

Norms from Above, Movements from Below: Climate Change and Global-Local Dynamics of Indigenous Resistance in the Philippines and Indonesia

Ferth Vandenstein Manaysay
Waseda University, Tokyo, Japan
E-mail: ferthmanaysay@toki.waseda.jp

Abstract

This article seeks to analyse how conceptions of global climate change norms have contributed to the framing strategies and tactics of local indigenous people's rights movements using the cases of Cordillera Peoples' Alliance (CPA) from the Philippines and the *Aliansi Masyarakat Adat Nusantara* (AMAN) from Indonesia. Drawing on the combined theoretical frameworks of the world society approach and the social movement framing theory, this article argues that global climate change norms have provided indigenous people's rights movements in Indonesia and the Philippines with new sources of vocabularies towards collective action. In theoretical and empirical terms, it contends that the exposure of the local indigenous social movements to global normative mechanisms have shifted local activism, as the world society approach envisages, while framing theory elucidates the manner in which movement-actors are able to interpret and transform the ideas they receive. A paired comparison, based on data collected from the CPA and AMAN's public pronouncements as well as in-depth interviews with local indigenous movement leaders and members, shows material ideas and instruments that social movements receive from global institutional sources (such as the United Nations climate change agreements, global indigenous declarations, and international climate justice coalitions) have enabled them to produce novel frames for collective action at the local level. Contrastingly, it demonstrates how indigenous climate justice activists have also been able to frame their contentions against the prevailing global norms and ideas about climate change.

Keywords: *Framing, World Society, Climate Change Norms, Indigenous People's Rights Movements, Philippines, Indonesia*

I. INTRODUCTION

Whilst the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) recognises indigenous and traditional knowledge are resources in the search for viable and

meaningful solutions in adapting to and mitigating climate change, many activists have protested against the erasure of indigenous people's rights in the global climate agreement. Indigenous peoples have been disproportionately affected by the brunt of climate change, but they remain amongst the most under-represented communities at the national, regional, and global levels of climate change decision-making processes. The indigenous people's fight against climate change is concomitant to different sets of interrelated issues, including human rights and sustainable development. Indigenous rights social movements are also characterised by constitutive and competitive relationships that exist within the area of climate change with governments and non-state actors (e.g. women, farmers, and youth groups) who have created their own identity-based climate mobilisations. The marginalisation of indigenous persons at different levels of decision-making processes has nonetheless enabled these actors to constitute "a unique, formidable, and cohesive social movement across borders, working both inside and outside official, governmental spaces and legal processes, in order to contest but also engage the dominant understandings of climate change and their hegemonic and (neo)colonial bases, while, at the same time, creating spaces to assert their own understandings and encounter potential allies."¹

Hence, indigenous peoples have participated in temporary and broad-based coalitions, which are fuelled by various sources of contentious repertoires and multiple layers of identities. These movement coalitions have also used 'convergence' as a political strategy in which indigenous peoples, for example, tend to identify their common points of contention with other agrarian and environmental movement actors focused on climate-related resource grabs and mitigation efforts.² Based on this strategy, indigenous peoples, along with other movement actors, have attempted to move towards a model of climate justice, which seeks to go beyond the environmental and physical aspects of the changing climate by framing its consequences as an ethical and political concern for the marginalised peoples and communities. Specifically, the emerging innovative forms of protest politics, which global indigenous movement actors have employed as part of their strategy to confront climate change issues, provide an opportunity to raise new questions as to how the definition of social movements is adapting to political and environmental changes.

This article is motivated by such social and political developments. Broadly, it seeks to analyse how conceptions of global climate change norms have contributed to the strategic framing processes of local indigenous people's rights movements. The aim of this article is two-fold. Firstly, it aims to combine and draw from two different theoretical models, namely the world society approach and the social movement framing theory, to examine the relationship between global climate change norms and local indigenous rights movements. By employing the world society and social

1 Ben Powless, "An Indigenous Movement to Confront Climate Change" (2012) 9:3 *Globalizations* 411-424.

2 Salena Tramel, "Convergence as political strategy: social justice movements, natural resources and climate change" (2018) 39:7 *Third World Quarterly* 1290-1307.

movement framing theories as the lens for analysis, the research is able to delve deeper into the aforementioned concerns and develop an understanding of the relationship between norms and collective action issues. The research asserts it is imperative to conduct a detailed study of these complex linkages across different socio-political contexts in order to document and identify the different variations and outcomes of collective action. For instance, the manner in which top-down mechanisms (e.g. the over-all implications of global indigenous and human rights declarations) are able to combine with the bottom-up agendas and actions of social movements (e.g. socio-political changes through policy-making processes).³

The second goal is both analytical and methodological. The article examines two case studies based on the distinct experiences of indigenous social movements from Indonesia and the Philippines, where local social movement actors initially conceived of resistance to “development” projects (e.g. dams, illegal logging, and mining) have grown to incorporate wider environmental issues including climate change into their work. The case studies offer empirically-grounded insights on global climate change norms and their ability to provide novel resources for the strategic framing processes of indigenous rights movements in Indonesia and the Philippines. Methodologically, the use of these two cases for this research provides an opportunity to analyse the data through a “paired comparison” method.⁴ In Indonesia and the Philippines, the global norms and agendas have progressively provided local indigenous people’s rights movements with material support, alliance-building, strategic advice and vocabularies for effective framing of climate change issues. Such resources have enhanced the capacity of local movements for effective mobilisation as well. The article goes on to illustrate how indigenous climate justice activists from the Philippines and Indonesia have also actively framed against the state-centric global normative agendas. They have done so by espousing their sense of indigeneity and have been critical of global and national actors’ adherence to dominant economic and political structures, which operate against the specific claims they make about their rights, needs and goals.

The article seeks to build on the nexus between global norms and local social movements by focusing on the world society approach and framing theory as central concepts adopted by social movement studies and transnational activism, the focus being climate change and indigenous movements. The following section discusses the theoretical framework employed in this study. The article proceeds to present the research design, methods of data collection and analysis as well as the limitations of the study. The empirical aspects of this research are presented in the subsequent section.

3 For an example of recent work on world society and framing, See Hwa Ji Shin & Kiyoteru Tsutsui, “Constructing Social Movement Actorhood: Resident Koreans’ Activism in Japan Since 1945:” (2016) 48:4 *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 317–335; Kiyoteru Tsutsui & Hwa Ji Shin, “Global Norms, Local Activism, and Social Movement Outcomes: Global Human Rights and Resident Koreans in Japan” (2008) 55:3 *Social Problems* 391–418.

4 Sidney Tarrow, “The Strategy of Paired Comparison: Toward a Theory of Practice”: (2010) 43:2 *Comparative Political Studies* 230–259.

Finally, the article concludes by summarising the lessons learned from the Philippine and Indonesian indigenous movements' framing strategies and normative interpretations of global climate change agendas.

II. NORMS ON THE MOVE: WORLD SOCIETY AND FRAMING

The world society theory is widely viewed as an approach that runs counter to the traditional theories of international politics.⁵ This approach departs from contemporary analytical tools (i.e. classical and structural realism, world system theories, and neo-liberalism) by putting “the institutional character of transnational development front and centre”⁶ and bringing “culture and norms back in international relations.”⁷ The world society has produced many empirical studies on the impact of global models on local policy changes by assuming that “ideas that acquire strong legitimacy in society become taken-for-granted models, or blueprint, and shape local policy making.”⁸ The theory of world society was introduced to provide a sociological strand of institutionalism in the analysis of international relations within which actors are expected to “interact across national boundaries and find themselves embedded in a global-level cultural context that essentially casts their identities, organisations, activities, and networks in a new light.”⁹

The world society perspective has been especially useful in contextualising how the global human rights regime has affected the behaviour of domestic political actors. For world society theorists, “global governance institutions constitute transnational power structures that provide new political opportunity structures for emergent transnational social movements.”¹⁰ This illustrates how the world society approach has been instrumental in making sense of social movements that take advantage of the global norms and models to advance their demands. The current literature, relating to the world society approach, however, often treats the global-local interaction as a unidirectional process whereby the global shapes the local. This article attempts to contribute to this discourse by attesting local indigenous social movements are also able to make meaningful contributions to the interpretation of global climate change norms.

