politics. In what follows, I first elaborate on the position of Indigeneity as radical otherness and delve deeper into lines of differentiation according to the global world order by discussing work of Latin American decolonial scholars, namely Quijano (2007) and Maldonado-Torres (2018). In this section, the decolonial concepts of Indigenous Environmental Justice and Ethical substance also shed light on the globalized struggle for Indigenous rights. After, I examined the presence of Indigenous peoples in the global political sphere through enhancing Indigenous worldmaking politics from a post-colonial perspective. By discussing post-colonial work from the Indigenous Studies, namely Escobar (2018), Fabricant & Postero (2018), Mendoza (2018), Viveiros de Castro (2004), and others, I gained a deeper understanding of Indigenous worldmaking politics and how these are crucial in Indigenous perspectives on environmentalism.

1.1 Decoloniality and Indigenous Politics

In *Coloniality and Modernity/Rationality*, Quijano (2007) stated that with the conquest of the lands now known as Latin America, the constitution of the new world order began. During colonial times, Indigeneity was categorized as radical otherness or alterity. According to Fabricant & Postero (2018), Indigenous peoples were seen as 'something' out of the convention. This categorization was a justification for the suppression of Indigenous peoples and the conquest of their territories. Understanding the colonial world order helped me grasp how the (imbalanced) global hegemony of power manifests in the heyday's settler's colonialism. Delving deeper into present-day settlers' colonialism, Whyte (2017) illustrates one interesting aspect of these lines of differentiation. Together with Maldonado-Torres (2018) and Fabricant & Postero (2018), Whyte (2017) argues that the lines of differentiation remain embedded in Western societies, and it remains the settlers' aspiration to transform Indigenous homelands into settlers' homelands. Whyte (2017) and McGregor *et al.* (2020) take on an Indigenous Environmental Justice (IEJ) frame to expose

the environmental crisis as an intensification of the settlers' aspiration that finds its roots in colonialism. Mining practices on Indigenous sacred lands might be perceived as an attempt of transformation that finds its roots in colonialism. Therefore, a decolonial IEJ frame adds to my research as it exposes that it is no accident that Indigenous peoples are impacted disproportionately by climate issues. (Maldonado-Torres, 2018; Quijano, 2007).

The theory discussed in the former paragraph illustrates that the conception of Western 'humanity' remains the standard global narrative. However, in the *Dawn of Everything*, Graeber and Wengrow (2021) explain that settlers spend many years understanding local customs and languages. In addition to the colonialization of Indigenous lands, Indigenous knowledge was a source of inspiration for the ideals of many European thinkers in the process of grasping Indigeneity's unfamiliar concepts, settlers made these concepts 'their own' (Graeber & Wengrow, 2021). Taking the above to today's settlers' colonialism in the context of the contemporary infrastructure of environmental politics, Indigenous knowledge might be a (post)colonial source of inspiration for the ideals of Western political leaders. Alternatively, applying an IEJ frame exposes today's imbalanced power structure between Western and Indigenous worldmaking concepts and how it manifests in systematic repression of knowledge and beliefs of the supernatural, as well as colonizing knowledge on natural resources to benefit capitalistic processes (Mendoza, 2018; Quijano, 2007).

As a reaction to the suppression of Indigenous lands and knowledge, Latin America's Indigenous peoples have been demanding citizenship, fighting for their (land) rights, and participating politically on a national and international level over the last three decades. Simultaneously to the contemporary emergency of environmental politics, the discourse on Indigeneity transformed to Indigenous people saving the planet and climate strategies more often incorporate Indigenous knowledge as well (Fabricant & Postero, 2018). However, to further understand the role of Indigeneity in political spheres, I highlight the encounters of Indigenous peoples with the above-explained geopolitical hegemony of knowledge.

1.2 Indigenous peoples in the global political sphere

To combat the challenges I described in the former section, Indigenous peoples more often engaged in the global discourse of rights by employing, what Tsing (in Fabricant & Postero, 2018) defined as the Indigenous Voice. Therefore, in what follows, I delve deeper into the presence and the emerging importance of the Indigenous Voice in the global political sphere and how it involves Indigenous worldmaking.

Since the 90s, the Zapatista army in Mexico has been fighting for Indigenous rights and demands through the Indigenous Voice¹. On an international level, they highlighted the territorial struggles of Latin America's Indigenous peoples, exposing that it is not only the physical access of Indigenous peoples to their lands but also the meaning of the lands that are integral to the lives of Indigenous peoples (Cifuentes, 2021; Reyes Godelmann, 2014). The Zapatista philosophy to create a world in which many worlds fit finds its roots in the arguably alternative Indigenous ways of understanding the world and forms of governance (Mendoza, 2018; Walter, 2020; Fabricant & Postero, 2018). Therefore, against global neoliberalism, the Zapatistas propose Indigenous alternative ways of self-government where the meaning of Indigenous land is integral. Considering my study, taking on the earlier mentioned IEJ frame and a decolonial lens reveal that Indigenous encounters in the political sphere and the demand for self-governance are an attempt of Indigenous peoples to save their sacred lands from today's environmental challenges and those that are still to come. In addition, a decolonial perspective also reveals that international Indigenous environmental declarations such as the Rights of Indigenous Peoples of the United Nations (UNDRIP) are progressive responses in international spheres because of the Indigenous Voice (Fabricant & Postero, 2018).

Turning back to the earlier mentioned global hegemony of knowledge, another angle within a decolonial approach suggests that the Western world remains perceived as the center of universal knowledge in the modern world (Quijano, 2007). This understanding of the imbalance of power sheds light on the position of Indigeneity as otherness as it explains how Indigenous peoples are subjected to the political sphere and how Indigenous worldmaking is perceived in these spheres.

¹ The Zapatista Army of National Liberation is an Indigenous armed organization. They declared war on the Mexican government in 1994. They strive for Indigenous rights by highlighting the interests and demands of Chiapas Indigenous peoples in Mexico (Reyes Godelmann, 2014).

Even though the Indigenous Voice is present in global politics, several scholars argue that the Indigenous Voice remains limited in global discussions on the future of our common planet (Fabricant & Postero, 2018; McGregor et al., 2020). Another line of thought on this position is that in combatting the emerging ecological challenges, the dominant Western political sphere turned to Indigenous knowledge and politics as the saviors of 'our' planet. Within this debate, Mendoza (2018) argues that by considering Indigenous knowledge to prevent the destruction of the Earth, the Western political sphere often perceives itself as the saviors of Indigenous peoples and thus, redeems itself from the harm of the colonial past. In what follows, I explain through the case study of Bolivia how this redemption of the colonial past might be embedded in ethical substance.

