Offshore Work: oil and the making of modularity in Equatorial Guinea

The morning of March 1, 2008, dawned warm in Bata, Equatorial Guinea’s second city. At 6:00 a.m., I stood outside the headquarters of a large U.S.-based oil company with a small group of others—a Spanish woman, a man from Louisiana, and two Equatoguinean men—waiting to “go offshore” by helicopter. We stood quietly and not quite together, separated by the early hour and by uncertainty about one another’s purpose for being there. Eventually, an Equatoguinean driver pulled up in a company bus. As we boarded, he requested our identification passes, to electronically register each of our exits from the company compound, and then he drove us to the company’s private wing at the airport. After an airport worker searched our bags, we sat in a small room to watch a safety video on the importance of in-flight protective equipment and what to do if our helicopter were to catch fire in midair. At liftoff, the helicopter rose effortlessly, and the city of Bata spread out beneath us. Farther from shore, behind us, the Ntem River marked the edge of the continent. After a while, the scenery faded into the calm of the open ocean seen from above, a stillness muted further by the gentle vibration of the helicopter through noise-cancelling headphones. Eventually, a bright flame appeared in the distance, attached to a still-indistinct industrial atoll—an oil rig. Just as the rig came into view, the helicopter banked left, and we landed briefly on what looked like an aircraft carrier, leaving the Spanish woman on what was in fact a floating production, storage, and offloading vessel (FPSO). With the production rig visible some hundreds of yards away, the FPSO was illuminated by its own large flare, burning the crude’s gaseous byproducts. This vast, self-propelling, shiplike structure floated above an oil field producing 100,000 barrels per day. Every ten days, a tanker would pull alongside the FPSO and leave with one million barrels. From subsea
hydrocarbon deposit to the rig to the FPSO to the tanker to market, the production chain of Equatorial Guinea’s oil was clearest to me by helicopter, far off the country’s shores.

In this article, I trace the work that makes the view from the helicopter possible, the work that allows Equatorial Guinea to recede into the distance, framing the production process—subsea to market—as “offshore.” I start from the assumption that “the offshore” is not given in the order of things, either as geographic location, as industrial site, or as an evocative metaphor of “placeless economic interaction” (Cameron and Palan 2004:105). Rather, the offshore is “brought into being, sustained, or allowed to wither away [through] common, day-to-day sociomaterial practices” (Mol 2002:6). Using my visit to a drilling rig I call the “TIPCO 330” as this article’s point of departure, I trace the practices that bring the offshore into being in Equatorial Guinea. In addition to the rig visit, I draw on material from 14 months of ethnographic fieldwork in and around the country’s oil and gas industry, including in-depth interviews with offshore industry personnel, near-daily presence in the industry’s gated corporate and residential enclaves, participant-observation in the country’s Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative program, and document analysis.

This ethnographic material enables me to think through a framing process that my rig trip made so clear: the work required for the transnational oil industry to disentangle the production of profit from the place in which it happens to find itself—in this case, Equatorial Guinea—and to structure liability and responsibility in such a way that it can seem to remove itself from local social, legal, political, and environmental entanglements.¹ This approach begins to pay ethnographic attention to the oil industry itself as I found it in Equatorial Guinea—its infrastructures, its labor regimes, its forms of expertise and fantasy. To the extent that scholarly literature on oil has generally focused on the effects of oil as money, the concrete specificity of
the industry itself has receded into a thin portrayal of a revenue-producing machine—a black box with predictable effects. As Michael Watts writes, “What is striking in all of this resource-politics scholarship is the almost total invisibility of both transnational oil companies … and the forms of capitalism that oil or enclave extraction engenders” (2004:53; see also Mitchell 2009, 2011). This article is part of a wider project that takes the U.S.-based industry in Equatorial Guinea as its primary object of analysis, placing transnational oil companies and the “forms of capitalism that oil extraction engenders” at the center of ethnographic inquiry.

The article is divided into three sections. The first section offers an ethnographic sketch of the oil and gas industry’s pervasive entanglements in Equatorial Guinea’s onshore life, to render starker the work required to frame the industry as “offshore.” Through the brief account of Equatorial Guinea’s recent history that concludes the section, I suggest that the specificities of the place render the industry’s work toward disentanglement particularly visible. Bringing the focus back to the rig in the second section, I introduce modularity as a central project in the industry’s work toward disentanglement—the use of mobile, compliant, and self-contained infrastructures, labor setups, forms of expertise, and legal guidelines to enable offshore work in Equatorial Guinea to function “just like” offshore work in Ghana, Brazil, or the North Sea. Putting Anna Tsing’s (2005) concept of “friction” in conversation with the work of Michel Callon and Koray Çaliskan on disentanglement and marketization (see Callon 1998; Çaliskan and Callon 2009, 2010; see also Thomas 1991), I follow the industry’s work toward the ever-receding horizon of frictionless profit. In the third section, I turn to the evocative promises of “the offshore” for those in industry management, many of whom imagined offshore oil operations to share with offshore financial setups the idea that there are spaces where the production of profit can evade or minimize contestation. But their fantasies remained disturbed.
by environmental and community overflows that have long haunted the industry’s work. In each section, I show the considerable work required not only to animate the offshore project but also to disentangle the participating companies from the thick webs of Equatoguinean politics, environments, and socialities in which they are so intimately implicated.