5 John Boli & George M Thomas, “World Culture in the World Polity: A Century of International Non-Governmental Organization” (1997) 62:1 *American Sociological Review* 171.

6 *Ibid* at 172.

7 Shin & Tsutsui, *supra* note 3 at 318.

8 Tsutsui & Shin, *supra* note 3 at 396.

9 Scott Y Lin, “The Evolution of Food Security Governance and Food Sovereignty Movement in China: An Analysis from the World Society Theory” (2017) 30:5 (*Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*) 667-695 at 670.

10 Tamara Kay, “Labor Transnationalism and Global Governance: The Impact of NAFTA on Transnational Labor Relationships in North America” (2005) 11:3 *American Journal of Sociology* 715-756 at 721.

As stated above, this article integrates the framing approach with the world society theory to analyse indigenous people's rights movements and their climate change advocacy. The framing approach provides invaluable insights in determining the set of factors which affect the development of social movements. The proponents of the political process theory posit there is a need to analyse the "conditions of conduciveness" for movements.¹¹ The political process is composed of three components: political opportunity structure, framing and resource mobilisation. Political opportunity structures provide conditions which "enable movements to emerge and in particular, point to various political environments which may help explain the fates of movement organisations."¹² Framing processes "enable social movements to render events or occurrences meaningful and thereby function to organise experience and guide action."¹³ In essence, "collective action frames are action-oriented sets of beliefs and meanings that inspire and legitimate the activities and campaigns of a social movement organisation."¹⁴ Scholars of resource mobilisation approach, on the other hand, contend that social movements cannot emerge without access to critical supportive resources. This approach therefore takes into account the differences between actors, allies and targets in terms of "the resources they command, their preparedness to make resources available, and their ability to use these resources effectively."¹⁵ The political process helps in fleshing out how movements take advantage of global models to lend credibility and support for the mobilisation towards climate change issues. Due to data constraints, the research will focus on the framing processes of indigenous movements. References, however, are made to the political opportunities and resources in the manner in which these are able to enhance the framing tactics of indigenous people's climate mobilisation.

This article employs a critical analysis of local indigenous people's right movements and the three steps in the construction of collective action frames.¹⁶ The first core framing task is the "diagnostic framing" or the identification of problems and the culprits behind such problems. Diagnostic framing also asks who caused the problems at hand (e.g. individual, group and/or the state). For social movements, the deployment of injustice frames provides narratives "that point to the violation of rights and principles."¹⁷ Indigenous rights movements, for example, are likely to raise the

11 Doug McAdam & David A Snow, *Social Movements: Readings on Their Emergence, Mobilization, and Dynamics* (Roxbury Pub., 1997).

12 Bert Klandermans & Suzanne Staggenborg, *Methods of Social Movement Research*, In *Social Movements, Protest, and Contention* 16 (University of Minnesota Press, 2002).

13 Robert D Benford & David A Snow, "Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment" (2000) 26:1 *Annual Review of Sociology* 611-639 at 614.

14 *Ibid.*

15 Klandermans & Staggenborg, *supra* note 12.

16 David Snow & Robert Benford, "Ideology, Frame Resonance, and Participant Mobilization" in Bert Klandermans, Hanspeter Kriesi & Sidney G Tarrow, eds, *From structure to action: comparing social movement research across cultures* (Greenwich, Conn: JAI Press, 1988) 197.

17 Joseph Chinyong Liow, *Religion and Nationalism in Southeast Asia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016).

marginalisation of the “first peoples” in the context of modernisation and state-sponsored oppression and dispossession of lands, territories and resources. Diagnostic framing is then followed by “prognostic framing” or “the articulation of a proposed solution to the problem, or at least a plan of attack and the strategies for carrying out the plan.”¹⁸ The solutions may come from individual, tactical and strategic levels. Thus, it is useful to note that the world society can become an important source for solutions given that global institutions can provide resources for effective framing to enhance the mobilisation capacity of local activists.¹⁹ The final task is called “motivational framing” or concrete venues through which movement actors are able to call upon participants to join their social movement organisation. Motivational frames are essential in that prospect movement participants with shared understandings of the causes are much more likely to participate through the construction of appropriate vocabularies of motives. For indigenous social movements, the goal of motivational framing is to provide an alternative course of action based on their unique view of the world.

The article is therefore primarily interested in how global climate change norms are interpreted and transformed at the local level to produce novel frames for the collective mobilisation of indigenous social movements. It shows how external sources of materials for framing play a key role in the success of social movements. There are arguments that “when local culture and politics divide activists and block effective activism, global ideas can provide key frames to focus their attention on an agreeable set of issues and unite them into a coherent social movement.”²⁰ It contends that the exposure of the indigenous rights movements to global ideas can shift local activism, as the world society approach predicts, whilst the framing theory elucidates how global climate change norms are interpreted and transformed at the local level to bridge formerly unconnected ideas (frame-bridging), by using existing “cultural tool kits” (frame-amplification), extending their primary areas of contention to include issues important to potential supporters (frame-extension), and transforming old meanings into new ones (frame-transformation).²¹ Within this article, the global climate change norms broadly refer to the different international treaties and agreements, instruments, non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and activists aimed at promoting climate action, as well as ideas, resources and vocabularies that these different entities disseminate. By looking into global institutional sources such as the UN Climate Change agreements, global indigenous declarations and international climate justice coalitions, the local indigenous people’s rights movements are conceptualised based on their framing strategies and processes or the different principles that inspire and legitimise their collective action.

18 Benford & Snow, *supra* note 13 at 616.

19 Tsutsui & Shin, *supra* note 3 at 395.

20 See Shin & Tsutsui, *supra* note 3 at 320.

21 *Ibid.*

III. DATA AND METHODS

This article uses Sidney Tarrow's notion of "paired comparison" as the methodological design framework, supplemented by various data collection methods to generate an empirically-grounded account of the relationship between global climate change norms and framing processes of indigenous people's rights movements.²² During the course of this research, paired comparison is considered as "a method of political analysis distinct from both single-case studies and multicase analysis."²³ More specifically, it is also considered as a "case study plus one" which holds a number of advantages that other types of research design frames often lack. Drawing from John Stuart Mill's strategy of similarities and differences, Tarrow's paired comparison method accounts for the selection of the cases for this study. As such, the two cases for this article were chosen based on their parallel developments as movement organisations. Paired comparison offers an analytical eclecticism for the inquiry at hand, which seeks to unpack the peculiarities of the global-local interplay between climate change norms and indigenous people's rights movements. The article uses two case studies: the Cordillera Peoples Alliance (CPA) from the Philippines and *Aliansi Masyarakat Adat Nusantara* (Indigenous Peoples' Alliance of the Archipelago: AMAN) from Indonesia.

An advantage of employing this strategy is it provides an analytical wedge with which the researcher is able to complement or contrast a case they know well. The goal is to complement the primary case from the Philippines with that of Indonesia to further demonstrate the different forms of variations of framing processes that indigenous people's rights organisations use in dealing with climate change issues. Another benefit of this methodology is that it is helpful in identifying new factors for and creating an intermediary step towards theory generation. Paired comparison complements the theoretical framework of this research, which is informed by world society and framing theories. The purpose of this research, however, is not theory testing; it is simply to bring attention to how global climate change norms can shape the framing processes of indigenous rights movements.