As a reaction to the harm of the colonial past, Bolivia declared the country plurinational, with decolonization as a fundamental goal (Fabricant & Postero, 2018). In both Bolivia and Ecuador, Indigenous worldmakings transformed into the basis of revolutionary state-building. The nation-states adopted the Indigenous worldview *Buen Vivir* (in English: living well) in the national constitution, which draws on the Indigenous knowledge tradition that conveys a deeper understanding of the relationship between humans, Mother Earth², and other non-human entities [nature, spiritual world, animals], prioritizing harmony with nature over economic development (Fabricant & Postero, 2018; McGregor *et al.*, 2020). However, according to Mendoza (2018) and Fabricant & Postero (2018), Indigenous worldmaking concepts in the global political sphere (read: *Buen Vivir*) have little effect on inequality structures, being that Indigenous peoples' lands are still sacrificed for the extraction of the resource. To explain this social phenomenon, Fabricant & Postero (2019) take on Povinelli's theorizing of the notion of ethical substance to address how Indigeneity actualizes in political and social mobilization (Fabricant & Postero in Vindal Odegaard & Rivera Andia, 2019). Here, the concept of ethical substance in liberal governmentality explains that particular objects, representations, languages, and actions are central sites for moral and ethical concerns (Povinelli in Vindal Odegaard & Rivera Andia, 2019). Taking on this notion, Fabricant & Postero question the legitimacy of the Bolivian government and claim that political actors 'use' Indigeneity to push their political agenda. Returning to the argument in the former paragraph, this might be similar to the Western sphere as 'saviors' of Indigenous people. The

^{2 2} Mother Earth is the Indigenous conception of Earth as a goddess, in many Latin American cultures Mother Earth is referred to as Pacha Mama (Dransart, 1994).

concept of ethical substance with an IEJ frame reveals that Indigenous peoples who fall within the standard of global capitalism are supported, and those who challenge modernity are not (Hale, 2002). However, this notion is rooted in the idea that Indigenous peoples are victims of the global world order. It fails to expose how 'Indigeneity' can also function for Indigenous peoples as emancipatory politics and as a powerful political force (Fabricant & Postero, 2018). Furthermore, the notion of ethical substance fails to expose how Indigenous leaders in the global political world experience the above according to their world perspectives.

In contrast to the idea of Western leaders as 'saviors', Mendoza (2018) argues that Indigenous peoples are actually saving Western societies by turning to Indigenous worldmaking concepts in the political domain (Mendoza, 2018). This post-colonial outlook on this debate suggests that the global political sphere continuously fails to assess the world environmental crisis from the perception and understanding of Indigenous peoples (McGregor *et al.*, 2020). In this realm, ethnographies of the Amazonia expose that Indigenous worldmakings that involve how to treat all-natural and supernatural entities in this world, and how these entities participate in politics, are central to understanding Indigenous territorial struggles (Cifuentes, 2021; Escobar, 2015; De la Cadena, 2015). To elaborate, scholars argue that the ideals conform to Western ways of living by considering Indigenous ideals adapted to Western goals to combat climate change, which undermines Indigenous decision-making and resource use (Cifuentes, 2021; McGregor *et al.*, 2020). From this argument, how do Indigenous peoples envision their future in the face of the ongoing environmental crisis?

In contrast to the argument that Indigenous peoples are victims of modernity, an alternative perspective exposes that they have survived the ongoing challenges of capitalism and colonialism and find ways to combat environmental change through their practices (McGregor *et al.*, 2020). The latter gives a distinct perspective on how Indigenous peoples position themselves in the global political sphere. Therefore, it adds the missing post-colonial lens to the concept of ethical substance and the IEJ frame and helps me answer my research question from an Indigenous perspective, which might contest the idea that Indigeneity is vulnerable. It sheds a different outlook on the possibility of projecting the world's political future with Indigenous knowledge and ways of living. With this in mind, in what follows, I delve deeper into post-colonial perspectives similar

to McGregor *et al.* (2020) to further understand the post-colonial and decolonial debate on Indigenous worldmaking.

1.3 Indigenous Worldmakings

In the Indigenous Study turn, Indigenous worldmaking has been approached through a post-colonial lens as a different way of defining what exists, how it exists, and especially the relationship between these existing entities (Escobar in Fabricant & Postero, 2018; Viveiros de Castro, 2004). Viveiros de Castro (2004) reveals that Indigenous worldmaking processes share 'humanity' and do not divide humans from non-humans such as spirits, animals, or plants. Through the eyes of many Indigenous Amazonian peoples, non-humans are fully sentient beings, which contrasts with the classical Western concept that there is one nature that is separate from culture (Walker, 2020; Viveiros de Castro, 2004). Within this perspective, the relationship between the above entities is more fundamental than the entity itself (e.g., the relationship between humans and Mother Earth) (Escobar, 2015). Ethnographies in this realm reveal that it is not only the Indigenous human and non-human understanding that is radically different from Western perceptions of the world, the demand for self-governance (see Zapatistas) emerges from a radically different way of doing politics as well, which is the foundation of Indigenous political subjectivity (Cifuentes; 2021; Fabricant & Postero, 2018; Fabricant & Postero in Vindal Odegaard & Rivera Andia, 2019; Vindal Odegaard & Rivera Andia, 2019; Viveiros de Castro, 2004; 2015; Walter, 2020; McGregor *et al.*, 2020). Understanding the importance of the relationship between entities within Indigenous politics helps me understand the position Indigenous leaders take to combat environmental challenges. For instance, Walker's ethnography of the Amazonian Uranian society (2020) exposes an Amazonian conception of common governance that embeds in the idea that every entity (human and non-human) on this planet is different with its subjectivity but must continuously and collectively produce resources that take care of the common and of Mother Earth. The former combats Western individualism and the approach to climate change as well.

Moreover, within the Indigenous ways of doing politics, the Indigenous language is crucial to understanding the symbolic meaning of the relationship between entities (Kohn, 2013). Kohn (2013) explains that Indigenous words carry feelings related to the movement of nature and, therefore, bring to light how we can move beyond the human understanding of nature. For this

reason, Indigenous language is thus crucial in understanding Indigenous environmental politics. As Viveiros de Castro (2004) states, equivocation and misunderstandings occur when radically different ways of worldmaking collide. Evidently, the above brings to light that an understanding of 'alternative' ways of politics in the global political sphere is critical for a possibility to co-govern.

The post-colonial scholarships within Indigenous studies provided a deeper explanation of Indigenous politics of worldmaking. It builds partly on the first section of this framework as Indigeneity is subjected to the global hierarchy by exposing the worldmaking elements that contest Western manners of perceiving the world. Interconnecting such narratives from Indigenous peoples with decolonial and post-colonial theories gives a contextual and in-depth view of how Indigenous worldmaking responds to different infrastructure elements, with and beyond power relations, between developed and developing countries. Along these lines, in post-colonial theories, Bhabha (in Bhabra, 2014) stated that identities are not preexisting entities, these are ongoingly formed through experiences and [power] relations, which form different realities. Therefore, a post-colonial lens to Indigenous worldmaking helps me interrupt Western discourses on the representation of Indigenous peoples in the Western political sphere; it goes beyond the decolonial perspective of Indigenous as 'victims' of the global world order (Bhabha in Bhabra, 2014). Finally, a decolonial lens helps me grapple with this 'vulnerable' position of Indigenous leaders within the global infrastructure of environmental politics and encounter elements within global infrastructures of environmental politics from this position. Post-colonial theories explain the main elements of Indigenous worldmaking and how Amazonian worldmaking becomes present in global environmental politics from the Indigenous perspective.

2. Research Methods

With this study, I aimed to scrutinize Indigenous environmental worldmakings in the global political sphere from the perspective of Indigenous peoples of the Amazon basin. With this research goal in mind, I have conducted a set of qualitative document analysis as my primary data source. In this chapter, I explain my choice to gather existing interviews, speeches, and official documents on COICA's perspective at COP26 that were published online by COICA and how I gathered these documents. Following, I elaborate on how I analyzed these documents based on sensitizing concepts that I formed based on the main concepts from the theoretical framework of this thesis; namely, (de)colonial encounters of environmental politics, presence of Indigenous voice, environmental worldmakings, Indigenous politics, view of western governance and co-governance.