**Entanglements**

The distancing view from the helicopter window belies the extent to which the oil and gas industry seeps into every corner of Equatoguinean daily life. Since the discovery of commercially viable hydrocarbon deposits in the mid-1990s, Equatorial Guinea has received over $50 billion in capital deployment from U.S. oil and gas companies alone. Among Africa’s most important new oil producers, the long-impoverished microstate is at the center of the petroleum industry’s “new Persian Gulf,” from which upwards of 17 percent of U.S. net petroleum imports now come (U.S. Energy Information Administration 2010). Production sharing contracts worth billions annually to companies and the state alike require protracted negotiation and complicity between President Obiang’s unopposed authoritarian regime, now the oldest in Africa, and U.S.-based oil and gas companies. Before oil, Obiang’s rule was crippled by debt and threatened by an opposition coalition. Today, these contracts have been an unparalleled state-making project; Obiang is not only still in power but he also now leads the African Union. And yet, in exchange for this newfound sovereignty, the Equatoguinean state must negotiate with oil companies to modify local environmental, labor, and taxation laws and regulations that might affect the companies’ profit margins.²

Oil and gas development subtends not only a transformed political landscape in Equatorial Guinea but a new physical landscape as well, which transmogrifies at an alarming pace. Offshore gas flares blaze against nighttime skies in an uninterrupted string that, from a
plane window, seems to stretch south all the way from Nigeria. “La Planta” screams into view as planes land in Malabo’s airport. Dazzlingly bright, the natural gas and methanol plant is a tangled, illuminated kingdom of pipes, some small and some big enough to fit a car inside, connecting metal vats and silos and containers and wires and more pipes and conveyor devices and cranes, weaving in and out of one another and reaching up until it seems the plane will scrape its metal belly on the highest reaches of the plant. The small capital city in the distance is dim and receding. Yet, around it, oil revenue and contractual clauses have built new cities as if overnight (Appel 2012). Malabo II sprouts beside colonial Malabo, and filaments of asphalt busy with Chinese and Egyptian construction workers extend in all directions. Stadiums, palaces, skyscrapers, and vast housing and apartment complexes rise from red dirt exposed beneath equatorial green, it seems, only days before. The small country’s private property regime has been entirely remade as the president publically expropriates his own substantial private holdings “in the name of development” while oil and gas companies rent what is still widely considered “his” land. Los de a pie (the masses; lit. those on foot) are expected to equate their own dispossession with the president’s hollow act. Gated residential and corporate enclaves for expatriate industry personnel spring up in these spaces, serviced by their own septic, electricity, telecommunications, and food procurement systems (Appel 2012; Ferguson 2006).

In 2008, hydrocarbons accounted for 99.3 percent of the nation’s exports and 98 percent of government revenues (IMF 2010; Kraus 2010; República de Guinea Ecuatorial 2010). The industry is the only large employer other than public administration, and work in and around it newly schedules people’s lives, sending them to offshore platforms for weeks at a time or putting them in security guard or maid uniforms. The booming industry enables some to return from degrees earned abroad to work as government liaisons or accountants, and it consigns others to
sex work and window washing. Corporate social responsibility programs subcontracted to international development firms fan across the country’s cities and towns touting education reform and malaria control or proffering hospital equipment and neighborhood drinking wells.

From keeping a regime in power to the ways in which law and regulation evolve, from staggeringly vast infrastructural projects and reconfigured modes of property adjudication to new forms of employment and the education of children, the oil and gas industry is everywhere enmeshed in Equatorial Guinea’s onshore life. And yet the industry creates and inhabits an eerie distance from its supply site. Boundary-making projects, including mobile offshore infrastructure and labor regimes, enclaved residential and corporate spaces, and profitable relationships built on the attenuated liability of contractual obligation, allow companies to bemoan poverty, pollution, and kleptocracy “out there,” as if they have nothing to do with it, while they work furiously to disentangle their operations, residential footprints, corporate practices, legal presence, shareholder value, and moral identity from life “outside their walls.” Looking at Equatorial Guinea as if from afar, expatriate industry personnel routinely talked to me about how locals should really learn to stop burning their small piles of garbage, even as industry flares blazed constantly around us; they remarked earnestly that Equatoguineans should diversify their economy, learn to “live off the land.” Or they would pass me literature on an economic theory known as the “resource curse” (Auty 1993; Collier 2007; Humphreys et al. 2007), lamenting that, unless the government got its act together, the litany of pathologies posited by that body of scholarship—corruption, inflation, armed conflict, antidemocratic tendencies—was sure to follow, as if their presence had nothing to do with that potentiality. How are these aporias made?