Most of the data for this research was derived from public statements, which were previously released by the aforementioned indigenous people's rights movements relating to environmental and human rights issues with a particular focus on climate change. The documents were collected during field visits to the offices of Cordillera Peoples Alliance (CPA) and *Aliansi Masyarakat Adat Nusantara* (AMAN). In addition, the research includes publicly available news reports about the activities of the indigenous movements, open source file interviews of movement actors and open-source statements (text and audio) from these indigenous movements about their goals and activities. The fieldwork was conducted in Baguio, Philippines between December 2018 and January 2019 and in Jakarta, Indonesia from February to March 2019. The article is additionally supplemented with data from interviews with targeted leaders of

22 Tarrow, *supra* note 4.

23 *Ibid* at 231.

the indigenous movements and international organisation officials who have been closely working with indigenous movements in both countries. These were semi-structured interviews the questions ranging from their views about climate change, experiences in international solidarity work, stories about their participation in international conferences and programs, movement activities and campaigns and challenges confronting their movement vis-à-vis climate justice.

Research design is subject to drawbacks and limitations, this article is no exception. Firstly, this research tries to avoid any misplaced expectations; it highlights the impossibility of covering each political aspect of collective action in every case where global climate change norms have affected the framing processes of local indigenous movements. The primary purpose of the two empirical cases is therefore not to sketch out historical trajectories or to provide a descriptive account of arguments, but rather to facilitate an integrated analysis of broader enduring trends of the constitutive and competing frames used by different movement actors. Secondly, the research seeks to focus on framing processes which are merely one aspect of the vast theoretical literature on social movements, although references are made in the analysis, for instance, to other key aspects of the theory such as political opportunity structures and resource mobilisation. Thirdly, numerous social movement scholars critique the murkiness of research on collective action frames – this article does not argue that combining the theory with the world society approach offers a panacea for the study of social movement actors. Transnational collective action, however, requires the field of social movement studies to meaningfully draw from the larger body of sociological and political science literature to make sense of the importance of the growing power and influence of certain global mechanisms and processes.

IV. LOCAL STRUGGLES, GLOBAL ACTIONS: INDIGENOUS RIGHTS ACTIVISM IN THE PHILIPPINES AND INDONESIA

The indigenous resistance in the Philippines and Indonesia began as mobilisations against authoritarian regimes, which were undermining the demands for the recognition of the rights of the ethnic minorities. In the Philippines, the CPA was established in June 1984 and began as a loose organisation of different tribal groups which reside in the Cordillera region on northern island of Luzon. The grassroots advocacy programs of the movement were born during the oppressive dictatorship of Ferdinand Marcos when the Philippine government, along with private entities, were pushing for destructive “development” projects in the region.²⁴ These projects initiated the environmental resistance movement and raised the profile of agendas such as the human rights violations and politically repressive activities of the state. In Indonesia, AMAN began as a domestic coalition of indigenous peoples against the repressive “New Order” government of Muhammad Suharto. It is believed the movement-leaders

24 Sarah Dekdeken, Interview (Baguio City, Philippines, 2019).

of AMAN had learnt about the establishment and relative success of the CPA in the Philippines during the mid-1980s, which consequently inspired the emergence of the collective action of indigenous community groups in Indonesia.²⁵

The governments of the Philippines and Indonesia harmed and suppressed indigenous peoples in economic, political, legal, environmental and socio-cultural contexts.²⁶ The purpose of the movements was to raise awareness and resist the negative impacts of “development” on indigenous communities. In the Philippines, mobilisation tactics commenced in the early 1970s to strongly oppose the World Bank-funded Chico River Dam project and commercial logging operations of Cellophil Resources Corporation in provinces in the Northern Philippines. In Indonesia, the indigenous resistance was sparked by the concern of social movement activists and academics regarding the situation of indigenous communities. Although ethnic mobilisations had sporadically happened much earlier, it was not until the early 1990s when indigenous leaders of Indonesia had thought of organising themselves in a more systematic manner. In 1993, traditional leaders, academics and movement activists established the *Jaringan Pembela Hak-hak Masyarakat Adat* (Indigenous Peoples Rights Defenders Network: JAPHAMA) in Toraja-South Sulawesi in recognition of the struggles of ethnic minorities in Indonesia. The initiatives and mobilisations in the Philippines and Indonesia aligned with broader struggles of the emerging global indigenous movement which originated from the ‘First Nations’ of Northern and Southern America. For the Cordillerans, the initial strategy of the movement was to cast themselves as part of the separatist agendas of the communist resistance against the Philippine government. The CPA also supported the Moro National Liberation Front (MNLF), which later engaged in an “all-out” war against the state in Mindanao.

Similarly, the Indonesian indigenous people were accompanied by the Free Aceh Movement (*Gerakan Aceh Merdeka: GAM*) and the independence movement in East Timor. Such nationalist aspirations, however, became unsuccessful. Eventually, the Filipino indigenous movement actors pursued another strategy, tapping into the growing international discourse on indigenous rights especially the recognition of their rights to ancestral lands and self-determination.²⁷ By moving away from their separatist and nationalist agendas, the Cordilleran activists strategically disassociated themselves from the communist movement and became one of the first “indigenous” movements in Asia. CPA reflected the manner in which the global indigenous movement initially gained some socio-political leverage by strengthening a mass federation to promote, recognise and defend the human rights of indigenous peoples across the world. Conceptually, many nation-states during the time of the CPA’s establishment failed to recognise and provide indigenous peoples with special protection given that such

25 *Ibid.*

26 Joan Carling, Interview (Baguio City, Philippines, 2019).

27 Jacques Bertrand, “Indigenous peoples’ rights’ as a strategy of ethnic accommodation: contrasting experiences of Cordillerans and Papuans in the Philippines and Indonesia” (2011) 34:5 *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 850–869.

minority groups had long been subject to injustices and forced dispossessions of ancestral lands, territories and resources.

Internationally, the indigenous movement made its first attendance at the UN Working Group on Indigenous Populations (UN WGIP) in 1984. Interestingly, the CPA was formed the same year when the Cordillerans appeared at the UN body's meeting indicating that there was a strategic attempt on part of the indigenous activists to find an alternative venue to voice their grievances, which had been silenced at that time due to the repressive authoritarian government in the Philippines. As part of the global movement, the Cordillerans, along with indigenous peoples from different regions across the world, lodged hundreds of statements and complaints to the UN WGIP, mainly covering the different cases of physical dislocation, massive plunder of land and resources, economic displacement, political discrimination, social marginalisation, violations of cultural integrity and denial of collective identity. The Cordilleran social movement also protested the lack of adequate rights to ancestral domains and militarisation of the region. Underscoring the effects of the international debut of Cordillerans with the indigenous people's movement, Jacques Bertrand argues that "in combination with domestic pressure at the crucial moment of transition to democracy and state vulnerability, Cordillerans' international presence helped to access information and strategies to steer the Constitutional Commission in the direction of enshrining indigenous peoples' rights."²⁸ He further emphasises "it was difficult for the new democratic government of the Philippines to deny the existence of indigenous peoples when it sought ways to curb the ongoing insurgency and Cordillerans had positioned themselves so significantly on the international stage."

