Paradigms and Perceptions

A Chronology and Analysis of the Events of the Chan-75 Hydroelectric Project and the Roles and Relationships of Participants, Bocas del Toro, Panama

Jessica Barber

Independent Study Project
SIT Panama: Conservation and Development
May 2008

Abstract

The pending construction of the Changuinola 75 Hydroelectric Project (Chan-75) has sparked significant controversy as the affected communities, national non-governmental organizations (NGO's) and international NGO's have protested against the conduct of the project's promoters, the AES Corporation and supporters, the Panamanian government. Located in the Bosque Protector Palo Seco, a buffer zone to La Amistad International Park, the Chan-75 hydroelectric dam project will have significant consequences for the biodiversity, flora and fauna of the area. The dam will also displace four indigenous Ngöbe communities, a traditionally marginalized and underrepresented group, as well as flooding the farmland of many others. Hydroelectric power accounts for 51% of the primary energy production in Panama. Though Panama does not currently need to import energy to meet demand, there is growing concern that the growing population may soon demand more than is available. The environmental and social effects of hydroelectric dams have sparked a worldwide anti-dam movement that has begun to intersect with the growing indigenous rights movement of Latin America; these two movements inform the movement in Changuinola. This paper provides a graphical representation and written account of major events surrounding the efforts of AES and its associates to push the Chan-75 project forward and the those of the project's opponents to block its construction based on primary documents. Using testimonies of participants from both sides of the controversy, it analyzes the relationships between participants and how they may have shaped what has occurred. The participant entities' views on the other stakeholders, most notably how AES views the Ngöbe, are central to how these events have occurred, the choices have been made and the effects of these choices.

Note: Due to the desire of the researcher for the research to be available to participants of the events of Chan-75, the graphical chronology has been written in Spanish and the executive summery has been expanded to provide a fuller review of the paper.

Acknowledgements

Thank you to all the people in Panama and in Changuinola who agree to talk with me about their experiences in the Chan-75 despite the risks. Thank you to Lucia Lasso for her time and guidence even when larger crises were looming; I couldn't have done it without your advice and knowledge. Thank you to Juan in Changuinola for his advice, generosity and willingness to help me with whatever I needed including driving me an hour away for an interview when he didn't have to. Muchas gracias a mi familia en la capital por acogerme con abrazos abiertos y darme comida y apoyo mientras estaba escribiendo mi proyecto. And finally thank you to my biological family, Fred, Liz, Kris and Sheba. I've thought about you constantly and I appreciate your support and love even when we're far apart.

Expanded Executive Summery (en español)

Debido al aumento en el uso de energía, el agotamiento de combustibles fósiles, y la creciente conciencia de cambio climático, se cree que las hidroeléctricas son una alternativa buena para la generación eléctrica. Sin embargo, sí causa efectos grandes en las comunidades en el área circundante, usualmente marginando poblaciones como los grupos indígenas. En el año 2005, la Autoridad Nacional del Ambiente (ANAM) de Panamá aprobó la construcción de tres

hidroeléctricas ubicadas en el Bosque Protector Palo Seco (BPPS), una zona de amortiguamiento para el Parque Internacional La Amistad (PILA) en la provincia Bocas del Toro. AES Corporation (en Panamá AES Panamá y AES Changuinola), una empresa multinacional de generación eléctrica, ya inició la etapa de construcción de la primera presa, Chan-75 (o El Gavilán o Chan-1). Si fuese construida, Chan-75 empezaría a producir 223MW de energía en 2012 con la etapa de operación por 50 años. Las implicaciones sociales y ambientales de Chan-75 han provocado oposición fuerte de las comunidades afectadas (Ngöbe), organizaciones ambientalistas panameñas y la comunidad internacional de ambientalistas y activistas de derechos humanos. La ubicación en un área protegida, los problemas legales con la concesión y estudios de impacto ambiental, y denuncias de violaciones de derechos humanos contra las comunidades han resultado en casos legales en juzgados nacional e internacional. La lucha se ha intensificado desde el principio del 2007 en la forma de manifestaciones y violencia policial.

Con los testimonios de miembros de AES, apoyo local de Chan-75, líderes y los afectados de las comunidades, y la Alianza para la Conservación y el Desarrollo, he concluido que sus relaciones informa las acciones de los participantes, los eventos que han ocurrido, y los resultados actualmente. Las acciones de la empresa contra las comunidades en la forma de intimidación, presión y en unos casos, violencia, han pasado en parte debido a su percepción de los Ngöbe. De unas entrevistas con ingenieros de AES, la empresa los percibía como ingenuos, incultos, y aislados. Mientras sea verdad que los Ngöbe no tengan acceso a escuela, más que la educación primaria, y vivan lejos de los centros urbanos de Bocas del Toros, AES usará estas ideas para justificar la devaluación de la cultura de los Ngöbe e intentará asimilarles a la cultura dominante. Además, AES le echa la culpa a ONG's y a ACD por la oposición comunitaria porque cree que las comunidades han sido confundidas por ellos. Por su parte, los Ngöbes creen que la empresa no los respeta y que todos los programas sociales que dicen que son beneficiosos en realidad son para lograr el acuerdo de las comunidades y convencerlas para marcharse de su tierra.

Por medio de documentos históricos, he compilado una cronología gráfica de los acontecimientos más importante en el caso de Chan-75. En el contexto de la relación entre los Ngöbes y AES, la secuencia de los acontecimientos durante los últimos años tienen sentido. El siguiente es un resumen breve de los eventos más importantes. Espero que mi investigación pueda ser una herramienta para entender la lucha y ayudar a los participantes en Panamá y de otros movimientos mundial.

Resumen breve de la Cronología

La historia de Chan-75 empezó en 2004 cuando la empresa Hidro Teribe entregó el estudio de impacto ambiental (EIA) a ANAM en octubre. El EIA fue aprobado en 2005 y las comunidades afectadas empezaron discutir sus posiciones a la hidroeléctrica el mismo año. La Alianza para la Conservación y Desarrollo (ACD), una organización ambiental no gubernamental de la capital, decidió apoyar las comunidades después de hacer estudios para su publicación "*Análisis de costo beneficio de cuarto proyectos hidroeléctricos en la cuenca Changuinola-Teribe*" en 2006. Por los estudios, ACD reconocía los problemas legales de los EIAs, y que a la empresa le falta mucho en mitigación social y ambiental. Con la ayuda de ACD, las comunidades empezaban organizarse, mejorar sus capacidades de defender sus intereses y tomar conciencia de las desventajas de Chan-75.

La situación en las comunidades se intensificaba en el principio de 2007 con las acciones de AES en las comunidades para lograr la tierra y el apoyo que se necesitaba para comenzar con

la construcción de Chan-75. La oposición la ha criticado por distorsionar los resultados de estudios de opinión en las comunidades y cortar árboles y vegetación en la tierra de los moradores sin permiso. Sin embargo, en enero de 2007, la empresa llevó a la Señora Isabel Becker de Charco la Pava a la capital para convencerla de vender su tierra. Después de doce horas en las oficinas de AES, Sra. Becker firmó un acuerdo en español, el cual ella no entendió porque no puede leer ni hablar Español, que dio su tierra a AES. Según ella y su familia, no entendía el documento y pensaba que no podría volver a su casa hasta que firmara el acuerdo. La empresa continuaba realizando acciones de intimidación contra la Sra. Becker hasta octubre de 2007, cuando se llega con tractores a su casa y la destruyen con todas sus pertenencias a dentro. Ella fue movida a Finca 4, y el mismo día AES inició y celebró oficialmente la construcción de Chan-75. Continuando la lucha legal, las tres denuncias sobre la omisión de sitios de valor arqueológico del EIA, la categorización de la vía de acceso y el caso de Sra. Becker fueron entregados en septiembre, octubre y diciembre de 2007.

El 17 de diciembre de 2007 la empresa anunció que dos días después comenzaría detonaciones en el sitio del cimiento de la presa. El 19, miembros de las comunidades iniciaron una manifestación para bloquear la vía a las máquinas de construcción. Diecisiete días después, con la vía bloqueada todavía, autoridades locales y policía fueron a la manifestación para negociar. Las manifestaciones consistieron en quitar el bloqueo pero regresaron el día después, el 3 de enero de 2008 para bloquear las máquinas que habían vuelto también. En respuesta, la policía llegó y la disolvía con fuerza. Las manifestantes sufrían golpes y gas lacrimógeno, y 50 personas fueron detenidos incluyendo mujeres embarazadas y 11 niños. Después de este incidente, la empresa colocó policía armados permanentemente en las comunidades "para seguridad", y hasta ahora no ha permitido personas de afuera entrar.

En el año 2008, debido de los esfuerzos de ONGs nacionales e internacionales, la situación esta logrando más atención internacional. Los casos de las violaciones de derechos humanos contra los manifestantes, Señora Isabel Becker y otros habitantes de Valle Riscó han tenido como resultado el apoyo de Cultural Survival, una ONG de Estados Unidos que apoya grupos indígenas, para algunas denuncias legales. En enero y febrero de 2008, tres denuncias contra a AES por limpiar la tierra sin permiso fue entregado en cortes nacionales. También, en marzo, ACD, entregó la petición *Violaciones de los Derechos Humanos por el Gobierno de Panamá contra las Comunidades Indígenas Ngöbe e Individuos en el Valle del Río Changuinola, Bocas del Toro, Panamá* a la Comisión Interamericana de Derechos Humanos. Las Visitas en febrero de representantes del Banco Mundial para conocer los efectos de Chan-75 a sus proyectos el Programa Nacional de Tierras (PRONAT) y el Corredor Biológico Mesoamericano (CBM) pueden que afectar los fondos que el WB da al gobierno panameño. El comité del Patrimonio Mundial de UNESCO vino en febrero también para observar la situación y decidirán si designar al PILA como un sitio "en peligro" en julio. Actualmente en los últimos días de mayo, la policía todavía permanece en las comunidades, y la empresa esta trabajando 24 horas por día para lograr la construcción de Chan-75. Debido a estos, el contacto entre los activistas comunitarios y los activistas de afuera es limitado. A pesar de las dificultades, la mayoría de los líderes de la oposición expresan esperanza que puedan lograr sus objetivos, y la lucha es lejos de terminar.

Introduction

In 2005 the National Environmental Authority (ANAM) of Panama approved the construction of three hydroelectric dams on the Changuinola River in the province of Bocas del Toro. The dams will be owned and operated by the US Company AES Corporation and its Panamanian affiliates. The first dam to be constructed, Chan-75 (also El Gavilán and Chan-1) will produce 223MW and is slated to be operational in 2012, with a generation life of 50 years. The environmental and social implications of the dam have resulted in strong opposition from the affected indigenous Ngöbe communities, Panamanian environmentalists, and the international environmental and human rights community. The location in the Bosque Protector Palo Seco, a buffer zone for the UNESO World Heritage Site, La Amistad International Park, as well as problems surrounding the accuracy of the environmental impact statement and the company's treatment and relocation plans for individuals in the area of construction have garnered even greater criticism and have resulted in legal action against the company. The struggle between the individuals, communities and organizations opposing the dam and the business and governmental interests that support it have escalated over the past year in the form of public protest and police violence.

Through the examination and analysis of primary documents such as government resolutions, legal cases, letters, transcripts of meetings, and newspaper articles, a chronology of events has been compiled in both graphic and written form. Using this chronology and personal interviews with members of participating groups, the major actors have been identified and their roles and relationships examined (see appendix 1). These relationships inform the chronology, as they provide lens to examine and interpret every choice made and its outcome.

As energy needs grow worldwide and fossil fuels become scarce, hydroelectric dams are becoming an increasingly popular alternative for electric generation. While these dams may seem more sustainable due to their reduction in carbon emissions they still have significant social, economic and environmental effects on surrounding communities and ecosystems. Around the world, and specifically in Latin America, the low social capital of affected rural and indigenous populations may make them unable to demand proper consideration and compensation for the losses caused by large hydroelectric projects. As communities join forces with national and international non-governmental organizations to oppose projects advocated by national governments and powerful business interests, it becomes important to analyze the evolving movements. By examining the relationships between participants in current struggles we can begin to understand the factors that influence the success of opposition movements and identify the best ways for communities and their allies to protect their land, livelihoods and interests in the face of powerful multinational interests.

Literature Review

Hydroelectric Energy, Dams and the International Opposition Movement

Worldwide hydroelectric power generation amounted to 2009.03 billion kilowatt hours in 2005 or 6.3% of the world primary energy production (US Department of Energy 2008). Central America had an electric generation capacity of 8.5 gigiwatts that year, 51% of which is hydroelectric. The capacity to exchange, transport and sell this electricity in Central America will be significantly expanded by the Plan Puebla-Panamá (PPP) proposed former president of Mexico, Vincente Fox, and signed by participating countries in 2001. The first step in the

implementation of the PPP is the construction of the Interconnected Electric System of Central American Countries (SIEPAC). The SIEPAC is a system of electric transmission lines that will connect Mexico, Belize, Guatemala, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Honduras, Costa Rica and Panama onto the same power grid. Construction began in 2006 and will allow for the sale and exchange of energy between countries. The project is slated to be finished by the end of 2008 (US Department of Energy 2008).

While one of the PPP's goals is to provide energy for the growing electricity demands and the oft-purported coming energy crisis, Panama currently produces more energy annually than they use. In 2005, Panama's net electric generation was 5.66 billion kilowatt-hours (bkWhr) and their net consumption was 4.74 bkWhr (US Department of Energy 2008). There are thirteen hydroelectric dams currently operating in the country that provide 51% of its electricity (Microsoft Encarta Online Encyclopedia 2007). Another seventy-six dams are currently in initial stages of planning or construction (Cordero et al 2006, 18).

The many dams that provide such a substantial percentage of Central America electric generation can be owned by governments, private national companies or private multi-national companies, have a generation capacity from 40MW to 300MW, and generate energy for local cities or countries thousands of miles away, but the debate surrounding all of them is virtually the same. Supporters say that hydropower is a sustainable and environmentally friendly alternative to carbon emitting energy sources such as oil and coal, and the many Latin American countries without a domestic source of oil it is a way to harnessing the natural resources available in country and reduce dependence on foreign oil. Critics cite the interruption of natural river flow, destruction of acres of habitat, and loss of lands and livelihoods without proper compensation of the thousands of people often already living at the margins of society displaced by vast reservoirs. As environmental and indigenous movements have gained momentum and begun to focus on these issue, governments and construction companies attempting to construct large dams have faced increasing opposition.