In the sections that follow, I turn to the daily industrial practices that enable this habitation of distance. But before returning to the rig, I highlight the ways in which the
industry’s entanglements, described above, and the relative ease with which those ties are attenuated, described below, are shaped in and by Equatorial Guinea’s specific history. After gaining independence from Spain in 1968, Equatoguineans suffered a brutal dictatorship under Macías Nguema, in which roughly one-third of the population was killed or fled into exile. The man who eventually took power in a 1979 coup—Obiang Nguema Mbasogo—was chief of security in the previous murderous regime and was intimately implicated in its brutalities. As noted above, Obiang remains president to this day. Though the climate of outright violence has changed considerably in Obiang’s more than 30-year rule, “la triste memoria” (the sad memory), as locals refer to the period of mass violence, is still present. Memories of indiscriminate violence also serve to threaten, and the vast majority of Equatoguineans today continue to talk about politics only in hushed tones and fear public political mobilization of any kind. In addition, Equatorial Guinea’s postcolonial legal inheritance has been particularly consequential for the coming of the oil industry. During his tenure, Macías annulled Spanish law, producing what one Equatoguinean Supreme Court judge described to me as “a legal vacuum” that lasted until 1980. After his 1979 coup, Obiang reinstated Spanish law and began to legislate regularly, but, the judge lamented, “now there is confusion … The principal problem is that no one knew what law was extant in Equatorial Guinea. Then along comes oil. What law applies?” The absent presence of la triste memoria, coupled with ongoing political repression and legal confusion, has left Equatorial Guinea a small place thick with fear, suspicion, and public silence.

The extreme specificities of Equatorial Guinea—a mere 600,000 inhabitants living in a paranoid and claustrophobic dictatorship, a citizenry barely out from under the pall of recent mass violence, economic collapse in the late 1960s so total that there was no paper in the country (Artucio 1968)—allow certain aspects of the industry’s work toward disentanglement and self-
containment to pop into visibility. Open contestation in other oil-producing places, often hard-won over years of exploitation, as in Nigeria or Ecuador, has buried the industry’s fantasies of frictionlessness in decades of political negotiation. But the mid-1990s in Equatorial Guinea were a moment in which an authoritarian regime already long in power, but facing increasing opposition, was happy to oblige nearly every demand of the industry, allowing everything from mobile labor regimes comprised almost exclusively of foreign workers to exploitative contracts to proceed uncontested. This historical specificity highlights the peculiarity and intensive work required of an industrial approach that treats Equatorial Guinea as if oil and gas production could proceed as it does in Houston, Ecuador, or Nigeria. I turn now to that work.

**Modularity and the making of the offshore**

The helicopter touched gingerly down on the rig, and João, the rig’s safety coordinator, immediately whisked me to the radio room for a safety-training minicourse on video. After an exam that tested my comprehension, João had me sign a liability waiver and then put me in my required personal protection equipment (PPE) of hard hat, safety glasses, gloves, ear plugs, coveralls, and steel-toe boots. I was to take off all rings, earrings, necklaces, the hair band around my wrist, and anything else that could snag or catch. None of these items was allowed on the rig. While walking on the rig, if a railing was available, I was to hold it at all times, especially on stairs, which, depending on their pitch, might have to be descended backward. From what João gave me to wear to what he told me to take off, from the ways he trained me to walk and climb and descend stairs to the safety videos, manuals, and waivers he required me to study and sign, my rig visit, from the moment I stepped off the helicopter, was an extended exercise in embodied and ornamental safety rituals. The offshore’s saturation with practices, performances, media, and bureaucracies of risk avoidance and safety—many of them written on and enacted through the
body in dress and modes of walking—gave it the immediate feeling of an immersive, hermetic environment.

João was a gregarious Brazilian capoeirista and vegetarian in his late forties who had been in the offshore oil and gas business for 28 years. He had been on the TIPCO 330 rig through a series of contracts that took him from the Irish Sea to Turkey, then Angola, the Congo, Gabon, Cameroon, Nigeria, and now Equatorial Guinea. Built in 1973 in a Texas shipyard, owned by offshore drilling contractor SeaTrekker, the TIPCO, and many of the men on board, moved around the world from contract to contract under the Liberian flag—a mobile technosocial assemblage at work today in Equatorial Guinea’s offshore waters as it had been in Turkey’s, as it would be in Ghana’s. Operating companies—the ExxonMobils, Chevrons, and British Petroleums of the world—contract with offshore drilling contractors, including SeaTrekker, for rigs like the TIPCO, paying up to $1 million per day for their offshore rental. With workers like João already on board, contracted rigs move into position to begin the grueling 24-hour workdays that will eventually bring crude oil to the surface.