It is worth noting that the CPA, which has been in existence longer than AMAN, was instrumental in leading successful campaigns to establish the autonomous status of the Cordillera Administrative Region (CAR) and the official recognition of the indigenous peoples within the 1987 Philippine Constitution and the 1997 Indigenous People Rights Act (IPRA). In fact, the Philippines became the first country in Asia to recognise and legislate the rights of its indigenous peoples. CPA was successful in securing their rights by taking advantage of the domestic and international political opportunities available to them such as the fall of the Marcos regime and the UN's accommodation of the interests of the indigenous peoples as a primary agenda. In Indonesia, AMAN started using the term "indigenous peoples" in the early 1990s to refer to the movement as a "national" group, a parallel strategy had been employed by CPA's pioneer indigenous activists. For them, the term connoted a form of resistance against the Indonesian government's derogatory terms such as isolated tribes, wild farmers, primitive communities and development barriers, amongst others. The consolidation of the interests of the indigenous peoples in the country, however, did not fully materialise until the first *Kongres Masyarakat Adat Nusantara* (Congress of

28 *Ibid* at 855.

Indigenous Peoples of the Archipelago: KMAN).²⁹ In March 1999, the Congress emphasised the constitutional rights of indigenous peoples as dignified humans and as Indonesian citizens. More broadly, AMAN utilised the concept of *adat* communities to encompass the local customs, traditions and norms of the ethnic minorities in Indonesia.

Based on AMAN's definition, they are "communities who live on land that has been passed down from generation to generation."³⁰ These communities are also characterised by their own territory and natural wealth with their social and cultural life being "governed by customary law and customary institutions that have continuously sustained them as a community." AMAN struggled to secure their rights as indigenous peoples, although the downfall of President Suharto's regime in 1998 provided the movement with greater political leverage and freedom to negotiate their status with the Indonesian government. This is also perhaps due to the resolute nature of AMAN's position regarding their indigenous rights. In their first Congress, for example, the movement leaders declared that "*jika negara tidak mengakui kami, maka kamipun tidak akan mengakui negara*" ("if the state does not recognise us, we will not recognise the country"). AMAN estimates that there are 50-70 million indigenous people in Indonesia, which accounts for around 20-30% of Indonesia's population.³¹ Such a significant mass of the country's population, however, has also allowed Indonesian government to argue against the vague notions of what it means to be an "indigenous" person. President Suharto, for example, maintained that Indonesia's 500 ethnic groups are all regarded as equally "indigenous" and dispelled criticisms as part of their reports in the UN Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination. The Indonesian government, therefore, makes no distinction between indigenous peoples and other minorities. This is reflected in *masyarakat adat* which uses "names, languages, environment and customs" to define one's indigeneity.³²

Both CPA and AMAN have relied on local, national and international networks to gain support for their causes. Since the establishment of CPA, the movement "has committed itself to establishing friendly and principled relations with overseas indigenous peoples' organisations, advocate groups, and progressive individuals and institutions." The movement has implemented different organisational programmes in the region through education seminars, trainings and various types of assistance based on the lessons they learned from the international community. One of the important

29 Monica Ndoen, Interview (Jakarta, Indonesia, 2019).; Erasmus Terre, Interview (Jakarta, Indonesia, 2019)..

30 Chip Fay & Ho-Ming So Denduangrudee, "Emerging options for the recognition and protection of indigenous community rights in Indonesia" in John F McCarthy & Kathryn Robinson, eds, *Land and Development in Indonesia: Searching for the People's Sovereignty* (ISEAS-Yusof Ishak Institute, 2016) 91.

31 Myrna Safitri, "Dividing the Land: Legal Gaps in the Recognition of Customary Land in Indonesian Forest Areas" (2016) 30:2 *Kasarinlan: Philippine Journal of Third World Studies* 31-48.

32 Rukka Sombolinggi, Interview (Jakarta, Indonesia, 2019).

lessons they learned from participating in different international political forums is the importance of broadening the scope of their audiences and members. Aside from indigenous people's rights, the movement has also tried to include broader development agendas relating to women's rights, social justice, genuine peace and democratic governance.³³

Whilst the official recognition of indigenous peoples under international law remains a major hurdle in Indonesia, AMAN's work on the empowerment of the *adat* communities has also produced significant results at the national level. In recent years, the indigenous movement has managed to build a more constructive relationship with the Indonesian government regarding indigenous rights issues. AMAN has several cooperative mechanisms with different national government agencies such as the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the National Human Rights Commission, Ministry of Environment and Forestry and the Ministry of Agrarian Affairs and Spatial Planning. Some of the national processes and legislation that AMAN has worked on include the draft of the Bill on Indigenous Peoples, the inclusion of maps of indigenous territories as part of the *Badan Informasi Geospasial* (Geospatial Information Agency: BIG), and the national inquiry regarding the violation of human rights of indigenous peoples in forest areas under the National Commission on Human Rights of Indonesia.³⁴ AMAN was involved in developing and implementing various regional regulations on indigenous peoples and the mapping of indigenous territories.

Similarly, CPA and AMAN's regional and international engagements intersect through a number of organisations and networks. Both movements have been active partners of the Asian Indigenous Peoples Pact (AIPP), a leading and influential organisation pertaining to indigenous people's rights in the region. In 1987, as one of the founding members, the CPA hosted the first ever Asian Indigenous Peoples Solidarity Conference, which then led to AIPP's formation. CPA and AMAN have assisted and worked with AIPP in developing country-level research and advocacy work. In addition, the two movements are also active in advocating for the empowerment of indigenous women. Both indigenous organisations have also been involved as members of the International Alliance of Indigenous or Tribal Peoples of the Tropical Forest. Both movements have been actively engaged with the international sessions of the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues ever since it was formed in 2001. Previously, CPA hosted a workshop in Asia after the adoption of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) by the UN General Assembly in 2007. AMAN, meanwhile, has been involved in UN meetings in Geneva such as the Universal Periodic Review Mechanism (UPR) and Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (EMRIP). Some of CPA's movement-leaders have previously held such important positions as UN Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous

33 Dekdeken, *supra* note 24.

34 Sombolinggi, *supra* note 32.

Peoples and as AIPP's secretary-general. AMAN has been a member of the International Indigenous Peoples Forum on Climate Change (IIPFCC).

The Cordillerans have heavily campaigned against large dams and commercial mining projects as part of their advocacy, linkages and partnership work. In terms of environmental issues, the movement also participated with the World Commission on Dams (WCD) and took part in the activities of the Dams and Development Forum Project of the UN Environment Program (UNEP).³⁵ Locally, CPA initiated partnerships and networks with different non-governmental organisations, including the Centre for Development Programs in Cordillera (CDPC). In addition, the movement has also sought links with indigenous peoples from other parts of the world through international exchange programs based on assumptions the problems faced by indigenous people are similar irrespective of territorial borders separating them.³⁶ In the past few years, both movements have actively included climate change within the action repertoire of issues they engage in. In Indonesia, the implementation of the UN's REDD (Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation) program has provided an opportunity for AMAN to engage in international platforms like the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility's (FCPF) Sub Commission and the Forest Investment Program (FIP) Sub Committee. It was also involved in FIP's formation of a Dedicated Grant Mechanism (DGM) for indigenous peoples and local communities. Meanwhile, CPA tapped and created diverse platforms and networks as the International Conference on Indigenous Peoples' Rights, Alternatives and Solutions to the Climate Crisis and the International Indigenous Peoples' Movement for Self Determination and Liberation (IPMSDL) as part of its global climate change advocacy.

The indigenous rights activism of CPA and AMAN has consequently provided an opportunity for the movements to improve their advocacy work and engagement by taking advantage of the different networks and alliances available within the international community. From an environmental standpoint, the movements have struggled with the market-based approach of these mechanisms and forums, which largely run in contrast with somewhat different ideas about their rights as indigenous peoples. Such an approach has been one of the major points of contention of the movement regarding climate change programs. CPA and AMAN's participation in these networks has provided the movement-leaders a chance to re-frame the goals and missions of their organisations and seek new ways to re-align their usage of indigenous rights frameworks.

