

Indigenous Peoples' Responses to Conquest

Franke Wilmer, Montana State University, Bozeman, MT, United States

© 2022.

Introduction

The past five decades have witnessed a burgeoning political movement among the world's Indigenous peoples. Indigenous representatives from every continent have mobilized in international, regional, and national arenas to protest, lobby, and litigate in pursuit and defense of their rights (Anaya, 2004; Wilmer, 1993). Indigenous peoples resist state policies aimed at their assimilation, cultural destruction, and expropriation of their traditional territories. Indigenous resistances are a continuation of centuries' long struggles in European settler states and a response to more recent state-building in the postcolonial Global South. In 2000 the UN Economic and Social Commission (ECOSOC) established a Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, which met for its first session in New York in May 2002. It serves in an advisory capacity to the UN Economic and Social Council. The Forum is charged "with a mandate to discuss Indigenous issues related to economic and social development, culture, the environment, education, health and human rights." The 2019 session held at UN headquarters in New York discussions focused on "Traditional knowledge: Generation, transmission and protection.

In September 2007, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) with 144 states voting in favor, 4 against, and 11 abstaining. The four voting against were, not surprisingly, the powerful, rich, European settler states of Canada, the United States, Australia, and New Zealand (or CANZUS). Since then, all four of these states have changed their position to one of support for the Declaration. The adoption of the Declaration in 2007 along with a UN Human Rights Council resolution to establish the Expert Mechanism on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples concluded the work of the Working Group on Indigenous Populations, created in 1982. The United Nations Development Program has affirmed a commitment to the inclusion of Indigenous peoples in the design and implementation of UNDP-sponsored projects, and acknowledges the "distinct legal status and rights" of Indigenous peoples. ILO Convention (No. 169) concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries entered into force in 1991 and is a legally binding international treaty.

Working through the United Nations, these developments put Indigenous rights and issues front and center at the work of the UN, articulating and strengthening norms and practices affecting Indigenous peoples. For example, representatives of 32 states, 12 UN agencies, and hundreds of Indigenous organizations and NGOs attended the August 2003 session of the UN Working Group on Indigenous Populations that focused on the theme "Indigenous Peoples and Globalization." Participants discussed Indigenous peoples' "permanent sovereignty over natural resources," grounding their claims in several relevant UN General Assembly resolutions. They also referenced cases from the World Court, the Inter-American Court of Human Rights, the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, the United Nations Human Rights Committee, and six cases from domestic US courts. They concluded that the right to permanent sovereignty over natural resources was also consistent with fourteen other international legal documents and substantiated that claim in a growing body of legal and official pronouncements of international norms. A Second International Decade of the World's Indigenous Peoples was declared in 2005. In June 2016, the Organization of American States adopted the "American Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples." Some states have amended their laws or constitutions to include Indigenous rights, though enforcement remains weak. The constitutions of Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Nicaragua, Paraguay, and Venezuela, for example, all address Indigenous rights.

Who Are Indigenous Peoples?

Indigenous peoples are descended from original inhabitants of a place who, for most or all of their history prior to the creation of states, controlled their own cultural practices, socio-economic systems, and political destinies. The United Nations initially tried to develop a definition of Indigenous peoples to include those who had previously been referred to as "tribal," "native," or "aboriginal" peoples living in European settler states. Efforts to be more comprehensive, however, soon revealed how difficult it would be to define indigeneity in Africa and elsewhere in the postcolonial Global South (Mutume, 2007). Postcolonial as used here means once colonized, then decolonized, and now struggling with social, political, economic, and cultural consequences of colonization. The United Nations now favors an "identify instead of define" approach, due largely to the participation of Indigenous peoples in UN processes. The UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues acknowledges the controversy that left the UN without an agreed upon definition. Instead, the Forum relies on (1) self-identification (in case of individuals, including acceptance by the community as a member; (2) historical continuity with pre-state societies; (3) strong link to territories; (4) distinct social, economic or political systems as well as language, culture and beliefs; (5) a resolve to maintain their ancestral systems as distinct peoples and communities, and (6) they now constitute non-dominant groups.

Globally, thousands of communal/identity groups now live in just under 200 states. The question of who is Indigenous has enormous political significance because state-building involves two assumptions that have rationalized infringements on the self-determination of Indigenous peoples. The first is that the state exists as a mechanism for appropriating resources for capitalist development. This assumes a shared "national" interest in capitalist development superior to the claims of subnational groups to use any resources for their own purposes. Indigenous peoples do not necessarily oppose industrialization but rather claim the right to exercise self-determination over the use of resources they have used traditionally to support their ways of life. Their claims predate the creation of states.

The second assumption is that the state has a legitimate interest in articulating and promoting a single national identity. In settler states this is often associated with “modernization” schemes as well as in the nation-building process that accompanies state-building (Maybury-Lewis, 1997). By rationalizing the assimilation of Indigenous peoples, it legitimates policies aimed at the destruction of Indigenous identities. Indigenous peoples become not only targets of policies aimed at expropriating Indigenous resources, but also at the destruction of their existence as a people.

Indigenous peoples' resistances produce two historical patterns that characterize their political situation and relations with states today. First, settler states harm Indigenous peoples and impair their rights by expanding the state's claim to territory. While some millions of Indigenous peoples died from infectious diseases against which they had no immunity, many also died as a consequence of a public violence (military force and forced relocation) and publically-sanctioned private violence as settlers moved into Indigenous territories. In the United States, for example, estimates of the pre-contact Indigenous population range from 10 to 40 million. By 1890, when the first census including Indigenous people was recorded, 230,000 remained. The second pattern involves postcolonial states where, after centuries of colonization, power was transferred from colonial governments to local elites who continued the “modernization” and (capitalist industrial) “development” processes. These local elites often reproduce the settler–Indigenous relationship and regard Indigenous peoples who wish to remain distinct as “backward,” legitimating them as targets of forced assimilation, relocation, and violence.

In settler states, Indigenous peoples' subjugation and resistance to it has taken place over several centuries, beginning with a period of initial contact characterized by violence and possibly treaty-making. An increasingly dominant settler population grows and settler political institutions subject indigenous peoples to forced assimilation and relocation. Indigenous peoples in settler states today resist mainly through legal and direct political action. Indigenous peoples in postcolonial Asian and African states have more recently become the targets of policies aimed at their assimilation and relocation. In Central and South America states were created both by settlers and colonial conquest. For a variety of reasons including geographic barriers, some Indigenous peoples, like the Yanomami in Brazil and Venezuela, remained relatively peripheral to state-building well into the second half of the 20th century. Others, in Guatemala and Ecuador, for example, became embroiled in a struggle involving both cultural and class cleavages.

