

[SUBSCRIBE](#)[GIVE A GIFT](#)[LOG IN](#) TO ACCESS
THE DIGITAL ISSUE[SIGN UP](#)
FOR AQ UPDATES[RSS FEED](#)  [GO](#)

- [Subscribe](#)
- [About](#)
- [Blog](#)
- [News](#)
- [Contact](#)
-
- [Archive](#)
- [Partners](#)

ARCHIVE

From issue: **Consulta Previa and Investment** (Spring 2014)

■ AQ FEATURE

Contradiction in International Law

BY [Angela Bunch](#)

International law and practice offer contradictory answers for what happens when communities say "no."

Indigenous peoples' control over natural resources continues to be one of the most controversial issues in international law.¹ Numerous international human rights treaties recognize Indigenous communities' right to be consulted over the use of resources on or beneath their communal lands. But international law tends to consider third parties' exploitation of natural resources on Indigenous land to be legal—as long as Indigenous rights to consultation, participation and redress, among other rights, are met.²

But there are disputing interpretations of whether Indigenous communities have the right to free, prior and informed consent (FPIC)—the right not only to be consulted about, but to reject activities that adversely affect them.



This is evident in the two main international human rights instruments that apply specifically to Indigenous peoples: the legally binding ILO 169 (1989), and the non-binding United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) in 2007.³ While ILO 169 does not clearly recognize Indigenous and tribal peoples' right to veto measures or investment projects that they oppose, UNDRIP does.

The ILO Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations⁴ has declared that under ILO 169, Indigenous peoples' ownership and possession rights can be subordinate to the interests of states, if states retain ownership of subsoil resources and comply with the following:

- Consult with Indigenous communities before natural resources on their lands are explored or exploited;
- Ascertain the impact of resource extraction;
- Provide Indigenous communities a fair share of the benefits accruing from any natural resource extraction; and
- Provide fair compensation for any damages caused by natural resource exploration and exploitation.⁵

ILO 169 also declares that “relocation of these peoples [...] shall take place only with their free and informed consent.” If consent is not granted, states must follow procedures established under national law to allow for the “effective representation” of the communities involved before relocating them.⁶

While ILO 169 sets the standards that should be met under any consultation (including a “genuine dialogue” between governments and Indigenous peoples and an “objective of reaching agreement or consent”), it does not state explicitly whether Indigenous peoples have the right to veto.⁷

UNDRIP, on the other hand, establishes that “Indigenous peoples shall not be forcibly removed from their lands or territories,” and that states need to obtain Indigenous peoples' free and informed consent before the approval of any project or legislative or administrative measure that may affect them.⁸ This is a major step in the advancement of Indigenous peoples' right to veto.

In light of these differing interpretations, what should happen when consultations do not take place, go sour, or when Indigenous peoples do not consent? In the Americas, Indigenous peoples' territorial rights have been interpreted primarily through cases that have come before the Inter-American Human Rights System (Commission and Court). In 2002, the Court declared that Indigenous peoples' “right to property over natural resources may not be legally extinguished or altered by State authorities,” unless they obtain the peoples' full and informed consent, and comply with other legal requirements.⁹

But in later judgments and opinions, the Court has suggested that FPIC is not required, as long as a consultation process has been carried out in line with the recommendations of the ILO Committee of Experts—“undertaken in good faith and in a form appropriate to the circumstances, with the objective of achieving agreement or consent to the proposed measures”¹⁰—except in cases where development projects involve displacement, deprive communities of the use of their lands, or involve the storage or disposal of hazardous waste.¹¹

Recently, the Court endorsed a qualified FPIC that differentiated between small and large-scale development projects.¹² The judges ruled that for large-scale projects, states must not only consult with Indigenous peoples, but also obtain their free, prior and informed consent; but small-scale projects require only consultation.¹³

Exactly what constitutes a small- and a large-scale project was not set and appears to have been left up to judicial interpretation.

This approach attempts to reconcile the rights of Indigenous people with those of states and investors. But does it adequately protect Indigenous rights? The answer remains unclear.