35 Dekdeken, *supra* note 24.

36 *Ibid.*

V. BETWEEN CLIMATE CHANGE AND INDIGENEITY: CPA AND AMAN'S FRAMING STRATEGIES AND TACTICS

As CPA and AMAN gained support from international networks, they have attempted to insert global political agendas which go above and beyond climate change issues. In general, indigenous social movements use different sets of collective action frameworks whenever they participate in international climate change discussions. In the Philippines, although CPA was instrumental in the recognition of the indigenous peoples' rights in the constitution and the passage of the landmark legislation protecting the rights of the indigenous peoples, the movement-leaders still felt their success has remained only on paper because of the presence of state-supported private entities, which threaten their rights to self-determination and ancestral lands. In Indonesia, there remain hurdles in terms of the conditions which need to be met in order to be considered as part of the *adat* community. After all, the provision of forest rights is dependent on specific legal conditions such as the recognition of district-level governments and the existence of traditional communal territory, clear leadership hierarchy and well-functioning traditional institutions.³⁷

The main thrust of CPA and AMAN's advocacy resonates with the claim-making dynamic of the global climate justice movement as is the case for transnational peasant and indigenous movements.³⁸ Based on recent discussions, the passage of land-related issues in the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) has generally provided political opportunities for the global indigenous movement to participate in the new cycle of negotiations, which include the reduction of emissions from deforestation and forest degradation as one of the crucial mechanisms to resolve environmental concerns. For the indigenous people's rights movements in the Philippines and Indonesia, a main point of contention has been regarding the formulation and implementation of UN's REDD program which quantifies credits from reduced emissions. Although the movements saw an opportunity to re-frame their advocacy to include climate change, the program has also been challenging for the indigenous leaders because of the relatively new concepts accompanying the issue. Indigenous leaders have raised the issue of climate justice at the international level while strongly emphasising the role of traditional knowledge and indigenous social systems to mitigate climate change at the local level. Strikingly, Joan Carling, CPA's former Chairperson, who was awarded the 2018 UN Champion of the Earth for her work related to the UNFCCC and REDD program, describes their initial struggles within the local indigenous rights movement in the Philippines:

37 Safitri, *supra* note 31.

38 Priscilla Claeys & Deborah Delgado Pugley, "Peasant and indigenous transnational social movements engaging with climate justice" (2017) 38:3 Canadian Journal of Development Studies 325-340.

“Climate change was definitely not taken seriously during my time with CPA. Although the issue has always been there it was not yet included as an advocacy issue by the movement. It was only in recent years that the issue has gained momentum among the indigenous peoples. It was quite hard to explain to them the sudden extreme droughts and floods they were experiencing are actually due to climate change. It was really because of the local environmental and agricultural conditions such as the presence of non-seasonal pests which convinced them that climate change is very much real.”³⁹

In terms of their engagements, both CPA and AMAN have reflected the discursive shifts “from major drivers of climate change because of their number and practices on the ground to particularly vulnerable populations, as climate change is associated with declining yields in agriculture, extreme weather events and consequent displacements.”⁴⁰ This has been evident, for example, in the ways in which the two movements have used the term “climate crisis” in providing a general framework in their understanding of the root causes of the changing climate. In convincing the public of the injustice surrounding the issue, the diagnostic frames of indigenous peoples related to climate change are deeply rooted in their rights to self-determination and collective ownership over land, territory and resource knowledge and the free determination of their political status, as well as the definition of their own course of development appropriate to their particular situations and cultures. Based on their environmental advocacy work, there is an attempt in bridging and transforming their collective action by generating new meanings based on existing claims they make about the struggles they are facing as indigenous people. In these initiatives, there is a resistance on the part of indigenous peoples against concepts like “green economy” which purportedly supports a market-based approach to climate action. One of CPA’s public pronouncements, for instance, contends that the movement’s opposition to the UN’s climate change programs is because of its “market-based context that would further entrench existing global economic system that benefits a few to the detriment of the majority, including indigenous peoples and undermines their self-determined development.”⁴¹ From prognostic and motivation framing standpoints, the indigenous peoples believe that the “real solutions” for climate change should include cutting emissions at source drastically, taking a paradigm shift in terms of the sustainable production, consumption and development, leaving fossil fuels in the ground, promoting renewable energy, promoting food sovereignty and security and ensuring a human rights-based conservation approach.

39 Carling, *supra* note 26.

40 Claeys & Pugley, *supra* note 38.

41 Cordillera Peoples Alliance and Centre for Development Programs in the Cordillera, “Cordillera Peoples Alliance-Centre for Development Programs in the Cordillera Position Paper on REDD”, (14 May 2012), online: <<https://www.cpaphils.org/disasterresponse.html>>.

During the promotion and consultation processes of the REDD programs in the Philippines, CPA released a statement with the CDPC to share their reaction to the UN REDD national strategic plan in the country. The CPA and CDPC's joint position on the REDD program provides an interesting source for strategic frames surrounding climate change issues. CPA called for social and collective action against the UN's proposed climate change program, which includes their recommendations, contentions and agendas for collaboration between the government and civil society. As previously mentioned, CPA has always constructed the UN REDD program as a "market-based" initiative within the global capitalist system, even though the movement leaders also note that it has the potential to become a "capacity building" tool for the promotion of indigenous people's rights and to serve as an alternative mechanism for "bottom-up" participation among the relevant stakeholders. Under the proposed program, businesses from different parts of the country and around the world are expected to pour in millions of dollars to the forest owners to support forest conservation while maintaining the economic development in the mountainous regions of the Philippines. Hence, while the different ideas about mitigating climate change, conserving the environment and promoting local economic development sound ideal, the position of the Cordillerans has been mostly characterised by active resistance against how this program can undermine the rights of indigenous peoples to their resources and self-determination:

"Giving values to the carbon in trees (e.g. resource valuation and forest carbon financing) will commodify and commercialise our forests, which is not the worldview of indigenous peoples."⁴²

Indeed, there have been arguments about the vulnerability of indigenous groups from losing their access to the forest under the program. The above statement reflects the view that the program would likely increase the marginalisation of indigenous people from accessing the forest, triggering land disputes and increasing state and "expert" control over forests. This opens the possibility of indigenous peoples shifting the power relations by representing themselves as "indigenous environmentalists" possessing valuable local knowledge of resources. The indigenous movement is also open to engage in capacity-building opportunities to enhance their campaigns which address issues related to them including the assertion of their ancestral land rights, self-determination and improved management of forest resources and biodiversity. It also sheds light on the indigenous peoples motivational framing based on their openness towards possible changes in the program:

"The bottom line for Philippine indigenous peoples on REDD is for it to recognise and respect indigenous peoples' rights, including a human rights and ecosystem-based approach to sustainable development. Thus, REDD aimed at peoples' empowerment and capacity building activities should be open for participation with simultaneous info-education for

42 *Ibid*

indigenous peoples to understand REDD program, to expose the capitalist system's use of the program for business.”⁴³

Tactically, the movement also draws from democratic principles to assert their territorial claims and rights over resources to amplify and extend their frames. Most notably, CPA has perceived this program as an opportunity to engage in formal political channels, which are available to promote indigenous and local communities' rights over resources and land reform. Indeed, this is deeply reflected, for example, in the organisations' call for greater consultations at the grassroots level and more local-based information, education and communication campaigns for indigenous communities based on their needs and priorities. This includes civil society's demand for a bottom-up process of participation and decision-making, which should be based on the rights of the indigenous peoples for self-determination and free, prior and informed consent. The movement suggests that there is a need for such programs to document the indigenous systems of governance and viable traditional knowledge in forestry and biodiversity management, ecological conservation and sustainable development policies.⁴⁴ This supports the argument that indigenous peoples are able to strategically take advantage of political opportunities provided by the program to advocate for reform and promote the full recognition of indigenous rights over forestlands and resources.