In 1970 the UN Commission on Human Rights Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protect of Minorities called for a study of Indigenous peoples rights and issues. The study was completed 11 years later. At that time, an estimate of the global population of Indigenous peoples often used was between 300 million and 350 million. This estimate persisted until 2007 when the declaration was adopted. Indigenous scholars and activists, however, reject it in favor of much higher numbers that take into account the diverse small-scale societies in Asia, the Pacific, and Africa. The International Labor Organization uses an estimate of 476 million living in over 5000 groups in 90 states, with 70% in Asia and the Pacific, 16.3% in Africa, 11.5% in Latin America and the Caribbean, 1.6% in North America, and 0.1% in Central Asia.

The numbers and locations of Indigenous peoples render the topic much too complicated to cover in this more general chapter. Suffice it to say that there are Indigenous peoples on every continent, and that the ideological and Eurocentric projects of conquest and assimilation make this both a contentious and important issue. This chapter will focus on the experience of Indigenous peoples in the large the settler states in the Western Hemisphere and Oceania. The case of Indigenous peoples in settler states is instructive because it established norms that modernizing elites in postcolonial states implicitly and explicitly draw on as justification for their own policies aimed at the subjugation and assimilation of Indigenous peoples.

Indigenous Peoples and Conquest

While norms of conquest have been asserted as the basis for state domination of Indigenous peoples, in practice European colonization was also aided in part by negotiating treaties with Indigenous peoples. Treaty-making was erratic, arbitrary, and inconsistent (Brown, 1970). The first treaties in North America were negotiated between the Dutch and the Iroquois (Haudenosaunee) Confederacy, and subsequently by the British and their successor settler states (Lyons, 1992). A debate among sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Spanish theologians on the status of Indigenous peoples according to the “law of civilized nations” produced a moral justification for the conquest and subjugation of Indigenous peoples without treaty-making (Williams, 1990). In the southwest United States, Indigenous sovereignty passed from the Spanish to the Mexican and finally the US governments – all without the consent of the Indigenous peoples. In New Zealand the Treaty of Waitangi was viewed by the British as the abdication of Indigenous sovereignty, while the Maori viewed it as the basis for shared sovereignty and co-equal coexistence. In Australia the British Privy Council initially held that the continent was terra nullius or “unoccupied” because the aboriginal peoples did not constitute “peoples” with discernible (to the British) governments capable of asserting proprietary rights to land and resources. This claim was finally overturned by the Australian High Court in 1993, opening the door to Indigenous land claims and initiating an Indigenous–state dialog on the prospect of negotiating a contemporary treaty on aboriginal rights. As the British, French, Belgians, Dutch, and Portuguese scrambled for dominance in Africa in the late 1800s, treaties of “friendship” and “tribute” were signed with African chiefs and headmen.

Surprisingly, conquest remained a justification for dominance over Indigenous peoples until very recently (Williams, 1990). When representatives of the Hopi and Navajo nations appealed to the United Nations Human Rights Commission to uphold their sovereign rights, representatives of the US State Department in 1987 claimed that the United States was not obligated to recognize Indigenous rights by asserting the applicability of the law of conquest. Although modern writers have been ambivalent toward the application of conquest to the contemporary law of nations, even the ancient Roman law of conquest on which any modern claims rest, holds that it can occur legitimately only after a “just” war between equals, such as nation-states. Eighteenth-century international lawyer Emerich

deVattel further argued that conquest could not be applied to the relationship between European powers and the North American Indigenous peoples, because in order to claim conquest one must be the victor in a war fought in self-defense. Two contemporary developments leave little doubt that a law of conquest has no validity in contemporary international law: the coming into force of the UN Charter, and the emergence of the principle of self-determination, which liberates peoples who were formerly subjugated to colonial and imperial power.

While in practice the UN and World Court have seemed reluctant to apply the principle of self-determination beyond the formerly colonized areas of the Global South, the spirit and intent of self-determination is to liberate peoples politically, socially, economically, and culturally subjugated by colonial practices. The 1960 General Assembly Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples holds that “the subjection of peoples to outside domination and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights,” and that “all peoples have the right of self-determination; by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development.” The Declaration also carefully balances the right of self-determination with the *a priori* rights of the state by prohibiting “any attempt at the partial or total disruption of the national unity and the territorial integrity of a country.” Such action, it claims, “is incompatible with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.”

Hesitancy to secure entitlement to self-determination for Indigenous peoples follows less from normative conflicts than from the lack of political will on the part of states. Indigenous assertions of sovereignty over land and resources, particularly in conjunction with existing treaties, are regarded as a threat to “national unity” as well as a barrier to non-indigenous access to coveted natural resources. The threat to territorial integrity is less ambiguous. The majority of Indigenous peoples do not aspire to secede from the state. The few who do, do not base their claims on a right of self-determination, but rather on the exercise of a continuous right of sovereignty predating the formation of contemporary states. Maori claims to sovereignty, for example, do not constitute an aspiration to secession, but rather to the exercise of co-equal sovereignty with the New Zealand state. In fulfilling the right to self-determination, there is an enormous degree of latitude to delineate the terms by which external sovereignty may be limited, while leaving internal sovereignty intact.

The central issue raised by Indigenous peoples' political resistance is how to achieve social justice both in older states, like the settler states and Scandinavia, given the history of domination and its legacy, as well as in postcolonial states. Attempts to secure a legal and normative justification for the international protection of Indigenous peoples are only part of the story of Indigenous peoples' responses to conquest. Although most Indigenous sociopolitical systems were not organized for the large-scale use of force that characterizes European states, they did at times resist through armed defense and rebellion. The history of Indigenous responses to conquest, however, is primarily a history of political, legal, and rhetorical resistance within states, and in regional and in international arenas.

Indigenous Peoples' Responses in Settler States

Indigenous peoples have never passively accepted their physical, social, and cultural destruction at the hands of Western colonists, settlers, and state expansionists. Armed resistance includes the Anglo-Powhatan War in 1609, the Maori–Pakeha Wars of the 1860s, the Plains Indians' resistance culminating in the defeat of the US army at the Battle of Little Bighorn in 1876, the Frog Lake and Louis Reil rebellions in Canada, numerous Indigenous African rebellions such as that of the Sotho and Zulu peoples led by Chaka against colonial domination, and the Huaorani use of violence to resist multinational and missionary encroachment in Ecuador in the 1990s. Their military defeat is explained not only by the more destructive technology of European weapons coupled with the devastating effects of alien disease, but also by the fact that the majority of Indigenous societies were not and are not organized for large-scale military operations, whether aggressive or defensive.

Yet in spite of military defeat and near-physical decimation, Indigenous peoples have never abandoned what for many has been a five centuries-long struggle for their cultural and physical survival. The term “cultural survival” is important because surviving as assimilated individuals is not the same as surviving as distinct Indigenous peoples. Worldwide, Indigenous resistance movements confront issues of land rights, forced relocation, and cultural, political, and economic self-determination, as the examples in **Table 1** illustrate.

By the far the most effective and persistent forms of resistance have been nonviolent: appeals to international organizations, publicity, protests, litigation, and political participation, including grassroots political organization and campaigns to alter the constitutional basis for Indigenous–state relations. The scope of Indigenous resistance today is truly global, as the participation of hundreds of Indigenous organizations in the UN process of drafting principles for the protection of their rights, and local, national, and regional resistance movements indicates.