On the day of my visit, the TIPCO was inhabited by 115 workers from 20 different nations: Australia, Brazil, Britain, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Croatia, Equatorial Guinea, France, India, Nigeria, Norway, the Philippines, Romania, Russia, Serbia, South Africa, Ukraine, the United States, and Venezuela. Of the workers on board, only four worked directly for the operating company, which I will call “Smith,” and only 25 worked directly for SeaTrekker. The remaining 86 men were hired from 15 different subcontracting companies, which provided everything from directional drilling experts to onboard cooks, radio operators, and mud engineers. In total, 17 different companies were at work on the rig. Within this multinational, multicompany crew, there were unambiguous working hierarchies: The offshore installation
manager (OIM) was at the top, with three supervisors under him, four “leads” under them, and then a series of workers organized by “levels,” two through five, five being the lowest. On the TIPCO, as well as the other rigs I studied, Americans or Canadians of European descent held top positions almost without exception, with nationalities diversifying through the middle levels, and Equatoguinean workers at the bottom, a few of them in level three. Men were assigned sleeping quarters on the rig according to their level, with those at the top in private rooms and those at the bottom in cramped bunks that held four or more people. Robert Vitalis (2007) has argued that these racialized hierarchies, structured under the rubric of skill differentiation, have come to characterize oil operations around the world.

That morning, 19 of us sat down for the daily 7 a.m. meeting in a small, low-ceilinged room below deck. Everything was steel—walls, benches, and stairs. A group of four Filipinos sat together in one corner; three Equatoguineans sat along the back wall. The rest of the men stood or sat where they could in the confined quarters. The OIM—a weathered American in his mid forties—led the meeting in English. He narrated the day’s work in short rhetorical bursts referring to “teams,” “strategies,” and “victories,” giving the dawn meeting the feeling of a pregame pep talk. “This is going to be a great day for our team,” he said. “We’ve had some trouble with the drilling process but we’re changing strategies, and we’re going to pull this one out!” João, seated to the OIM’s immediate left, translated his sentences several at a time into heavily Portuguese-influenced Spanish. Though I do not speak Portuguese and thus had some trouble following the nuances of João’s translation, he seemed to drop most of the sport metaphors. In translation, the OIM’s opening salvo that morning became, “We have fixed the drilling problem, and today will be a great day.” The Equatoguinean workers for whom João’s translation was intended also had trouble understanding his Spanish, and I could hear one of
them translating again for the other two, “The drilling problem is over. Today work will be normal.” As the meeting’s game of telephone-translation intimates, the rig was home to a floating world of intercultural communication and miscommunication, where extremely diverse personnel lived and worked in claustrophobic and rigidly hierarchical quarters for weeks on end.

On the TIPCO and rigs around the world, workers live “rotating” lives—spending a few weeks working and sleeping on the rig and then a few weeks at home, wherever that might be. In the industry’s (English) lingua franca, each rotation is referred to as a “hitch.” My Equatoguinean informants called each shift a “marea,” the Spanish word for “tide” but also evocative of seasickness, mareado. International and Equatoguinean workers alike described their rotating lives as surreal temporal experiences. One Texan explained that he felt he had two parallel lives—one in Houston and one wherever he happened to be posted—each of which stopped when he left that place and started again when he came back, “like pressing stop and start on a DVD,” as he put it. While on the rig, the workers’ three- to six-week hitches were characterized by grueling 24-hour workdays in which shifts lasted 12 hours. Given that the rig ran constantly, however, everyone was on call at all times.

The 24-hour intensity of their workdays was shaped both by the material requirements of the drilling process and by the exorbitant daily rental rates on rigs. In deepwater drilling—the work being done on the TIPCO—specific stages of the process must be executed without pause. Formation collapse, for instance, is a material risk in the drilling process that demands 24-hour attention. Once you have drilled to a certain depth, you have to “case off” the hole, installing large iron tubes to stop the hole from collapsing. If the borehole is not cased off in time, the drill bit and all the “jewelry”—an industry term for the valuable technical components used in the drilling process—will be buried in the formation collapse. Twenty-four-hour work is also
required to provide protection against overpressurized formations and sudden releases of gas. These biophysical requirements for constant work, coupled with daily losses in the millions of dollars if drilling cannot proceed, give a sense of the forms of sociotechnical pressure (Anand 2011) simultaneously at work on the rig.