In Indonesia, AMAN has more directly engaged with the adverse implication of the UN's REDD program. Unlike the Philippines, the neighbouring country has engaged in and targeted the different financing schemes to implement the controversial climate change program. Most notably, AMAN opposed the one-billion dollar forest deal between the Indonesian and Norwegian government, which threatened the rights of the indigenous peoples in the country.⁴⁵ The adverse stance taken by AMAN is informed by negative experiences of indigenous peoples during a similar deal between Brazil and Norway, which has led to the double-edged sword of destruction and conservation in the Amazon rainforest. One of the main points of contention has to do with the lack of the deal's free and prior informed consent, which is an important aspect of the UNDRIP as a measure to protect indigenous peoples.⁴⁶ AMAN, however, sees the REDD program as an avenue of engagement to raise their concerns, although the group has also supported the “No Rights, No REDD” position as part of the global indigenous movement. In an interview with the online website called REDD Monitor, one of AMAN's former Secretary-Generals, Abdon Nababan, explained his movement-organisation's strong opposition to the bilateral climate change deal:

“In AMAN we see REDD as an opportunity if the result is that before we talk about REDD we have first secured indigenous rights. That's the

43 *Ibid.*

44 Carling, *supra* note 26.

45 Sombolinggi, *supra* note 32.

46 Ndoen, *supra* note 29; Terre, *supra* note 29.

meaning of “No Rights, No REDD”. If we talk about REDD, we don’t talk about the carbon market. We talk about the traditional way that indigenous people protect their forest from deforestation and from forest degradation. They have that way, they have that knowledge. They have that customary right to do that. They don’t have the power to reject threats like forest concessions or mining concessions, that’s why they want the national law, the state law. That’s all they don’t have. In that sense, we believe that REDD is already there. REDD is not a new animal in their territories, because they already have a system to protect the forest. But REDD as a market scheme, of course that is new. They don’t have any imagination of how carbon can be traded. So we need to clarify this, because this is very important for us.”⁴⁷

For AMAN’s leaders, it has been imperative to build the capacity of indigenous groups, which is why part of their mandate has been to educate their members about the implications of the REDD program in Indonesia.⁴⁸ Whilst they see the program as a threat, one movement leader, however, wants to “change this threat to an opportunity.” As an advocacy group, AMAN has not been directly involved with the negotiation processes for the Norway-Indonesia deal. When Norway asked about their position, the group, however, maintained the global “No Rights, No REDD” position. There is, nevertheless, more leeway for AMAN to engage with and pressure the Indonesian government. After all, much of AMAN’s international advocacy work has largely focused on the different interventions with treaty-monitoring bodies to pressure the Indonesian government to include indigenous rights in the different national laws and policies such as the Coastal Zone and Small Islands Management Law and National Forestry Law. The main problem remains defining who is an indigenous person in Indonesia:

“If we can recognise and respect indigenous peoples’ rights in coastal zones and small islands management and environmental protection and management, why isn’t it the same in national forestry law? Because, of course, we understand that in the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIPs), there is no definition, but there is a bundle of rights. We can use that. Then I reminded them the comment of the Indonesian delegation when UNDRIPs was adopted. They said we will have a terrible time in Indonesia to implement this declaration because we don’t have a national definition for indigenous people. That has always been our issue here.”⁴⁹

47 Chris Lang, “We Want to Change This Threat to an Opportunity: Interview with Abdon Nababan and Mina Setra”, (4 July 2010), online: *REDD-Monitor* <<https://redd-monitor.org/2010/07/04/%E2%80%9Cwe-want-to-change-this-threat-to-an-opportunity%E2%80%9D-interview/>>.

48 Ndoen, *supra* note 29; Terre, *supra* note 29.

49 Lang, *supra* note 47.

Based on these challenges, AMAN has also tried to contribute to the mapping of the indigenous territories, although the movement-leaders also noted that the Indonesian government rarely uses these maps in terms of their engagements with international organisations and foreign countries. This is related to the lack of a comprehensive enabling law on indigenous people. In the Philippines, the indigenous people's law created the National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP), which is committed to protecting and promoting the indigenous people's interests in the country. Although AMAN views the indigenous law in the Philippines as being far from perfect, the leaders underscore the benefits of the presence of such a government agency on indigenous affairs.⁵⁰ In Indonesia, the lack of a legal enabling environment has often constrained AMAN because the movement-leaders have to deal with multiple government agencies. The movement highlights the lack of coordination and communication between Indonesian Ministries when it comes to the different issues confronting the indigenous peoples.

It has certainly not been easy for AMAN to put pressure on the Indonesian government despite the presence of international networks and mechanisms available to them. It is, however, important to note that the group has benefitted from mobilising internationally whilst they gained some formal recognition at the domestic level. For the most part, AMAN was able to participate in the global indigenous movements' push to increase the participation of indigenous organisations and communities under the UNFCCC with a focus on the REDD program. Although their *adat* rights remain narrow, in her statement during the Oslo Climate and Forest Conference, Mina Setra, AMAN's deputy Secretary-General lauded the efforts of the Indonesian government for making some progress at the national level on the issues confronting indigenous peoples. She says the government has opened political spaces for engagement about indigenous issues through dialogues between the Indonesian state and civil society:

“We have signed MoU (Memorandum of Understanding) with the Ministry of Environment on the Identification of Indigenous Peoples' Rights and their Traditional Knowledge, as an effort to identify the real contribution of traditional knowledge and the important of the protection of Indigenous People's Rights in climate change adaptation and mitigation. We have MoU with National Commission on Human Rights on Mainstreaming Indigenous Peoples' Rights in Indonesia. We also have dialogue with Ministry of Forestry on REDD and customary forests.”⁵¹

Building on their work within UNDRIP's recognition of indigenous peoples collective rights, the focus of CPA and AMAN has been on advancing and integrating this framework into climate debates. Both organisations have underscored human rights in the framing of their claims. As discussed above, the ability of the movement to

50 Ndoen, *supra* note 29.

51 This is based on Mina Setra's speech at the Oslo Climate and Forest Conference last May 2010.

bind together the indigenous rights framework with the climate change norms have been a strategy at the national and global level to formulate a common ground with other diverse networks, which provide both movements with better bargaining power to participate in global discussions relating to climate change. Victoria Tauli-Corpuz, CPA's former Secretary-General and present Chairperson of the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, has advocated for the use of ideas and principles housed within UNDRIP to assert global indigenous rights vis-à-vis climate change:

“The UNDRIP is the only declaration in the UN, which was drafted with the rights-holder themselves: the indigenous peoples. This is a strong declaration that embodies the most important rights we and our ancestors have long fought for: our right of self-determination, our right to own and control our lands, territories, and resources, and rights to free, prior, and informed consent.”⁵²

The articulations of indigenous rights-based frames have enabled movement-leaders to talk about climate change issues in a way that is more relatable to their members. AMAN, however, notes that one of the hurdles confronting indigenous movements has always been about diffusion of the principles embedded in international treaties, especially the rigidly technical and scientific terms employed within global climate discussions.⁵³ In this sense, the challenge for indigenous activists has to do with moving beyond frame-bridging or the fusion of two or more frames. In other words, movement-leaders have to grapple with “frame diffusion” or the process of how a frame travels within the group at different levels. An illustration of this hurdle can be reflected in the accounts of AMAN's movement-leaders about the difficulty of explaining “carbon trade”, a normative agenda embedded within the UNFCCC's REDD program:

“How can AMAN, say to our members, community members, that we oppose this carbon market? Or that we agree? We cannot explain this exactly. We can talk about it to a journalist, but to our movement? We have positions on REDD because we can explain this. Why? We can explain how our position relates to our struggle for our livelihoods. We can explain it well. But for carbon markets, there's nothing. To understand exactly how it works, we can read books and reports and there's good information, but can we say this to the communities who have the rights?”⁵⁴