The United States

When Europeans arrived in North America, hundreds of Indigenous communities were living in a variety of sociopolitical organizations, including a number of confederacies. They practiced agricultural food production as well as hunting and gathering. Initially, the Dutch, French, and English engaged in treaty-making with North American Indigenous nations, and there can be little doubt that during early colonization these treaties were viewed by both sides as agreements between equals (**Brown, 1970**). By the middle of the 18th century, however, the European and African slave population east of the Mississippi vastly outnumbered the Indigenous population. As settlement and conquest pushed westward, alien diseases and settler violence were rapidly devastating the Indigenous peoples.

Native American political and legal activism in the mid-20th century was fueled both by US Federal Indian policies known as “termination” (aimed at “terminating” the collective, tribal existence of Native American Indian people and assimilating them as individuals into mainstream American society), and by the growing civil rights activism initiated by African–Americans in the late

Table 1 Examples of grass-roots Indigenous-controlled political movements

<i>Country</i>	<i>Movement/Organization</i>	<i>Issue</i>
USA	American Indian movement	End termination, sovereignty
Canada	North American Indian Brotherhood	Oppose external interference in indigenous self-government
	Aotearoa (New Zealand) Maori unity movement	Recognition of Maori
	Maori peoples liberation	Sovereignty
	Movement of Aotearoa	
	Waitangi action committee	
Australia	Federal council for the Advancement of aboriginals and torres strait Islanders	Land rights, resource rights
Malaysia	Residents action committee sarawak indigenous peoples' Association	Halt Bakun dam construction resist encroachment by logging companies
West papua	Kanak Independence movement	Self-determination
Pradesh, India	Chipko movement	Protest to save forest homelands
Chotanogpur, India	Jharkhand parry	Call for creation of indigenous state
Philippines	Cordillera peoples alliance	Autonomy
Norway	Nordic saami council saami union	Cultural rights, legal protection, language rights
Sweden	Saami youth council	
Japan	Hakkaido utari	Ainu language, land rights
Alaska, USA	Federation of Alaskan natives	Land settlement Act
Chile	ADMMapU (Mapuche)	Oppose allotment policy
Ecuador	CONFENIAE, ECUARUNARI, COISE, CONAIE	Resistance to encroachment by oil companies
El Salvador	Association nacional Indigena del salvador	Land, cultural rights

Wilmer, F. (1993). *The Indigenous voice in world politics: Since time immemorial*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

1950s and 1960s. By 1970, as a result of Indigenous political opposition, the termination era officially ended with many of the terminated tribes restored to their federally recognized status (Wilkins). The National Indian Youth Council (NIYC) was formed during an historic American Indian Conference in Chicago in 1961. Today it not only publicizes the sovereign rights of Native Americans, but also conducts voter participation drives, job training, and youth leadership and internship programs. The NIYC participated in protests in support of Indian fishing rights that became known as “fish-ins” in the 1960s. The NIYC is one of 15 organizations with consultative status at the United Nations.

The American Indian Movement (AIM) adopted more confrontational, though still primarily nonviolent, strategies of resistance, leading to the 19-month occupation of Alcatraz Island in 1969, asserting treaty rights entitling Indians to the return of unused federal property. AIM was also instrumental in the week-long occupation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs following the “Trail of Broken Treaties” march to Washington, DC in 1972 and a two and a-half month stand-off at Wounded Knee, South Dakota, in 1973. The Wounded Knee protest served both to expose the highly questionable legitimacy of the US-supported tribal government and to heighten solidarity and pride in Indigenous identity. Some of the early founders of the American Indian Movement went on to form the International Indian Treaty Council, which received consultative status at the United Nations and is headed by an international board of Indigenous representatives.

A number of factors converged – the Civil Rights movement, Red Power activism, more Native American students graduating from university and law school programs, and a federal policy allowing tribes standing to sue in federal court – to raise key Indigenous issues in American courts beginning in the 1970s (Nagel, 1996). A conflict over Western Shoshone land claims under the Treaty of Ruby Valley arose in the 1970s and was heard and appealed through US courts. The Supreme Court upheld the US position that aboriginal land rights for the Shoshone had been “extinguished” through settlement and through the Indian Claims Commission. The case centers on the rights of the Danns to continue working a ranch that has been in their family for over 100 years, previously in the territory occupied by the 60 000 Shoshone in the area. Although the Danns did not prevail, in 1993 the Indian Law Resource Center filed a complaint on behalf of the Danns in the Inter-American Commission for Human Rights.

Though many battles are still being fought – over the Black Hills and the Western Shoshone land claims, for example – there have also been some gains. In a 1980 decision, the Supreme Court upheld a decision that acknowledged the illegality of US confiscation of the Black Hills. The Sioux, however, refused to acknowledge receipt of the monetary compensation, holding that only the return of land would satisfy their grievance. The Blue Lake Lands taken from the Taos Pueblo by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1906 to be incorporated into National Forest lands were returned to them by a bipartisan congressional act supported by President Nixon in 1970. Without a treaty-based claim, the Passamaquoddy instituted a suit in 1971 against the US government for land lost that, through appeals, was eventually upheld in 1980. Fishing rights entitling Indigenous peoples of the Pacific Northwest to one-half of the harvestable

fish were upheld in a 1974 case. Native American Indian activism also led to a series of legislative victories for Indian rights in the US: the Indian Self-Determination and Educational Assistance Act in 1975, the American Indian Religious Freedom and Indian Child Welfare Acts in 1978, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act in 1979, and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990, also known as NAGPRA (Lerma, 2014). In 2019 (*Herrera v Wyoming*), the Supreme Court held that Wyoming's statehood did not abrogate the Crow Tribe's 1868 treaty rights to hunt on the lands of the Bighorn National Forest that had not yet become "occupied" by non-Indians when the forest was designated.

In 2011, environmentalists joined Indigenous protesters in opposition to a proposed 1180 mile oil pipeline known as the Keystone XL Pipeline. The planned route would run from the tarsands in Alberta, Canada, to Nebraska and through Montana and South Dakota. The pressure generated by these protests led President Obama to ultimately reject the proposal in November of 2015.

Finally, although the federal government continues to officially recognize Columbus Day, opposition has led 8 states and more than 130 US cities to replace the holiday with "Indigenous Peoples" or "Native Americans" Day in acknowledgment of the devastating consequences of colonization for Indigenous peoples (Hauck, 2019).

Canada

Between the 1870s and 1921, the Canadian government negotiated a series of treaties to "open" the western and northern provinces for Canadian state expansion. The original Indian Act of 1876 that asserted jurisdiction over Indian affairs until the 1950s was so restrictive that Natives were required to have passes to leave their reserves. Potlatch and other ceremonies were banned, and Indian women who married non-Indian men lost their status as Native people, as did their children. The Act also provided for involuntary enfranchisement. Amendments to the Act in 1951 provided only modest improvements. Native ceremonies were no longer outlawed, but provisions pertaining to the status of Indian women and involuntary enfranchisement remained until national voting rights were extended to Natives by 1960.