2.1 Documents as Data

Due to limited research time, I was unable to step into the field and build deep relationships with my research participants, COICA's Indigenous leaders, which I believe is necessary to gain an adequate understanding of Indigenous worldmakings. Considering the emotional labor as an academic and the research participants required when doing a long-term observation, a qualitative document analysis felt like the right approach. One reason I chose to conduct a qualitative document analysis is that it gives room to carry out research that is otherwise not feasible to complete due to limited time and resources (Morgan, 2022). A more interesting motive for me was the already existing wealth of studies on Indigenous worldmaking concepts. Rethinking and combining these existing studies with statements published by COICA provided a new perspective on Indigenous climate politics in the international / Western sphere on one particular case, COICA's presence at COP26.

For this research, I retrieved all data from online sources. Namely: COICA's official website; websites with interviews of COICA members (Awasqa, Medium, the Guardian, API Official; Pachamama Alliance); UN official website; University Library for Ethnographies. This deductive approach helped me maintain the focus of the purpose of my research. In total, I analyzed nine documents of COICA (2 official documents, 7 interviews/speeches/videos), two of the UN

(official document and website), and four ethnographies of Amazonian Indigenous peoples. The documents and sources are all explained in Table 1 in Appendix I.

2.1.1 Data gathering

In the introduction of this thesis, I briefly stated that COICA is the biggest alliance group of the Amazon basin. Over the last three decades, the organization's presence in the global political sphere has increased. At COP26, more Indigenous leaders from the organization were present than at previous global events (COICA, 2021). Furthermore, COICA publishes on their website and social media (Facebook and Instagram) regularly, making gathering the data feasible. Considering the above, selecting COICA at COP26 was the most strategic case study to answer the main research question of this thesis.

For this study, I believed that the adequate documents were published by the organization COICA, as these would give the perspective of COICA's leaders on the event itself, in contrast to other organizations (e.g., Human rights watch or UN) involved in the event. In order for me to sample the cases strategically, I adopted a generic purposive sampling strategy. However, borrowing the words of Bryman (2016), it is tempting to assume that documents represent organizations when using secondary data. Therefore, researchers should analyze the documents in the context they are produced. In my analysis, I bore in mind what the statements of COICA were supposed to accomplish, it quickly became clear that the 'cases' were published to display the position of Indigenous peoples in the fight against climate change. Clearly stated in the documents was the message COICA wanted to convey about the harm of capitalist practices and the daunting consequences of climate change. To avoid any assumptions, I adopted an inter-textuality approach to which existing literature on Amazonian environmental worldmakings served as an informative contextual resource (Bryman, 2016). I gathered vignettes from ethnographies on some Indigenous territories of the COICA Indigenous leaders. Looking at the narratives from COICA leaders - through a narrative review of ethnographies on the same territories- gave me a deeper understanding of the meaning behind the spoken words (Snyder, 2019). Instead of analyzing the ethnographers' analysis, I used words from the Indigenous peoples as their research participants (vignettes) to give me an emic understanding. Although I was only interested in the perspective of COICA at COP26, I wanted to reduce my subjectivity in this research. Therefore, within the intertextuality approach, I gathered official documents on Indigenous rights of the UN. This gave

a 'western' understanding of the event that COICA's documents were unable to provide, such as the steps the UN takes to (eventually) achieve equal rights for Indigenous peoples.

To ensure the quality of the documents, I gathered data based on the criteria set by Bryman, namely: Authenticity, Credibility, Representativeness, and Meaning. Following these guidelines, I selected 'genuine' documents by the document's source (published by COICA) and revised if the information in the documents were consistent and comprehensible and if there was a similarity or overlap in the perspectives and data.

2.2 Operationalization

After gathering the data, I systematically grouped the documents according to the main concepts I derived from the theoretical framework. These concepts served as my sensitizing concepts during the analysis, namely: (1) what elements Indigenous Worldmakings of environmentalism consists of; (2) the position it takes in the global infrastructure of environmentalist politics; (3) how such Indigenous worldmaking responds to the different elements in this infrastructure.

I took a thematic analysis, searching for overlapping themes in the documents, and narrative analysis as I tried to understand how Indigenous Amazonian leaders make sense of their encounters in the global political sphere. The narrative analysis synthesized the Indigenous worldmaking perspective in possible lines of inquiry (Given, 2008). Simultaneously, I adopted an iterative coding technique for my study, from which I was able to define sub-concepts per sensitizing concept. With these sub-concepts, I could code the documents systematically and group the outcomes according to the sub-question of this research. The following table (Table 2) shows how I categorized the sub-concepts according to the main concepts of this research (2nd column). While I grouped the relevant data according to these sub-codes, I re-grouped these employing comments. This included relevant theories I recognized and if the data gave an implicit or explicit explanation of the appropriate concept and approach (3rd and 4th column).

Main Categories	Sub-concepts	Comment	Approach & Type of document
What elements Indigenous Worldmakings of environmentalism consists of	Vision of World <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definition of Non-human entities • Relationship with entities • How to treat Earth and non-human beings • Ways of Governing • Philosophy: World in which many worlds fit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Worldmakings • Explaining if it is an Implicit or Explicit (Stories & Myths) definition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ethnographic accounts / Vignettes
The position it takes in the global infrastructure of environmentalist politics	Decolonial Encounters of Environmental Politics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indigenous Environmental Politics • Indigenous Voice (political participation) • Position: Savior or Radical Other • (de)Colonizing Indigenous Knowledge • Beneficial Key Outcomes COP26 • Execution of Key Outcomes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (International) Political participation: Demands Manifestations / Speeches • Moral performance (Ethical substance) • Indigenous Environmental Justice frame 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decolonial theories
How such Indigenous worldmaking responds to the different elements in this infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vision of Modernity • View on Western governance of climate action • Mode of Survival • Co-governance • Indigenous Concepts in Western world • Adaptation to Neoliberalism • Reformation of worldmakings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Defining connection between topic 1 and topic 2. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Post-Colonial theories • Ethnographies

Table 2.

2.3 Limitations and Ethics

Conducting a document analysis helped me understand COICA's Indigenous climate politics and how they perceive these concepts in the global political sphere. Analyzing this perspective of COICA during COP26, together with existing studies on Indigenous climate politics, allowed me to address the climate politics in the global political sphere from the standpoint of Indigenous views. I could provide new insights into Indigenous studies by engaging with Indigenous worldmakings from the Indigenous environment and in the global sphere through decolonial and post-colonial concepts. Furthermore, I could combine perspectives from various Indigenous groups across different sites, from the Amazon and the Western world. Moreover, by using existing research, I minimized the inevitable emotional harm to research participants in conducting ethnographic work (e.g., building emotional connections and leaving the field site).

However, my research design also has limitations involving my biases and the organization COICA. During the analysis, I had to bear in mind for what purpose the documents were published and the context. Although COICA aims to represent the Indigenous peoples of the Amazon Rainforest, the interviews, speeches, and official documents of COICA represent the worldmaking concepts of Indigenous leaders who are fully integrated into the global political sphere. While my broader interest lies in the worldmakings of Indigenous Amazonian peoples, the analyzed documents represent only a small fraction of this region. To reduce this limitation, I implemented a triangulation strategy by analyzing words from Indigenous peoples from existing ethnographies which I explained at the beginning of this chapter. Furthermore, I selected the analyzed documents with a purpose in mind, which raises questions about biased selectivity. For this reason, I tried to make my reader aware that I selected a case study for this research and solely analyzed the perspective of COICA in the political spectrum.