Since the 1970's the worldwide anti-dam movement has grown. Initially led by environmentalists mainly concerned with wilderness and biological conservation, the movement has expanded to address the social effects dams have on affected communities. As opponents to large dams have become more inclusive and more effective in their opposition, alliances have been formed between non-governmental organizations, human rights group, and local and indigenous communities (McCully 1996). International organizations such as International Rivers collaborate with national or local-level organizations such as Friends of River Narmada in India help local communities oppose large dam projects that threaten riparian ecosystems and lives and livelihoods of surrounding communities. There are dam opposition movements in Taiwan, India, Europe, Brazil, the United States and countless other countries (International Rivers 2008). The work of anti-dam organizations and many environmental and indigenous NGOs that object to lack of accountability or sufficient mitigation of issues caused by large dam projects have increased pressure on international entities such as the World Bank in recent years and have experienced success (Leslie 2005). Their work in Latin America and worldwide has prompted the creation of the World Bank Inspection Panel in 2003 that allows communities affected by World Bank funded projects such as hydroelectric dams to defend their rights and interests (Clark et al. 2003), and the development of the World Commission on Dams and their publication of guidelines for large dams, *Dams and Development: A New Framework for Decision-Making* (2000), which addresses displacement of communities the mitigation of other social affects (World Commission on Dams 2001, Leslie 2005).

As in the rest of the world, resistance to dams in Latin America has been occurring since the 70's and has been widespread due to the region's historical dependence on hydroelectricity and the high rate of dam construction. In Brazil, the construction of dams such as the one on the Rio Sao Francisco, which displaced over 70,000 people sparked local mobilization against them (Movimento dos Atingidos por Barragens-Brasil 2007). Local movements joined to form coalitions such as the *Comissão Regional de Atingidos por Barragens*, [Regional Committee of those Displaced by Dams] in 1979 which evolved in *Movimento Nacional de Atingidos por Barragens*, [National Movement of People Affected by Dams] in 1991(Rothman et al 1992). Some governments have responded to opposition brutality, such as in Guatemala when 376 people were massacred in 1980 and 1982 for resisting eviction to allow the construction of the Chixoly Dam (Witness for Peace). Situations like these and countless more have triggered the formation of countless national anti dam organizations all over Central and South America from Mexico to Chile that continue to fight large dam projects today. (International Rivers).

International and Latin American Indigenous Movements

Anti-dam movements often intersect with indigenous movements as the best dam locations often occur in ancestral territory and disproportionately affect indigenous groups (Leslie 2006). Indigenous people worldwide have historically been marginalized from political and social systems and continue to be today. From wide-spread extermination by colonizers to continued efforts of national governments to assimilate or exclude groups, indigenous peoples continue to experience inequality, political marginalization and threats to their cultural survival. Recently, domestic efforts to secure rights and protect their traditional lifestyles and ancestral lands have grown into international coalitions such as The World Council of Indigenous Peoples that promote indigenous activism, organization and popular protest (Hodgson 1039-1040). Part of this shift has been the "reindigenization" and recognition of communities and groups that had previously been considered campesinos (Jackson and Warren 2005, 551). International governing bodies have also begun to address the challenges and interests of the world's indigenous groups. In 1982 the United Nations established the Working Group on Indigenous Populations (WGIP) of the Sub-Commission on the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights. One of the group's projects was the writing of the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, adopted by the UN General Assembly in 2007. The high-level UN advising body, The UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues meets yearly in two-week sessions to address worldwide indigenous issues (United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues 2006).

With the growth of the international movement, indigenous groups of Latin America have become more politically organized and have been experiencing some success. Movements have addressed a variety of issues, from political autonomy and land rights to exploitation of natural resources on indigenous territory and intellectual property rights (Dove 2006). The implementation of ubiquitous neoliberal projects mandated by the World Bank and International Monetary Fund have also become factors in indigenous movements (Jackson and Warren 2005), most notably the Cochabamba uprising in Bolivia over water privatization (Perreault, 2006). Indigenous groups of Bolivia have experienced success with organizations such as the Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities of Ecuador and Movement Towards Socialism in Bolivia experiencing growing political influence (Naim 2003) the election of indigenous leaders to high positions such as president Evo Morales. Other struggles, though well publicized, such as the Zapatista uprising in Mexico have not had the same level of success. (Jackson and Warren 2005). Indigenous groups still experience structural discrimination within political systems, and

some governments have reacted violently to indigenous movements (552). Moisés Naim, in his article *An Indigenous World,* argues that the successes had are partially due to globalization that has allowed indigenous groups to network with non-governmental organizations that work for human rights, anti-poverty and environmental conservation (96). NGOs can both advocate for indigenous groups on national and international scales and help the groups to organize for successful local action and activism. Naim also argues that decentralization of governments has allowed indigenous leaders to be elected into local and regional governments and therefore address issues particular to the often majority indigenous populations in those areas (96). Indigenous movements face many obstacles of which state produced reputations as being "subversive" and internal conflict and splintering are just a few (565), but with collaboration with in Latin America and worldwide.

Panama, Bocas del Toro and Bosque Protector Palo Seco (BPPS) and Parque Internacional La Amistad (PILA)

Panama is located on the Central American isthmus between Costa Rica and Colombia. It has an area of 78,200 square kilometers making it slightly bigger than South Carolina. The country's population is 3,292,693 (estimation for July 2008) (CIA World Fact Book 2008). Bocas del Toro is a province located in the Northwestern part of the country on the border of Costa Rica. Its population is approximately 90,000 people and its main industries are tourism and banana production. Demographically the population of Bocas del Toro is made up of Latinos, Afro-Antilleans descended from immigrants from Caribbean islands and two main indigenous groups, the Ngöbe, previously called the Guaymi together with the Buglé, and the Naso, also know as the Teribe (Panama Census 2000). Due to the Cordillera de Talamanca mountain range that extends through the middle of the country, Bocas del Toro has been historically cut off from Panama City and the development that has occurred there and has not experienced the growth of urban centers or large cattle farms or agriculture that has led to the deforestation of much of the interior (Garcia). Due to this, the rainforests and ecosystems are remarkably intact in the province and have led to the creation of multiple protected areas of international importance.

The largest of these is La Amistad International Park (PILA), encompassing land in Costa Rica and Panama that is "the largest remaining upland virgin forest in Central America" and "one of the most ecologically diverse and rich in the whole of…Central America" (IUNC Summery 1990). The 491,896-hectare Costa Rica section of the park was created in 1982 (Costa Rica National Parks 2005) and was designated a UNESCO World Heritage Site the next year (Thorson et al. 2007). In 1988 the Panamanian government fulfilled the commitment made in 1979 and designated 207,000 hectares (Sistema de Información Ambiental Mesoamericano 2005) which was also included in the UNESCO listing.

The Bosque Protector Palo Seco (BPPS) was created in 1983 in part due to the hydroelectric potential of the Changuinola and Teribe Rivers that had been investigated since the 1970's (De los Santos, et.al. 2006). The Changuinola-Teribe watershed encompasses much of the land in the BPPS. It's headwaters are located within PILA and it meets the ocean at the protected area San San Pond Sak, designated as a Wetland of International Importance (Cordero et.al. 2006). The Plan de Manejo de ANAM written in 2004 lists the park as a buffer zone to PILA and categorizes areas into three zones of management, from absolute protection to open local use for the communities located inside the park (Plan de Manejo BPPS 2004).

The Ngöbe of Panama and Valle Riscó

The Ngöbe are the largest indigenous group in Panama with the 2000 census listing total population as 169,130 (Perfil de los Pueblos Indígenas de Panamá 2002). They share a *comarca*, a semi-autonomous indigenous reserve, with the Buglé, a linguistically related but culturally distinct group, which encompasses land formally in the provinces of Bocas del Toro, Chiriqui and Veraguas. Various economic and social pressures increasingly threaten Ngöbe culture and ways of life both inside and outside the *comarca*. Decrease in available land has made indigenous subsistence farming techniques such as fallow cycles difficult to maintain and less economically viable (Wickstrom 44). While the existence of the *comarca* helps to preserve ancestral land and traditional activities, growing populations within the boundaries have significantly affected the sustainability of subsistence agriculture and slash and burn clearing practices (Bort and Young 2001, 127). In addition, natural resources that exist on Ngöbe lands attract attention from national and international companies and the Panamanian government interested in exploiting these resources in the form of mines and hydroelectric dams (Young 2007). In 1997, after years of political struggle, the Panamanian government designated the Ngöbe-Buglé *comarca* through Law 10. (Young 2007, 11) Consisting of 2,500 square miles, the comarca only encompassed half of the territory the Ngöbe had requested, and the Law contained a number of problematic provisions (12). While the Ngöbe General Congress has the right to be involved in development projects, the national government legally can control and initiate projects within the *comarca* if it's "in the best economic interest of the country" (22). Outside the Comarca, Ngöbe communities have no special rights that allow them to protect their land from natural resource exploitation, nor do companies or the government have to consult them regarding concessions of the land. (Wickstrom 58).

The communities of Valle Riscó in the Changuinola River watershed are part of the 40% of the Ngöbe population that live outside the *comarca* (Young 2007, 3). They are some of the many Ngöbe communities that exist outside of the protection of the *comarca* yet are not fully integrated into the Latino economic and political systems (Wickstrom 50). This has many implications for both the preservation of their culture and their ability to respond to threats to their land and resources. The area is not pre-colonial Ngöbe territory, but was colonized in the 1960s as land pressures from population growth and the development of Panama's interior forced many Ngöbe to search for new lands (Engineer, AES #1, Bort and Young 2001). The inhabitants, like most Ngöbe, live in scattered subsistence farms collectively owned by kin group (Young 2007). Like many Ngöbe communities inside and outside of the *comarca*, the people of Valle Riscó have only limited participation in the cash economy, partially due to the extreme inaccessibility of the area. Their lives are dependent on the land they farm and the growth of more centralized communities has been due to the construction of primary schools. Many families with houses in the communities farther up the mountains continue to keep fincas in the Changuinola River valley where there is richer farmland (Inhabitant #2).

Part One: The Participation of Many- A Brief Chronology of Chan-75

1970's-2004

Evaluations of the Changuinola-Teribe watershed for hydroelectric potential began in the 1970's (De los Santos et.al. 2004, 43). In 1981 the company Chas. T. Main International Inc. submitted a study to IRHE (4), the state run electric company detailing the hydroelectric generation potential of the Changuinola River. The promising findings played a role in the

deliniation of the Bosque Protector Palo Seco (BPPS) on September 28th, 1983 (1) but its status as a protected area would later prove to be an obstacle. Interest in potential projects was growing in 2001, and researchers began arriving in the communities of the Changuinola River starting in 2004 when Hidro Teribe S.A of Panama hired the Panamanian Ecological Consultants S.A. (CEPSA), to begin studies for the environmental impact statement (EIA) (inhabitant #1). The first community response to the proposed projects was in September 2004 with a joint declaration against the projects by members of fourteen communities surrounding the dam site including those that would be inundated by the dam, Charco la Pava, Valle el Rey, Changuinola Arriba and Guayacan. Hidro Teribe submitted the completed document *Environmental Impact Study-Category III: Construction and Operation of the Hydroelectric Dam El Gavilán (Chan-75)* October 2004.

2005

In 2005 the company began taking social surveys of community residents as part of the required social mitigation the company has to do and to begin trying to buy people's land (Inhabitant #1). The company also began clear the line that marks the height of the reservoir, often clearing trees and crops from residents' land without permission (Stein 2005). In response, some community residents began to organize more resolutely against the dam (Inhabitant #1). In April, a required public forum regarding Chan-75 was held in the town of Almirante, a half an hour away from the affected communities, and attendance was low due to its inaccessibility. The Center for Ngöbe Development and Technical Assistance sent a letter that same month asking why the forum had not been held in a place within the affected areas and accessible to community members.

From the beginning, the impacts studies of Chan-75 experienced some setbacks within the approval process, as various government entities declared them insufficient. The National Direction of Historical Heritage Office (DNPH) of the National Institute of Culture (INAC) sent a letter to Hidro Teribe in March saying that according to the members of a INAC-commissioned archeological study, CEPSA needed to do more investigations of the area of Charco la Pava in order for the EIA to be approved. When there was no response, DNPH rejected the submitted EIA until the archeological studies were completed. However DNPH rejection was technically only a recommendation and the EIA was approved by ANAM in October 2005. and CEPSA and Hidro Teribe submitted their expanded archeological study over a year later in October 2006.

The next step in the approval process was to obtain a land concession. Hidro Teribe had already received the necessary concession for the actual hydroelectric project from Regulating Entity of Public Services (ERSP), but in order to build the dam in the Palo Seco Protected Forest, they needed a land concession from ANAM, the granting of which would require a judicial agreement saying the proposed project meet certain standards. Hidro Teribe submitted their request to ANAM for a concession of 6,215 hectares in June.

2006

While the legal documents worked their way through governmental approval, the company continued to do local surveys of residents and do work to prepare the site for construction. A number of residents have asserted that employees of the company entered and cut paths, trees or even destroyed crops when granted permission only to do a study, or no permission at all (inhabitant #1, Lasso pers. com.). As residents became more concerned with the implication of Chan-75 and the presence of the company on their land, the majority of

communities in Valle Riscó had began holding individual meetings to discuss their positions between May and November. 2006 also saw the beginning of coalition building of those against the dam. First aware of the Chan-75 project through their work with the Naso of the Teribe River and the proposed Bonyic dam, the Alliance for Conservation and Development (ACD) increased their participation in the early months of 2006 (Jordan pers. comm.). As the organization became more involved in the growing Bonyic controversy and began providing technical and capacity building support to the Naso, they also began working with the communities of the Changuinola River (Jordan). Lucia Lasso, the current executive director of ACD, explained that throughout the studies conducted for the 2006 publication *Cost-Benefit Analysis of Four Hydroelectric Projects in the Changuinola-Teribe Watershed*, it became apparent that the process of developing Chan-75 was "problematic… with vacuums in knowledge that needed to be addressed". (Lasso 2008). ACD's involvement was initially moderate, consisting mainly of writing letters to ANAM officials and helping the communities improve their capacities to organize (Jordan, e-mail 2008). However, as the legal issues surrounding the impact statements, the significant threats to La Amistad International Park, and the marginalization of the communities in the development process became more obvious, ACD began to increase their level of participation through legal cases, international coalition building and greater local collaboration.