In 1968 and 1969 the Canadian government, in consultation with Indigenous leaders, issued a White Paper on Indian Policy. Like termination policy in the United States, it proposed ending the special status of First Nations in Canada by repealing the Indian Act and assimilating them as individuals into the dominant society. First Nations mobilized rapidly to oppose the policy and in 1969 Indian agents were removed from reserves, beginning an era of restructuring in Canadian-Indian relations. The Act was amended in 1985 and 1988 to (1) end gender discrimination and restore Native status to Indigenous women (and their children) who married non-Natives, (2) to give control over enrollment to the First Nations councils, and (3) to allow First Nations to develop bylaws and on-reserve taxing power. The 1982 Constitutional Act also recognizes the aboriginal and treaty rights of Indians, Inuit, and Metis, although some Indigenous peoples opposed their inclusion in the Canadian constitution, arguing that, as sovereign nations, inclusion would compromise their sovereign status.

Shushwap leader George Manuel, then President of the National Indian Brotherhood of Canada (now the Assembly of First Nations) traveled to New Zealand to meet with Maori activists. He also attended the United Nations conference on the environment in Stockholm as a member of the Canadian delegation where he connected with Saami leaders. Manuel went on to the International Labor Organization and World Council of Churches in Geneva, the International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs in Copenhagen, and the Anti-Slavery Society and Survival International in London. These contacts led to a landmark international meeting of Indigenous peoples in 1974, after which the NIBC was granted consultative NGO status at the United Nations.

Although the Canadian government began to recognize the need to address Native claims in the 1970s, it was not until 1991 that it lifted restrictions preventing consideration of pre-Confederation claims. Conflicts between Natives and the Canadian government over the James Bay hydroelectric project arose in 1974 and 1975 and led to several agreements addressing land claims, aboriginal rights, and compensation settlements. By March 2020, over 900 specific claims had been concluded resulting in 535 negotiated settlements (Crown and Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs, Canada, 2020). Under agreements with the Gwich'in, Sahtu Dene, and Metis, the DIAND (Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development) in 1994 and 1995 collected \$70 million in resource royalties. Agreements with the Yukon First Nations, Vuntut Gwitchin First Nation, First Nation Nacho Ny'a'k Dun, Champagne, and Aishihik First Nations over land and monetary compensation have since been concluded. Twenty-five First Nations in Saskatchewan were awarded \$450 million for land purchases to increase reserve territories. In 1992 a Treaty Commission was established in British Columbia, where the absence of treaties had complicated the claims issues. By 1996, 70% of the First Nations in British Columbia had become involved in negotiating the first ever treaty with the Canadian government. By 2020, 189 claims were settled through negotiations with First Nations in the province (Crown and Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs, Canada, 2020).

Conflicts in Mohawk communities in 1980 and 1990 led to violent confrontation between Native groups within Iroquois communities in disagreement over the legitimacy of tribal governments, and between Natives and the federal (Mounties) and provincial authorities (Hornung, 1991; Simpson, 2014). The 1990 standoff at Kanesatake/Oka, 30 miles northwest of Montreal, precipitated by plans to construct a municipal golf course in an area claimed to be a traditional burial site, lasted 78 days. When the provincial authorities dispatched a paramilitary unit armed with automatic weapons, grenades, and tear gas to disband the initially nonviolent protesters, the conflict turned violent, leaving one police officer dead. In solidarity with the Mohawks at Oka/Kanesatake, Kahnawake Mohawks blockaded the Mercy Bridge between Montreal and the outlying city of Chateaugay.

In the 1980s the Sheshatshiu and LaRomaine Innu in Labrador/Nitassinin initiated a nationwide campaign protesting the use of airspace over their territory for NATO training overflights, which they say are detrimental to their way of life and destructive of

the wildlife that they continue to hunt for food. The Innu engaged in civil disobedience, initiated land claims and litigation, and aroused publicity to bring pressure on the Canadian government to end the overflights.

The Nisga'a and Nuxalk nations in British Columbia have vehemently opposed clear-cutting in disputed territory, arguing that they do not oppose development, but seek Native-controlled development. Protests accelerated in 1994, and in 1995 protest rallies were coordinated by the Forest Action Network in London, Ottawa, Los Angeles, Seattle, Victoria, and Vancouver, although some Nuxalk representatives were annoyed with the Network's "appropriation" of the issue for their own purposes. Three hereditary chiefs and 19 supporters were arrested in connection with a blockade against logging companies, with 21 of those arrested being found guilty of criminal contempt in June 1996. Another logging blockade organized by the Nuu-Chah-Nulth First Nations along with Friends of Clayquot and Greenpeace, followed in late June. In August Nuxalk Chief Quatsinas made a formal statement to the UN Subcommission on the Nuxalk Logging Dispute, explaining the nations' commitment to the use of nonviolent means of opposition, the creation story in which the area in question appears as a sacred site, and his view of the logging operation as an act of ethnocide and continuing genocide aimed at destroying Native peoples as Native peoples.

The process of political restructuring of Indigenous–state relations continues in Canada. In 1994 the Canadian government and the First Nations in Manitoba agreed to dismantle the Department of Indian Affairs in the province. In 1995 a new round of negotiations were initiated to add further amendments to the Indian Act. A number of self-government agreements have been signed between First Nations and the federal government, and in 1996, 13 First Nations signed a Framework Agreement on land management. The Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples was created in 1991 to evaluate the need for rebuilding the relationship between Canada's aboriginal and nonaboriginal societies. The final report recommends a new Royal Proclamation and companion legislation on treaty implementation, recognition of First Nations, a treaty tribunal, the creation of an Aboriginal Parliament, and reform of the federal agencies involved in Aboriginal Affairs.

In a landmark settlement between the Inuit of Nunavut and the Canadian government, not only was 350 000 square miles transferred to the Inuit, but a new territory of Nunavut was created. Beginning in 1999 and concluding in 2009 the government of the Northwest Territories will transfer responsibilities to the new Inuit-controlled Nunavut government. Finally, in the course of its search for a new constitutional foundation, the Canadian government has undertaken extensive studies on the question of electoral reform for aboriginal peoples. The Royal Commission on Electoral Reform and Party Financing considered in detail the question of aboriginal electoral participation and alternatives for restructuring the basis of aboriginal political participation. Among the alternatives considered, the Commission examined the New Zealand/Aotearoa model for Maori participation in the federal government and the possibility of adapting such a model to Canada.

When the Canadian federal government implemented its 2012 omnibus budget including changes that threatened Indigenous First Nations' management of land and water resources, three Indigenous women and one allied non-Indigenous woman responded by organizing a Facebook discussion, naming their page "Idle No More" (Caven, 2013). Aimed at defending Indigenous sovereignty and promoting social and environmental sustainability, the movement has spawned hundreds of direct action protests and now observes December 10, long recognized as International Human Rights Day, as the National Day of Action.