By selecting only online documents published by COICA, I reduced the ethical concern associated with the privacy of documents. However, using existing materials, such as ethnographic accounts, in new ways raises concerns about my interpretation of the text. Solely analyzing vignettes from a multitude of ethnographies reduced the impact of my interpretation of another researcher's work in this thesis. As I described before, I had to ensure that my subjectivity did not influence the analysis of the documents. In the analysis, I reflected on my opinion toward Western climate policies. To reduce (my negative) view on the policies, that aligned with the criticism of

COICA, I also analyzed documents of the UN on Indigenous rights. I constantly reflected on my opinion of these policies and my position as a Western academic / climate activist.

Finally, as I was dealing with colonial subjects, I believe this thesis's most significant ethical concern was ensuring that my research did not reproduce the colonization of Indigenous knowledge. I used the words of the research 'objects' from existing ethnographies from vignettes (read: Indigenous peoples in conducted ethnographies) instead of the theoretical interpretation of the ethnographer. As will become apparent in the result section, according to COICA's leaders, voicing Indigenous perspectives is the only way to decolonize the global political sphere. Following this argument, I believe the only way to decolonize the academic world is to give the participants' perspectives. Therefore, I did not use the words of the Indigenous peoples to mine the Amazon. I aimed to communicate their perspectives further. This empirical study and reflecting on the possibility of decolonizing what we understand as global politics pursue my aim of decolonizing Indigenous knowledge in the academic world.

3. Results

In this chapter, I show the main findings of the document analysis. Through contextual information and extensive quotes from COICA's Indigenous leaders, I reveal how Indigenous Amazonian environmental worldmakings respond to the global political sphere. In the first part of the chapter, I explain how the Indigenous Voice emerged from the position of Indigenous peoples in the global political sphere through the presence of COICA at the COP26. This section also provides an understanding of how Western climate governance is perceived through the words of COICA's Indigenous leaders. In the second part of the chapter, I give a detailed account of Indigenous environmentalist worldmakings and the integral meaning of Indigenous territories within these worldmakings. This section sheds a different light on the Indigenous Voice and illustrates how these worldmakings respond in the global political spheres by the Indigenous Voice.

3.1 COICA's Indigenous Voice in the Global Political Sphere

After COP26, COICA's Indigenous leaders expressed that they had attended high-level political forums and bilateral meetings, where they had raised their voices intending to influence countries' decisions at a global level. In the theoretical framework of this thesis, it was explained that the Indigenous engagement in the global discourse of (Indigenous) rights is defined as the Indigenous Voice. In what follows, I elaborate on the presence of the Indigenous Voice as the demand for Indigenous environmental and territorial rights from the perspective of COICA's leaders.

Despite the growing presence of COICA's Indigenous leaders in the global political sphere, it was stated that during COP26 Indigenous peoples were not part of any state negotiations. Andres Tapia argued that this resulted in gaps in protecting Indigenous peoples' human and socio-environmental rights in global agreements. An Indigenous Environmental Justice (IEJ) frame gave a decolonial understanding on COICA's perspective on the position of Indigenous peoples in the global climate. The frame exposes that the geopolitical hegemony of knowledge continues to oppress Indigenous environmental knowledge systematically. Moreover, shedding light on the above through the IEJ frame illustrated that Indigeneity remains categorized as radical otherness in the global infrastructure of environmental politics. Building from this idea, the following quote of COICA's Indigenous leader, José Gregorio Diaz Mirabal demonstrates that Indigenous peoples perceive themselves as 'the other' in the Western spheres as well: *“Our connection with Mother Earth makes us the most reliable source of information to guide policies on the protection of*

ecosystems. Even though it has been scientifically proven that we are the best keepers of nature, we continue hearing declarations, plans, and promises that are not fulfilled, and they continue to ignore our transcendental role in protecting life on the planet. The devastation of our territories continues, and the resources hardly ever reach Indigenous peoples". It became clear from the document analysis that COICA's presence at COP26 emerged from a vulnerable position, they described themselves as original activists, and they aimed to defend the rights of the inhabitants of the Amazon basin.

On the other hand, the above quote also illustrates that Indigenous peoples perceive themselves as the protectors of the planet. The Indigenous Voice at COP26 also emerged from the idea that Indigenous environmental knowledge is the 'savior' of the earth. As an explanation, COICA's Indigenous Coordinators believe that Western societies are dedicated to "savage capitalism". From their perspective, capitalist societies prioritize extractivist practices over human life. In their argument, Western development destroys people, *"the environmental crisis is a crisis of civilization"*, said COICA leader Juan Carlos Jintiach. The above sheds a different light on Mendoza's notion of 'Indigenity as savior'. In her argument, Indigenous environmental knowledge is presented in the global fight for climate change because there is a Western conception that Indigenous peoples will 'save the planet'. However, looking at the data, it is clear that COICA's Indigenous leaders perceive their position as saviors as well.

Building on the idea that Indigenous peoples view their position in the global political sphere as saviors of the planet, COICA's Indigenous leaders believe that a "wrong" idea exists in Western societies that saving the planet is solely the responsibility of Indigenous peoples. This line of thought does not contradict the belief that Indigenous knowledge is crucial in saving the earth, it emphasizes the importance of a sense of responsibility for Indigenous peoples from all important actors in saving the planet. The following quote by Indigenous leader, Nara Baré, demonstrates the described perceived position and the importance of co-responsibility: *"Governments should not be afraid of us because we are the solution. That responsibility cannot be only ours, not only of the Indigenous peoples."* To further understand how the Indigenous Voice performs responsibility, Indigenous leader Tuntiak Katan explained that it is because of a "lack of co-responsibility" COICA's Indigenous leaders need to use their Indigenous Voice to ensure strategic partnership with Western political leaders.

It is clear that according to COICA's vision, the position of Indigenous peoples should be co-decision makers in international spaces as defenders of Mother Earth (emic term for the Earth), and this should include oversight of government decisions and agendas. Within this line of thought, for COICA's Indigenous leaders, mutual governance is a value within the Indigenous Voice. Notably, solidarity (term) was often used to explain the need for mutual support or co-working to regulate the climate. This is demonstrated in the following words of Nara Baré, *"If we talk about equality and solidarity, we have to be present in all international spaces. Mutual support is meant to be part and included in the participation and as fundamental actors in decision-making processes."* To further understand the role of solidarity in co-responsibility, Indigenous leader Juan Carlos Jintiach explained that solidarity entails changing a model of governance under the framework of Indigenous knowledge, including local and ancestral knowledge. In his perspective, it is difficult to change a model of Western governance because countries of the EU do not understand and respect Indigenous languages (the second part of this chapter entails a detailed account of ancestral knowledge and Indigenous language). He clarified by giving the example of Ecuador and Bolivia, in his view the states had shown "solidarity" by amending the rights of Indigenous peoples in the constitutions. Another line of thought on the meaning of solidarity in the Indigenous Voice goes back to the demand for Indigenous rights. To explain, in her speech at COP26, Txai Suruí expressed that Indigenous peoples are continuously confronted with issues related to colonization. In this statement, she used the word solidarity as *"I ask you to show solidarity with our cause"*. For COICA's Indigenous leaders, solidarity as an aspect of the Indigenous Voice in the global political sphere thus means both Indigenous rights concerning Indigenous ancient knowledge and including such practices in governmental frameworks on climate change. Txai Suruí adds to this by arguing that the presence of the Indigenous Voice in the global political sphere is the only manner to decolonize Indigenous territories.