[Endnotes](#)

To read more from *Americas Quarterly*, [sign up for a free trial](#) issue of the print magazine. No risk, no commitment.

0 Comments

Americas Quarterly

Login ▾

Sort by Best ▾

Share  Favorite 



Start the discussion...

Be the first to comment.

ALSO ON AMERICAS QUARTERLY

WHAT'S THIS?

Monday Memo: Colombia Legislature – Argentine Debt – ...

1 comment • 3 months ago



perfectinvesting — The Best Investment Company - Invest \$100 Return \$500 in 24 hoursWe offer ...

Stakes Involved in The Scottish Choice

3 comments • 2 months ago



LucMenard360 — John super good post that sums up much of the situation.I comment on your post ...

Mesoamerica’s Infrastructure Projects and Reducing Climate ...

2 comments • a month ago



Carolina Neal — Dear Reader,Thank you for you comments. My intentions, as you well stated, are ...

Los Límites del Consejo de Defensa Suramericano

1 comment • 2 months ago



Gabriel Marcella — Dolor de cabeza para algunos gobiernos? Reconozcamos que son gobiernos ...

 [Subscribe](#)

 [Add Disqus to your site](#)

 [Privacy](#)



**SUBSCRIBE
TO AQ**
**1-Year Print,
Digital, and
New App
Subscription
for only
\$20.95**
Save 30%!

Connect with AQ



Most Popular

MOST POPULAR ON AQ ONLINE

Most Viewed

Past: [1 day](#) [1 week](#) [1 month](#) [1 year](#)

[Uruguay's Frente Amplio Outperforms Expectations Ahead of Runoff](#) (11 times)

[Brazil's Long To-Do List](#) (8 times)

[Day of the Dead Celebrations Unite Food and Memory](#) (8 times)

[Argentine Congress Passes Energy Bill, Opens Door for Shale Gas Development](#) (7 times)

[Humanitarian Interventionism Brazilian Style?](#) (6 times)



[Read our new series of first-person articles.](#)

WEB EXCLUSIVES

- [AQ Slideshow: The People's Climate March in New York City](#)

September 24, 2014

by [Mari Hayman](#)



View a series of photos from the People's Climate March on September 21, which brought more than 300,000 protesters to the streets of New York City.

- [AQ Video: An Interview with Lilian Tintori](#)

September 17, 2014

by [Leani García](#)



Lilian Tintori, the wife of imprisoned Venezuelan opposition leader Leopoldo López, discusses her husband's arrest and her new role as a human rights activist.

[MORE WEB EXCLUSIVES »](#)

AQ Online is sponsored by



AQ Course Packets: Now Available for Your Classroom!



[Browse our catalogue.](#)

AQ and Efecto Naím: NTN24 Partnership

June 1: This AQ-Efecto Naím segment looks at sustainable cities in the hemisphere.



NOW ON AS/COA ONLINE

[Artista Gabriel Orozco Recibe Premio de Americas Society a la Creatividad en la Cultura](#)

Oct 31, 2014

Nueva York, 31 de Octubre, 2014—Americas Society se complace en otorgar el primer Americas Society Cultural Achievement ...

[Artist Gabriel Orozco to Receive Americas Society Cultural Achievement Award](#)

Oct 31, 2014

New York, October 31, 2014—Americas Society is honored to recognize Mexican artist Gabriel Orozco with the first Americas ...

[Weekly Roundup: Colombia's Military Courts, Bolivia's Vote Count, Brazil's Defense Deal](#)

Oct 31, 2014

Mexico's Top Court Nixes Bid for Energy Referendum On Thursday, Mexico's Supreme Court deemed unconstitutional a ...



AQ MEDIA PARTNER

FINANCIAL TIMES

World

[EU steps up trade fight with Brazil](#)

Oct 31, 2014

Request to WTO to set up a panel to rule on issue

Companies

[EU steps up trade fight with Brazil](#)

Oct 31, 2014

Request to WTO to set up a panel to rule on issue