

## THE RIGHTS OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES LEGAL PROTECTIONS FOR LAND, CULTURE, AND SELF-DETERMINATION IN CONSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORKS

**AUTHOR** – R PRIYANKA, FACULTY OF LAW AT TAMIL NADU DR. AMBEDKAR LAW UNIVERSITY

**BEST CITATION** – R PRIYANKA, THE RIGHTS OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES LEGAL PROTECTIONS FOR LAND, CULTURE, AND SELF-DETERMINATION IN CONSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORKS, *INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW (IJLR)*, 5 (4) OF 2025, PG. 312-329, APIS – 3920 – 0001 & ISSN – 2583-2344.

### ABSTRACT:

*Indigenous rights were a central topic in the discourse of constitutional law and international human rights. This study examines legal protections of Indigenous communities in terms of land ownership, cultural conservation and self-determination. Many Indigenous groups face systemic challenges, including the conditions of the constitutional and international legal framework, such as explanations of the rights of the United Nations Indigenous Peoples including national expropriation, cultural erosion, and legal frameworks, which examined national impact analysis such as the International Labour Organization (ILO) Convention 169's intervention with competent countries in Brazil's intervention with Brazil in Canada, Australia and Brazil. In this study, in this study. Protection of Indigenous rights. symbols of legal cases are highlighted in studies that analyse the role of courts and human rights authorities in shaping indigenous land claims and cultural protection measures and maintaining these rights. This study also examines the principles of self-determination and highlights how indigenous governance structures are perceived and integrated into national legal systems. The results show that a legal framework exists and enforcement and implementation of considerable hurdles remains. This requires stronger political measures and legal advocacy. This study highlights the need for ongoing legal reform to ensure proper recognition of Indigenous rights and sovereignty. By fighting historical injustice and promoting legal integration, constitutional conditions can play an important role in promoting justice and sustainable development in Indigenous communities.*

**KEY WORDS:** Indigenous Rights, Land Ownership, Cultural Protection, Self-Determination, Constitutional Law, Human Rights, Indigenous Sovereignty.

### INTRODUCTION

Indigenous peoples have historically faced systemic discrimination, dispossession, and marginalization despite being the original inhabitants of their respective lands. Over time, legal frameworks have evolved<sup>[1]</sup> to recognize and protect their rights, particularly concerning land ownership, cultural preservation, and self-determination. Constitutional law, along with international legal instruments such as the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) and the International Labour Organization (ILO) Convention 169, has played a crucial role in shaping the legal landscape for Indigenous

rights. However, while these frameworks exist, the effectiveness of their implementation varies widely across different jurisdictions.

The right to land is a fundamental aspect of Indigenous identity, livelihood, and cultural survival. Many Indigenous communities maintain deep spiritual and ancestral connections to their territories, making land rights an essential component of their legal protections. However, historical injustices, such as colonialism and forced displacement, have resulted in the widespread loss of Indigenous lands. Legal frameworks in countries such as Canada, Australia, and Brazil have attempted to address these injustices through land restitution

programs, treaty negotiations, and legal recognition of Indigenous land ownership. Despite these efforts, conflicts over land rights continue, often involving state interests, corporate exploitation, and natural resource extraction.

Cultural preservation is another critical area where legal protections are essential. Indigenous traditions, languages, and practices are often at risk due to globalization, assimilation policies, and inadequate legal safeguards. Many constitutional frameworks recognize the right of Indigenous peoples to maintain and develop their cultural heritage. However, challenges remain, particularly in ensuring that Indigenous knowledge systems, languages, and traditional practices are legally protected and passed on to future generations. In some countries, Indigenous languages are officially recognized and promoted, while in others, they continue to face threats of extinction due to neglect and lack of state support. Legal cases addressing cultural protection, such as those involving sacred sites and intellectual property rights over traditional knowledge, highlight the ongoing struggle for cultural survival.[2]

Self-determination is a cornerstone of Indigenous rights, allowing communities to govern themselves and make decisions regarding their social, economic, and political development. This principle is recognized in international law and enshrined in some national constitutions. However, the extent to which Indigenous groups can exercise self-governance varies significantly. Some nations, such as Canada and New Zealand, have recognized Indigenous self-government structures, allowing for greater autonomy in decision-making. Others continue to impose legal and administrative barriers that limit Indigenous sovereignty. The recognition of self-determination also raises complex legal and political questions, including the extent of Indigenous jurisdiction within a state and the balance between national sovereignty and Indigenous governance.[3]