The status of the Palo Seco Protected Forest as a buffer zone the World Heritage Site La Amistad International Park brought the issue to the attention of international conservation organizations, specifically the Center for Biological Diversity (CBD). A 2006 visit took CBD members to the site of Chan-75 and the combination of the threat to the biodiversity of PILA and the involvement of a US-based company led to their decision to join ACD in opposing the projects. (Galvin) Together with ACD and 36 other national and international organizations, they began preparing and submitted a petition to UN World Heritage Committee requesting the designation of PILA as a World Heritage Site "in danger" due to the threats posed by the four proposed dam projects. CBD also began publishing press releases on their website in 2006 to raise international awareness and supported the legal cases currently pending in the Panamanian courts.

In June, Carlos Fitzgerald, a Panamanian archeologist, was contracted to carry out the archeological studies requested by INAC. According to Fitzgerald, a road had already been built though the area of the archeological sites, but the company wanted to enlarge it. Fitzgerald carried out the studies and submitted them to CEPSA, the contracted company who executed the EIAs, who than submitted them to ANAM in October. However, according to Fitzgerald, the report contained "conceptual and factual differences" from the one he had submitted and so did not include the relevant information needed to correctly assess the archeological value of the area. This irregularity violates Panamanian Law 14, which protects all archeological findings by law and requires their preservation or excavation. (Fitzgerald, Serracín). Despite these irregularities, ANAM proclaimed the Chan-75 EIA complete and legal through Resolution DINOERA IA-127-06 on December 21st.

In November, Hydro Teribe the submitted their Category I impact study of an access road called Río Riscó. Category I is the lowest impact categorization of a project by ANAM and is defined in Executive Decree No. 209 of September 5, 2006 as projects that "…that do not generate significant environmental and that do not entail environmental risks." (translation by the author) (Ramos) However, the construction of the access road required large movements and the terracing of a steep slope to allow the entrance of large machinery for the construction of Chan-

75, and both the Ministry of Public Works and the Regional ANAM Office in Bocas del Toro rejected this categorization.

2007

On a national scale, Chan-75 finally achieved the legal permissions to begin work. On May 2nd 2007, despite the objections of the Ministry of Public Works and the administration of ANAM's Bocas del Toro branch, the National ANAM office approved the Río Riscó EIA as a category I project. Two week later, Hidro Teribe, now know as AES Changuinola, was granted a concession of 6,215 hectares within BPPS on May 23 2007. Both these decisions prompted the filing of court cases later that year. On the international scale, the movement gained momentum as CBD submitted the petition to list PILA as "in danger" In response, on June 26 the UN World Heritage Committee decided to investigate the claims made by the petition and visit Panama in order to assess the level of danger the projects present to La Amistad.

On a local scale early 2007 marked the beginning of one of the most publicized series of events related to Chan-75: the case of Isabel Becker, who owned land in Charco La Pava at the site of the dam. On January 4th 2007, AES flew Sra. Becker and her daughter to Panama City for what they thought was a vacation. Instead, the company brought her to their offices, where she stayed for ten hours until she signed a document selling her finca to the company (Lutz 2004, 17). Sra. Becker asserts that she was not told truthfully the contents of the document, written in the Spanish she can neither read nor speak, thinking it only rented the land to the company, and only signed it so they would be allowed to leave and return home (17). After returning from Panama City, Sra. Becker continued to experience pressure from Aes to leave her house. On July 21st, tractors arrived at the house, the shock of which caused Sra. Becker to faint and the police took her to the hospital in Changuinola. When she had recovered she was not allowed to return home until the next day and spent the night at the new house in Finca 4 that AES had built for her (Stein 2008, 75). Three months later in October, AES arrived with another document in Spanish that sold her finca for a higher price, which she signed. Six days later, on October 25, Aes arrived again with tractors, bulldozed her house with all of her possessions still inside, and moved her permanently to Finca 4 (75). That same day AES officially inaugurated the construction of Chan-75 (Arcía 2007).

In addition to the official beginning of construction on Chan-75, the end of 2007 also saw the filing of a series of court actions against the company and the government. ACD filed an Environmental Criminal Report in September requesting an investigation of the categorization of the Río Riscó access road as a Category I. In October, the Association of Environmental Rights (ADA) and the Association of Panamanian Ecologists (ASEP) filed a Environmental Criminal Report (Denuncia Penal Ambiental) in the Environmental Prosecuting Court #5 asking for the investigation of the irregularities in the impact statement in regards to the archeological studies (Serracín).

In November, Ellen L. Lutz, the executive director of Cultural Survival, a non-profit organization based in Cambridge, Massachusetts in the USA that works with indigenous groups around the world to support their rights and cultural traditions, visited Charco la Pava. Prompted by the experiences of Isabel Becker, the apparent human rights violations perpetrated by the company, Cultural Survival decided to become involved in the opposition of Chan-75. ACD and Cultural Survival began preparing a petition *Human Rights Violations by the Government of Panama against the Indigenous Ngöbe Communities and Individuals the Changuinola River*

Valley, Bocas del Toro, Panama to the Inter-American Court of Human Rights, which was officially submitted in March 2008.

As construction began and the communities began to experience more unauthorized work on their lands situation became tenser. Tensions escalated to action when on December 17th AES announced that on the two days later they would begin detonations to remove bedrock for the dam's foundations (Lasso 2008). Members of the affected communities responded by staging a protest at access road the day of the detonations, December 19th, and closing the entrance to the company's equipment. The protesters continued to block to road for the rest of December, setting the construction significantly behind schedule. The mayor of Changuinola arrived on December 29th and issued a statement requiring the immediate abandonment of the area or the face the police intervention. The declaration was ignored and later that day the Head of the Valle Riscó Police issued an order for the arrest and 24 hour detainment of all participants.

2008

Four days later on January 2nd, the road still blocked, the local police and the AES sub-commissioner arrive at the site to negotiate with the protesters. After four hours, the protesters agreed to leave on the condition that they would have a meeting with AES and the local government on the 8th to seriously address their concerns. The next morning, the 3rd of January, with the arrival of AES construction machinery, the protesters returned to prevent the detonations until the agreed-upon meeting. In response, the National Police forcibly broke up the protest and arrested 54 people including pregnant women and 11 children. Two other children were taken to the hospitals with injuries and the leaders of the protest were forced to escape into the mountains to avoid arrest. All 54 detainees were kept over night in the Changuinola jail. The morning of the fourth the police released the children, and after a protest in front of the jail for the release of the remaining people, the adults were released that night. (Lasso 2008)

In the aftermath of these events AES installed a permanent armed police force at the entrances and in the communities in the area for reasons of security on January 8th which have been denying access to anybody who does not live or own land within the area. (Lasso 2008). The treatment of the protesters by the police has increased the accusations of human rights violations and had led to legal cases being filed against the company in January and February by various community members. These cases have addressed both the illegal destruction of individuals' fincas by the company and the treatment of the protester at the hands of the police.

Repression in the communities did not slow down the international momentum. In February, a number of international entities visited Panama in order to assess various aspects of Chan-75's environmental impacts. UNESCO made a well publicized visit from the 18th to 23rd to assess the request submitted by ACD and the Center for Biological Diversity (CBD) for PILA to be classified as a World Heritage site In Danger. Their visit included meetings with major Panamanian environmental organizations including ANCON and the Panamanian branch of The Nature Conservancy, as well as ANAM, and ACD and CBD (ACD 2008). However, the police refused to allow members of UNESCO, ACD and Cultural Survival to enter the area of dam construction on the 21st and the tight control by ANAM on the visit meant the committee never actually got to visit PILA to truly assess the damages (ACD 2008). UNESCO will make its decision regarding the petition during its 2008 summer session.

Also in February, the World Bank sent representative to assess how the Chan-75 project is affecting their Panama Land Administration Project (PRONAT), which aims to increase land

tenure security and environmental conservation in protected areas and indigenous territories (World Bank 2000). The World Bank gives the government of Panama money to maintain these projects and could pull funding if it finds that allowing the construction isn't compatible with the goals of the projects. This visit was also tightly controlled by the government and the representative from PRONAT did not even visit Charco la Pava or the affected communities to speak with the inhabitants. Police refused admittance on March 5th to members of ACD, the Latin-American Water Tribunal and UICN, two more organizations that had come to assess the situation.

In the months of April and May, ACD and other organizations have continued to send letters to the government, pursue the involvement of the Interamerican Court of Human Rights, the World Bank and other international entities, and push the pending legal cases through the justice system. On a community level, the Congress of the Comarca Ngöbe-Bugle officially declared their opposition to the project and called for its suspension on April 4th. Also in April, members of ACD and a growing national movement against hydroelectric, mining and tourist development projects successfully pressured President Martin Torrijos into creating a governmental committee to address their concerns, though little has been achieved in the few meetings they have had. The World Bank sent another representative to assess the second project it has in Panama, the Mesoamerican Biological Corridor, but similar to the visit in February, it was tightly controlled by the government (Lasso pers. com.). As of the end of May, armed police continued to be stationed in the area, despite letters from community residents and the Mayor of Changuinola asking their removal. AES continues to realize the detonation of dynamite twice everyday for the construction of the foundation and continued to work 24 hours a day, 7 days a week in construction of the access road and preparation of other sites in the area.

Part II: Cause and Effect- Analysis and Discussion of Stakeholder Roles and Relationships

The complex and interwoven events surrounding Chan-75 have occurred as they have due to many factors, but one of which is the preconceived perceptions and current relationships that exist between significant stakeholders. How one-group views another in regards to their values, motives and culture is central to the conscious and unconscious treatment of said group, and therefore the actions the group chooses to take. The most significant relationship is that between AES and the Ngöbe of the affected communities. This relationship is central to the story of Chan-75 as they are the two actors with the greatest stake in the future of the project, the two with the least in common, and the two most at odds. The majority of choices made on the part of the company and the issues that have arisen from these choices can be considered direct results of this complex and problematic relationship. Also important are the ways the company and the Ngöbe perceive the involvement of non-governmental organizations (NGOs), specifically the Alliance for Conservation and Development (ACD), and the role the government and their representative, National Authority on the Environment (ANAM), has had in this long controversy.[1]

[1] The interviews cited in this section were conducted between May 5th and May 21st 2008. Members of AES and the community opposition movement are kept anonymous here due to the sensitive nature of the topic. Prominent participants in the issue are referred to by name due to their high level of recognition within the movement and because I believe their identities are relevant to the interpretation of their answers. Though three interviewees are referred to as "inhabitants" all three are also leaders in the local movement against the dam, however I wanted to

The Gift of Development: AES and the Ngöbe

Jean Jackson and Kay Warren discuss the policies of assimilation as a tenet of state-indigenous relationships before the 1980s and the rise of the international indigenous movement (2004, 551), but in the case of AES and Chan-75 it is a guiding principle. Within this indigenous movement, rights are a substantial part of the dialogue; human rights, territory and land rights, intellectual property rights and cultural rights. Cultural rights are defined by Kottak as the right "to preserve its culture, to raise its children in the ways of its forebears, to continue its language" and perhaps most applicably, "to not be deprived of its economic base" (1999, 29). However, the recognition of cultural rights requires the recognition of the existence of a valuable culture, which is not present in the rhetoric of AES. The Ngöbe of Valle Riscó have not been part of the growing indigenous rights movement in Latin America, nor have they had access to the increased political capital that has become associated with the concept of indigeneity (Dove 2006). This, however, does not invalidate their claims to a distinctive valuable culture or the right to protect it from development projects not only threaten to destroy their way of life, but purport its destruction as an opportunity.

There is a vast inequality present between the powerful multinational company and the indigenous subsistence farmers in the form of political, social and economic capital. AES is a multinational electric generation and distribution company that has 123 electric generation plants in 29 countries around the world with annual revenues of 13.6 billion dollars,. (AES 2008) In Panama, they successfully built the Chiriqui Estí dam in 2003 and have operated three dams, Bayano, La Estrella and Los Valles, since 1999. AES has the money, governmental support and experience to challenge any opposition to their goals. The Ngöbe of Valle Riscó have no legal protection, no institutional support and very little capacity to organize, protect their interests or challenge the immense threat that the dam presents. These inequalities are further exacerbated by the company's pre-conceptualized views on who the Ngöbe people are as well as the unshakable belief in the virtues of western-style development. These views are fraught with contradictions, but constitute the basis of how the company has conducted itself in the communities and within the project in general.

AES's perception of the Ngöbe of Valle Riscó and the value of their culture have been apparent through throughout the development of Chan-75. From early days of controversy, the surveys conducted of community opinions have been described as insufficient and "misrepresented" (Stein 2008, 65). The relocation of the inundated communities was not included or addressed in the 2004 environmental impact study, and the Relocation Plan published in July 2007 was harshly criticized for not providing sustainable or culturally appropriate solutions. A revised Relocation Plan, prepared in April 2008 by Gestión Urbana and currently pending approval of AES, is significantly longer and more detailed with four sections,: "Food Security and Economic Sustainability", "Empowerment of the Communities in the Process of Implementation of Relocation", "Collective Construction Program of the New Communities and Territories" and the "Improvement of Channels of Communication." Though these programs are carefully presented, they are inadequate in terms of long term plans to ensure sustainability and long-term security. Under the section "Food Security and Economic Sustainability", one of the three minimum achievements was "five farms improved through the application of the program." (Programa de Reasentamiento 2008) When asked how this could be

---

distinguish them as members of affected communities in contrast to the other two "leaders" who live outside the area.

the minimum for the 150 households that are being relocated, a representative from Gestión Urbana asserted that it was "just a minimum" and of course more than 5 farms would benefit (Gestión Urbana, architect) Despite its four part plan, ubiquitous references to "participation" and inclusion of requirements of AES, the relocation plan not only does not provide a reevaluation program to ensure long term security but it also does not provide compensation or training for the acres of farmland in the flood area that is owned by people who live in communities that aren't being relocated.

The presentation of the Relocation Plan to the public exhibits the devaluation of traditional indigenous culture in the face of Westernized values. Originally, all families displaced by the dam were going to be moved outside Valle Riscó to small settlements nearer to Changuinola as in the case of Isabel Becker. Her house in Finca 4 is prominently displayed in publicity ads in Panamanian newspapers as well as in posters describing the relocation that are hanging in the AES offices in Ojo de Agua. The photographs show a modern, boxy, one-floor house similar to most of the houses in urban Panamanian towns. This photo is usually paired with an interior shot showing a cushioned living room couch and large television. These photos and others of the houses AES will buy or build for relocated families are usually printed next to photos of the original homes, open-air, thatched roofed, one or two-room wooden houses on stilts. The subtext of these advertisements invites a comparison between the conditions the people were living in before AES and the ones they will be living in now with AES's help. To the general Panamanian public and most westernized viewers, the better life is clearly the one with full walls and a personal television.