New Zealand

As the English colonists in North America prepared for a war with the British after two centuries of settlement, Captain James Cook made the first English landing in New Zealand. Between Cook's landing in 1769 and 1835, European settlement in New Zealand was sparse. Thirty-five raritanga met with James Busby in Waitangi in October 1835, and signed a "Declaration of Independence" declaring a new "state" under the "United Tribes of New Zealand." They agreed to meet on a yearly basis, but as English settlers began to arrive in increasing numbers, Maori sovereignty and land rights affirmed by the 1835 Declaration were increasingly ignored. By 1840 there were both intertribal conflicts as well as conflicts between the settlers and the Maori. These conflicts, particularly the latter, would come to be known as the "land wars", and lasted over the next 20 years. In 1840 four Maori rangatira from the North signed the Treaty of Waitangi, which is now considered to be the foundational document of the New Zealand state (Kawharu, 1989).

During the 1850s, concern over continued Pakeha (European settler) ignorance of their sovereignty and land rights, Maori leaders began to meet and discuss the possibility of unifying through a confederation and naming a single Maori leader in what came to be known as "The King Movement." In 1958 the first Maori king was named. The movement, however, did not resolve the growing tensions between the Maori and the English who were determined, as in North America and Australia, to conquer the land and people of New Zealand/Aotearoa by settlement and force.

When, in 1863, conflicts arising over attempts by the Maori to retain self-government erupted over a controversy involving British purchase of Maori land at Waitara, the British invaded Waikato. In the aftermath of defeat, a nonviolent Maori resistance known as Pai Marire formed and spread through the northern tribes. A series of Land Acts were passed by the parliament in order to force the destruction of the Maori system of collective land tenure and authority in favor of individual titles, which in turn made the transfer and sale of property from the Maori to the settlers much easier. As in the western United States, this period was marked both by the most severe decline in the Indigenous population and the most widespread dispossession of them from their lands.

It is estimated that when the Treaty of Waitangi was signed in 1840, the Maori outnumbered settlers 100 to 1. Within twenty years the populations were roughly equal, but for the next four decades Maori population steadily declined. As elsewhere, diseases against which they had no immunity, were devastating the Maori. As the settler population grew, their relationship with the Maori was increasingly focused on an assimilationist policy. "Native" schools established in 1867 were a prime instrument for the destruction of Maori culture.

In 1926, Maori visionary and spiritual leader T W Ratana traveled to England to appeal to the King, and to Geneva to address the League of Nations on behalf of the Maori and their grievances against the settlers. He was granted an audience with neither. He went on to become a political leader in New Zealand, serving in the Parliament along with several of his followers. Apirana Ngata, often called “the most able Maori leader of the century,” became the Minister of Maori Affairs in 1928 and from there spearheaded a Maori cultural revival and land recovery.

The 1945 Maori Social and Economic Advancement Act promised help for tribal committees, assistance for Maori health, education, and welfare, and the creation of Marae (Maori community) administration. In 1967 a Maori Affairs Act made it still easier for Maoris to sell land to Europeans, resulting in the loss of millions of acres of land formerly under Maori control, and a massive migration of Maoris seeking work in the cities. The 1967 Act also evoked widespread Maori protest as a new generation of younger leaders emerged. They demanded that their Maori names be properly pronounced in public arenas, began to establish bilingual programs, and celebrated pride in Maori culture (Walker, 1987). The Nga Tamata or Young Warriors and the Maori Organization on Human Rights provided organizational structure from which to launch protest through picketing, petitioning, and publicity. In 1975 organizers of the Maori Land March collected over 60,000 signatures on a petition protesting the sale of Maori land. In a 1977 land dispute at Bastion Point, Maori protesters occupied the area for 506 days in protest, although a court ruled in 1978 that the protesters were trespassing and had them removed.

In 1975, the Treaty of Waitangi Act established the Waitangi Tribunal and for the first time recognized the conflict over Maori and Pakeha interpretations, but it was not until the Act was amended in 1985 that the Maori text achieved statutory recognition. The original act, which allowed only for claims pertaining to grievances from 1975 on, was amended so that Maori grievances extending all the way back to 1840 could be considered by the Tribunal. The effect was dramatic – during the first 10 years of the Tribunal, only 24 claims were made, but during the first 2 years after the amended act was passed, the number of claims jumped to over 150. As of 1993, six major negotiated agreements were underway; one followed Tribunal hearings and two followed Tribunal mediation. A large claim was settled in 1995 when Queen Elizabeth II signed a parliamentary bill apologizing to the Tainui people for the British military invasion of their lands in 1863. The settlement returned 39 000 acres and awarded (US) \$112 million to the Tainui tribe. The Queen's 1995 visit was also marked by protests when 60 Maori activists demonstrated against the Crown's continued involvement in Maori affairs.

Like the other CANZUS states, New Zealand's initial failure to support the UNDRIP was later reversed. Since its official endorsement of the declaration in 2010, both Maoris and New Zealand's political leaders and institutions have engaged in a wide-ranging discussion and debate over its relationship to the Treaty of Waitangi. Consensus today is that they are mutually reinforcing. Recent direct action protests have focused on Maori control over previously confiscated land, focused on an occupation of and opposition to the sale and private development of a plot of land near Auckland known to the Maori as Ihumatao, and considered a sacred and historically significant site. In late January 2020, Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern ordered construction to stop, and a settlement promised that the government would pay compensation to the landowners and return control of the land to the Kingitanga and Tainui Maori (Garner, 2020).

Australia

Of the 1007 settlers arriving in Australia in 1788, three-fourths were convicts. Most of the rest were their wardens and caretakers. It is often alleged that the particularly ruthless treatment of aboriginal peoples by European settlers in Australia is in part attributable to the callous treatment of convicts-turned-settlers by their wardens (who also became settlers). Richard Broome, for example, writes of 8- and 9-year-old aboriginal girls being raped; Tasmanian aboriginals being “flogged, branded, castrated and mutilated by convicts”; the killing of between 100 and 300 people by 23 “troopers” on the Naomi River in 1838; at Mayall Creek six months later “about 30 [aboriginal people] were roped together, shot, stabbed and their bodies burned by a party of 12 stockmen”; and 200 aboriginals killed at Gravesend the same year. Aboriginal resistance became a pretext for white brutality. From an estimated original population of 300 000, by 1930 there were only 60 000 aboriginal people in Australia. The aboriginal population today remains below the pre-conquest level. Many aboriginal Australians also died from contact with deadly alien diseases. In Victoria alone, an estimated 80% of the aboriginal population died from violence and disease between 1820 and 1840 – just 20 years. Early aboriginal resistance consisted mainly of raiding parties and what today would be called guerilla tactics. They were soon, says Broome, vastly outnumbered, and resistance leaders were designated as “outlaws” and thus “liable to be shot on sight.”