Another global climate agenda on the radar of indigenous movements is the issue of climate finance. The sources of funding for the adaptation of UNFCCC include financial institutions such as the World Bank, bilateral official development assistance

52 Victoria Tauli-Corpuz, Interview (Baguio City, Philippines, 2019).

53 Sombolinggi, *supra* note 32.

54 Lang, *supra* note 47.

and private investments.⁵⁵ This is particularly relevant for developing countries such as Indonesia and the Philippines where funding can be allocated to minimise the adverse effects of climate change. For CPA and AMAN, however, the lack of explicit mention of vulnerable communities within the global climate funding mechanisms remains a sticky point. Mina Setra, for instance, shared that AMAN has supported the World Bank's Dedicated Grant Mechanism to Fund Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities, which mobilises forest communities to mitigate climate change. "We agreed that if the fund is to truly benefit Indigenous Peoples then we have to fight to ensure that all the decision-making processes of the fund should be given to Indigenous Peoples," she said adding that the global funding mechanism has involved consultative processes with indigenous communities in Asia, Africa and Latin America.⁵⁶ As a state-centric global institution, the UNFCCC, however, has remained vulnerable to the demands of its member-states, who usually block references made to the UNDRIP.

This demonstrates why there has been little progress in terms of including human rights principles into the global climate change agreement. Within the UNFCCC, aside from the REDD program, there are several global standards affecting the ways in which states are able to deal with climate change. The promotion of renewable energy as a high-potential mitigation measure, for example, has been projected as an emerging norm among the UN member-states, which is why there have been efforts from the international community to set targets towards the use of clean energy sources. Interestingly, there are contrasting views within indigenous people's rights movements about the mainstream solutions pushed by the global community. In the Philippines, CPA has linked the acceleration of "development projects" to the greater militarisation of ancestral lands without free, prior and informed consent of indigenous peoples:

"The core issue has always been about the landlessness of the indigenous peoples. Our movement is able to articulate climate change better when it is tied into other issues that are being felt by the people. It is easier for non-indigenous peoples to understand them when we use broader terms. In our view, the militarisation of ancestral lands has been a very big issue for the indigenous people's communities. However, we really feel that this has intensified during the construction of renewable energy power plants after the Philippines signed and ratified the Paris climate agreement."⁵⁷

In fact, a number of indigenous climate justice activists were previously included in the Philippine government's list of terrorist and outlaws pursuant to the Human Security Act of 2007. CPA has connected this "red-tagging" practice of the Philippine government's casting of activists as security threats to their opposition against destructive "development" projects in the Cordillera region. They also view this as part

⁵⁵ Carling, *supra* note 26.

⁵⁶ Mina Setra, Interview (Jakarta, Indonesia, 2019)..

⁵⁷ Dekdeken, *supra* note 24.

of the larger context of the U.S.-led War on Terror and counter-insurgency programs and policies, which have led to increased militarisation, impunity and extra-judicial killings in the Philippines.⁵⁸ This goes beyond not only the issues of violating collective rights of indigenous peoples, but also the oppressive practices of the state. In Cordillera, the official data from the government shows the Department of Energy approved the construction of at least 87 hydropower projects.⁵⁹ Utilising the language of frame extension, development aggression has been linked to the global norm of using renewable energy as a tool to mitigate climate change. From this perspective, there is also a need to critically re-examine the positive notions about climate change adaptation and mitigation efforts against the backdrop of indigenous environmental defenders who have been killed, displaced from their ancestral lands and framed as terrorists and security threats.

Nonetheless, CPA and AMAN's movement-leaders agree that there are also some internal divisions amongst the indigenous peoples at the global level. Whilst the collective activism of the indigenous peoples is global in aspiration, much of the movement actors are still divided along geographical lines. Such a division reflects the criticism that movement actors from the global north (i.e., North America, Western Europe) tend to dominate the international discussions on the concerns of the marginalised sectors which often leave behind the issues confronting those from the Global South (i.e., Africa, Asia, Latin America). The relative openness of the indigenous activists from the Philippines and Indonesia has been criticised by other climate justice activists who want a complete boycott of the REDD and other international land use-oriented carbon market activities.⁶⁰ The strong desire of these indigenous people's movements, however, to be taken seriously as actors against deforestation and market-focused schemes reflects the wider discourse about the need to recognise the inherent rights of the local communities over their territories and resources.

In both AMAN and CPA, the interpretation of global norms is therefore dependent on the manner the movement-leaders are able to create a broader appeal and connect to other interrelated issues which are pertinent to their own goals. In other words, frame-bridging takes place by connecting climate change with social justice issues confronting the indigenous people. While framing processes have been on-going as demonstrated by the collective action of indigenous social movements in the

58 This list included several CPA personalities: UN Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples Victoria Tauli-Corpuz; Joan Carling, co-convenor of the Indigenous Peoples Major Group on Sustainable Development; Jose Molintas, an Ibaloi human rights lawyer, former Asia representative to the UN Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (EMRIP); Beverly Longid, a Kankanaey-Bontok, current global coordinator of the International Indigenous Peoples Movement for Self-Determination and Liberation (IPMSDL) Windel Bolinget, a Kankanaey-Bontok, current Chairperson of the CPA; and 600 hundred other human rights movement-leaders across the country.

59 Dekdeken, *supra* note 24.

60 Carling, *supra* note 26.

Philippines and Indonesia, it confirms the claim that the master frame of climate change has shifted towards climate justice based on the normative interpretations and mechanisms accompanying them.⁶¹ CPA and AMAN's strategic framing processes have also gone beyond carbon capture by tackling a more comprehensive management of ancestral lands and highlighting their connection with pre-existing issues facing indigenous communities.

VI. CONCLUSION

This article has drawn on two theoretical models, the world society approach and the social movement framing theory, to analyse how global normative processes and mechanisms on climate change contributed to framing strategies and tactics of local indigenous people's rights movements, broadened the action repertoires and agendas and facilitated the engagement of local indigenous rights activists with institutional frameworks at the global level. By documenting the different experiences and normative interpretations of the indigenous social movements in the Philippines and Indonesia, this article observes the global climate discussions have widened the scope of issues confronting indigenous peoples such as land and territorial autonomy. Both movements have interpreted global climate change norms by "localising" them. They offered radical and progressive solutions by not only thinking about the possible changes in the present global climate framework, but also by seeking a massive shift against the global capitalist system.

This article is based on a premise that the framing processes taking place amongst indigenous social movements in the Philippines and Indonesia can shed light on how the growing library of literature on global norms and local social movements can help make sense of alternative development views. Focusing on the complementary diagnostic, prognostic and motivational frames found within the two movements, this research has attempted to show how the movement-actors developed their political claims-making and suggested solutions and actions as to how climate change should be addressed and debated upon. The parallel experiences of the two movements have shown that indigenous activists have taken advantage of opportunities and resources to engage in climate change issues. Indigenous movements have used the recognition of their collective rights through such mechanisms as the UNDRIP to ensure their relevance in international climate debates. Although they have often denounced the market-based logic of UN's climate change programs, indigenous climate justice activists have attempted to secure and increase their participation in the implementation of climate change projects in their respective countries to gain some

61 See for example Eurig Scandrett, "Climate justice: contested discourse and social transformation" (2016) 8 *International Journal of Climate Change Strategies and Management* 477-487; Donatella della Porta & Louisa Parks, "Framing processes in the climate movement: from climate change to climate justice" in Matthias Dietz & Heiko Garrelts, eds, *Routledge handbook of climate change movements* (Routledge, 2014).

leverage in influencing the rules of game of the state-centric international discussions. In addition, CPA and AMAN have also sought the support of existing global indigenous and climate justice movements to borrow ideas on how they can engage with policy agendas at the local and national levels. The climate justice campaigns of indigenous people's movements are still in-progress, which raises questions regarding movement outcomes. How will indigenous movements institutionalize their proposed solutions to climate change in relation to their land rights? Which political opportunities are available to accommodate the indigenous people's interests and rights within the global climate governance? These issues warrant further investigation from scholars as they directly impinge on our global environment.