The rhetoric of the benefits and opportunities being provided by Chan-75 also exhibit the extent to which AES find the Ngöbe's current lifestyle legitimate. Despite claims of advocates that AES will *sacar* (remove) the communities from poverty and give them something better (Caballero) the reality is that the communities are being forced to assimilate into the dominant Westernized culture. This culture is based around a capitalist monetary exchange system that they are not prepared to enter because their cultural system if one of self-subsistence, collective land, and little, though always increasing, participation in the monetary economy. The relative merits of these two systems are beyond the scope of this paper, but the issue here is not which system holds more value, but rather the forced removal of people from a system they know and understand and that holds cultural importance for them. The modern houses in town may come with a TV but they do not come with farmland, the only source of food most community residents have ever known. Without the ability to produce their own food, the residents are forced into low-paying jobs by their lack of training for anything better. The company's plans and abilities to provide the support for these families after relocation inspires little confidence in community or environmental leaders, but AES remains convinced that the relocation is for the people's own good. One AES engineer dismissed the concerns of families regarding the planned relocation by confiding that many Ngöbe families engaged in incest, a comment that implied the existence of a backwardness that needs to be corrected. In general, the company and its advocates refuse to believe that the opportunity they are providing could be anything but good, and a general development-oriented society is inclined to agree (AES engineer #1, Gestión Urbana architect, Caballero).

The company's view of the Ngöbe people themselves, which was echoed in the interviews of many who support the dam, stems from a mixture of cultural realities, feelings of superiority and the same Western views of the virtues of development. The Ngöbe are seen uneducated, naïve, and isolated. An AES engineer described them as entitled, believing that

others are "obligated" to provide them with money and services yet ungrateful because the gift of these opportunities "doesn't mean they're going to say thanks" (AES engineer #1). The opposition that is present in the communities is explained through a variety of ideas, some contradictory. The same engineer explained that for the Ngöbe, "it's easier to say no than yes," implying that the opposition is based not on valid concerns but a cultural trait. A more common view from dam supporters inside and outside of AES is that "the people don't understand it," implying that if they were smarter or familiar with the dominant culture, they would understand and accept the benefits and opportunities being offered to them (AES engineer #1; AES engineer #2; Gestión Urbana, architect; Caballero). Another set of viewpoints is that the Ngöbe are suspicious and distrusting of people from *afuera* (outside the communities), namely the company, yet naïve and easily influenced by outside ideas, namely those of environmental NGOs (AES engineer #1). Community members who openly oppose the project were consistently presented as manipulated and confused by outside influences.

Culturally, not all these views are unfounded. The Ngöbe are isolated from the dominant, westernized Panamanian culture and unfamiliar with its "benefits". They have experienced discrimination from the non-indigenous community and therefore have good reason to suspicious of outsiders coming in with large-scale plans for their ancestral territory (community leader #1). It is not uncommon to be asked for money when visiting their communities, and a low level of education is generally accepted as an obstacle to making well-informed and independent decisions. The issue with the views held by high-level employees of AES is the extent to which the company has used them to disregard the opinions and wishes of the people of Valle Riscó. Cultural differences and low levels of education are not indicators of the value of a person, but the condescension and lack of respect present in the tones of the AES engineers interviewed exhibits the existence of exactly that belief.

"No hay respecta": The Ngöbe and AES

On the part of the Ngöbe activists, these perceptions have not gone unnoticed. Every community activist spoken with asserted that AES had no respect for the people, their opinions, lands or livelihoods and consistently ignored them in their efforts to initiate, develop, and build Chan-75. An interviewee personally affected by the company's insensitivity when they cleared his finca without his permission asserted that all the company's actions had been carried out without community consultation and with "no respect" (inhabitant #3). An indigenous rights activist specifically criticized the company's treatment in regards to indigenous culture saying that the project was going to "break" their traditions and customs and force them into unsustainable lives in unfamiliar cities or on insufficient farmland (community leader #1). The company's actions were described as dishonest and placing no value on people's lives. All four interviewees believe the company does not actually care about the people they are displacing and the social programs AES has proposed simply done as a matter of form to silence opposition.

The result is a shared animosity and almost no communication between community leaders and the company. Communication is minimal and some leaders seemed content to keep it that way. It seems that in the past, community leaders who had gotten close to the company had been influenced by the relationship and, possibly with a promise of money or other benefits, had switched sides (community leader #1). Another activist expressed an unwillingness to let the general community get too close to the company in the fear that the company will buy their support or agreement to sell their land through money, gifts or simply force (inhabitant #2). This loosely echoes the company's sentiment that the Ngöbe are naïve and easily convinced of outside

ideologies or ideas. Whereas the company thinks outside NGOs are doing this, these community leaders are afraid of the company being able to do the same thing.

Unwelcome Ideology vs. Social Empowerment: The Role and Relationships of ACD

The Panama City-based Alliance for Conservation and Development (ACD) was founded in 2003 by a group of Panamanian scientists and professionals is a member of the growing community of environmental NGOs in Latin America that has attracted the attention of many anthropologists. Price, in her 1994 paper *Ecopolitics and Environmental Nongovernmental Organizations in Latin America* examines the characteristics of these local NGOs as they are influenced by the unique social, environmental and political forces of Latin American countries. A major challenge for environmentalists in developing countries is that "…concern about employment, infrastructure [and] services…takes precedence over environmental activism"(42). This becomes a particular concern when environmentally destructive projects purport to provide or improve the conditions of all three things, as is the case with Chan-75. For this reason, NGOs in Latin America have been more concerned with social and human development and the concerns of communities than their more preservation-oriented counter-parts in developed countries (43). Many organizations attempt to connect the goals of environmental conservation with sustainable development for the people and communities that depend on natural resources. This focus on exploited environmental resources and the needs of marginalized rural communities has led to a natural alliance between NGOs and indigenous groups. Indigenous groups are often threatened by both development and conservation projects that "expect local people to give up…their customary economic and cultural activities without clear substitutes, alternatives, or incentives" (Kottak 1999, 27) whether it be in the form of a hydroelectric dam or a national protected area. Kottak argues that local participation is essential to the success of any development or conservation project (27), and this has been a central tenet for many fledgling and NGOs in Latin America including ACD. They aim to support rural communities in regards to sustainable development that is compatible with the conservation and include the communities in decision-making (Alianza para la Conservación y el Desarrollo, 2007). Though a small group, they have become the face of the movement against Chan-75 and have been both lauded and vilified for their willingness to get involved. As the situation has intensified, Chan-75 has become their primary project.

However, Latin American NGOs have been criticized for their primarily North American funding base and for conservation programs that fail to take into account the realities and cultures of indigenous communities in the areas. Primary funding sources tend to be from large environmental organizations located in the North America or Europe, raising concerns about the influence of foreign money and foreign interests on the projects addressed by Latin American NGOs (Price 1994). Working in indigenous territories with cultures that may not seem to fully appreciate the worth of the natural resources they have creates a temptation to environmental organizations "…to remake native landscapes and cultures in their own image" (Kottak 1999, 26) just as social programs such as AES's Relocation Plan seek to do the same. The involvement of NGO's from the global North (North America and Europe) in environmental and indigenous issues have also been viewed as "imperialist" and "self-interested" as in the case of the indigenous Penen's campaign against logging on their lands in Malaysia (Brosius 1999, 41) Criticisms such as these combined with AES's perception of the Ngöbe as naïve and unable to separate ideology from reality has resulted in the blame for creating any and all opposition to the dam being set entirely on ACD. To AES, ACD has brought in ideas from *afuera* that have

confused the Ngöbe and brainwashed them with an outside ideology. AES and the dam's supporters also do not believe the NGOs voice any reasonable concerns about the dams or have the interest of the communities in mind but are fighting the dam for personal gain. Referring to them as *ambientalistas malas* (bad environmentalists), allusions were made to pay-offs from oil companies and according to ACD members, Hugo Chavez has even been suggested as a possible backer (Caballero, AES engineer #1, Lasso pers. com.). This view both stems from and further exacerbates the already acute issue of AES refusing to recognize the legitimacy of community opposition. ACD views the company as corporately irresponsible, corrupt, morally bankrupt and unabashedly destroying the culture of an indigenous group and one of the most biodiverse areas in the world for the financial windfall of select members of society. As one ACD member bluntly put it, "We hate each other." Initially there were some unsuccessful attempts at negotiation but these have disintegrated into essentially no communication (Lasso), and the relationship itself does not extend past their mutual efforts against each other.

The blame placed on ACD for "confusing the communities" extends to other supporting environmental organizations. International NGOs bring in ideas from even further away and represent "left-wing hippie values" from Europe and the United States that an AES engineer implied had no place in Panama (AES engineer #1). (He incorrectly said that ACD was originally from the US, but the implied meaning behind the comment was clear). The Center for Biological Diversity and Cultural Survival, the two international groups most involved in the issue, have both sent letters expressing their concerns over the project but AES has failed to respond (Galvin). The engineer I spoke to mentioned the Peace Corp as another ill-intentioned entity that has been speaking against the dam (AES engineer #1), perhaps explaining why the volunteer stationed in Nance de Riscó was escorted out of the area by police after the events of January 3rd.

In contrast to AES's claims, all of the community activists interviewed described their relationship with the NGOs as "very good". A few mentioned ACD specifically as supportive and willing to come help whenever there was a problem. One indigenous rights leader asserted that the NGOs' work was mainly "sharing experience and technical advice so the communities can speak in their own interests." (community leader #1) Another, perhaps familiar with the "ideas from afuera" accusation said that the communities make decisions for themselves and the environmental organizations "support us, nothing more." (community leader #2) While one community member was frustrated with the lack of tangible success achieved and the current loss of momentum the community is experiencing, he did not seem to blame ACD for this, but the power and resources of the company and their unequivocal support from the Panamanian government (inhabitant #2).

They're Not There: The Role and Relationships of ANAM

The role of ANAM in the events of Chan-75 appears to be more straightforward than the complex relationships between other actors and also much more minimal. Officially, ANAM describes its role as "ensure that the company, in execution of the project [Chan-75], follows the law" (official statement ANAM). Time constraints prevented an official interview with a member of ANAM either from the national office or the regional office of Bocas del Toro so the following analysis is based on other stakeholders' description of their views of the role and relationships of ANAM.

The creation of government environmental agencies began in Latin America in the 1970's (Price, 46). Generally concerned with the establishment and management of national

protected areas and the creation and enforcement of environmental laws, in many countries the effectiveness of these bodies in the face of both governmental and business interests is questionable (46). The National Authority of the Environment (ANAM) is the Panamanian National Government's environmental governing body that was created by Law No. 41 (the general environmental law) on July 1st 1998 as "the autonomous governing entity of the state in matters of natural resources and the environment to assure the observance and application of the laws, regulations and national policies towards the environment" (Ley 41, ANAM website, translation by author). ANAM's duties include the revision and approval of all Environmental Impact Studies, and the delineation and management of the National System of Protected Areas (SINAP). However Panamanian scientists and environmentalists alike generally consider ANAM to be desperately under-funded, ineffectual, and extremely susceptible to pressure from the national administration (Ramos, Lasso). There are regional ANAM offices in every province, but the influence of these satellite bodies on national policy is weak, as exemplified by the rejection of the categorization of the Rio Riscó access road by the Bocas del Toro ANAM office which was ignored by national level officials.

To the communities, ANAM, which is seen as the same as the national government and administration, has often appeared as an extension of AES, ignoring environmental laws on behalf of the company and standing to gain just as much from Chan-75's construction (community leader #2). This view was universally expressed by those against the dam, with ANAM being seen as not only aiding the company, but also shirking its responsibilities to both the environment and the communities. Members of ANAM have spent very little time actually in the area of the dam site or the communities, and the most common description of ANAM's relationship with the residents of Valle Riscó, cited by both community members and members of activist and environmental groups, distills to "they fine us for cutting one tree on our own land than they let a huge foreign company come in and cut them all". An AES employee was much less verbose regarding their relationship with ANAM, simply stating that they work with ANAM to receive the proper legal permission from the work and to address the management of the resource (AES engineer #1). In regards to that relationship, this was the only response supporters of the dam seem willing to give.

According to Lasso, the ACD has maintained a relationship with ANAM, though very little comes from it. She believes that though there are members of ANAM who recognize the social, environmental and legal issues with Chan-75, but they fear retaliation from the national administration if they act against it. While communication with activists outside the community may be open, if not meaningful, those inside the communities report little to no contact, not surprising as local meetings that have included ANAM have also included AES. Indeed, ANAM seems unwilling to go to the area or discuss the project without AES at their side. Lasso reports that the confidential meeting ACD tried to have with the government organization proved useless when engineers from the company also showed up. The active involvement of ANAM with the project appears to have started and ended with the approval of the environmental impact statements and the granting of the concession, which according to their official statement, is exactly what it should be. After the achievement of both these things, ANAM has been unwilling to assume their role as an independent third party and seems to prefer to allow AES and the communities to fight it out on the ground (Lasso).

Sequence of influence: relationships, choices, events, outcome, and next steps

This analysis of relationships can be used to inform the choices made by each actor, the events that have arisen from these choices, the outcome and effects of these events and subsequent choices made up through the current situation. Analyzing all events in detail using this framework is beyond the scope of this paper, but using the traceable line of influence that leads up to the police intervention into the closure of the dam's access road by community activists and their subsequent arrests on January 3rd and the events that follow it one can see a clear example of how the aspects of the stake-holders' relationships have shaped this chronology.

The relationship between AES and the Panamanian government, and therefore ANAM, has been one of collaboration and support from the start. Support from the most powerful entity in the country (who virtually promised the success of Chan-75 with their approval of the problematic EIAs and concession) contributed to expectations of the company regarding what they could and should be able to achieve. AES's perception of the only clear opposition, the Ngöbe communities surrounding the dam site, added to their assumption of a straightforward project with levels of opposition being no higher than expected. But the community opposition was stronger then AES expected and ACD's participation in the conflict starting in 2006 allowed the affected communities to access legitimate lines of resistance socially and legally and strengthened their resolve.