Because uninterrupted work was required, each employee had his “back to back”: When one man left the rig to spend his 28 days off, another man with the same job description came to take over the constant work during his 28 days on. As they flew on and off the TIPCO, most of the foreign workers barely set foot on Equatoguinean soil. Though incoming workers would fly into the Malabo or Bata airport, they often then flew immediately out to a platform via helicopter or spent one night in private company compounds before leaving for the rig the next morning. As one Filipino rig worker put it to me, “I live here like I did in Angola: from the airport to the rig.” He voiced a common refrain, echoed again by a U.S. drilling manager who worked both on rigs and in his company’s private compound in Bata: “I rarely if ever go out in public. From the rig to the office. I’ve rotated into Equatorial Guinea for six years and I’ve maybe gone out for dinner 12 times. One of my [Guinean employees] says he’s disappointed I’ve never come to his house for dinner.”

Mobile technologies and mobile labor forces organized by contracts and subcontracts moved the technosocial assemblage that is the TIPCO 330 from Turkey to Equatorial Guinea to Ghana, all under the Liberian flag. Indeed, when I wrote João to request a follow-up stay on the rig, he responded with the following e-mail: “Surprise! We no longer work with SMITH but with another client named Regal Energy … You have to rush as we will soon leave to Congo, around the beginning of August.” In the three months between March and June 2008, the rig had not only switched operating companies (and, consequently, locations at sea) but had also gotten
sailing orders for the Congo, with João and others in tow. The TIPCO’s circulation through the world’s oil-rich waters and the men flying to the mobile rig from Australia, Venezuela, and nearly everywhere in between to inhabit an immersive world of embodied safety rituals and rigid working hierarchies at least partially allow extraction, production, transport, and marketization of subsea hydrocarbon deposits to proceed in Equatorial Guinea as in the Congo and in Angola. These are the day-to-day sociomaterial practices that make the aporia of the offshore, that allow Equatorial Guinea to recede into the distance from the helicopter window.

The assemblage is hardly seamless. Linguistic and material misfires leak in, and “the offshore” requires tremendous logistical coordination and financial investment not only to contract and translocate some of the largest mobile infrastructure in the world but also to bring in the necessary labor, in the case of the TIPCO rig alone, 115 men and their labor twins from 20 different nations and 17 different companies. Nevertheless, that the TIPCO 330 is still able to simply move on to the Congo, where the OIM will have to find a French translator for the new local crew, shows how this assemblage facilitates consequential forms of disentanglement from the specificities of place. The daily working lives of these men allow them quite reasonably to inhabit a world that seems fundamentally separate from the industry’s deep ties with Equatorial Guinea’s political, environmental, and social life.

Thinking with the TIPCO, I suggest that the transnational oil and gas industry in Equatorial Guinea is a modular capitalist project: a bundled and repeating set of technological, social, political, and economic practices aimed at profit making that the industry works to build wherever companies find commercially viable hydrocarbon deposits. Whereas extraction sites around the world—from the North Sea to the Gulf of Mexico, Equatorial Guinea, to Malaysia—vary radically, the people, technology, contractual regimes, and infrastructure the oil industry
brings to them do not (Barry 2006). The contents of this bundle change as technologies and regulations change over time, as the relationship between companies and local power holders evolves, and in response to previous—often negative—experiences, so that the module’s instantiation in Equatorial Guinea (beginning in the 1990s) looks quite different than its instantiation in Nigeria or Angola (beginning in the 1960s). Most importantly, the making of modularity requires a tremendous amount of work, intended to navigate the specificity of each extraction site within the oil market’s legal, fiscal, and regulatory conditions of possibility. In this work-intensive quest for frictionless profit, messy engagement with difference is the assumed starting point; the hoped-for framing requires massive logistical and infrastructural investment; and the intended distancing from local conditions is compromised at its core, as the industry can only animate the repeating extraction, production, and marketing processes widely accepted as standardized by seeping into every crevice of Equatorial Guinea’s daily life.

Mobile, flexible, and licit, the architecture of modular infrastructures, labor, and contracting regimes tends not toward external standardization, as so many anxious accounts of globalization feared, but, rather, internal self-containment (see also Riles 2011). Modular or prefabricated structures do not require changing the zoning code but, instead, come with an anticipatory relationship to place and time—legally compliant, mobile, without foundation, impermanent, and disposable or reusable elsewhere. So too with offshore oil platforms, contracts and subcontracts, and mobile labor forces. These are work-intensive efforts to create juridical and even geographic spaces in which companies can abide by their own rules, bring their own technologies, infrastructures, evidentiary and legal regimes, and people—laborers, lawyers, technicians, consulting firms, specialists, and managers.
Tsing has written of global capitalism that “the closer we look at the commodity chain, the more every step—even transportation—can be seen as an arena of cultural production … yet the commodity must emerge as if untouched by this friction” (2005:51). Indeed, the technology, labor, contracts, and imaginaries that move hydrocarbons from subsea to futures market are full of the messy frictions of cultural production, not only in their entanglements with Equatorial Guinea’s political and infrastructural landscapes but also with the mareado temporalities and linguistic miscommunications of rotating workers and the mobility of certain forms of hierarchy and discrimination. And yet the commodity does emerge “as if untouched” by this friction. How? Modularity draws our attention to the productive though ever-incomplete work done in the name of frictionlessness and disentanglement. At issue here is the oil industry’s intentional disengagement from sociopolitical membership in Equatorial Guinea.