This research aims to examine the constitutional and legal protections available to Indigenous peoples, focusing on land rights, cultural preservation, and self-determination. By analyzing key legal cases, policy developments, and international standards, this study seeks to highlight the strengths and weaknesses of existing frameworks and explore potential reforms. Ensuring the protection and promotion of Indigenous rights is not only a legal obligation but also a moral imperative in fostering justice, equality, and reconciliation.

## 1.1 DEFINITION OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES

Indigenous peoples are the original inhabitants of a particular region who have distinct cultural, linguistic, and historical identities that differ from dominant societies. They often have a deep connection to their ancestral lands and maintain traditional governance systems, customs, and spiritual beliefs. The definition of Indigenous peoples varies across legal frameworks, international treaties, and national legislations. In India, while the term "Indigenous peoples" is not explicitly used in legal statutes, various acts, bills, constitutional provisions, and special laws recognize the rights of Scheduled Tribes (STs) and other marginalized Indigenous communities. Below are the definitions provided under different Indian legal frameworks.[4]

### The Constitution Of India (1950)

The Indian Constitution does not use the term "Indigenous peoples" but recognizes Scheduled Tribes (STs) under **Article 366(25)**, which defines Scheduled Tribes as "such tribes or tribal communities or parts of or groups within such tribes or tribal communities as are deemed under **Article 342** to be Scheduled Tribes for the purposes of this Constitution." The Fifth Schedule provides for the administration and control of Scheduled Areas, which are predominantly inhabited by Indigenous communities, while the Sixth Schedule grants autonomy to tribal areas in northeastern states such as Assam, Meghalaya, Tripura, and Mizoram.

### **The Scheduled Castes And Scheduled Tribes (Prevention Of Atrocities) Act, 1989**

This Act provides a legal framework to prevent discrimination and violence against Scheduled Tribes and Scheduled Castes. It defines STs in accordance with **Article 342** of the Constitution and aims to protect their social, economic, and cultural rights.

### **The Forest Rights Act, 2006 (Scheduled Tribes And Other Traditional Forest Dwellers (Recognition Of Forest Rights) Act)**

The Forest Rights Act (FRA) recognizes Indigenous communities' rights over forest lands they have traditionally occupied. Under **Section 2(c)**, "forest-dwelling Scheduled Tribes" are defined as members of Scheduled Tribes who primarily reside in and depend on forests for their livelihood, culture, and survival. **Section 2(o)** also recognizes "other traditional forest dwellers," referring to those who have lived in forest areas for at least three generations before December 13, 2005.

### **The Panchayats (Extension To Scheduled Areas) Act, 1996 (PESA Act)**

The PESA Act extends the provisions of self-governance to tribal areas under the Fifth Schedule. **Section 4** of the Act empowers Gram Sabhas (village councils) in Scheduled Areas to manage local resources, safeguard traditional customs, and protect community lands, recognizing Indigenous self-governance structures.

### **The Tribal Sub-Plan (TSP) And Special Central Assistance (SCA)**

Though not a legal definition, the Tribal Sub-Plan (TSP) was introduced to ensure budgetary allocation for the development of Scheduled Tribes. Various ministries are required to allocate funds proportionate to the ST population to uplift Indigenous communities economically and socially.

### **The Lokur Committee Report (1965)**

The Lokur Committee, set up to define Scheduled Tribes, identified five key criteria:

- ❖ Primitive traits
- ❖ Distinct culture
- ❖ Geographical isolation
- ❖ Shyness of contact with outsiders
- ❖ Economic backwardness

These criteria continue to influence policy decisions regarding the recognition of Indigenous groups in India. Despite multiple legal recognitions, Indigenous communities in India continue to struggle for full recognition and enforcement of their rights. Legal frameworks must be continuously strengthened to uphold their identity, land rights, and cultural heritage.[5][6]

## **1.2 IMPORTANCE OF LEGAL PROTECTIONS**

Legal protections for Indigenous peoples are crucial in safeguarding their rights, preserving their cultural heritage, and ensuring their socio-economic well-being. Historically, Indigenous communities have faced systemic marginalization, forced displacement, and cultural erosion due to colonialism, industrialization, and government policies that often prioritize economic development over Indigenous rights. Legal frameworks, both national and international, serve as essential mechanisms to protect Indigenous lands, traditions, and self-governance, ensuring their survival and dignity in modern societies.