Two things have profoundly shaped the course of aboriginal–white relations: (1) a growing aboriginal reliance on the expanding pastoral economy, particularly in the north; and (2) the absence of Commonwealth or federal involvement in aboriginal affairs until 1967. The history of aboriginal work on the pastoral stations is one of labor exploitation, and thus resistance has often been combined with economic marginalization and labor struggles. Before World War II only about half of the aboriginal cattle workers received any pay, and aboriginal wages were still much lower than whites for the same work. These conditions led to nonviolent aboriginal labor strikes beginning in the 1940s, escalating to economic sabotage until the Federal Council for the Advancement of Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders was created in the 1960s. The Federal Council pressured the labor movement and heavily lobbied the Australian Council of Trade Unions Congress meetings in 1950, 1961, and 1963. When a case involving aboriginal laborers was sent by the North Australian Workers Union for arbitration in 1965, the Commission issued a landmark decision in favor of equal wages for aboriginal workers. Although implementation was delayed for 3 years, by the late 1960s aboriginal workers were paid an equal wage, ironically leading to a backlash against hiring aboriginal labor (Broome, 1996) Foreign Sovereign Immunity Act (FSIA), Agencies and Instrumentalities.

The 1960s saw a tremendous increase in minority protest movements, freedom rides, student activism, advocacy for voting rights, the return of reserve lands, and in Australia, petitions for aboriginal citizenship. In 1967 the Australian federal government took over responsibility for aboriginal affairs, granting citizenship to all aboriginal people and shifting reserve policy from government control

to self-determination. Yet even with the granting of citizenship, many aboriginal people in the 1960s still found themselves unable to obtain passports since their births were often recorded in stock books. In 1972 aboriginal protesters established a “tent embassy” in Canberra to publicize their plight. Youth leadership, employing strategies of direct action, emerged within a pan-aboriginal movement demanding publicity, accountability, and change. By the 1970s the Labor Party responded, recognizing the political value of taking on the issue of aboriginal equality, and repealed most of the discriminatory legislation by the 1980s. Federal investigations into land rights were initiated, while aboriginal leaders formed alliances with environmentalists, advancing their own concerns with land rights, mining rights, and restrictions on corporate development. Aboriginal peoples formed Land Councils to represent their interests, and in 1975 the Northern Territory passed an Aboriginal Land Rights Act including rights to royalties from mining and an aboriginal veto over mining in the state. The first controversy between an Aboriginal Land Council and mining interests went to court in 1978. Thirty percent of the Northern Territory was acknowledged to be under aboriginal ownership, as was 20% of South Australia. Aboriginal activists began flying a pan-aboriginal flag to symbolize their unity and right to self-determination.

In 1979, the National Aboriginal Commission called for a constitutional amendment allowing the government to negotiate a compact (treaty) for the first time with aboriginal Australians. Parliament passed the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders Commission bill in 1979. The Aboriginal Development Corporation (ADC), wholly controlled by aboriginal people, was created in 1980. That same year aboriginal activists in Victoria staged the occupation of a proposed mining site against the Alcoa corporation. Activists pressed for the establishment of Aboriginal Studies programs, the teaching of aboriginal culture at all levels of education, the creation of aboriginal health services programs, and progressive self-management of their own affairs.

Protests heated up as the Bicentenary approached, and a Royal Commission launched investigations into “deaths in custody” – the problem of a disproportionate number of aboriginal people dying while in policy custody. The issue became the subject of international criticism from both the United Nations and Amnesty International. The Royal Commission on Aboriginal Deaths in Custody also publicized the need to address the “Lost Generation” on a national scale. (Aboriginal children were often forcibly removed from their families and placed either in white homes to learn “domestic skills” or in institutional schools, creating what has recently become known as the “Lost Generation.” In New South Wales, for example, one out of seven children had been removed between 1909 and 1969.) During the 1988 Bicentenary, aboriginal activists also “landed” on the cliffs of Dover and proclaimed England “discovered” by aboriginal Australians.

During the 1980s, housing, health, and education grants for aboriginal programs increased by 80%. In 1988, Prime Minister Hawke spoke to a crowd of more than 10 000 at the Barunga Festival, promising the negotiation of an Australian–Aboriginal Treaty. A Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation was created in 1991, made up of 12 aboriginal members, 2 Torres Strait Islanders, and 11 “other” Australians.

The most significant event to follow from two decades of sustained pan-aboriginal political activism involved the 1993 court case brought by Eddie Mabo and the Torres Strait Islanders against the government of Queensland. The court's decision overturned the doctrine of terra nullius used to dispossess aboriginal peoples from their land. According to terra nullius, the continent was “unoccupied” upon the arrival of the British because aboriginal peoples did not possess governments like European governments and therefore did not exercise ownership of the land. This doctrine precluded any claim of native title under the Commonwealth or Australian governments for more than two centuries. Following the landmark Mabo ruling that aboriginal people did exercise ownership of the land and sovereignty prior to settlement and retained a right to land title in the present, the entire foundation of aboriginal–white relations crumbled. Land claims filled the courts. In December the Native Title Act was passed, reflecting a fragile balance between the landholder, aboriginal, and state interests. It outlined procedures for transfer to native title, provided funding for land acquisition, and promised additional steps toward social justice. Aboriginal peoples were awarded 250 000 square kilometers in the Kimberleys, the Wiradjuri claimed most of central New South Wales, claims were made in the Snowy Mountains, the Yorta Yorta claimed areas of the Barman Forest on the Murray River, and the Martu claimed 200 000 square kilometers on the east Pilbara.

Recent struggles center on controversies over mining since many new mining projects seek access to aboriginal lands and involve areas now subject to native title applications. A resources boom in the 1970s brought a tremendous increase in both domestic and multinational mining activities in Australia. The Northern Territories passed legislation recognizing aboriginal interests in mining and gave them the right to share in royalties that were previously paid to the Crown. Being forced to deal with the issue of native title has brought mining companies and governments into negotiations with Aboriginal Land Councils as representatives of aboriginal interests. A 1991 Commonwealth Industry Commission report recommended federal recognition of aboriginal title to minerals in their territories, direct negotiation between commercial interests and aboriginal councils, and federal funding of aboriginal councils.

Reconciliation Australia was a panel of experts created in 2001 to lead reconciliation efforts as successor to the Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation established under the *Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation Act* in 1991. In 2012, the panel of experts initiated a campaign to raise awareness of Indigenous/Aboriginal rights and to open a national conversation about potential reforms to include recognition of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders in the Australian constitution. The “Recognize” campaign culminated in the release of *The Uluru Statement from the Heart* in 2017, presented to the Prime Minister as well as the opposition leader that year. The statement declares that “Our Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander tribes were the first sovereign Nations of the Australian continent and its adjacent islands, and possessed it under our own laws and customs.” It furthermore elaborates that

This sovereignty is a spiritual notion: the ancestral tie between the land, or “mother nature”, and the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples who were born therefrom, remain attached thereto, and must one day return thither to be united with our ancestors. This link is the basis of the ownership of the soil, or better, of sovereignty. It has never been ceded or extinguished, and co-exists with the sovereignty of the Crown.