Early in 2007, perhaps frustrated by the growing opposition in the communities and many inhabitants' unwillingness to sell their land to the company, AES increased the pressure on the owners areas key for the construction of the dam, resulting a series of events that increased the intensity of the situation for all actors involved and led to the full participation of ACD as the face of the opposition against the dam. As accusations of human rights violations reached the international level and biological concerns prompted international attention in ways that could legitimately threaten the construction of Chan-75, AES was suddenly in a situation they had thought they would avoid from their relationships with the supportive government and the under-educated, marginalized Ngöbe communities. It became all the more important to begin the construction in hopes that they may get the dam built before anyone can stop them. For the communities, the continuing disregard for their opinions and criticisms on the part of the company, civil disobedience may have seemed the only way to truly get the attention of AES and affect the company's behavior. When the community activists successfully prevented the company from beginning construction on the dam's foundation for 18 days, they resorted to intimidation, repression and violence.

These events exemplified the willingness of the company to use force to obligate the communities to allow them to build Chan-75, their disregard for the legal and human rights of the Ngöbe, and a confidence that the limited political and social power of the group would prevent consequences from the government or the public. It also may be framed as the beginning of a kind of desperation in the face of strong opposition from a coalition of local, national, and international actors. In some ways, the strategy of unabashed use of force has worked; with the installation of police in the communities, AES has successfully cultivated a culture of fear and cut the communities off from consistent outside support of ACD and other activists. One resident expressed concern for the children of the communities "no lo conoce" the presence of police and especially in the aftermath of the brutality on January 3rd are always scared. Another community leader said that the movement in the communities had been stymied by the loss of resources and communication with allies outside, and he expressed frustration that they did not have weapons of their own to force the police to leave to area. "I don't know what

more we can do," he said, "What more can we do?" (inhabitant #2). Lasso expresses similar concerns about being continually denied access into the area since AES stationed police at the roads. ACD's relationship with the community "used to very good, but expectations were bigger than what's been accomplished," and now unable to enter the area and talk with the general population ACD no longer has a clear idea of their thoughts or what may be changing. She adds that five months ago, with the local and international momentum she was confident that the dam would be stopped but now "the police intervention has weakened the communities resolve."

However, while AES may have successfully isolated their main opponents from outside help and installed a mechanism to prevent further threats to day to day construction of Chan-75, their conduct and disregard for human rights has raised awareness and concern on both a national and international level. Especially on the national level, where support for the activists against the dam has been the weakest, consistent news coverage of the police brutality at the protest as well as a well publicized 3 week protest in the Panama City cathedral by a coalition of indigenous and campesinos threatened by mega-development projects has begun to strengthen national involvement, a crucial part of the movements success. Internationally, momentum has increased as well with January 3rd strengthening the case against AES and the Panamanian government now pending in the International Court of Human Rights, and catching the attention of more international actors. Despite the constant work at the dam site as AES races to finish the dam, and the ever present challenge of finding enough resources to challenge the bottomless funding of the corporation, the opponents to the dam have not and will not give up hope, and though the optimism may sometimes be forced, it is there nonetheless.

Conclusion: The Continuing Fight for Legitimacy

The relationships that have shaped the sequence of events that have led to the current situation indicate larger issues surrounding the wider world of multi-national companies, developing countries, indigenous groups and environmental NGOs. Consciousness is being raised on multiple levels, even if it continues to be insufficient to truly mobilize the general public in Panama. International coalitions, widely viewed as indispensable instruments of success for environmental conservation and social justice have been formed to address the environmental and social wrongs of AES. ANAM may have a limited role in the actual events that have occurred, their cognizance of the issue may be growing as society begins, however slowly, to react. At least in theory, the government is a function of the people, and while corruption may abound, there is hope that within a democracy concerns of the people will eventually influence the choices of the state. Strengthening democracy and reducing corruption are two steps towards the full inclusion of indigenous groups under the law and the successful addressing of environmental and social concerns.

In some ways, the most pressing task here is to legitimize the Ngöbe's culture and values in the eyes of AES and their advocates such as the government whose decisions have a direct effect on the survival of their culture and livelihoods. To change a company or countrywide perception of an entire people may seem a momentous task, if not entirely hopeless, but the steps that lead to this shift are already part of the current efforts against the dam. AES may not be open to changing their paradigm of the value of development and the value of indigenous people, but other actors are, and with enough support this can spread upwards, at least to the entities that have some control over what AES is allowed to do. Current activities of the NGO's, capacity building, community organization, and helping the Ngöbe understand their legal rights and exercise them, empower the communities in a way AES's relocation program will never be able

to do. Helping the Ngöbe protect their cultural interests in the larger westernized society will help them follow in the paths of many indigenous groups across Latin America who have engaged in decades of struggle to further their interests and influence in order to protect their culture and traditions from international business and development interests. While the fate of the Ngöbe and the possibility of success are unclear even for the opposition's leaders, like every struggle, the controversy of Chan-75 will add valuable experience and new knowledge to the backlog of social and environmental struggles against mega-development projects around the world.

This paper has attempted to identify and examine one factor of many and to provide a clear chronology of the complex and many-layered events that have surrounded Chan-75, the relationships and perceptions between major stakeholders and participants. Pre-conceived conceptions of other groups, paradigms of the virtues of development and the value of culture, and assumptions, proven or unproven, all inform the series of choices actors have made throughout the evolution of Chan-75. The conclusions of this paper are part of a greater web of factors including the national and international political climate, the growing worldwide demand for energy, climate change, and globalization, all of which need to be examined to gain a full understanding of the events of Chan-75. However, academic analysis can only be so illuminating, and we must remember that the most insight can be gained from the words of the people intimately affected by Chan-75 themselves.

> "We depend on this land, it is what we live. How can we negotiate when it doesn't have a price? It's the same as a person, how can I negotiate the price of a person? I don't know what price they could have."
>
> Inhabitant, Charco la Pava, 15 May 2008

Works Cited

ACD. Alliance for Conservation and Desarrollo Office Log. 2007-2008.

Alianza para la Conservación y el Desarrollo, ACD Panamá, *Quien Somos*. [cited 22 May 2008] Available from http://acdpanama.org/?/Quienes-Somos/

AES Corporation. [updated 2008; cited 25 May 2008] Available from http://www.aes.com/aes/index?page=home

AES Engineer #1. Interview by Jessica Barber. 13-14 May 2008, Changuinola/Ojos de Agua, Bocas del Toro

AES Engineer #2. Interview by Jessica Barber. 14 May 2008. Ojos de Agua, Bocas del Toro

Architect, Gestión Urbana. Interview by Jessica Barber. 14 May 2008 Ojos de Agua, Bocas del Toro

Arcia, José. 2007. El adios de un Bosque protegido. *La Prensa* 19 November, national edition.

Autoridad Nacional del Ambiente. Gaceta Oficial. *Ley No. 41 de 1 de julio de 1998.* 1 July 1998.

Autoridad Nacional del Ambiente. *Plan de Manejo de Bosque Protector Palo Seco, Provincia de Bocas del Toro.* February 2004

Bort, John R. y Phillip D. Young "The Ngobe of Western Panama." *Endangered Peoples of Latin America: Struggles to Survive and Thrive.* Wesport CT: Greenwood Press, 2007.

Brosius, Peter J. "Green Dots, Pink Hearts: Displacing Politics from the Malaysian Rain Forest." *American Anthropologist* 101 (1999): 36-57.

Caballero, Venencio. Interview by Jessica Barber. 11 May 2008. Changuinola, Bocas del Toro.

Central Intelligence Agency. *World Factbook-Panama.* [updated 2007; cited 2 May 2008]. Available from https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/pm.html.

Clark, Dana "Understanding the World Bank Inspection Panel." *Demanding Accountability; Civil-Society Claims and the World Bank Inspection Panel*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield, 2003.

Community Leader #1. Interview by Jessica Barber. 15 May 2008. Changuinola, Bocas del Toro.

Community Leader #2. Interview by Jessica Barber. 13 May 2008. Changuinola, Bocas del Toro.

Contraloría General de la Repíblica de Panama. *República de Panamá-Censo 2000.* [cited 2 May 2008] Available from http://www.contraloria.gob.pa/.

Cordero, Sarah, Ricardo Montenegro, Maribel Mafla, Irene Burgués, and John Reid. *Análisis de costo beneficio de cuartro proyectos hidroeléctricos en la cuenca Changuinola-Teribe.* July 2006.

Costa Rica National Parks. *La Amistad (Talamanca) International Park.* [updated 2005; cited 22 May 2008]. Available from http://www.costarica-nationalparks.com/laamistadinternationalpark.html.

De los Santos, Eugenio J., Nelson Barranco, Isabel Alle, Mariela Fruto. *Estudio de Impacto Ambiental Categoria III Construcción y Operación de la Central Hidroeléctrica El Gavilán (Chan-75)* October 2004.

Dove, Michael R. "Indigenous People and Environmental Politics" *Annual Review of Anthropology* 35 (2006): 192-208.

Energy Information Administration, US Department of Energy *Country Analysis Briefs, Central America, Electricity.* [updated 2007; cited 2 May 2008] Available from http://www.eia.doe.gov/emeu/cabs/Central_America/Electricity.html.

Energy Information Administration, US Department of Energy *Panama Energy Profile.* [updated

21 April 2008; cited 2 May 2008.] Available from http://tonto.eia.doe.gov/country/country_energy_data.cfm?fips=PM.
Energy Information Administration, US Department of Energy *World Energy Overview 1995-2005*.[updated 2007; cited 2 May 2008] Available from http://www.eia.doe.gov/iea/overview.html.
Fitzgerald, Carlos. Interview by Jessica Barber. 2 May 2008. Panama City.
Galvin, Peter. Phone interview by Jessica Barber. 5 May 2008.
Gestión Urbana. *Programa de Reasentamiento Familias Río Changuinola-Chan-75; Propuesta Técnica*. April 2008.
Hodgson, Dorothy L. "Introduction: Comparative Perspectives on the Indigenous Rights Movement in Africa and the Americas." *American Anthropologist* 104 (2005) 1037-1049.
Inhabitant #1. Interview by Jessica Barber. 15 May 2008 Changuinola, Bocas del Toro.
Inhabitant #2. Interview by Jessica Barber. 17 May 2008 Valle de Riscó, Bocas del Toro.
Inhabitant #3. Interview by Jessica Barber. 17 May 2008 Valle de Riscó, Bocas del Toro.
International Rivers. *Latin America.* [updated 2008; cited 3 May 2008.] Available from internationalrivers.org.en.latin-america
McCully, Patrick "We Will Not Move: The International Anti-Dam Movement" excerpted from *Silenced Rivers: The Ecology and Politics of Large* London: Dams Zed Books, 1996. [cited 3 May 2008] Available from International Rivers Organization. http://internationalrivers.org/en/node/567
Ministro de Gobierno y Justicia. Government of Panama. *Perfil de los Pueblos Indígenas de Panamá*. March 2002.
Jackson, Jean E. and Kay B, Warren. "Indigenous Movements in Latin America, 1992-2004: Controversies, Ironies, New Directions." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 34 (2005): 49-73.
Jordan, Osvaldo. 18 May 2008. personal e-mail to author.
Kottak, Conrad P. "The New Ecological Anthropology." *American Anthropologist* 101 (1999): 23-35.
Lasso, Lucia. "Violacion a los derechos humanos y constitucionales de indigenas por el proyecto hidroelectrico de aes changuinola en bocas del toro panama- denuncia publica nacional e internacional- Situación Actual del proyectos hidroelectrico Chan-75: construcción avanza gracias a la fuerza policial y no al dialogo." Press Report, 11 January 2008.
Lasso, Lucia. Interview by Jessica Barber. 20 May 2008. Panama City.
Leslie, Jacques. *Deep Water; The Epic Stuggle over Dams, Displaced People, and the Environment*. New York: Picador, 2005.
Lutz, Ellen. "Dam Nation." *Cultural Survival Quarterly* 31 (2008): 16-23.
Microsoft Encarta Online Encyclopedia. *Panama.* [updated 2007; cited 3 May 2008] Available from http://encarta.msn.com/encyclopedia_761577478_5/panama.html.
Movimento dos Atingidos por Barragens-Brasil. *History of MAB.* [updated 2007; cited 3 May 2008] Available from http://www.mabnacional.org.br/english/historia.htm.
Naim, Moisés. "An Indigenous World." *Foreign Policy* 139 (2003): 95-96.
Panama Land Administration Project. Latin America and Caribbean Region (LCSER). World Bank *Project Appraisal Document.* 2000.
Perreault, Thomas. "From the *Guerra Del Agua* to the *Guerra Del Gas*: Resource Governance, Neoliberalism and Popular Protest in Bolivia." *Antipode* 38 (2006): 150-172.
Price, Marie "Ecopolitics and Environmental Nongovernmental Organizations in Latin

America." *Geographical Review* 84 (1994): 42-58.
Ramos, Denis, Lecture "Estudios de Impacto Ambiental" Conservation Biology, March 14, 2008.
Rothman, Franklin Daniel and Pamela E. Oliver, *From Local to Global: The Anti-dam Movement in Southern Brazil, 1979-1992*, [cited 2 May 2008] Available from: http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/~oliver/PROTESTS/ArticleCopies/Dams_moby.pdf.
Serracín, Susana. Interview by Jessica Barber. 5 May 2008. Panama City.
Sistema de Información Ambiental Mesoamericano *Sistemas Nacionales de Áreas Protegidas (SINAP)-Panama*. [updated 2006; cited 24 May 2008] Available from http://www.ccad.ws/areasprotegidas/SINAP_pan.htm.
Stein, Jeffery "Resistance to Dam Nation: An analysis of the Stance and Strategies of the Opposition Movement to the Chan-75 Hydroelectric Project in Bocas del Toro, Panama." senior thesis, Wesleyan University (2008).
Thorson, Erica, Linda Barrera, and Jason Gray. *Petition to the World Heritage Committee* Requesting Inclusion of Talamanca Range-La Amistad Reserves/La Amistad National Park on the List of World Heritage in Danger. 2007.
United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues. *About UNGFII and a brief history of indigenous peoples and the international system.* [updated 2006; cited 3 May 2008.] Available from http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/en/history.html.
Wickstrom, Stefanie. "The Politics of Development in Indigenous Panama." *Latin American Perspectives* 30 (2003): 43-68.
Witness for Peace. *NGOs Demand World Bank Investigation Into 1980s Massacres at Guatemalan Dam Report Reveals 376 Murdered After Resisting Eviction.* [updated 9 May 1996; cited 3 May 2008] Available from http://www.hartford-hwp.com/archives/47/158.html.
World Commission on Dams. *Outline of the WCD*. [updated 2001; cited 24 May 2008] Available from http://www.dams.org/commission/intro.htm.
World Heritage Nomination – IUNC Summery. *La Amistad Interational Park and Volcun Baru National Park/Panama.* April 1990.
Young, Philip D. "Ngöbe Cultural Survival in the Twenty-first Century: Four Challenges" (2007)

Appendix 1: Major Actors and Stakeholders in Chan-75

AES Changuinola: -multinational energy generation company based in the US. Builds generation plants that run on a variety of fuels including coal, natural gas, wind, and water. In Panama, the company exists as AES Panama, with AES Changuinola operating as its regional entity in Bocas del Toro.