One of the primary reasons for legal protection is the preservation of Indigenous land rights. Land is central to Indigenous identity, spirituality, and livelihood. However, land encroachments, deforestation, and industrial projects continue to threaten Indigenous territories. Legal protections such as The Forest Rights Act, 2006 (India), the Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989 (ILO 169), and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) provide frameworks for recognizing Indigenous land ownership and ensuring that their consent is obtained before any developmental projects



take place. These legal measures help prevent land dispossession and environmental degradation, thereby protecting Indigenous ways of life.

Another crucial aspect of legal protection is the safeguarding of Indigenous culture and traditions. Many Indigenous languages, rituals, and customs are at risk of disappearing due to globalization and assimilation policies. Legal frameworks such as constitutional provisions, heritage protection laws, and international conventions ensure that Indigenous cultural expressions, sacred sites, and traditional knowledge are preserved and respected. In India, **Article 29** of the Constitution guarantees the right of minorities, including Indigenous communities, to conserve their distinct language and culture. Additionally, the Sixth Schedule of the Indian Constitution grants autonomy to certain tribal areas, allowing them to govern themselves according to traditional practices.[7]

The protection of Indigenous self-determination and governance is another significant legal safeguard. Self-determination allows Indigenous communities to control their political, economic, and social development without external interference. In India, the Panchayats (Extension to Scheduled Areas) Act, 1996 (PESA Act) empowers Gram Sabhas (village councils) to make decisions regarding local resources and governance. Globally, self-determination principles are enshrined in UNDRIP and ILO Convention 169, which advocate for Indigenous participation in decision-making processes affecting their lives.

Legal protections also play a vital role in ensuring social justice and economic development for Indigenous peoples. Laws such as The Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 in India aim to prevent discrimination and violence against Indigenous communities. Additionally, affirmative action policies like reservation in education and employment help bridge

historical inequalities and promote socio-economic upliftment.

In the legal protections are fundamental in addressing historical injustices and securing the future of Indigenous peoples. However, effective enforcement and continuous legal reforms are necessary to ensure that these protections are not merely theoretical but actively improve the lives of Indigenous communities. Strengthening legal frameworks, promoting awareness, and ensuring the participation of Indigenous voices in governance are essential steps toward achieving true justice and equality for Indigenous populations worldwide.[8]

### 1.3 OVERVIEW OF CONSTITUTIONAL SAFEGUARDS

Constitutional safeguards play a vital role in protecting the rights of Indigenous peoples by ensuring legal recognition, social justice, cultural preservation, and economic empowerment. In India, Indigenous communities are primarily identified as Scheduled Tribes (STs) under **Article 366(25)** of the Constitution, and various constitutional provisions provide them with special protections. These safeguards are designed to address historical injustices, prevent exploitation, and promote the welfare of Indigenous populations through affirmative action, self-governance, and legal protection of their land and culture.

One of the key constitutional safeguards is the recognition of Scheduled Tribes and Scheduled Areas. **Article 342** empowers the President of India to identify and notify Scheduled Tribes, ensuring targeted welfare measures. Additionally, the Fifth and Sixth Schedules of the Constitution provide administrative and legal protections to tribal communities. The Fifth Schedule governs Scheduled Areas in states with significant tribal populations, granting special powers to the Governor to regulate land transfers and resources to prevent exploitation. The Sixth Schedule applies to certain northeastern states

(Assam, Meghalaya, Tripura, and Mizoram) and provides for autonomous district councils that allow Indigenous communities to manage their local affairs, laws, and traditions.