The statement called for a “First Nations Voice” to be included in the constitution and was rejected by the Australian government. Some Indigenous/Aboriginal critics also argued that the campaign could undermine Aboriginal sovereignty either as a result of incorporation into the constitution, or absent political support from the public and government leaders.

Indigenous Resistance in Central and South America

As the British were successfully establishing colonial dominance in North America, Australia, and New Zealand, the Spanish proceeded unhindered with the colonization of Central and South America. Unlike Spanish and Portuguese colonization, however, did not produce democratic settler states. Racially mixed births and a greater degree of acculturation produced a large Mestizo, mostly peasant population in many Central and South American countries. Until the end of the cold war, the governments in these countries had been controlled by descendants of European conquerors. The end of the cold war raised expectations about the transition from authoritarian, often military rulers, to leaders and institutions that were more democratic, and thus, potentially more responsive to Indigenous peoples' rights. To an extent, this did happen, as evidenced in the cases of Ecuador and Bolivia (Martin and Wilmer, 2017). But politics in many Central and South American states has taken a turn back to more right wing style leaders, albeit often supported by right wing populist movements and support from the business community.

Additionally, geographical factors made the southern hemisphere more difficult for expanding settler states to penetrate, and many Indigenous peoples survived with little or no contact with outsiders into the middle of the 20th century. Several states – Guatemala and Bolivia, for instance – today contain a majority Indigenous population. As elsewhere, diseases also killed many Indigenous peoples during the earliest period of contact, and where contact was more recent, continue to do so today. Within the past three decades, for example, as many as 85% of the Yanomami may have been killed by disease and violence at the hands of settlers.

Contemporary resistance in Central and South America is partly a response to growing pressure for industrial development since the 1960s. As governments, multinationals, and miners attempt to penetrate dense tropical forests and mountain highlands, they encounter numerous Indigenous peoples who managed to survive five centuries of European conquest and colonization. But their resistance is not only a result of recent Indigenous activism as much of the region's history has involved Indigenous opposition to domination and brutal government responses. A 1934 “uprising” of “peasants” against the Salvadoran government, for example, met with the ruthless torture and murder of over 30 000 Indians. More recently the mobilization of the Zapatista Army of National Liberation in Mexico was partly in response to the murder of Indian leader Sebastian Nunez Perez by a landowner in 1990. The Zapatista movement itself grew out of a resistance alliance formed in 1989 with widespread Indian support. That same year, a less publicized armed uprising occurred along the Pichis River in Peru when some 50 000 Ashaninkas responded to a Tupac Amaru assassination of an Ashaninka leader.

The subject of Indigenous resistance in Central and South America is too vast to cover here, but some highlights will illustrate the seriousness, effectiveness, and generally nonviolent nature of contemporary Indigenous movements. In 1992, on the occasion of the Columbian Quincentenary, the Organization of Indigenous People of Pastaza organized a march to Quito, capital of Ecuador, to draw attention to the situation and demands of Indigenous peoples. They, called for government recognition of their legal right to land, for the reform of the Constitution to include Indigenous rights, and for Indigenous control over the remaining Amazon rainforests in Ecuador. Ten thousand Quichua, Shiwari, Zapara, and Achuar Indians, “wearing feathered plumes and toucan headdresses, carrying spears, they marched, followed by thousands of highland Indians in their traditional ponchos,” reports Veilleux. Ten thousand Indians protested the Columbian Quincentenary celebration in San Cristobal.

Resistance movements in Central and South America over the past few decades have been aided by those Indigenous peoples to the North whose struggles for cultural and physical survival in more open and democratic states began 100 or more years earlier. They have also been aided by a growing global environmental movement, though their interests can be subverted by some environmental groups. Nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) allied with Yanomami leaders to combat invasions into Yanomami territory and advance Indigenous rights have made the Yanomami a symbol of Indigenous resistance in recent decades. In Venezuela, environmental activists and Pemón Indian groups have allied to oppose a plan to open the Imataca rain forest reserve to gold, diamond, and emerald mining. In Brazil, the Tapajós Roadway–Waterway “megaproject” in the Mundurucu Indigenous Area was suspended as a result of opposition by Indigenous groups and environmentalists. In May 1997, in response to assassinations of Indigenous leaders, activists staged a nonviolent protest at the Honduran capital as part of a continuing struggle for land rights. They were forcibly removed by Honduran armed forces, with reports of brutal beatings and disappearances accompanying the “removal”.

One of the most successful and sustained Indigenous resistances is the case of the Kayapo of the Xingu River in Brazil. To open the area to “development” in the 1970s, the Brazilian government attempted to relocate them to an “Indian Park.” The Kayapo quickly learned how to effectively utilize the media for their cause over the next 15 years as they engaged in a struggle against territorial encroachment with violence when necessary, while emphasizing the violations of their rights that drove them to do so. Their confrontations with the government in 1984 and 1988 became major media events, opposing a project in which 60 of 136 proposed dams would flood their lands. International human rights and environmental groups joined the protest. Kayapo leaders traveled to the World Bank to stop its financing. In 1989 they organized a meeting of investment bankers, government officials, environmentalists, and hundreds of representatives from 20 different Indian tribes. Environmental NGOs pressured international lending agencies to withdraw support for the project, and the dam projects were derailed.

The experience of the Huaorani and other Indigenous peoples in Ecuador is also illustrative (Martin and Wilmer, 2017). A coalition of Indigenous peoples and environmentalists called for a 15-year moratorium on new oil development projects so that the

Ecuadorian government could assess the damages such development had caused already and devise plans to implement safeguards against future damage. The government anticipated some \$3 billion in foreign oil investments by the year 2000, but environmental activists in the United States, including the New York-based Natural Resources Defense Council, and Europe protested so strenuously that the Ecuadorian government was compelled to cool relations with Conoco. Indigenous alliances representing seven Indigenous nations in the region have been spearheading opposition strategies. The “Declaration of Villano” was issued at a meeting among these groups in January 1994, calling on petroleum companies to withdraw from petroleum auctions. In March the Confederation of Indigenous Nations of Ecuador called for a United Nations mediation panel and an investigation into human rights violations as well as environmental damage. In addition to the National Resources Defense Council, the Sierra Club has also become involved, filing a petition on behalf of the Huaorani with the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights. In November 1993, Indigenous organizations also filed a \$1 billion damage suit in New York against Texaco, prompting Texaco to yield its exploration rights to other companies.