Anthropology has long used ethnographic research to show how the failure to engage with the specificities of place, people, politics, or history has impaired innumerable projects—developmental or humanitarian, activist or capitalist. Here, my analysis moves in the opposite direction. I follow the work of the oil companies themselves, for whom disengagement from Equatorial Guinea’s specificity was not a mistaken starting point (ready to be “exposed” by the anthropologist) but an always-unfinished project they worked daily to build. This direction of analysis starts from the “proliferation of relations” (Callon 1998:4; see also Çaliskan and Callon 2009, 2010) and then traces the framing work that makes marketization possible. For profit to emerge “as if untouched” by the sites of production, here the rig must seem as far as possible from the deep contractual complicity between the operating companies and the Equatoguinean state, as far as possible from communities who might make claims on companies for environmental degradation or gainful employment. This is the haunted fantasy of the offshore.
Frictionless profit?

Like offshore financial setups, offshore oil operations are predicated on the idea that there are spaces where the production of profit can evade or minimize contestation. Industry advocates frame offshore operations as off the shores of political entanglements, community entitlements, discernable forms of pollution in inhabited areas, or militant attacks and bunkering focused on accessible pipelines. That the entire commodity chain, from exploration to processing to export can take place in the middle of the ocean, without ever touching land, seems to at least partially remove oil and gas companies from the most visible and most controversial consequences of their industry. For the management-level, expatriate oil company employees and Equatoguinean government appointees with whom I worked, this was the fantasy of the offshore; a fantasy always-already haunted by the very entanglements it claimed to sever.

Consider the comments of a recently appointed Equatoguinean government official:

Onshore–offshore is an operation question. Socially there is more positive than negative to it. An oil infrastructure has a lot of environmental problems. When you build that onshore next to a community there is more potential for problems for that community. Environmentally, the safest way to have an oil facility is to have it removed from social settings. It’s an advantage for offshore operations. Having an onshore operation involves a lot of piping, infrastructure, which for some people may not be beautiful architecturally. It may not be impressive for environmentalists and people who care for trees.

At first, this official suggested that the difference between onshore and offshore was simply an operations question, a mere spatial designation denoting where the work of exploration and extraction gets done. But he moved immediately into the social and environmental implications of each setup, making clear that far more is at stake than mere operation location. In his
estimation, the visible infrastructure of onshore production is not only aesthetically disruptive for communities ("it may not be beautiful or architecturally impressive") but environmentally problematic as well. "An oil infrastructure has a lot of environmental problems," he says, whether it is onshore or offshore, so it is best to get those ongoing problems away from people.

The official’s comments also flag a set of supralocal issues, including regulation and visibility. Often when “environmentalists and those who care for trees” are not “impressed” by what they see (and the ability to see onshore infrastructure is a crucial difference from what goes on offshore), there is a call for action or regulation. When the visuals of oil infrastructure and operations are in the middle of the ocean, by contrast, there is a noticeable attenuation of public and government attention, facilitating unimpeded production. Here, the modular project is facilitated by spatial deregulation or the thinning of sovereignty in Equatorial Guinea’s offshore waters. As an Equatoguinean petroleum engineer explained,

> Normally, in the United States for example, the more petroleum you extract, the harder it is to clean the water. In other sites the amount [of oil] taken is conditional on water quality. Here there is not this conditionality. Here there is no outside testing. On the platform from time to time people are told to prepare for an environmental assessment but it’s always someone from within the company, and the results are always good.

For both the Equatoguinean government appointee and the petroleum engineer, the offshore enabled specific kinds of framing. The social and environmental problems long associated with oil and gas were still there—pollution, notoriously leaky piping and infrastructure, unreliable environmental testing—but offshore operations moved those problems both away from onshore communities and beyond the reach of state regulation (a reach that, given Equatorial Guinea’s postcolonial legal history, was already quite short). For these two Equatoguineans differently
positioned in the industry, the self-containment toward which the modular project worked was spatialized in the distance between communities and offshore platforms, but this was merely an apparent disentangling of problems that were in fact ongoing.