Another significant constitutional safeguard is affirmative action through reservations. **Article 15(4) and Article 16(4)** allow the state to make special provisions for the advancement of Scheduled Tribes, including reservations in education, public employment, and legislatures. **Article 330 and Article 332** mandate the reservation of seats for Scheduled Tribes in the Lok Sabha (House of the People) and State Legislative Assemblies, ensuring their political representation. This helps Indigenous communities have a voice in policy-making and governance. To protect Indigenous culture and identity, Article 29 ensures the right of minorities, including tribal communities, to conserve their distinct language, culture, and traditions. This is particularly important in preserving Indigenous languages, folklore, and spiritual practices, which are often at risk of being lost due to assimilation and modernization. Additionally, **Article 350A** directs the state to provide facilities for instruction in the mother tongue at the primary education level for children belonging to linguistic minorities, benefiting many Indigenous groups.[9][10][11]

Social and economic protections are enshrined in the Constitution to prevent exploitation and marginalization. **Article 46** directs the state to promote the educational and economic interests of Scheduled Tribes and protect them from social injustice and all forms of exploitation. To safeguard Indigenous lands and prevent alienation, **Article 244** provides the basis for laws that restrict the transfer of tribal land to non-tribals, ensuring that Indigenous communities maintain control over their ancestral territories. In constitutional safeguards for Indigenous peoples in India provide a strong foundation for protecting their rights and promoting their welfare. However, the effective implementation of these safeguards remains a challenge due to administrative

inefficiencies, lack of awareness, and conflicts with economic interests. Strengthening enforcement mechanisms and ensuring active participation of Indigenous communities in governance are crucial to making these constitutional protections more effective in practice.

## CHAPTER-II

### HISTORICAL CONTEXT COLONIZATION AND DISPOSSESSION

The history of Indigenous peoples is deeply intertwined with colonization, which led to widespread dispossession of their lands, cultural suppression, and systemic marginalization. Colonization, driven by European imperialism, resulted in the forceful occupation of Indigenous territories across the world, including in India, North America, Australia, and Africa. This process was justified through legal doctrines, such as the **Doctrine of Discovery**, which claimed that European powers had the right to seize lands occupied by Indigenous peoples. Colonizers often viewed Indigenous communities as “uncivilized” and imposed foreign governance systems, dismantling Indigenous legal, economic, and social structures.

In India, British colonial rule drastically altered Indigenous landholding patterns. Under colonial policies, large-scale land acquisitions were undertaken to expand revenue collection, exploit natural resources, and establish plantations, railways, and industries. The Permanent Settlement Act of 1793 and the Forest Acts of the 19th century deprived Indigenous communities of their traditional land rights by classifying vast areas as state-owned forests. This led to large-scale displacement of Indigenous tribes, forcing them into bonded labor and economic servitude. The Chotanagpur Tenancy Act (1908) and the Santhal Parganas Tenancy Act (1876) were later introduced to provide some protection, but land alienation continued due to loopholes in enforcement. [13]

Beyond land dispossession, colonization also led to cultural suppression. Indigenous languages, traditions, and belief systems were undermined as colonial authorities imposed their own cultural and religious norms. Missionary activities promoted Christianity while discouraging Indigenous spiritual practices. In India, tribal communities who resisted British rule faced violent crackdowns, as seen in revolts such as the Santhal Rebellion (1855–56) and the Munda Rebellion (1899–1900). The suppression of these uprisings further entrenched colonial dominance over Indigenous lands and governance.

The economic impact of colonization on Indigenous peoples was severe. Traditional systems of self-sustaining agriculture and trade were disrupted, leading to widespread poverty and dependence on colonial economies. Indigenous labor was exploited in mines, plantations, and construction projects under harsh conditions. This economic displacement persisted even after independence, as many Indigenous communities continued to struggle with land alienation, lack of access to resources, and exclusion from mainstream economic opportunities.

In colonization led to the systemic dispossession of Indigenous lands, destruction of cultural identities, and long-term socio-economic marginalization. While post-colonial legal frameworks, including constitutional protections, have sought to rectify historical injustices, Indigenous communities continue to face challenges in reclaiming their rights. Addressing these historical wrongs requires stronger legal enforcement, land restitution policies, and active participation of Indigenous peoples in decision-making processes to ensure justice and reconciliation. [14]

## 2.1 EARLY LEGAL RECOGNITION OF INDIGENOUS RIGHTS

The early legal recognition of Indigenous rights emerged as a response to the widespread dispossession, marginalization, and discrimination faced by Indigenous

communities due to colonization and state-led development policies. The acknowledgment of these rights was initially slow and often influenced by colonial interests, but over time, legal frameworks were developed to provide limited protections to Indigenous peoples. These early legal efforts laid the foundation for modern constitutional and international laws that safeguard Indigenous land, culture, and self-governance.