In contrast to Juan Carlos Jintiach's explanation of solidarity from the Bolivian and Ecuadorian states, Andres Tapia and Tomas Cania (COICA Indigenous leaders) claimed that Ecuador and Bolivia are false plurinational states and questioned the solidarity of both States. They argued that the States adopt a double standard because both advertise an environmentally friendly image while governments remain involved in extractivist projects. While Indigenous worldviews on the rights of nature, e.g., Buen Vivir, are part of the Bolivian constitution, the above might indicate that the global political sphere takes on Indigenous environmental knowledge as a

representation of climate activism as a moral and ethical concern. Therefore, shedding light on the above events through the notion of ethical substance together with an IEJ frame indicate that the presence of Indigeneity in the global sphere might be supported because of the Indigenous environmental knowledge and that governments use Indigeneity to push their political agenda. This decolonial lens to the words of COICA's Indigenous leaders exposes that Indigenous peoples remain subject to unequal relations of global capitalism. However, in the theoretical framework of this thesis, it was already debated that Indigenous peoples find ways to contest the decolonial discourse of Indigeneity as vulnerable. Following this argument, they find ways to combat environmental challenges through their practices based on ancestral traditions and worldviews. To understand how this contest the idea of Indigeneity as vulnerable, in the following section, I give a detailed account of Indigenous worldmakings of environmentalism as well as how this is performed in the global political sphere.

3.2 Indigenous Environmental Worldmakings

3.2.1 Territories and Environmentalism

From the document analysis, it became clear that understanding the meaning of Indigenous territories is fundamental in Indigenous environmental worldmakings. The following section entails a detailed description of the meaning of Indigenous territories within Indigenous worldmakings. In this light, COICA's Indigenous leaders reveal that Indigenous territories represent more than the land that they live on. This is demonstrated in the following quote: *“Our territory is a comprehensive space, where all beings coexist in harmony; where the spiritual and the physical, the individual and the community, the past and the present, nature, and human beings as part of it, are combined to achieve balance, good living for a full life. Therefore, its protection has become a process of life and death”*. One aspect of this worldview is that Indigenous territories comprise [spiritual] worlds that, from the perspective of Indigenous leader Alonso Tacana, non-Indigenous peoples are unable to see. In addition, territories were described as indivisible entities or flows of entities that contain forests, biodiversity, the sacred, the supernatural, water, and other resources. They represent various spheres of life; nourishment, medicine, and spirituality. In this context, the vitality of life on and on Mother Earth revolves around the functional relationship of all these entities, which depends on the intervention of the non-humans. This explanation of territories complements the notion of relationality specifically for worldmaking concepts in the

spectrum of environmentalism because it gives a deeper understanding of the relationship between all entities (e.g., Mother Earth, spirits, and Indigenous peoples) is more critical than the entity itself. Another element of this relational worldmaking concept that became clear in the analysis is that there is a sense of belonging with Indigenous territories (and indivisible entities) for Indigenous people. This contests the Western idea of territory as ownership.

Within this worldmaking, when using the Indigenous Voice at COP26, COICA Indigenous leader Nemo Andi referred to the Waorani territory at COP26 as *"my land, my territory Waorani"*. This conceptualization of territory and belonging shows a different aspect of the Indigenous Voice that explains why 'ownership of land' is integral for Indigenous peoples. From the perspective of COICA's female Indigenous leaders, territories, knowledge, and bodies are unitary, they are considered as one. This perspective is also reflected in the following quote from Alonso Tacana, *"We are territory, we are trees, we are rivers, we are gorge, we are land. This is, there is a coexistence of biodiversity with Indigenous peoples"*. This conception of the body and territory might indicate that Indigenous women perceive violence to their territories as violence upon their bodies. The following statement by COICA's Indigenous leader reflects that practices such as deforestation are not only consequent in global warming, they, again, challenge Indigenous bodies and life, *"Affecting a medicinal plant can affect the lives of many peoples and condemn them to extermination. This has not been understood by the West."*

This Indigenous worldmaking on territories builds further on the IEJ frame (former section on vulnerable position) as it shows an interesting aspect of the Indigenous Voice as more than a fight for land. It can be argued that the Indigenous Voice in the global political sphere represents territories as both the physical and cultural survival of Indigenous peoples themselves.

3.2.2 Our Mother Earth

One crucial aspect of this conception of territories concerning the environment was the intimate relationship with Mother Earth. In the former section, it became clear that Indigenous peoples perceive themselves as protectors of the ecosystems because of their relationship with Mother Earth. COICA's Indigenous leaders stated that Indigenous peoples understand "her" (Mother Earth) language. It is because of the understanding of Mother Earth that she can tell Indigenous peoples what she needs; therefore, Indigenous peoples described themselves as original environmentalists. Indigenous leader Andres Tapia argued that the root of climate change is *"Our*

Mother Earth is exhausted” and saving the planet as “*there is no solution of the healing of Mother Earth that does not require connecting with the Earth and feeling what she needs.*” Having established the intimate relationship with Mother Earth as a living being, the above-stated words by Andres Tapia are not a figure of speech. Contesting the Western concept of land and environmental changes (e.g., global warming), Mother Earth communicates her needs by performance of the Indigenous Voice. Therefore, the following section explains in detail how communication with Mother Earth is crucial in the vitality of territories and life

One aspect which illustrates how Indigenous peoples communicate with Mother Earth becomes evident in the stories of the Runa peoples of Ecuador. They reveal that the communication with the forest is the root of the vitality of the whole forest; the communication between entities is an integral part of the Runas' vocabulary, which they defined as *forest talk*. Understanding how forest talk incorporates Indigenous worldmaking concepts on environmentalism reveals how the perseverance of the native languages is crucial in Indigenous worldmaking concepts.

Nonetheless, the communication with, and the understanding of, the flow of the forest goes beyond vocabulary. Communication with Mother Earth was described as looking at the sky, feeling the temperature, and listening to the beat of the land. For COICA Coordinator Cecilia and other Guajajara peoples, nourishment of the forest is only possible with the permission of Mother Earth. Through their eyes, spirits, and the spiritual world nourish and protect Mother Earth. They communicate with the *above and below* through rituals of singing for permission, protecting their territories, the arrival of seeds and plants, and teachings on how to cultivate. COICA's Indigenous leaders explained that elements of the territory, namely medicinal plants -ayahuasca, guayusa, and tobacco³-, are used to communicate with the spiritual world as well. To illustrate, by drinking ayahuasca, the shamans of the Peruvians' Amazonian Urarina peoples communicate with the spiritual world to ensure resources on which collective life of all entities on land depend and benefit

³Ayahuasca is a plant-brew that is used as a ceremonial spiritual medicine used in the Amazon basin. Guayusa is a holy tree from the Amazon, it has a stimulating effect similar to caffeine and it has antioxidant and anti-inflammatory properties. Tobacco smoke opens the soul to the spiritual world, which brings healing powers and reduces negative energy.

of, such as a stable climate and steady supply of animals to eat. The Yshiro peoples put into words that if there exists a lack of animals on land, it means that the communication in the network of entities is failing. This is demonstrated in the following quote on a hunting ban by an international NGO on Paraguayan Yshiro territories: “... *the authorities said that fishing restrictions were meant to protect the resource from disappearing. The Yshiro said that this made no sense because the amount of fish in the river had nothing to do with how much they were harvested because the fish come with rain. As long as there is rain, there is fish.*”

The above quote from the Yshiro peoples displays that an understanding of how the network of entities communicates with each other is integral to Indigenous environmentalism. As the quotes in the above section reveal, these crucial networks of entities become present by performance of the Indigenous Voice. However, the quote from the Yshiro also shows phrases that contest Western standards might result in misunderstandings when responding to the global political sphere through the Indigenous Voice. To further understand the role of the Indigenous Voice as a performance of territories, I explore COICA's Indigenous Voice with the meaning of Indigenous territories in the following section.

