

SEARCH OUR SITE



- Subscribe
- About
- Blog
- News
- Contact
- Advertise
- 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. 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.



Be the first to comment.

ALSO ON AMERICAS QUARTERLY

I'm No Scientist, But It's Sure Hot in Rio

2 comments • a month ago

AvatarScience Officer — Well I'm no scientist either, but why did the seasonal sea ice at both poles ...

Why I Wasn't a Fat Kid in Mexico

2 comments • 3 months ago

AvatarRichard — Glad to see you post & while I agree with the advice to parents, shouldn't we demand ...

U.S.-Cuba Agreement: Diplomacy At Its Best

WHAT'S THIS?

1 comment • 3 months ago

Avatarcliffordblais — Yes diplomacy as it's best for politicians but a great deal of Fraternity from a latino pope ...

Are the Elections Behind the Crackdown in Caracas?

3 comments • 4 days ago

AvatarGerardo Ferrer — maduro, is doing all this scandal so he can take Venezuela forever like castrohe ...









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

Brazil, Ecuador, and the Inter-American Human Rights System (76 times)

Venezuelan Attorney General Denies Leopoldo López Parliamentary Candidacy (23 times)

Colombian Military Join Peace Talks (23 times)

Terrorism: Fear is Not a Policy (20 times)

Resource Extraction and Protest in Peru (14 times)

WEB EXCLUSIVES

• AQ Slideshow: El Bote at Cambalache: Life at a Landfill

February 13, 2015

by Timothy Bouldry



For years, the Indigenous Warao relied on "El Bote," the landfill in Cambalache, Venezuela for their livelihood. View a slideshow of "El Bote" to learn more.

• AQ Slideshow: Climbing Aconcagua, the Summit of the Americas

February 5, 2015

by Stephen Kurczy



Aconcagua is the tallest peak in the Western Hemisphere and a meeting place for people from around the world.

MORE WEB EXCLUSIVES »

AQ Online is sponsored by



AQ Course Packets: Now Available for Your Classroom!



Browse our catalogue.

NOW ON AS/COA ONLINE

Parting Shot: Leading Talent

by Susan Segal - 21 hours ago

When it comes to gender parity in leadership positions, Latin America is falling behind. Fewer than 5% of the world's ...

Weekly Chart: Latin American Women in Leadership

by Luisa LemeCarin Zissis - Mar 06, 2015

When it comes to women leaders in government, the Americas has made strides in the past 15 years. The average portion of women ...

Exhibition Opens Window to World of Latin American Design

Mar 06, 2015

A new exhibition offers a look at the world of Latin American Design, a period regarded as one of the region's most ...



AQ MEDIA PARTNER

FINANCIAL TIMES

Politicians named in Petrobras scandal

17 hours ago Supreme court to investigate heads of both houses of Congress

Companies

Politicians named in Petrobras scandal

17 hours ago Supreme court to investigate heads of both houses of Congress