One of the first legal recognitions of Indigenous rights came in the form of treaties and agreements between Indigenous groups and colonial governments. In North America, for example, treaties such as the Royal Proclamation of 1763 (issued by the British Crown) recognized Indigenous land ownership and prohibited settlers from encroaching on Indigenous lands without official agreements. However, while such treaties acknowledged Indigenous rights, they were often violated or manipulated to favor colonial expansion.

In India, early legal recognition of Indigenous rights was shaped during British rule, particularly in response to tribal uprisings against exploitative policies. The Chotanagpur Tenancy Act (1908) and the Santhal Parganas Tenancy Act (1876) were among the first legal measures introduced to protect Indigenous land from alienation. These acts sought to prevent the transfer of tribal land to non-tribals, recognizing the economic and cultural significance of land to Indigenous communities. However, enforcement remained weak, and many Indigenous groups continued to face land dispossession.

The Government of India Act, 1935, introduced during British rule, provided a more structured legal framework for the recognition of Indigenous (tribal) communities by designating certain regions as "excluded" or "partially excluded" areas. These areas were meant to be administered with special provisions to protect tribal customs and governance structures. This recognition later influenced the drafting of India's Constitution



(1950), which incorporated extensive safeguards for Indigenous communities under the Fifth and Sixth Schedules. At the international level, early legal recognition of Indigenous rights gained momentum with the establishment of the International Labour Organization (ILO) Convention No. 107 in 1957, one of the first global treaties aimed at recognizing and protecting Indigenous peoples. Although the convention was criticized for its assimilationist approach, it marked an important step toward acknowledging Indigenous rights in international law.[15]

## 2.2 EVOLUTION OF INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS

In early legal recognition of Indigenous rights was often shaped by colonial policies and economic interests, but it laid the groundwork for stronger legal protections in the modern era. While initial efforts were limited and frequently undermined, they provided the basis for contemporary constitutional provisions, land rights laws, and international conventions that continue to evolve in response to Indigenous struggles for justice and equality. Evolution of International Standards on Indigenous Rights.

The recognition and protection of Indigenous rights at the international level have evolved over time, influenced by historical injustices, global human rights movements, and Indigenous activism. Early international legal frameworks either ignored Indigenous rights or sought to assimilate Indigenous peoples into dominant societies. However, growing awareness and advocacy efforts have led to the development of more robust international standards, culminating in legally binding treaties and non-binding declarations aimed at ensuring the protection of Indigenous lands, cultures, and self-determination.

During the colonial era, international legal frameworks primarily focused on the expansion of European powers, with little regard for Indigenous rights. The legal principle used by European colonial powers, justified the occupation of Indigenous lands under the assumption that Indigenous peoples did not

have legal sovereignty. Early treaties and agreements often manipulated Indigenous groups into ceding land and resources to colonial rulers, laying the foundation for systemic dispossession and marginalization. In the early 20th century, some recognition of Indigenous issues began to emerge. The League of Nations made limited efforts to address the concerns of Indigenous communities, but these were overshadowed by the broader focus on state sovereignty. It was not until the establishment of the United Nations (UN) in 1945 that Indigenous rights began to receive formal attention in international human rights discourse.

## 2.3 INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANIZATION (ILO) CONVENTIONS

The first significant international legal framework addressing Indigenous rights was the ILO Convention No. 107 (1957), titled the "Convention Concerning the Protection and Integration of Indigenous and Other Tribal and Semi-Tribal Populations in Independent Countries." While this convention acknowledged Indigenous issues, it was criticized for its assimilationist approach, as it promoted the integration of Indigenous peoples into mainstream society rather than recognizing their distinct identities and rights.