3.2.3 Cry of the Jungle

COICA's leaders explained that during the two weeks of COP26, they had raised the Cry of the Jungle, it was defined as the call of Indigenous peoples to governments in line with their roles and responsibilities as caretakers of the planet. Because of the unity between Indigenous peoples with the Indigenous territories and their medicinal knowledge, COICA's Indigenous leader Fany Kruiiri emphasized that Indigenous women should voice their knowledge themselves to maintain the jungle. In this context, the political participation of COICA means that the Indigenous Voice is the voice of the Amazonian territories. Having established that Mother Earth communicated by performance of the Indigenous Voice, the Cry of the Jungle would indicate a call (cry or scream of help) from Mother Earth to Western governments. This became clear in the words of José Gregorio Díaz Mirabal, “*With our voice, the jungle screams louder on the planet, showing the world that the peoples continue to fight and resist without fear. Listen to the cry of the jungle and come build a path together to stop the ongoing eco- and ethnocide.*”

Considering the above, the Cry of the Jungle is an important aspect in the conceptualization of the Indigenous Voice. Adding worldmaking politics of the Indigenous Voice builds on the

decolonial notion of the Indigenous Voice that I explored in the first section of this chapter. On the one hand, the decolonial conceptualization of the Indigenous Voice explains that the demand for Indigenous territorial rights in the global political sphere emerges from the vulnerable position of Indigenous peoples. On the other hand, for Indigenous peoples, the Indigenous Voice gives voice to the network of entities that ensure vitality on the planet. The words of Hector Gabio Yununa Perea reveal the latter as he explained that his presence included not only the voice of all Indigenous people on his territory but as well as the presence of their ancestors -the spiritual world-. He voiced this and criticism of the western world through the following statement, *“In the face of such profound collectivism, individualism is suddenly exposed and looks sadly impotent”*.

Having gained knowledge on Indigenous environmental worldmakings, the analysis shows that misunderstandings occur when Indigenous and Western environmental solutions collide. As a result, many of COICA's Indigenous leaders criticized modern and western 'solutions' to save the environment. Scientific and technological solutions were described as temporary and ignorant of reality, they failed to consider the relationship between entities (see the beginning of the chapter). Therefore, Juan Carlos Jintiach argued that it is essential that the global political sphere recognizes concepts of territorial governance, their organic structures, and life plans. They describe this form of co-governance as the only way to succeed in climate goals. Not adopting Indigenous ancestral knowledge would be *“a failure for humanity,”* said José Gregorio Mirabal. In this context, the IEJ frame provides a counter-narrative to the concept of Indigeneity as a victim as well. According to COICA's Indigenous leaders, the coexistence of Indigenous worldviews on environmentalism in the global political sphere is a "critical intellectual project" for global and Indigenous leaders. It would mean that 'otherness' is taken seriously from both sides, identifying the differences but also the connections. They stated that even if they would partially escape their own concepts, this strategy would undermine the global political hegemony. In this context, Indigeneity can also serve as a powerful political voice.

Conclusion

In this thesis, I analyzed how Indigenous Amazonian worldmakings of environmentalism respond to the global infrastructure of politics by taking the presence of COICA at COP26. In this study, I focused on three factors that clarify how worldmaking concepts respond in the global political sphere. I first explored the main elements of Indigenous worldmakings of environmentalism, in which the Indigenous meaning and relationship with and on territories are crucial for the vitality of Mother Earth. Next, I closely examined that Indigenous peoples perceive themselves as the radical other within the global world order as well as saviors of the planet because of their Indigenous environmental knowledge. Most importantly, in this study, I centered COICA's perspective of the Indigenous Voice and its performance by COICA as the representation of Indigenous rights in the global political sphere, as well as the voice of the Amazonian territories / Mother Earth.

The three factors in the above were analyzed through decolonial and post-colonial studies within Indigenous studies. It has been established that Indigenous worldmakings of environmentalism respond to the global political sphere by performance of the Indigenous Voice. Rather than giving two contrasting views, this approach adds to the sociological sphere of Indigenous Studies by giving two complementary understandings of the presence of the Indigenous Voice and how it interacts with environmental and territorial worldmaking in the global political sphere. While a decolonial lens to the analysis revealed that the demands of the Indigenous Voice in the global political sphere emerged from Indigeneity as the radical other, a post-colonial lens to the same event adds that the demands are not about Indigenous territorial ownership rather, they represent mutual belonging. With this in mind, the Indigenous Voice is the voice of all entities that are vital for life on (Mother) Earth.

First, taking a decolonial Indigenous Environmental Justice (IEJ) frame to the analysis revealed that the Indigenous Voice in the global political sphere emerged out of continuous suppression of Indigenous, territorial, and environmental rights. In the analysis, this frame exposed that Indigeneity is perceived as the solution to the destruction of the planet in the global political sphere as well. Instead of contesting this conceptualization, a post-colonial lens elaborated on the IEJ frame by explaining that the Indigenous Voice is both the physical and cultural survival of Indigenous peoples themselves. First, it became clear that within the indigenous worldmakings,

territories are integral as they represent a network of entities (human and non-human) that are essential for all life, they represent various spheres of life; nourishment, medicine, and spirituality. The post-colonial perspective revealed that the Indigenous Voice includes the voice of Indigenous territories, Mother Earth, as well as the presence of their ancestors by Indigenous peoples in the global political sphere. Within this worldview, territories and bodies are unitary, for this reason, violence upon the territory is perceived as violence against Indigenous life. In this light, another important aspect of the Indigenous Voice is how Indigenous peoples communicate with all the entities, which includes vocabulary, feeling, listening, medicinal, and spiritual practices.

Combining the two schools revealed that the emerging presence of the Indigenous Voice is the voice of the Amazon that speaks through the Indigenous leaders, which emphasizes the essential flow of human and non-human entities for environmental justice and Indigenous life. Secondly, by incorporating such Indigenous worldmaking, COICA deliberately introduced a form of 'otherness' to global climate politics, which encourages other ways of doing environmentalism.

Because of these 'radically' different ways of communicating, misunderstandings might occur when Indigenous worldmaking concepts become present in the global political sphere. However, according to COICA's Indigenous leaders, the coexistence of Indigenous worldviews on environmentalism in the global political sphere is a "critical intellectual project" for both global and Indigenous leaders. Adding an IEJ frame to Indigenous worldmaking concepts also provides a counter-narrative. While, indeed, Indigenous peoples perceive their position as 'vulnerable,' their ancestral knowledge has equipped them with knowledge on how to survive in the neoliberal climate. From the perception of COICA, it would mean that 'otherness' is taken seriously by the Western sphere, as well as Indigenous peoples, identifying the differences but also the connections. According to COICA's Indigenous leaders, even if they would partially escape the Indigenous worldmaking concepts, it would undermine the global political hegemony.

Through the lens of Indigenous worldmaking concepts, the relationship between entities is more important than the entity itself. From this worldview, the relationship between Indigenous leaders and political leaders are entities within the indivisible entities necessary to save Mother Earth. From a post-colonial lens, Indigenous worldmaking concepts could form and reform as a response to experiences with and within the global infrastructure of environmental politics. Within this conceptualization, Indigeneity can also serve as a powerful political voice.