Government: -constitutional democracy with a four year presidential term. The current president is Martín Torrijos.

ANAM: -governmental body in charge of environmental management including the approval of environmental impact assessments (EIA) and the national protected areas.

Valle Riscó : -the Changuinola River valley where Chan-75 is located. Communities included this area are Charco la Pava, Valle Rey, Guayabal, Changuinola Arriba, Bajo Culubre, Guayacan, Valle Libre, Ceiba, Nance de Riscó, Pluma, Punta Pena de Riscó, Soledad, Bajo la Esperanza and the community of Valle de Riscó. Charco la Pava, Valle Rey, Guayabal and Changuinola Arriba will be displaced by the reservior.

ACD: -small non-governmental organization (NGO) based in Panama City. They have become the national and international face of the campaign against the dams.

Other Actors: -media sources, international NGOs involved in the campaign and any other associated or unassociated groups who do not fit inside the first categories.

Appendix 2: La Cronología de Chan-75

Notas de la Cronología

Esta cronología no es una lista completa de todos los documentos o acontecimientos ocurridos en relación al proyecto Chan 75, más bien es un resumen general de la evolución de estos hechos. Algunas cartas han ilustrado los niveles de acciones comunitarias y temas importantes, sin embargo algunas cartas, contratos y otros documentos se han omitido para evitar redundancias o irrelevancias. He incluido algunos artículos de medios de comunicación nacional e internacional que presentan el caso de Chan-75 y la crisis de energía en Panamá. Las acciones de la policía están categorizadas como "GOBIERNO" pero cuando la policía fue contratada por la empresa fueron incluidas dentro de "EMPRESA"

Leyendo de Appendix 1- La Cronología de Chan-75

Colores:

Rojo: eventos de alta importancia
Azul: cartas
Verde: cosas legales
Violeta: artículos

Acrónimos:

ACD- Alianza para la Conservación y el Desarrollo
AES- AES Panamá, AES Changuinola, Changuinola Civil Works
ANAM- Autoridad Nacional de Ambiente
BID- Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo
BPPS- Bosque Protector Palo Seco
CBD- Centro para la Diversidad Biológica
CBM- Corredor Biológico Mesoamericano
CEDETENG- Centro de Desarrollo y Asistencia Técnica Ngöbe
CEPSA- Consultores Ecológicos Panameños S.A.
EIA- Estudio de Impacto Ambiental
GEPSA- Generadora Eléctrica de Panamá S.A.
IACHR- Comisión Interamericano de Derechos Humanos
INAC- Instituto Nacional de Cultura
IRHE- Instituto de Recursos Hidráulicos y Electrificación
PILA- Parque Internacional La Amistad
PRONAT- Programa Nacional de Administración de Tierras
UICN- Unión Mundial para la Naturaleza
UNESCO- Organización de Las Naciones Unidad para la Educación, la Ciencia y la Cultura

Personas:

ANAM:

-Ligia Castro- Administradora Nacional
-Diana Velasco- Jefa de Departamento de Evaluación de Impacto Ambiental

-Aleida Salazar- Directora de Dirección de Áreas Protegidas y Vida Silvestre
-Bolivar Zambrano- Director de Evaluación y Ordenamiento Ambiental
-Eduardo Reyes, Subadministrador General
-Denis González- Jefe del Departamento de Evaluación
-Indira Duran Oliva- Evaluadora de Proyectos

AES:

-Humberto González- Representante Legal de Hydro Teribe S.A.
-Ing. José Victoria –Director Ambiental

ACD:

-Osvaldo Jordán, Coordinador de Asuntos Internacionales,
-Ariel Rodríguez: Presidente
-Lucia Lasso- Directora Ejecutiva
-Susana Serracín- Abogada Ambiental
-Donaldo Sousa- Abogado

Otros Funcionarios del Gobierno Nacional:

-Domingo Varela- ex Director Nacional del Patrimonio Histórico
-Generoso Atencio P. – Jefe de la Sección Ambiental Ministerio de Obras Públicas
-Maria Roquebert, Ministra de Desarrollo Social (MIDES)
-Rina Rodríguez, Secretaria General, MIDES
-Ricardo Vargas, Defensor del Pueblo
-Ana Matilde Gómez, Procuradora General de la Nación
-Anel Omar Rodríguez, Director General, Instituto Nacional de Cultura
-Rolando Mirones, ex Director de la Policia Nacional

Autoridades Locales:

-Virginia Ábrego, la alcaldesa de Changuinola
-Nelso Ábrego Molina, corregidor de policía Valle Riscó
-Jose Rios, sub-comisionado de policía, Bocas del Toro
-Norberto Palacio- secretario corregiduria Valle Riscó

Instituciones Internacionales:

-Ellen Lutz- Directora de Cultural Survival
-Peter Galvin- Director del Centro para la Diversidad Biológica
-Rolando Armuelles, Programa Nacional de Administración de Tierras (PRONAT)

FECHA	ACD	COMUNIDADES	GOBIERNO NACIONAL	EMPRESA	OTROS ACTORES
1970s			-Los presidentes de Costa Rica y Panamá declararon su intención establecer un parque natural internacional (1979)[1]	-Se empieza investigaciones hidroeléctricas en el área del río Changuinola[2]	
1980s			-Se crea el BPPS por ***Decreto Ejecutivo No. 25*** (28/9/83)[3] -Se crea PILA según la ***Resolución No. JD-021-88*** (6/9/88)[4]	-Chas. T. Main Internacional Inc. entrega un estudio a IRHE sobre potencial de proyectos hidroeléctricas en el río Chan (1981)[5]	
1990s			-El área de PILA de Panamá es declarado un sitio de patrimonio de la humanidad por UNESCO (1990)[6]		
2000-2001			-ANAM indica por **Nota No. AG-2079-2001** que GEPSA debe presentar un EIA (31/10/01)[7]	-GEPSA solicita concesión hidroeléctrica para El Gavilán (Chan-75) de ERSP (2001)[8]	

FECHA	ACD	COMUNIDADES	GOBIERNO NACIONAL y LOCAL	EMPRESA	OTROS ACTORES
2002-2003	-ACD va al Teribe para evaluar la situación de el Naso y la presa de Bonyic (diciembre 2003)[9]		-ERSP autoriza Hydro Teribe S.A. preparar y presentar un EIA para Chan-75 a ANAM según ***Resolución No. JD-3986*** (9/6/03)[10]		
2004 enero – junio				-Hydro Teribe entrega a ANAM ***Estudio de Impacto Ambiental para la Construcción y Operación de una Central Hidroeléctrica, El Gavilán (CHAN-75)*** por CEPSA (marzo)	-Peter Galvin viaja al Río Teribe y CBD se invoca contra la presa Bonyic[11]
2004 julio – diciembre	-ACD empieza una campaña contra Bonyic para apoyar los Nasos (septiembre)[12]	-Declaración contra las hidroeléctricas del Comité de Concentración de Charco la Pava, Valle Rey, Guayabal, Changuinola Arriba, Bajo Culubre, Guayacan, Valle Libre, Ceiba, Nancé de Risco, Pluma, Punta Pena de Risco, Soledad, Bajo la Esperanza y Valle de Risco (26/9)		-Hydro Teribe entrega a ANAM ***Estudio de Impacto Ambiental para la Construcción y Operación de una Central Hidroeléctrica, El Gavilán (CHAN-75)*** por CEPSA (octubre)	

FECHA	ACD	COMUNIDADES	GOBIERNO NACIONAL y LOCAL	EMPRESA	OTROS ACTORES
2005 enero -marzo		-algunas personas en las comunidades empiezan organizarse contra la presa (2005)[13]	-carta de **INAC** recomendando más estudios arqueológicos en Charco La Pava a **CEPSA** (3/3)	-Hidro Teribe llega en las comunidades del Río Changuinola hacer Consultas Públicas (enero)[14]	-World Heritage Comité incrementa la importancia del PILA porque logra el cuatro criterio de patrimonial natural (2005)[15]
2005 abril-junio	-ACD empieza los esfuerzos influir en las decisiones de Bonyic, Chan-75, Chan-140, Chan-220 (abril 05-octubre 06)[16]	-carta de **Centro de Desarrollo y Asistencia Técnica Ngöbe** a **Ligia Castro** preguntando por que una reunión de las presas no estuvo en las comunidades afectadas (5/4)	-carta de **Domingo Varela**, a **Denis González**, que rechaza el EIA hasta CEPSA haga investigaciones arqueológicas (7/6)	-Hidro Teribe organiza el Foro Público en Almirante para discutir Chan-75 y los otros dos proyectos en el Changuinola con las comunidades afectadas (abril)[17]	
2005 julio – diciembre	-carta de **ACD**, y otros ONGs a **Ligia Castro** solicitando una reunión para discutir las hidroeléctricas de Changuinola (5/9) -se entrega Informe Preliminar Estudio Económico-Ambiental (14/11)		**-ANAM aprueba *Estudio de Impacto Ambiental Chan-75* por *Resolución DINEORA IA-086-2005* y obliga Hidro Teribe a suscribir un acuerdo jurídico para lograr la concesión y entrega un estudio arqueológico (14/10)**	-Hidro Teribe solicita una concesión de administración parcial para 6,215 ha de BPPS (12/6)	-Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo (IADB) retira su apoyo de la presa Bonyic (julio)[18]

FECHA	ACD	COMUNIDADES	GOBIERNO NACIONAL y LOCAL	EMPRESA	OTROS ACTORES
2006 enero-febrero		-Francisco Santos firma un acuerdo con AES permitiendo estudios técnicos y socio ambientales en su tierra. (6/2)		-anuncio de AES en La Estrella "¡Hoy damos el primer paso para un futuro mejor!" A7 (27/1)	Peter Galvin regresa a Panamá y CBD se involucra contra Chan-75 (2006)[19]
2006 marzo-abril		-reunión de las comunidades de Río Changuinola se emita *Concentración No. 3* que rechaza el proyecto Chan-75 (3-4/3)			-CBD realize un comunicado de prensa "Protests in Panama Cast Shadow Over US Trade Deal" (14/3)
2006 mayo-junio		-reunión en Qda Pluma para discutir la posición de la comunidad del proyecto Chan-75 (1/5) *-Declaración de Valle de Risco* reunión de Ngöbe, Bribri y Naso donde se oponen a las presas en los Ríos Changuinola y Bonyic (19-21/5)			
2006 julio-agosto	-ACD, ANAI y CSF publican ***Análisis de costo beneficio de cuatro proyectos hidroeléctricos en la cuenca Changuinola-Teribe*** (julio)	-reunión en comunidades se emita *Acta No. 1* que declara que las reuniones de AES son insuficientes (24/8)		-Carlos Fitzgerald inicia estudios arqueológicos de los sitios río debajo de Chan-75 por CEPSA y Hidro Teribe (julio)	

FECHA	ACD	COMUNIDADES	GOBIERNO NACIONAL y LOCAL	EMPRESA	OTROS ACTORES
2006 septiembre-octubre	-ACD empieza campaña de intensidad baja para desarrollar las capacidades de las comunidades Naso y Ngöbe en contra de las presas. (octubre)[20]	-reuniones en las comunidades de Guayacán, Ceiba, Culubre y Oriente para discutir la posición del proyecto Chan 75 (5-17 de septiembre) -Acta del Taller Celebrado en la comunidad de Nancé de Riscó entre ACD y los moradores de las comunidades. Ing. José Moza quites y Hilaria Sánchez de ANAM llega y decir que deberían decir a ANAM sobre la reunión y los estudios de ACD no tenia valides (26/9)		-Hidro Teribe presenta ***Caracterización Arqueológica de Sitios de Campamentos y Caminos para el proyecto Chan-75*** por CESPSA a ANAM (octubre)	

FECHA	ACD	COMUNIDADES	GOBIERNO NACIONAL y LOCAL	EMPRESA	OTROS ACTORES
2006 noviembre-diciembre		- reunión en Nudobidi discutir posición comunitaria de Chan-75(11/10)	- carta de **Domingo Varela** a **Diana Velasco**, diciendo que la Caracterización Arqueológica cumple los requisitos (15/11) - Se emite ***Acta de Constitución de la Mesa Institucional Programa de Reubicación de Familias,*** un acuerdo entre AES, ANAM y las comunidades (23/11) -ANAM declara que EIA de Chan-75 es válido por ***Resolución DINEORA IA-127-06*** (21/12).	-Hidro Teribe entrega ***Estudio de Impacto Ambiental Categoría I Construcción del Tramo de Carretera Río Riscó a Sitio de Presa Chan 75*** elaborado por CEPSA (noviembre)	
2007 enero-febrero	-ACD, CBD y 36 otras organizaciones nacionales e internacionales se reúnen para entregar una petición a UNESCO pidiendo la clasificación de PILA come "parque en peligro"	-carta de los **dirigentes de Charco La Pava** a **ANAM** que no aceptan la concesión porque viola sus derechos humanos y derechos constitucionales (15/1)	-Edicto de Notificación de la concesión en BPPS (1/1) -Informe Técnico de Evaluación del EIA de la Carretera Río Riscó emita por ANAM Bocas del Toro, rechaza el EIA como Categoría I (30/1)	-AES lleva Isabel Becker y su hija a la ciudad de Panamá y las retiene en las oficinas de AES por 10 horas hasta ella firma un documento vendiendo su finca a AES (4/1)[21]	