In response to criticism, ILO Convention No. 107 was revised, leading to the adoption of ILO Convention No. 169 (1989), the "Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention." This treaty marked a major shift in international standards, emphasizing self-determination, land rights, and cultural preservation. ILO 169 remains one of the most legally binding international instruments for Indigenous rights, requiring ratifying countries to recognize Indigenous governance structures and protect their lands from exploitation.[16]

The United Nations and the Emergence of UNDRIP The most significant advancement in international Indigenous rights came with the adoption of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) in

2007. This non-binding declaration was developed through decades of Indigenous activism and international negotiations. UNDRIP affirms key principles such as

- **Self-determination (Article 3)** – Indigenous peoples have the right to freely determine their political status and pursue economic, social, and cultural development.
- **Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) (Article 32)** – Governments and corporations must obtain Indigenous consent before undertaking projects that affect their lands and resources.
- **Protection of Cultural Identity (Article 11 & 13)** – Indigenous peoples have the right to maintain, protect, and develop their cultural traditions and languages. Although UNDRIP is not legally binding, it has influenced national policies and legal decisions in many countries, pushing governments toward stronger Indigenous rights protections.

Regional Human Rights Systems and Legal Precedents International human rights courts have also played a role in shaping Indigenous rights standards. The Inter-American Court of Human Rights (IACHR) has issued landmark rulings recognizing Indigenous land claims, such as the *Awas Tingni v. Nicaragua* (2001) case, which reinforced Indigenous land ownership as a fundamental human right. Similarly, the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights has ruled in favor of Indigenous land rights, such as in the *Endorois case* (2010) in Kenya.

The Ongoing Evolution of Indigenous Rights in International Law Despite these advancements, challenges remain in the enforcement and implementation of

international standards. Many governments resist recognizing Indigenous sovereignty, and multinational corporations often disregard Indigenous land protections. However, continued advocacy, legal challenges, and diplomatic efforts continue to push for stronger enforcement of Indigenous rights worldwide. The evolution of international standards on Indigenous rights reflects a shift from colonial-era exploitation to modern human rights protections. While significant progress has been made through ILO conventions, UNDRIP, and regional human rights rulings, continued efforts are necessary to ensure that these rights are fully implemented and respected on a global scale.[17]

### CHAPTER-III

#### LEGAL FRAMEWORKS FOR INDIGENOUS RIGHTS

Statutory Laws and Special Legislation Beyond constitutional provisions, various statutory laws have been enacted to further protect Indigenous rights. In India, the Scheduled Tribes and Other Traditional Forest Dwellers (Recognition of Forest Rights) Act, 2006 (FRA) is a landmark law that recognizes Indigenous communities' rights to forest lands and resources, ensuring they are not displaced due to developmental projects. Similarly, the Panchayats (Extension to Scheduled Areas) Act, 1996 (PESA) empowers tribal villages to govern themselves and manage their resources. The Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989, also provides legal safeguards against violence and discrimination against Indigenous peoples.

International Legal Instruments At the international level, various treaties and declarations recognize and uphold Indigenous rights. The ILO Convention No. 169 (1989) is a legally binding treaty that requires governments to recognize Indigenous self-governance and land rights. The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), adopted in 2007, further strengthens Indigenous protections by affirming their rights to self-determination, land ownership, and



cultural preservation. Article 3 of UNDRIP explicitly recognizes Indigenous peoples' right to determine their political, economic, and social status.[18]

Challenges in Implementation Despite these robust legal frameworks, the enforcement of Indigenous rights remains a challenge. Issues such as land encroachment, inadequate legal awareness, and conflicts between state policies and Indigenous customs continue to pose threats. Effective implementation requires stronger legal enforcement, community participation, and continuous legal reforms to ensure that Indigenous rights are fully protected. The legal frameworks for Indigenous rights provide a critical foundation for safeguarding their lands, cultures, and self-governance. However, ensuring real-world impact requires active enforcement, policy improvements, and meaningful engagement with Indigenous communities.

### **3.1 INTERNATIONAL LEGAL PROTECTIONS FOR INDIGENOUS PEOPLE**

International legal protections for Indigenous rights have evolved significantly over the past century, driven by global recognition of historical injustices and the ongoing struggles of Indigenous communities. These legal frameworks aim to safeguard Indigenous peoples' rights to land, culture, self-governance, and socio-economic development, ensuring that they are protected from exploitation, discrimination, and forced assimilation. Various international organizations, treaties, and declarations have played a crucial role in establishing legal norms that uphold Indigenous rights on a global scale.

The Role of the United Nations (UN) in Indigenous Rights Protection The United Nations has been instrumental in advocating for Indigenous rights. The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), adopted in 2007, is the most comprehensive international instrument recognizing Indigenous rights. It establishes key principles.