Expatriate managers had different anxious fantasies of offshore production, haunted less by local environmental or community outcomes and more by the human threats to their operations that come with onshore extraction. Three different managers (two Americans and one Brit) offered remarkably consonant offshore aspirations:

Offshore makes it easier. Reduces investment risk … You’re not exposed—you’re shielded from the masses. You can control the interaction and contain the asset. It’s a clean containment. If a boat drifts in our area we call the navy. There’s a lot less opportunity for negative interaction and distraction. In Nigeria people steal oil. We don’t have that. It’s clean. Less leakage, shrinkage. Controls are tight. It’s expensive offshore but it’s clean. No laying pipelines through jungles, uprooting villages. There’s nobody out there. We lay pipelines in the seabed and it doesn’t bother anyone.

Offshore has made it easier. You’re on an island if you know what I’m saying. Diamond mines in Angola are an absolute nightmare. Armies get to you. Pirates get to you. [You have to] have massive South African war vets to secure the places. When you’re out there on an oil rig you’ve got a huge moat around you. That has made it easier. It’s more expensive to get the oil out of the ground but you don’t have to worry about onshore issues which are massive expenses.

For these managers, the offshore offered the possibility of control and containment of potentially volatile sociopolitical situations (note the comparisons with Nigerian oil and Angolan diamond
mining) and of profit margins (less “leakage” and “shrinkage”). In their narratives, the offshore setup at least forestalled the risks of visible spills and attack by armies, by oil bunkerers, or by MEND, which was often rumored to be planning an attack on Equatoguinean installations. Avoided too in the offshore setup, as these managers narrate it, is the unpleasant task of relocating entire villages and negotiating the attendant set of community claims for employment, for reparations, for development projects, and the subsequent security problems for which “massive South African war vets” have been hired in the past to secure onshore installations. The idealized industrial offshore in these managers’ descriptions coincides with the evocative promises of the financial offshore, sites “of disinterested and placeless economic interaction” (Cameron and Palan 2004:105). In avoiding the risks people bring, these managers envisioned the offshore setup as reducing contestation, even if it could not be evaded completely.

“Cleanliness” also came up repeatedly in management accounts of offshore production; by implication, onshore extraction is a dirty business. Having spent years in Nigeria, Ecuador, and other onshore sites around the world, managers looked to the increasing technological viability of offshore production as an opportunity for, as one put it, a “clean containment.” Even where onshore hydrocarbons are available, the more expensive offshore becomes the preferable choice. Petroleum geologists in the field believed that Equatorial Guinea had onshore oil, for instance, but (showing modularity to be an iterative process) they would often invoke Nigeria to explain that the risks of onshore production justified the exorbitant investment of money, time, and personnel that the offshore requires. According to one expatriate geologist, whose own iterative career had taken him from Guatemala to Brazil, Venezuela, Canada, Houston, Algeria, Angola, and, finally, Equatorial Guinea,
Locals report oil seepage to the surface, so absolutely it’s only a matter of time before there’s onshore exploration. [But] offshore they can go after elephants. Onshore, because of the geological setting, you’re looking for squirrels. That being said the cost to drill onshore is one-tenth the cost to drill offshore. The facilities construction is one-tenth [the cost] because it’s easier. You don’t have to build platforms. You don’t have to use floating rigs. Everything is one-tenth the size. If you do find a large onshore reservoir it’s very economic, but there are associated risks, political risks. If this country were to go through a civil war our structures out in the water are safe. But look at Nigeria; nothing’s to stop people from coming onto your facility, stopping production, blowing up the facility.

This geologist helps us to see that the choice to go offshore is not merely a response to ecological constraints (an exhaustion of onshore resources) or dominant technological developments in the field that make subsea extraction increasingly viable. Rather, the offshore becomes a space of capitalist desire—a space where “associated political risks” seem to be avoided. While onshore reserves may be “squirrels” quantitatively, the infrastructure required for their extraction is cheap, small, and easy to construct. It requires fewer personnel, simpler logistics, and far less money. Offshore wells, by contrast, can cost over $100 million for a six-month lease and require vast infrastructure in the middle of the ocean. Significantly riskier technologically, mechanically, and economically, the offshore setup is one in which things can and do go wrong, as the 2010 Deepwater Horizon catastrophe so ferociously showed. At ten times the price and double the personnel of onshore drilling, disentanglement can hardly be said to inhere in the model. But the distance from Equatoguinean “politics” provided by the helicopter ride is considered well worth the additional investment.
In these descriptions from Equatoguinean engineers and government appointees and expatriate managers and geologists, the fantasy of the offshore is haunted by the fears of earlier moments and places of oil production. The ongoing failures of Nigeria and the complicity with South African mercenaries in Angola represent themselves in the desire for disentanglement. And yet, in Equatorial Guinea, the offshore enables distance only from the immediacy and visibility of these contestations, which remain unresolved. This is a partial disentanglement predicated on deep complicities with the very forms of Equatoguinean politics the industry claims to avoid.