The analysis of this thesis focused solely on one Indigenous alliance group, COICA, on one global political event. Even though COICA represents the Indigenous peoples of the Amazon Basin, the Indigenous leaders from this organization that are present in the Western political sphere are fully integrated into the neo-liberal climate. Future research is necessary to fully understand the possibilities of Indigenous worldmaking concepts on environmentalism and how this aligns with the results in this thesis. Therefore, it would be interesting to have a more in-depth analysis of Indigenous political practices from other Indigenous political initiatives. In addition, to grapple with the worldmakings from COICA's Indigenous leaders, it would be of additional value to observe how these worldmakings come alive on and with their territories.

With this thesis, I add to the sociological landscape of Indigenous Studies by giving a new perspective of Indigenous climate politics as I discussed how worldmakings directly respond to today's Western models of development. Despite its limitations, the understanding of Indigenous environmental worldmakings from the perspective of COICA might not only reduce misunderstandings in the global political sphere but also gives academic focus to Indigenous worldmakings in the global political sphere from an Indigenous perspective. Hopefully this creates possibilities for the Western world to step away from “savage capitalism” and address climate change in a more holistic way.

References

Awasqa. (2021, November 8). COP26: “There Will Be No Solution for Humanity Without Us”. Awasqa: The Green Network Project. Retrieved March 3, 2022, from <https://awasqa.org/en/2021/11/08/cop26-there-will-be-no-solution-for-humanity-without-us/>

Awasqa. (2021). COP26: “There Will Be No Solution for Humanity Without Us”. Awasqa. <https://awasqa.org/2021/11/08/cop26-there-will-be-no-solution-for-humanity-without-us/>

Bhabha in Bhabra, G.K. (2014). Postcolonial and decolonial dialogues. *Postcolonial and decolonial dialogues*, 17(2), 115-121. 10.1080/13688790.2014.966414

Bryman, A. (2016). *Social Research Methods*. Oxford University Press.

Bolognesi, L. (Director). (2021). *The Last Forest* [Film].

Cifuentes, S. (2021) "Rethinking Climate Governance: Amazonian Indigenous Climate Politics and Integral Territorial Ontologies," *Journal of Latin American Geography* 20(2): 131-155.

COICA.

_COICA. (2022). We Are COICA 1. COICA. Retrieved March 3, 2022, from <https://coicamazonia.org/revista-coica/>

_COICA. (2022). We Are COICA 2. COICA. Retrieved March 3, 2022, from <https://coicamazonia.org/revista-coica/>

_COICA. (2022). Videos de la COP26. From <https://coicamazonia.org/cop26/>

_COICA. (2022). Pronunciamiento COICA. From <https://coicamazonia.org/cop26/>

_COICA. (2022). Boletines de Presa. From <https://coicamazonia.org/cop26/>

_COICA. (2021). DECLARACIÓN DE GLASGOW SOBRE METAS PARA LA PROTECCIÓN DE DEFENSORES Y DEFENSORAS DESDE LA COICA EN LA COP26 » COICA. COICA. <https://coicamazonia.org/declaracion-de-glasgow-sobre-metas-para-la-proteccion-de-defensores-y-defensoras-desde-la-coica-en-la-cop26/>

_COICA. (2021). Formación constante para una mayor incidencia: experiencias desde pueblos indígenas en espacios de negociación internacional. COICA. <https://coicamazonia.org/formacion-constante-para-una-mayor-incidencia-experiencias-desde-pueblos-indigenas-en-espacios-de-negociacion-internacional/>

_COICA. (2021). LAND BACK: There is no solution to the climate crisis without us. APIB. <https://apiboficial.org/2021/10/29/land-back-there-is-no-solution-to-the-climate-crisis-without-us/?lang=en>

_COICA. (2021). Pueblos indígenas de la cuenca amazónica frente a los resultados de la COP26. COICA. <https://coicamazonia.org/pueblos-indigenas-de-la-cuenca-amazonica-frente-a-los-resultados-de-la-cop26/>

Dransart, P. (1994). "Pachamama: The Inka Earth Mother of the Long Sweeping Garment. In *Dress and Gender: Making and Meaning* (pp. 145-63). New York/Oxford: Berg.

Fabricant, N., & Postero, N. (2018). The Indigenous Studies Turn. In J. Poblete (Ed.), *New Approaches to Latin American Studies: Culture and Power* (pp. 128-144). Taylor & Francis Group.

_Tsing, A. in Fabricant & Postero (2018). The Indigenous Studies Turn. In J. Poblete (Ed.), *New Approaches to Latin American Studies: Culture and Power* (pp. 128-144). Taylor & Francis Group.

_De la Cadena in Fabricant & Postero (2018). The Indigenous Studies Turn. In J. Poblete (Ed.), *New Approaches to Latin American Studies: Culture and Power* (pp. 128-144). Taylor & Francis Group.

_Escobar in Fabricant & Postero (2018). The Indigenous Studies Turn. In J. Poblete (Ed.), *New Approaches to Latin American Studies: Culture and Power* (pp. 128-144). Taylor & Francis Group.

Geertz, C. (1973). *Thick Description: Towards an Interpretive Theory of Culture*. The Interpretation of Cultures. HarperCollins Publishers, Inc

Given, L. (2008). *The sage encyclopedia of qualitative research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Goodman, N. (1978). *Ways of Worldmaking*. Harvester Press. DOI: 10.2307/2219267

Hale, C. (2002). Does Multiculturalism Menace? Governance, Cultural Rights, and the Politics of Identity in Guatemala. *Journal of Latin American Studies*, 34(3), 485-524.

IYNF. (2019). We must form alliances with young people. IYNF. <https://www.iynf.org/2019/12/we-must-form-alliances-with-young-people/>

Kohn, E. (2013). *How Forests Think: Toward an Anthropology Beyond the Human*. University of California Press.

Maldonado-Torres, N. (2018). The Decolonial Turn. In J. Poblete (Ed.), *New Approaches to Latin American Studies: Culture and Power* (pp. 111-127). Taylor & Francis Group.

McGregor, D., Whitaker, S., & Sritharan, M. (2020). Indigenous environmental justice and sustainability. *Environmental Sustainability*, 43(35), 40.

Mendoza, B. (2018). Can the Subaltern save us? *Tapuya: Latin American Science, Technology and Society*, 1(1), 109-122.

Miles, P. (2021). Txai Surui 'The Earth is Speaking' | by Peter Miles | Age of Awareness. Medium. <https://medium.com/age-of-awareness/txai-surui-the-earth-is-speaking-e7758bd5ca05>

Morgan, H. (2022). Conducting a Qualitative Document Analysis. *The Qualitative Report*, 27(1), 64-77. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2022.5044>

Quijano, A. (2007). Coloniality and Modernity/Rationality. *Cultural Studies*, 21(2), 168-178. 10.1080/09502380601164353

Reyes Godelmann, I. (2014, July 30). The Zapatista Movement: The Fight for Indigenous Rights in Mexico - Australian Institute of International Affairs. Australian Institute of International Affairs.

Salazar, N. (2022). "We do not want payment— we want funds to guarantee our rights": Tuntiak Katan in conversation with Tenure Facility. Tenure Facility. <https://thetenurefacility.org/article/we-do-not-want-payment-we-want-funds-to-guarantee-our-rights-tuntiak-katan-in-conversation-with-tenure-facility/>

Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 333-339. 10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039

UN. (2022). United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples | United Nations For Indigenous Peoples. the United Nations. <https://www.un.org/development/desa/indigenouspeoples/declaration-on-the-rights-of-indigenous-peoples.html>

UNFCCC. (2021). 4 Key Achievements of COP26. UNFCCC. <https://unfccc.int/news/4-key-achievements-of-cop26>

UNFCCC. (2021). The Glasgow Climate Pact – Key Outcomes from COP26. UNFCCC. <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/the-glasgow-climate-pact-key-outcomes-from-cop26>

Vindal Odegaard, C., & Rivera Andía, J. J. (Eds.). (2019). *Indigenous Life Projects and Extractivism: Ethnographies from South America*. Springer International Publishing. 10.1007/978-3-319-93435-8

Fabricant & Postero in Vindal Odegaard, C., & Rivera Andía, J. J. (Eds.). (2019). *Indigenous Life Projects and Extractivism: Ethnographies from South America*. Springer International Publishing. 10.1007/978-3-319-93435-8

Viveiros de Castro in Vindal Odegaard, C., & Rivera Andía, J. J. (Eds.). (2019).