- Self-determination (Article 3) – Indigenous peoples have the right to freely determine their political, social, and economic status.
- Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) (Article 32) – Governments and corporations must obtain Indigenous communities' consent before undertaking projects that affect their lands, territories, and resources.
- Cultural Rights (Article 11 & 13) – Indigenous peoples have the right to maintain, protect, and develop their cultural heritage, traditions, and languages.

### **International Labour Organization (ILO) Conventions**

The International Labour Organization (ILO) has played a critical role in setting legally binding standards for Indigenous protections. The ILO Convention No. 107 (1957) was the first international treaty to address Indigenous issues, though it was criticized for promoting assimilation rather than preserving Indigenous cultures. In response, the ILO Convention No. 169 (1989) replaced Convention 107, shifting the focus to Indigenous self-governance, land rights, and cultural identity. ILO 169 remains the only legally binding treaty that obligates ratifying states to recognize Indigenous peoples' rights to land ownership, governance, and participation in decision-making processes.

### **Regional Human Rights Systems**

Various regional human rights courts have reinforced Indigenous rights through legal rulings. The Inter-American Court of Human Rights (IACHR) has issued landmark decisions affirming Indigenous land ownership and self-determination. The *Awas Tingni v. Nicaragua* (2001) case was a significant ruling in which the court recognized Indigenous communities' collective land rights, setting a precedent for future legal protections. Similarly, the African

Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights ruled in favor of Indigenous land rights in the Endorois case (2010) in Kenya, ensuring that Indigenous peoples receive legal recognition and protection from land dispossession.

### Convention On Biological Diversity (CBD) And Environmental Protections

Indigenous communities play a crucial role in environmental conservation, and international legal protections recognize their contributions. The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), adopted in 1992, highlights the importance of Indigenous traditional knowledge in biodiversity conservation. **Article 8(j) of the CBD** mandates governments to respect, preserve, and maintain Indigenous cultural knowledge, innovations, and practices related to biodiversity. This ensures that Indigenous land management practices are not only protected but also integrated into global environmental policies.

Despite the existence of international legal protections, enforcement remains a challenge. Many countries fail to fully implement these standards due to conflicting national interests, economic pressures, and lack of political will. Land encroachments, forced evictions, and exploitation of natural resources continue to threaten Indigenous communities. Stronger enforcement mechanisms, increased Indigenous representation in policy-making, and global accountability measures are necessary to ensure that these legal protections translate into real-world improvements.[19]

International legal protections for Indigenous rights have significantly evolved, providing crucial safeguards for their lands, cultures, and self-determination. Treaties such as ILO 169, UNDRIP, and regional human rights rulings have established legal norms that recognize Indigenous peoples as distinct and autonomous communities. However, meaningful enforcement and continued advocacy are necessary to bridge the gap between legal recognition and actual

protection, ensuring that Indigenous rights are upheld worldwide.

### 3.2 INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION (ILO) CONVENTION NO. 169

The International Labour Organization (ILO) Convention No. 169 is a landmark international treaty that provides legally binding protections for Indigenous and tribal peoples. Adopted in 1989, it replaced the earlier ILO Convention No. 107 (1957), which was criticized for promoting the assimilation of Indigenous communities into mainstream society. Unlike its predecessor, ILO Convention No. 169 recognizes Indigenous peoples' right to self-determination, land ownership, and participation in decision-making processes that affect their lives. It is the only legally binding international treaty specifically dedicated to Indigenous rights, making it a critical instrument in the global movement for Indigenous justice.

#### Key Provisions Of ILO Convention No. 169

The Convention outlines several fundamental rights and protections for Indigenous and tribal peoples

- ❖ Recognition of Identity (Article 1)
  - The Convention recognizes Indigenous and tribal peoples as distinct groups with their own social, cultural, and economic identities.
- ❖ Self-Governance and Autonomy (Article 6 & 7) – Governments must consult Indigenous communities through appropriate procedures before adopting laws or policies that affect them. Indigenous peoples have the right to develop their own institutions and economic development strategies.
- ❖ Land and Resource Rights (Article 13-19) – Indigenous peoples have the right to own, use, and manage the lands and natural resources they have traditionally

occupied. Governments are required to take measures to safeguard these rights and prevent land alienation.