In 2005 Bolivia elected the first Indigenous president. Evo Morales remained in office until resigning after an OAS investigation of the 2019 election claimed to find evidence of fraud, although that evidence has been called into question by other investigations (**Curriel and Williams, 2020**) In Ecuador, where seven percent of the population is Indigenous, an Indigenous-labor alliance successfully protested and overturned President Romero's abolition of fuel subsidies. The subsidies were part of an austerity deal the president made with the IMF (**Herrera, 2019**). In 2016 the Organization of American States adopted the American Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

Conclusion

One of the most striking features of contemporary Indigenous resistance is the effectiveness of transnational and international mobilization as well as the speed with which it emerged. Alliances with environmental activists are also increasingly apparent and effective, particularly among young Indigenous and environmental leaders. The formation of Indigenous NGOs accelerated in tandem with increased United Nations activity during the 1970s and 1980s. During the 1990s, on average more than 100 Indigenous NGOs have participated in the annual Working Group meetings. The Center for Human Rights in Geneva lists over two hundred Indigenous NGOs. Indigenous issues have been raised within the Food and Agricultural Organization, the International Labor Organization, the United Nations Development Program, the United Nations Environmental Program, the United Nations High Commission on Refugees, the World Health Organization, and the World Bank. Sixteen Indigenous NGOs now have consultative status at the United Nations, Indigenous representatives are more active and visible in UN programs, particularly those addressing environmental issues.

Indigenous activism has produced tangible results. In addition to the UNDRIP and OAS Declaration, the World Bank has issued policies and programs to assess and mitigate project impacts on Indigenous peoples. In 1989 the International Labor Organization – the only international organization to have concluded a convention addressing the issue of Indigenous peoples – was pressured into revising its 1957 convention (No. 107) Concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries to eliminate its paternalistic tone and to reflect the concerns of Indigenous peoples. The reconciliation processes in Australia and New Zealand were, at least partly, a response to international Indigenous activism, and a number of Central and South American states have undertaken constitutional revisions to protect the rights of Indigenous peoples.

The most significant aspect of Indigenous political activism is its overwhelmingly nonviolent nature. Indigenous peoples possess virtually no international resources associated with the ability to influence international political outcomes, such as weapons, monetary wealth, or statehood. Thus their success in influencing national and international outcomes and utilizing international mechanisms to influence domestic outcomes challenges conventional thinking about international relations as a political arena of anarchy where might prevails over rights. Indigenous peoples have fought for their survival and advanced toward their objectives using primarily the tools of rhetorical power, moral suasion, and nonviolent resistance, accompanied by a sophisticated understanding of nonIndigenous politics (**Alfred, 2009**). Indigenous political activism suggests that international politics bears a much greater resemblance to “normal” politics – struggles over interests, ideas, and values carried on through political and legal institutions – than conventional accounts of international relations acknowledge.

Uncited References

Wilkins, 2010.

References

- Alfred, T., 2009. *Indigenous Manifesto Peace, Power, Righteousness: An Indigenous Manifesto*, second ed. Oxford University Press.
- Anaya, S.J., 1996. *Indigenous Peoples in International Law*, second ed. Oxford University Press, New York, 2004.
- Broome, R., 1996. *Aboriginal Australians: Black Response to White Dominance*. Paul and Co. Publishing Consortium, Concord, MA.
- Brown, D., 1970. *Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee: An Indian History of the American West*. Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, New York.
- Curriel, J., Williams, J., 2020. Bolivia Dismissed its October Elections as Fraudulent. Our Research Found No Reason to Suspect Fraud. February 27, 2020. The Washington Post, online. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2020/02/26/bolivia-dismissed-its-october-elections-fraudulent-our-research-found-no-reason-suspect-fraud/> Accessed 2 March 2020.

- Garner, D., 2020. Duncan Garner: Ihumatao Deal to Be Struck This Week. January 27, 2020, online. <https://www.newshub.co.nz/home/new-zealand/2020/01/duncan-garner-ihumatao-deal-to-be-struck-this-week-sources.html> Accessed 16 March 2020.
- Hauck, G., 2019. Columbus Day: Celebrating Cultural Heritage, or Colonization of Native Americans?. October 12, 2019. USA Today, online. <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2019/10/12/columbus-day-indigenous-peoples-day-why-some-change-name/3932258002/> Accessed 16 March 2019.
- Herrera, I., 2019. In Ecuador and beyond, Indigenous Groups Are Fighting to Be Seen. October 14, 2019. The New York Times, online. <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/10/14/style/ecuador-indigenous-protests.html> Accessed 2 March 2020.
- Hornung, R., 1991. *One Nation under the Gun*. Pantheon Books, New York, NY.
- Kawharu, I.H. (Ed.), 1989. *Waitangi: Maori and Pakeha Perspectives of the Treaty of Waitangi*. Oxford University Press, Auckland.
- Nagel, J., 1996. *American Indian Ethnic Renewal: Red Power and the Resurgence of Identity and Culture*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Lerma, M., 2014. *Indigenous Sovereignty in the 21st Century: Knowledge for the Indigenous Spring*. Florida Academic Press.
- Lyons, et al., 1992. In: Lyons, O., Mohawk, J., Deloria Jr., V. (Eds.), *Exiled in the Land of the Free*. Clear Light Publishers, Santa Fe, NM.
- Martin, P., Wilmer, F., 2017. Normative struggles and globalization: the case of indigenous peoples in Bolivia and Ecuador. In: Stohl, M., Lichbach, M.I., Grabosky, P.N. (Eds.), *States and Peoples in Conflict: Transformations of Conflict Studies*. Routledge, New York, NY.
- Maybury-Lewis, D., 1997. *Indigenous Peoples, Ethnic Groups and the State*. Allyn and Bacon, Needham Heights, MA.
- Mutume, G., 2007. 'Indigenous' Peoples Fight for Inclusion: Press for an End to Discrimination and Marginalization. April 2007. *Africa Renewal*, online. <https://www.un.org/africarenewal/magazine/april-2007/%E2%80%98indigenous%E2%80%99-people-fight-inclusion> Accessed 27 February 2020.
- Simpson, A., 2014. *Mohawk Interruptus: Political Life across the Borders of Settler States*. Duke University Press, Durham, NC.
- Walker, R., 1987. *Nga Tau Tohetohe: Years of Anger*. Penguin Books, Auckland, NZ.
- Wilkins, D.E., 2010. *American Indian Politics and the American Political System*, third ed. Rowman and Littlefield, Lanham, MD.
- Williams Jr., R.A., 1990. *The American Indian in Western Legal Thought: The Discourses of Conquest*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Wilmer, F., 1993. *The Indigenous Voice in World Politics*. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Websites

Center for World Indigenous Studies: <https://www.cwis.org/>.

Forest Peoples Program: <https://www.forestpeoples.org/>.

Indigenous peoples at the UN: <https://www.un.org/development/desa/indigenouspeoples/about-us.html>.

International Indian Treaty Council: <https://www.iitc.org/>.

International Workgroup for Indigenous Peoples: <https://www.iwgia.org/en/network.html>.

Biography **Franke Wilmer** is Professor of Political Science at Montana State University and author of *The Indigenous voice in world politics: since time immemorial* (Sage 1993), *The social construction of man, the state, and war* (Routledge, 2002), *Human Rights in World Politics: An Introduction* (Lynne Rienner, 2015) as well as numerous articles and book chapters on identity and conflict, and political violence. She also served as Chair of the Montana Human Rights Commission 2004–06 and was elected to a seat in the Montana House of Representatives in 2006, where she served four terms until 2014.