FECHA	ACD	COMUNIDADES	GOBIERNO NACIONAL y LOCAL	EMPRESA	OTROS ACTORES
2007 enero-febrero con.		-reuniones en Guayacán, Bajo Culubre, La Ceiba u Guayacán discutir la posición de la comunidad del proyecto Chan-75 (24/1-17/2) -cartas de **Ismael y Florencio Quintero** de Valle Risco a **Virginia Abrego**, y **Valentín Pineda** pediendo ayuda porque AES entro sin autorización a sus fincas (27/2)	-Norberto Palacio, visita las fincas de Julián Abrego y su familia para investigar la construcción de caminos y trochas que realizó AES sin permiso. (5/2)[22] -carta de **Bolívar Zambrano** a **Humberto González**, Hidro Teribe, pidiendo mas información del EIA para la Carretera Río Riscó (28/2)		
2007 marzo-abril		-Francisco Santos firma un acuerdo que le permite a AES hacer estudios en su tierra (11/4)	-carta de **Indira Duran Oliva,** a **Aleida Salazar,** repuesta a la carta de Lic. Salazar as unto "observaciones al documento Soporte Técnico" (14/3)	-Hidro Teribe entrega ***Soporte Técnico de CEPSA*** para a implementación de la Concesión Administrativa en el BPPS (marzo) -Hidro Teribe presenta una Adenda al EIA de la Carretera Río Riscó (marzo)	-El gobierno de la Republica Dominicana acusa AES Corp. del fraude (13/3)[23] -CBD comunicado de prensa "Petition Filed to Protect Panama World Heritage Site" (23/4)

FECHA	ACD	COMUNIDADES	GOBIERNO NACIONAL y LOCAL	EMPRESA	OTROS ACTORES
2007 mayo-junio	-carta de **ACD** a **La Comisión Interamericano de Derechos Humanos** pidiendo por una visita para ver la situación de territorios indígenas.(3/6)	-manifestación en Valle de Agua contra las presas del Changuinola, cierran la vía por tres horas (15/5)[24] **Samuel Palacio de CEDETENG, Nicasio Castillo de La Asociación de Educadores Ngöbe y Pedro Abrego de Comisión Consultiva Ambiental del Chanuinola** presentan una denucia de la violacion de derechos humanos por Aes a **Monica Perez,** Defensora del Pueblo (5/6)	--ANAM aprueba EIA de Construcción del Tramo de Carretera Río Risco a Sítio de la presa Chan-75 como categoría I por ***Resolución DIEORA IA 143-2007*** (2/5) -ANAM emite ***Resolución de Gabinete No. 62*** que da las concesiones de 6,215 hectáreas del BPPS a AES para realizar los proyectors Chan-75, 140, y 220 (23/5)	Aes inicia la construcción de carreteras de acceso y casas de trabajadores (mayo)[25] -Aes compra la finca a Patricia Castillo de Santos e Hilario Santos Baker (15/6)	-UN Patrimonio Mundial decide visitar PILA (26/6)[26] -CBD comunicado de prensa "World Heritage Committee Commits to Protecting Panama World Heritage Site (26/6)

FECHA	ACD	COMUNIDADES	GOBIERNO NACIONAL y LOCAL	EMPRESA	OTROS ACTORES
2007 julio-agosto	-ACD empieza campaña de alta intensidad en contra de Chan-75 (julio)[31] -carta de **ACD** a **Ligia Castro**, solicitando una reunión sobre las fallas graves en la construcción de Chan-75 (7/8) -Ariel Rodríguez presenta una denuncia al Defensor del Pueblo sobre la violación de derechos humanos por AES en las comunidades (23/7)[32]		-primera reunión entre ANAM, AES y las comunidades hablar sobre reubificación-Valle el Rey (7/8)[33]	-AES y Gestión Urbana presentan ***Programa de Reasentamiento "Comunidades Río Changuinola"*** (julio) -carta de **AES** a **Isabel Becker** invitándola a las oficinas de AES para conversar de su sitio nuevo (5/7) -se envía tractores a la casa de Isabel Becker de Charco La Pava. Isabel pasa mas de 24 horas fuera de su casa antes de poder regresar (21/7)[34]	-CBD comunicado de prensa "International Coalition Demands Cancellation of Virginia-based AES Corporation Dams that Will Villages and Drive Species Extinct" (23/8)
2007 septiembre-octubre	-ACD presenta la ***Denuncia Penal Ambiental en defensa de BPPS DCA-018-07*** en el Centro de Recepción de Denuncias del Ministerio Público por el EIA de la carretera Río Risco como Categoría I (5/9)	-Cabecera Río Changuinola, III Congreso Local rechaza el proyecto Chan-75 (10/9) -Manifestación de los Ngöbe-Buglé de Veraguas contra proyectos hidroeléctricos, turísticos y minerías (12/10)[35]		-AES realiza una donación a ANCON (3/10) -Isabel Becker firma otro documento vendiendo su finca tras la presión de AES y la Alcaldesa de Changuinola (19/10)[36]	-Miami Herald tiene articulo sobre Isabel Becker y Chan-75 (2/10)[37] -Asociación de Estudiantes Ngöbe-Bugle de la Universidad de Panamá denuncian la violación de los derechos humanos de las indígenas Ngöbe-Bugle (12/10)

FECHA	ACD	COMUNIDADES	GOBIERNO NACIONAL	EMPRESA	OTROS ACTORES
2007 septiembre-octubre con.	-ADA y ASEO se entrega ***Denuncia Penal Ambiental en Defensa del BPPS DCA-022-07*** al Departamento de Delitos Contra el Ambiente para el caso de sitios arqueológicos (25/10) - se entrega ***Ampliación Denuncia por Donaldo Augusto Sousa Guevara a Departamento de Investigaciones Criminales, Unidad de Delitos Contra el Ambiente DCA-022-07*** sobre los problemas de el EIA y los derechos de Isabel Becker (31/10) - ACD se empieza filmar un video de la situación de Chan-75 (octubre)	carta y petición de **habitantes de Charco la Pava, Valle el Rey y Guayabal** con 105 firmas **al Presidente Martín Torrijos** para detener la construcción de Chan-75 (27/11)	-la policía Nacional esta apostando en el área (25/10)[38]	-representantes de AES expulsa a Isabel Becker a una casa nueva en Finca 4 (25/10) -AES empieza la construcción de Chan-75 oficialmente (25/10)[39] -anuncio de AES en La Prensa "Ponemos la primera piedra del futuro energético de Panamá-Iniciamos la construcción de la Central Hidroeléctrica Changuinola I en Bocas del Toro" (26/10) -el mismo anuncio de AES en La Prensa (29/10) -anuncio de AES en La Prensa "Panamá Crece y así crecen sus necesidades de más energía Limpia y confiable" (30/10)	

FECHA	ACD	COMUNIDADES	GOBIERNO NACIONAL y LOCAL	EMPRESA	OTROS ACTORES
2007 noviembre	-Ellen L. Lutz, directora ejecutivo de Cultural Survival, viaja con ACD al área para ver la situación con Chan-75. Ella decide ayudar con la oposición contra la presa (noviembre)[40]	-Acta de pronunciamiento por poblaciones Ngöbe afectado en Río Changuinola (7/11) -Ana Castillo entrega una denuncia de infracción ambientales contra su madre, Isabel Becker, a ANAM (9/11)	-reunión de ANAM, AES, autoridades de la provincia y comunidades afectadas en Charco La Pava (8/11)[41] -ANAM ratifica su decisión que el EIA de la construcción de la carretera debe ser categoría I (19/11)[42]	-AES inicia trabajos de movimientos de tierra en la finca de Isabel Becker (noviembre)[43] -se destruye la finca de Ana Castillo (noviembre)[44] -Ing. José Victoria de AES envía una acta de acuerdos comprar y usar la finca y tierra de Alejandro Jiménez (2/11) -anuncio de AES La Estrella "Somos parte del Cambio" C6 (11/11) -anuncio de AES La Estrella "Panamá Crece y ya estamos trabajando en beneficio de Todos" C8 (13/11)	-artículos "Bosque en peligro" bajo de la firma José Arcia, aparece en la primera pagina de La Prensa (19/11)[45]

FECHA	ACD	COMUNIDADES	GOBIERNO NACIONAL y LOCAL	EMPRESA	OTROS ACTORES
2007 diciembre	-Donaldo Sousa y Susana Serracin presentan la demanda v. Administradora General del Ambiente, Dra. Ligia Castro, ***Recurso de Amparode Garantías Constitucionales Expediente No. 1057-07*** en la Corte Suprema de Justicia (21/12)	-La manifestación indígenas inicia contra la construcción y cierra la vía al sitio del explosiones y continua por diciembre (19/12)[46]	-carta de Defensor del Pueblo a ACD sobre violaciones de derechos humanos. (5/12) -Gaceta Oficial declara que las presas en Changuinola "son de interés social para el país" (10/12)[47] -Virginia Ábrego les orde a los manifestantes abandonar la calle. Ellos no se cumple (29/12)[48]	-anuncio de AES a pagina entera en La Prensa "US$3366,000,000-Préstamo Interino de Construcción y Préstamo a Término" 59ª (11/12) -AES anuncia que realizarían explosiones con dinamita el 19 de diciembre (17/12)[49] -Orden de arresto para los manifestantes de Nelso Abrego Molina, corregidor de policía Valle Risco	-articulo "Dam Nation" por Ellen L. Lutz aparece en *Cultural Survival Quarterly* sobre la situación de las comunidades con Chan-75 -carta a **Lic. Rina Rodríguez**, de **Adelaida Miranda** sobre su preocupación que nadie de MIDES ni el Departamento de Pueblos Indígenas atendió Alejandro Jiménez y Ana Castillo cuando viajaron a Panamá para presentar denuncias (5/12) -las asociaciones ecologistas, las comunidades indígenas y los científicos panameños envían un ordenamiento jurídico contra las represas a AES (21/12)

FECHA	ACD	COMUNIDADES	GOBIERNO NACIONAL y LOCAL	EMPRESA	OTROS ACTORES
2008 enero	-carta de **ACD** a **Virginia Ábrego**, sobre las violaciones de los derecho humanos de los Ngöbe (2/1) -carta de **Ariel Rodríguez** a **Ricardo Vargas**, informe de los eventos de el 3 de enero (3/1) -carta de **Osvaldo Jordán** a **Maria Roquebert,** informe de la violencia contra menores de edad en eventos de 3/1 (4/1) - dos cartas de **ACD** a **Ana Matilde Gómez**, sobre la violación a los derecho humanos y constitucionales (11/1, 14/1)	-Los manifestantes acuerdan desojar del área con la condición que tendrían una reunión con AES y el gobierno local el 8 de enero. (2/1)[50] -Los manifestantes regresan y son detenidos por la policía. 50 personas son detenidos con violencia incluyendo mujeres embarazadas y 11 niños. 2 niños más van al hospital con heridas. (3/1)[51] -Manifestación en frente del cartel para liberar las personas detenidas (4/1)[52] -100 Ngöbe-Buglé piquetean las oficinas de CCW en Finca 08 y las oficinas de la Anam en Changuinola contra las hidroeléctricas (8/1)[53]	-La policía y subcomisionado de AES llegan y hablan con los manifestantes (2/1)[54] -La policía libera los niños por la mañana y los adultos por la noche después la manifestación en frente del cartel. (4/1)[55] -repuesta de Defensor del Puebla a ACD diciendo que ya inicia una investigación en las comunidades (18/1)	-Empecé construcción de la puente a través Río Changuinola (enero)[56] -La policía no permite un grupo de corresponsales de prensa entrar el área cubrir la protesta (2/1)[57] -la policía obliga a salir a un miembro de Cuerpo de Paz de Nancé de Risco (4/1)[58] -AES coloca un grupo de policías armados en el área (8/1) -AES se entrega los EIA's de reasentamiento de Charco la Pava, Valle el Rey, Changuinola Arriba y Guayabal (21/1)	-articulo "Panamá hydropower push generates controversy" por Steven Ambrus en *EcoAmericas* Vol. 10 No. 3 (enero) -articulo en Panamá América bajo de la firma Santiago Cumbrera "Distribuidoras incumplen con la compra de energía" 3 (4/1) -Dr. Philip Young, catedrático norteamericano del departamento de antropología de la Universidad de Oregon visita las comunidades Ngöbe del BPPS para hacer una gira antropológica (5/1)[59] -1,500 indígenas y campesinos protestan y tienen un foro en Santiago contra proyectos mineros y hidroeléctricas (8/1)[60]

FECHA	ACD	COMUNIDADES	GOBIERNO NACIONAL y LOCAL	EMPRESA	OTROS ACTORES
2008 enero con.	-carta de **ACD** a **Rolando Mirones**, sobre los eventos de los 3 y 4 de enero (15/1) -carta a **ACD** de **Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo** en repuesta a carta de ACD expresando preocupación sobre el financiamiento de gestión ambiental de ANAM (15/1) -carta de **Susana Serracín** a **Comisión de Derechos Humanos, Asamblea Nacional de Panamá** sobre las violaciones (16/1) -carta de **ACD** a. **Ligia Castro** (17/1)	-declaración jurada por Ana Castillo Beker al Despacho de la Fiscalía Segunda del Circuito de Bocas del Toro contra AES para el maltrato de ella y sus hijos el 3 de enero (8/1) -querella presentada por Ernesto López Abrego al Despacho de la Fiscalía Segunda del Circuito de Bocas del Toro sobre violaciones de derechos humanos (8/1)	-la Dirección Nacional del Patrimonio Histórico emite ***Resolución No. 001/DNPH de 29 de enero de 2008***, el informe de inspección de sitios arqueológicos (29/1)	-La policía cerra las calles a Charco la Pava, Valle el Rey y sitio de la presa a personas no viven allí (enero) -Se destruye la finca de Francisco Santos de Charco la Pava (final de enero)[61] -la policía nacional y maquinaria de construcción de AES va a la finca de Alejandro Jiménez y inicia construcción sin permiso (7/1 y 8/1)[62]	-Ellen Lutz envía una carta a Paul Hanrahan, CEO de AES Corporation pidiéndole parar la construcción hasta las comunidades esta incluyendo en el proceso (10/1)