Indigenous Life Projects and Extractivism: Ethnographies from South

America. Springer International Publishing. 10.1007/978-3-319-93435-8

vanPool, C. (2019). Ancient medicinal plants of South America. *PNAS*, 116(23). 10.1073/pnas.1906805116

Viveiros de Castro, E. (2004). *Perspectival Anthropology and the Method of Controlled Equivocation*. *Tipiti: Journal of the Society for the Anthropology of Lowland South America*, 2(1).

Viveiros de Castro, E. d. (2015). *The Relative Native: Essays on Indigenous Conceptual Worlds*. Hau Books.

Walter. (2020). *Equality without equivalence: an anthropology of the common*. (2020). *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 26(1), 146-166. 10.1111/1467-9655.13183

Wengrow, D., & Graeber, D. (2021). *The Dawn of Everything: A New History of Humanity*. Allen Lane.

Whyte, K. (2017). *The Dakota Access Pipeline, Environmental Injustice, and U.S. Colonialism*. *An International Journal of Indigenous Literature, Arts, & Humanities*, 19(1).

Whyte, K. (2017). *Indigenous Climate Change Studies : Indigenizing Futures, Decolonizing the Anthropocene*. *English Language Notes*, 55(1-2), 153-162.

Zarraga, A. (2021). "The Earth is speaking: she tells us we have no more time". *Global Witness*. <https://www.globalwitness.org/en/blog/earth-speaking-she-tells-us-we-have-no-more-time/>

Appendix I.

Type of Document	Specifics	Source	Date
COICA			
Official Documents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Magazine, We Are COICA 1 Magazine, We Are COICA 2 	COICA Amazonia Website – Revista (Magazine) COICA	March 2022
Speeches and Interviews of COICA during and about COP26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Videos of Summary COP26 per day (6 videos) Txai Suruí at COP26; Youth leader COICA from Suruí people Brazil. José Gregorio Díaz Mirabal, Wakuenai Kurripaco people Venezuela, General Coordinator at COICA. Tuntiak Katan, Shuar people Ecuador, General Coordinator COICA Nemo Andi, member of Waorani People of Ecuador, Coordinator Women COICA Tomas Candia Yusupi, Chiquitano people Bolivia, General Coordinator COICA Eligio Da Costa Evaristo, Orpia people Venezuela, COICA Coordinator Julio Cesar Lopez Jamioy, OPIAC Colombia, Coordinator COICA Tabea Casique Coronado, Coordinator COICA Education Hector Fabio Yucuna Perea, Yukuna people Colombia OPIAC, Youth Coordinator COICA Juan Carlos Jintiach, Shuar people Ecuador, Coordinator COICA Ecuador Harol Rincón Ipuchima, Maguta people Colombia, COICA Climate Change Coordinator Andres Tapia, Puyo People Ecuador, Coordinator COICA 	COICA Amazonia Website - COICA at COP26 Medium. com with speech Awasqa, the Guardian, API Official; Pachamama Alliance	During and after COP26. Oct. and Nov. 2021
UN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change UNFCCC's Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples Platform Facilitative Working Group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UNFCCC Website Lcipp.unfccc (platform) 	During COP26 10/31 - 11/6 2021
Ethnographies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cifuentes, S. (2021). Rethinking Climate Governance: Amazonian Indigenous Climate Politics and Integral Territorial Ontologies. (Different COICA Indigenous leaders, Clemencia, a Murui-Muina peoples Colombia Cecilia, Guajajara women Brazil, OPIAC Colombia peoples) Fragment of the documentary The Last Forest, Davi Kopenawa Yanomami people Brazil and Venezuela. Escobar, A. (2015). Territorios de diferencia: la ontología política de los "derechos al territorio". ("[PDF] Territorios de diferencia: la ontología política de los "derechos ...") Yurumangüí peoples of Colombia. Kohn, E. (2013). How forests think: Toward an anthropology beyond the human. Runa peoples of Ecuador. 	University Library	

Table 1.

Appendix II.

CHECKLIST ETHICAL AND PRIVACY ASPECTS OF RESEARCH

INSTRUCTION

This checklist should be completed for every research study that is conducted at the Department of Public Administration and Sociology (DPAS). This checklist should be completed before commencing with data collection or approaching participants. Students can complete this checklist with help of their supervisor.

This checklist is a mandatory part of the empirical master's thesis and has to be uploaded along with the research proposal.

The guideline for ethical aspects of research of the Dutch Sociological Association (NSV) can be found on their website (http://www.nsv-sociologie.nl/?page_id=17). If you have doubts about ethical or privacy aspects of your research study, discuss and resolve the matter with your EUR supervisor. If needed and if advised to do so by your supervisor, you can also consult Dr. Jennifer A. Holland, coordinator of the Sociology Master's Thesis program.

PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION

Project title: Qualitative research on Indigenous Worldmaking in the Global Infrastructure of Environmental Politics

Name, email of student: Andrea Knotter. 625856ak@student.eur.nl.

Name, email of supervisor: Dr. Jess Bier. bier@essb.eur.nl

Start date and duration: 14th of April, 3 months.

Is the research study conducted within DPAS YES

v. 1.1 (September 2020)

PART II: HUMAN SUBJECTS

1. Does your research involve human participants. NO
If 'NO': skip to part V.

part V.

Where and when will you store your data in the short term, after acquisition?

On a personal USB. All digital data files. Written content and coded content will be saved on a hard drive, not on cloud. All data is digital - derived from online sources, so already published-

Note: indicate for separate data sources, for instance for paper-and pencil test data, and for digital data files.

Who is responsible for the immediate day-to-day management, storage and backup of the data arising from your research?

I am.

How (frequently) will you back-up your research data for short-term data security? Every time I write.

In case of collecting personal data how will you anonymize the data?

Not collecting personal data.

Note: It is advisable to keep directly identifying personal details separated from the rest of the data. Personal details are then replaced by a key/ code. Only the code is part of the database with data and the list of respondents/research subjects is kept separate.

v. 1.1 (September 2020)

PART VI: SIGNATURE

Please note that it is your responsibility to follow the ethical guidelines in the conduct of your study. This includes providing information to participants about the study and ensuring confidentiality in storage and use of personal data. Treat participants respectfully, be on time at appointments, call participants when they have signed up for your study and fulfil promises made to participants.

Furthermore, it is your responsibility that data are authentic, of high quality and properly stored. The principle is always that the supervisor (or strictly speaking the Erasmus University Rotterdam) remains owner of the data, and that the student should therefore hand over all data to the supervisor.

Hereby I declare that the study will be conducted in accordance with the ethical guidelines of the Department of Public Administration and Sociology at Erasmus University Rotterdam. I have answered the questions truthfully.

Name student: ANDREA KNOTTER

Name (EUR) supervisor:

Date: June 17, 2022

Date:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Andrea Knotter', written in a cursive style.

Con gracias a las voces de los Indígenas de las Amazonas y la Madre Tierra