Whilst the extant literature on these two theoretical traditions has certainly helped in understanding the discursive shifts within the indigenous movements in the Philippines and Indonesia, other theoretical approaches, of course, may shed light on the climate change-related issues confronting the movement actors. This analysis did not aim to take into account the specific domestic political factors, which may affect the collective action framing of the movement-leaders featured in this research. In the Philippines and Indonesia, a change in government leadership impacts policy lobbying agendas of social movements. AMAN, for example, recalls that former president Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono was more responsive to the concerns of indigenous peoples than the government of Joko Widodo. CPA, meanwhile, notes that the ambiance of impunity has visibly increased during the time of Philippine president Rodrigo Duterte, whose stance is geared toward greater militarisation of the state's development projects. In other words, it is entirely possible that domestic political factors may well account for the variations in collective action outcomes of the indigenous social movements in this inquiry.

Another research agenda based on the findings of this article is related to the current literature on world society approach and social movement theory and how they have treated the global-local interaction between norms and movements as a unidirectional process (i.e. the global shapes the local). This research has provided insights into this literature by demonstrating that local indigenous social movements are also able to contribute to the interpretation and transformation of global climate change norms. The article, however, cautions going further and claiming that there is a functional two-way mechanism in which social movement actors themselves can influence the creation and expansion of global norms. The danger here has to do with the possibility of overestimating the role of local social movements in shaping and influencing the global decision-making processes. As such, it would also be worth studying the complex ways in which everyday politics of resistance and accommodation of the indigenous climate justice activists at the local level intersect with actions at the national and global levels.

Acknowledgement - The author is grateful to the anonymous reviewers for their comments and suggestions and to Professor David Leheny for his academic guidance. This research would not have been completed without the generous support from Waseda University's Haraguchi Memorial Asia Research Fund.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Benford, Robert D. & David A. Snow. "Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment" (2000) 26:1 *Annual Review of Sociology* 611-639.
- Bertrand, Jacques. "'Indigenous peoples' rights' as a strategy of ethnic accommodation: contrasting experiences of Cordillerans and Papuans in the Philippines and Indonesia" (2011) 34:5 *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 850-869.
- Boli, John & George M Thomas. "World Culture in the World Polity: A Century of International Non-Governmental Organization" (1997) 62:1 *American Sociological Review* 171-190.
- Carling, Joan. Interview (Baguio City, Philippines, 2019).
- Claeys, Priscilla & Deborah Delgado Pugley. "Peasant and indigenous transnational social movements engaging with climate justice" (2017) 38:3 *Canadian Journal of Development Studies* 325-340.
- Cordillera Peoples Alliance and Centre for Development Programs in the Cordillera. "Cordillera Peoples Alliance-Centre for Development Programs in the Cordillera Position Paper on REDD", (14 May 2012), online: <<https://www.cpaphils.org/disasterresponse.html>>.
- Dekdeken, Sarah. Interview (Baguio City, Philippines, 2019).
- Fay, Chip & Ho-Ming So Denduangrudee. "Emerging options for the recognition and protection of indigenous community rights in Indonesia" in John F McCarthy & Kathryn Robinson, eds, *Land and Development in Indonesia: Searching for the People's Sovereignty* (ISEAS-Yusof Ishak Institute, 2016) 91.
- Kay, Tamara. "Labor Transnationalism and Global Governance: The Impact of NAFTA on Transnational Labor Relationships in North America" (2005) 11:3 *American Journal of Sociology* 715-756.
- Klandermans, Bert & Suzanne Staggenborg. *Methods of Social Movement Research*, In *Social Movements, Protest, and Contention* 16 (University of Minnesota Press, 2002).
- Lang, Chris. "We Want to Change This Threat to an Opportunity: Interview with Abdon Nababan and Mina Setra", (4 July 2010), online: REDD-Monitor <<https://redd-monitor.org/2010/07/04/%E2%80%9Cwe-want-to-change-this-threat-to-an-opportunity%E2%80%9D-interview/>>.

- Lin, Scott Y. "The Evolution of Food Security Governance and Food Sovereignty Movement in China: An Analysis from the World Society Theory" (2017) 30:5 (*Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*) 667-695.
- Liow, Joseph Chinyong. *Religion and Nationalism in Southeast Asia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016).
- McAdam, Doug & David A Snow. *Social Movements: Readings on Their Emergence, Mobilization, and Dynamics* (Roxbury Pub., 1997).
- Ndoen, Monica. Interview (Jakarta, Indonesia, 2019).
- Porta, Donatella della & Louisa Parks. "Framing processes in the climate movement: from climate change to climate justice" in Matthias Dietz & Heiko Garrelts, eds, *Routledge handbook of climate change movements* (Routledge, 2014).
- Powless, Ben. "An Indigenous Movement to Confront Climate Change" (2012) 9:3 *Globalizations* 411-424.
- Safitri, Myrna. "Dividing the Land: Legal Gaps in the Recognition of Customary Land in Indonesian Forest Areas" (2016) 30:2 *Kasarinlan: Philippine Journal of Third World Studies* 31-48.
- Scandrett, Eurig. "Climate justice: contested discourse and social transformation" (2016) 8 *International Journal of Climate Change Strategies and Management* 477-487.
- Schlosberg, David and Lisette B. Collins. "From Environmental to Climate Justice: Climate Change and the Discourse of Environmental Justice" (2014) *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change* 5 (3): 359-374.
- Setra, Mina. Interview (Jakarta, Indonesia, 2019).
- Shin, Hwa Ji & Kiyoteru Tsutsui. "Constructing Social Movement Actorhood: Resident Koreans' Activism in Japan Since 1945:" (2016) 48:4 *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 317-335.
- Snow, D & R Benford. "Ideology, Frame Resonance, and Participant Mobilization" in Bert Klandermans, Hanspeter Kriesi & Sidney G Tarrow, eds, *From structure to action: comparing social movement research across cultures* (Greenwich, Conn: JAI Press, 1988) 197.
- Sombolinggi, Rukka. Interview (Jakarta, Indonesia, 2019).
- Tarrow, Sidney. "The Strategy of Paired Comparison: Toward a Theory of Practice": (2010) 43:2 *Comparative Political Studies* 230-259.
- Tauli-Corpuz, Victoria. Interview (Baguio City, Philippines, 2019).
- Terre, Erasmus. Interview (Jakarta, Indonesia, 2019).
- Tramel, Salena. "Convergence as political strategy: social justice movements, natural resources and climate change" (2018) 39:7 *Third World Quarterly* 1290-1307.

Tsutsui, Kiyoteru & Hwa Ji Shin. "Global Norms, Local Activism, and Social Movement Outcomes: Global Human Rights and Resident Koreans in Japan" (2008) *55:3 Social Problems* 391-418.

Ferth Vandenstein Manaysay is a Research Associate with Yayasan Peta Bencana, an Indonesia-based non-profit organisation, where he has been supporting the replication of digital humanitarian infrastructures from Jakarta to Manila. He is also a Research Fellow with the South China Sea Big Data Initiative under the University of California San Diego School of Global Policy and Strategy and Emory University Department of Political Science. He obtained his Master's degree in International Relations from the Graduate School of Asia-Pacific Studies, Waseda University, Tokyo, Japan.