FECHA	ACD	COMUNIDADES	GOBIERNO NACIONAL y LOCAL	EMPRESA	OTROS ACTORES
2008 febrero	-carta ACD-14-08 de **ACD** a **Dirección Nacional del Patrimonio Histórico** diciendo que el informe de inspección de sitios arqueológicos fue insuficiente (12/2) -Reunión con BID (15/2)[63] -ACD se reune con Banco Mundial y entrega documentación sobre concesiones de reubicación en BPPS (17/2)[64] -Reunión de ANAM, UNESCO, ANCON, The Nature Conservancy, Center for Biological Diversity, Fund Smithsonian, Fund Natuza, Audobon, MarViva, ACD y gente de Tito Santano (ex rey de Naso) (18/2, 19/2, 23/2)[65]	-denuncia presenta a el Despacho de la Personería Municipal de Changuinola, por Francisco Santo de Charco La Pava contra AES por la destrucción de su finca sin permiso (11/2) -denuncia realiza por Ernesto López, Ana Castillo, Manuel López y Amalia Ábrego contra la violencia de el 3 de enero. (8/2)	-anuncio a pagina entera de ANAM y Gobierno Nacional en Panamá Metro "Producción de Energía Limpia en áreas protegidas" 36-37 (11/2) -repuesta a ACD de MIDES sobre el tratamiento de los niños el 3 de enero de 2008 (29/2)	-La policía continua cerrar las vías al área y queda en las comunidades con armas (febrero) -La policía no permite miembros de ACD, UNESCO, CEDETENG, y Cultural Survival entrar el área ir a una reunión en Charco la Pava y dice que nadie puede contactar ni hablar con ningún miembro de las comunidades durante la construcción del proyecto (21/2)[66]	-CBD comunicado de prensa "UN Delegation Visits Central Americas Largest Rainforest, Panama's La Amistad, Threatened by Dams" (18/2) -CBD comunicado de prensa "Environmental and Indigenous Groups Meet UN Delegation in Panamá" (22/2) -CBD comunicado de prensa "UN Delegation's Visit Highlights Inadequate Studies of Dam's Effects; Panama Prevents On-the-Ground Visit to La Amistad Park" (25/2)

FECHA	ACD	COMUNIDADES	GOBIERNO NACIONAL y LOCAL	EMPRESA	OTROS ACTORES
2008 marzo	-ACD y Cultural Survival entrega a la Comisión Interamericana de Derechos Humanos la petición ***Violaciones de los Derechos Humanos por el Gobierno de Panamá contra las Comunidades Indígenas Ngöbe e Individuos en el Valle del Río Changuinola, Bocas del Toro, Panamá*** (7/3) -ACD presenta a Sub-Comisionado Manual Moy Zapateiro, Dirección de Responsabilidad Profesional, Policía Nacional dos videos con testimonios de residentes de Río Changuinola, informe legal sobre las violaciones, y otra pruebas de abuso de autoridad (7/3)	-Congreso Valle Risco escribe una resolución pidiendo el retiro de la policía y pidiendo que todo el corregimiento de Valle Risco sea considerado área anexa(2/3) -El campamento "Panameño Muévete por tu ambiente, tierras y aguas" de indígenas y campesinas afectadas por proyectos mineros, hidroeléctricos y turísticos, incluyendo activistas de las comunidades de Valle Riscó funda en Plaza Catedral, ciudad de Panamá (12/3)[67] -El campamento de la catedral se reune con el Presidente Martín Torrijos y el forme un comisión para discutir los problemas hidros, mineros y turísticos (29/3)[68]	-Dirección Nacional del Patrimonio Histórico rechaza las denuncias de ACD-24-08 y mantiene ***Resolución No. 001/DNPH de 29 de enero de 2008*** **por** ***Resolución No. 023-08/DNPH de 13 de marzo de 2008*** (13/3) -carta de **Virginia Abrego**, a **José Ríos**, pidiéndole retirar la policía de las comunidades (25/08) -La comisión del presidente se reune con el campamento. ACD participa en la misma (2/4 y 9/4)[69]	-La policía continua cerrar las vías al área y queda en las comunidades con armas (marzo) -AES empecé detonaciones en el sitio de Chan-75 (marzo) -La policía no permite entrar miembros de ACD, el Tribunal Latinoamericano del Agua, y UICN al área por razones de seguridad (5/3)[70]	-representantes de Banco Mundial programa PRONAT visita Valle de Risco (6/3)[71] -Día Mundial Ante-represas (14/3)

FECHA	ACD	COMUNIDADES	GOBIERNO NACIONAL y LOCAL	EMPRESA	OTROS ACTORES
2008 marzo con.	-Se **entrega *Impulso Procesal al Recurso de Amparo de Garantías Constitucionales***, Susana Serracín y otros vs. La Administradora General del Ambiente Dra. Ligia Castro a La Corte Suprema de Justicia (7/3) -ACD reunión con Defensoría del Pueblo sobre derechos humanos[72] -carta de **Ariel Rodríguez,** a **Anel Omar Rodríguez,** donde se apela la resolución de la Dirección Nacional del Patrimonio Histórico y recalca los problemas con el informe de inspección (28/3)				

FECHA	ACD	COMUNIDADES	GOBIERNO NACIONAL y LOCAL	EMPRESA	OTROS ACTORES
2008 abril	-**ACD** envía repuesta de IACHR a **Cultural Survival** (4/4) -carta de **Osvaldo Jordán**, a **Ing. Rolando Armuelles**, sobre la pasividad del Banco Mundial en los casos de los Naso y Ngöbe (11/4) --repuesta a **Osvaldo Jordán** de **PRONAT** rechazando todas las solicitudes (23/4)	-El Congreso Ngöbe-Buglé escucha los testimonios de víctimas de violaciones de derechos humanos en Charco la Pava (5/4)[73] -Declaración del Congreso Ngöbe-Buglé de acuerdo de las comunidades y exigiendo la suspensión de los proyectos (6/4)		La policía continua cerrar las vías al área y queda en las comunidades con armas (abril) -AES y Gestión Urbana empiezan preparar el plan nuevo de reubicación ***Programa de Reasentamiento Familias Río Changuinola- Chan-75, Propuesta Técnica, Fase de implementación y seguimiento*** (abril)	- la Comisión Interamericana de Derechos Humanos solicita mas información a ACD y Cultural Survival (2/4) -Taller Latinoamericano de la Red de Mujeres Indígenas sobre Biodiversidad (7/4 y 9/4) -Declaración de la Red de Mujeres Indígenas sobre Biodiversidad(RMIB) de Latinoamérica en apoya con el pueblo Ngöbe y Naso contra las presas (9/4)
2008 mayo	-representantes de Banco Mundial programa Corredor Biológico Mesoamericano visita Charco la Pava (3/5)[74]		-reunión entre Comisión de Asuntos Indígenas, autoridades provinciales de Bocas del Toro, AES para analizar la situación en el área de Charco la Pava (2/5)[75] -El gobierno nacional decide cerrar todos de sus oficinas a las 1pm por la crisis energía (18/5)	-policía armada continua cerrando las vías al área y se queda en las comunidades (mayo) -Construcción de Chan-75 continua 24 horas/día y 7 días/semana con 2 detonaciones cada día.	-artículos en Panamá América "Fortuna paralizada por falta de agua para generar energía" y "Producción en problemas" por Enrique Ho http://www.pa-digital.com.pa/ (20/5)

[1] The World Conservation Union IUCN Summary: La Amistad International Park and Vulcan Baru National Park (Panama). [updated April 1990; cited 8 April 2008]. Available at http://whc.unesco.org/archive/advisory_body_evaluation/205.pdf
[2] De los Santos, Eugenio J., Dr. Nelson Barranco, Arq. Isabel Alle, Lic. Mariela Fruto. Estudio de Impacto Ambiental Categoria III Construcción y Operación de la Central Hidroeléctrica El Gavilan (Chan-75) March 2004. 43
[3] ibid. 1
[4] ibid. 4
[5] De Los Santos,et al. Estudio De Impacto Ambiental. 2005 4
[6] Thorson, Erica, Linda Barrera, and Jason Gray Petición al Comité del Patrimonio Mundial pidiendo la Inclusión de Resrvas de La Cordillera de Talamanca-la Amistad/Parque Nacional La Amistad en la Lista de Patrimonio Mundial en Peligro. El Centro para la Diversidad Biológica. Estados Unidos: 2007.
[7] De Los Santos,et al. *Estudio De Impacto Ambiental.* 2005 5
[8] ibid. 4
[9] comunicación personal, Olsvaldo Jordon 18 mayo 2008
[10] De Los Santos,et al. *Estudio De Impacto Ambiental.* 2005 i
[11] Galvin, Peter. Entrevista por Jessica Barber 6 mayo 2008
[12] comunicación personal, Olsvaldo Jorden, 18 mayo 2008
[13] Habitante #2, entrevista por Jessica Barber 17 mayo 2008
[14] ibid.
[15] Thorson, Erica, Linda Barrera, and Jason Gray. Petition to the World Heritage Committee 2007 2.
[16] comunicación personal, Olsvaldo Jorden, 18 mayo 2008
[17] Santiago, Ángel "Presentan a la ANAM estudio de impacto" La Prensa 11 de abril de 2005, online edition, http://prensa.com/hoy/nacionales/186906.html
[18] comunicación personal, Osvaldo Jorden, 18 mayo 2008
[19] Galvin, Peter. Entrevista por Jessica Barber 6 mayo 2008
[20] comunicación personal, Olsvaldo Jorden, 18 mayo 2008
[21] Lutz, Ellen L. "Dam Nation" en *Cultural Survival Quarterly* Vol 31 issue 4 Winter 2007 p18
[22] Palacio, Norberto Informe de Inspeccion de Secretaria, Corregiduria de Valle Risco Municipio de Changuinola. Panamá: 5 febrero 2007.
[23] "Dominican Government accuses AES Corperation of Fraud" Dominican Today 13 de marzo de 2007, online edition http://www.dominicantoday.com/app/article.aspx?id=23071
[24] comunicación personal, Olsvaldo Jorden, 18/5/08
[25] carta de Defensor del Pueblo 5 diciembre 07
[26] 2007. Temen ser reubicados con proyecto hidroeléctrico. *La Prensa,* 16 octubre, versión de web.
[27] correo electronico de Ariel Rodriguez, presidente de ACD a Ricardo Vargas 21/7/07
[28] Castillo, Ney "Indígenas dicen que son víctimas del abandono" La Prensa 13 de octubre de 2007, ed. nac. 8A
[29] ibid.
[30] Shors, Benjamin "Panama's farmers resist hydroelectric projects" Miami Herald 2 de octubre de 2007 online edition
[31] comunicación personal, Olsvaldo Jorden, 18/5/08
[32] carta de Defensor del Pueblo 5 diciembre 07
[33] 2007. Temen ser reubicados con proyecto hidroeléctrico. *La Prensa,* 16 octubre, versión de web.
[34] correo electronico de Ariel Rodriguez, presidente de ACD a Ricardo Vargas 21/7/07
[35] Castillo, Ney "Indígenas dicen que son víctimas del abandono" La Prensa 13 de octubre de 2007, ed. nac. 8A
[36] ibid.
[37] Shors, Benjamin "Panama's farmers resist hydroelectric projects" Miami Herald 2 de octubre de 2007 online edition
[38] comunicación personal, Lucia Lasso 19 mayo 2008

[39] entrevista, Ingeniero de Aes, 13/5/08
[40] Lutz, Ellen L. "Dam Nation" en *Cultural Survival Quarterly* Vol 31 issue 4 Winter 2007 p19
[41] ibid.
[42] Arcia, José "Anam mantiene proceso a Aes" La Prensa 20 de noviembre de 2007, ed. nac, 5A
[43] ACD. Repuestas a IACHR 4 abril 08
[44] personal communication, Lucia Lasso 19 mayo 2008
[45] Arcia, José "Bosque, En Peligro" La Prensa 19 de noviembre de 2007, ed. nac. 1A
[46] Santiago P., Ángel "Con machete en mano se oponen a hidroeléctrica" La Prensa 22 de diciembre de 2007, ed. nac. 8A
[47] Castillo, Ney "Piden debate nacional sobre tema de la minería" La Prensa 7 de enero de 2008, ed.nac. 8A
[48] Santiago P., Ángel "Indígenas desalojan el área de Charco La Pava" La Prensa 3 de enero de 2008, ed. nac. 10A
[49] Lasso, Lucia. "Violacion a los derechos humanos y constitucionales de indigenas por el proyecto hidroelectrico de aes changuinola en bocas del toro panama- denuncia publica nacional e internacional- Situación Actual del proyectos hidroelectrico Chan-75: construcción avanza gracias a la fuerza policial y no al dialogo." Press Report, 11 January 2008
[50] Santiago P., Ángel "Indígenas desalojan el área de Charco La Pava" La Prensa 3 de enero de 2008, ed. nac. 10A
[51] Santiago P., Ángel "40 detenidos en Charco La Pava" La Prensa 4 de enero de 2008, ed. nac. 9A
[52] ibid.
[53] Castillo, Ney y Ángel Santiago P. "Aumenta descontento por desarrollo hidroeléctrico" La Prensa 9 de enero de 2008, ed. nac. 10A
[54] Santiago P., Ángel "Indígenas desalojan el área de Charco La Pava" La Prensa 3 de enero de 2008, ed. nac. 10A
[55] Santiago P., Ángel "Liberan a los 50 indígenas" La Prensa 5 de enero de 2008, ed. nac. 8A
[56] ACD. Repuestas a IACHR 4 abril 08
[57] ibid.
[58] Ibid.
[59] carta de Lucia Lasso, ACD a Edgar Araúz, Jefe del Departamento de Áreas Protegidas, ANAM 3 enero 08.
[60] Castillo, Ney y Ángel Santiago P. "Aumenta descontento por desarrollo hidroeléctrico" La Prensa 9 de enero de 2008, ed. nac. 10A
[61] comunicacion personal- Lucia Lasso 19/5/08
[62] ACD. Repuestas a IACHR 4 abril 08
[63] ACD. archivo de actividades.
[64] ibid.
[65] ibid.
[66] ibid.
[67] el campamento "Panameño Muévete por tu ambiente, tierras y aguas" Comunicado de Prensa 24 marzo 08.
[68] ACD. archivo de actividades.
[69] ibid.
[70] ACD. Repuestas a IACHR 4 abril 08.
[71] ACD. archivo de actividades.
[72] ibid.
[73] Rodriguez, Pedro Declaración del Congreso Ngöbe-Buglé, correo electronica a ACD Panama, 14 abril 08.
[74] ACD. archivo de actividades.
[75] carta a los moradores de la Comunidad de Charco la Pava de HD. Bernardo Ábrego J., Presidente, Comisión de Asuntos Indígenas. 1 abril 08.