**Conclusion**

If oil appears to affect the producer states largely after its transformation into flows of money, that appearance reflects the building of pipelines, the placing of refineries, the negotiation of royalties, and other arrangements … The transformation of oil into large and unaccountable government incomes is … the outcome of particular ways of engineering political relations out of flows of energy.

—Timothy Mitchell, *Carbon Democracy: Political Power in the Age of Oil*

In this article, I have explored the work that made the view from the helicopter possible, the daily practices that allowed the specificities of Equatorial Guinea to recede into the distance as the oil and gas industry profited spectacularly from the country’s subsea resources. The offshore, as a work-intensive and always-unfinished project of frictionless profit making, contributes to this effect of disentanglement. As Mitchell and others have suggested, this distancing work can be found in specific projects that engineer “political relations out of flows of energy” (2011:5; see also Barry 2006). Mobile technologies, infrastructures, and workforces in the middle of the ocean frame the industry’s work as self-contained, separate from the local
conditions in which they are, in fact, so deeply implicated and on which they rely. I have referred to these mobile, licit practices in the transnational oil and gas industry as a modular capitalist project, in which intentional disentanglement from and thinning of liability for local conditions is intentional, always incomplete, and, in fact, requires sticky entanglements with local people and environments.

And yet the unrelenting political disentanglement, legal compliance, and spectacular profit the oil industry produces in Equatorial Guinea and elsewhere attest to modularity’s effects in the world and, in turn, to our obligation to account for those effects. For the oil industry, Equatorial Guinea is, in consequential ways, just like Kazakhstan. Rather than explain this resemblance as symptomatic of the global systematicity of capitalism or try to refute it through ethnographic specificity, I have traced the practices that make this precarious and work-intensive accomplishment possible. Following that work helps us to understand the how of certain transnational capitalist projects. Where anthropologists often dwell on the shortcomings of misrepresentation—that nation-states can be conflated, that capitalism is the same everywhere—this project follows interlocutors who are profitably at work in the world these “mis” representations help to organize (Ferguson 2006; Latour 2005; Mitchell 2002). Their work is ethnographically available, and following it opens up an array of ethnographic and political projects that complement anthropology’s long-standing and indispensable commitment to heterogeneity and contingency.

If Tsing (2009:172) urges attention to humanitarian and environmental scandals that riddle supply chains as crucial openings for criticism and oppositional mobilization, modularity draws our attention, in addition, to the opposite: the licit techniques and technologies that make these contingent practices that operate on the edge of legitimacy formally legitimate, legal,
felicitous, and productive of extraordinary profit. This is a distinct yet complementary project that asks us to look in multiple directions at once—both at exceptions, frictions, and gaps and toward the consequential processes that smooth those over.

Notes

1. This work of disentanglement is equally visible through ethnographic attention to the industry’s production sharing contracts, gated corporate and residential enclaves, extensive subcontracting arrangements, and corporate social responsibility programs, all of which I explore elsewhere (Appel 2011, 2012).

2. Production sharing contracts between the Equatoguinean state and operating companies contain sweeping fiscal stability clauses, which stipulate that the legal and fiscal regimes in place in the supply site at the time the contract is signed—environmental law, labor law, tax codes—will not change over the life of the contract. If those fiscal and legal regimes do change, and if those changes reduce companies’ profit margins, the state is contractually obligated to indemnify the corporation. Fiscal stability clauses limit the normal scope of any legislature, including the freedom to enact environmental law, labor law, or other forms of regulation. While public policy in a variety of countries can trump the practice of fiscal stability (also known as “regulatory takings”), this is certainly not the case in Equatorial Guinea.

3. I have changed all proper names of people, companies, and infrastructure to protect confidentiality.

4. My research focuses on large U.S. oil companies, which, during my fieldwork, were the major players in Equatorial Guinea. Neither my research nor the concept of “modularity” claims to encompass, for example, Chinese investment or national oil companies, though the question of its applicability to other forms of oil production is an interesting one.


6. Anna Zalik, for instance, has written that Mexico’s offshore is “environmentally deregulated” (2009:293) insofar as restrictions on maritime movement around platforms render spills and other practices largely invisible (see also Reed 2009).

7. MEND is the Movement for the Emancipation of the Niger Delta (see Watts and Kashi 2008). Nigeria is a northern neighbor of Equatorial Guinea and effectively shares productive offshore waters, so every time there was a serious uptick of violence in Nigeria, Equatorial Guinea would go on high alert. The “intel” grapevine would start buzzing with rumors that an attack was also planned on that country, the rationale being that the Nigerian government had stopped paying attention to militant action within its borders, so fighters were going to carry out attacks outside Nigeria to regrab the attention of their own nation.
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