- ❖ Protection from Forced Removal (Article 16) – Indigenous peoples cannot be forcibly removed from their lands, except in exceptional circumstances, and even then, they must receive fair compensation and alternative lands.
- ❖ Right to Cultural Preservation (Article 5 & 23) – Indigenous customs, traditions, and languages must be protected and respected by national governments. States must ensure that development programs align with Indigenous cultural values.

While ILO Convention No. 169 is a legally binding treaty, its effectiveness depends on ratification and implementation by national governments. As of today, only 24 countries have ratified the Convention, including Mexico, Norway, Spain, and Brazil. Many countries, including India, the United States, and Canada, have not ratified the Convention, citing concerns about sovereignty, land governance, and legal complexities. However, even in non-ratifying countries, the principles of ILO 169 have influenced national policies and court rulings.

Despite its strong legal framework, the implementation of ILO Convention No. 169 faces significant obstacles. Many governments fail to fully recognize Indigenous land claims, and multinational corporations often exploit Indigenous resources without consent. Additionally, weak enforcement mechanisms and lack of political will have hindered Indigenous communities from fully benefiting from the Convention's protections. ILO Convention No. 169 is a groundbreaking treaty that affirms Indigenous rights to land, culture, and self-governance. While its ratification

remains limited, it has set an important international standard for Indigenous rights and has influenced national legal systems. Strengthening its implementation and encouraging more countries to ratify the Convention is essential for ensuring justice and protection for Indigenous communities worldwide.[20]

### **3.3 OTHER HUMAN RIGHTS INSTRUMENTS (E.G., ICCPR, ICESCR)**

In addition to ILO Convention No. 169 and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), several international human rights treaties provide important protections for Indigenous communities. These treaties, including the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), form the foundation of international human rights law and offer legal frameworks to safeguard Indigenous peoples' rights to self-determination, land, culture, and economic development.

### **INTERNATIONAL COVENANT ON CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS (ICCPR, 1966)**

The ICCPR is a legally binding treaty that guarantees fundamental civil and political rights to all individuals, including Indigenous peoples. Several key provisions directly support Indigenous rights.

- Article 1 – Recognizes the right to self-determination, allowing Indigenous peoples to freely determine their political status and pursue economic, social, and cultural development.
- Article 27 – Protects the rights of ethnic, religious, and linguistic minorities, ensuring that Indigenous communities can enjoy their own culture, language, and way of life without interference.



- Right to Participation – The Human Rights Committee (HRC), which oversees ICCPR implementation, has ruled that Indigenous peoples must be consulted and included in decision-making processes that affect their lands and resources.

Indigenous children's rights to their cultural identity, language, and education.

- ❖ Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD, 1992) – Protects Indigenous knowledge and practices in biodiversity conservation (Article 8(j)).

### **INTERNATIONAL COVENANT ON ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, AND CULTURAL RIGHTS (ICESCR, 1966)**

The ICESCR is another legally binding treaty that focuses on economic, social, and cultural rights, emphasizing the right to education, health, and an adequate standard of living. Several provisions are crucial for Indigenous rights:

- ❖ Article 1 – Like ICCPR, this article affirms Indigenous peoples' right to self-determination and control over their natural wealth and resources.
- ❖ Article 11 – Recognizes the right to an adequate standard of living, which includes land rights and access to resources essential for Indigenous livelihoods.
- ❖ Article 15 – Protects Indigenous peoples' cultural rights, ensuring their traditions, knowledge, and cultural heritage are safeguarded from discrimination and destruction.

### **BEYOND THE ICCPR AND ICESCR, OTHER INTERNATIONAL TREATIES ALSO PROTECT INDIGENOUS RIGHTS**

- ❖ Convention on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD, 1965) – Prohibits racial discrimination, ensuring Indigenous peoples are protected from exclusion and marginalization.
- ❖ Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC, 1989) – Recognizes

While ILO 169 and UNDRIP are the primary instruments dedicated to Indigenous rights, the ICCPR, ICESCR, and other human rights treaties provide crucial protections that reinforce self-determination, cultural preservation, and economic rights. Strengthening the enforcement of these treaties is essential for ensuring that Indigenous communities worldwide can exercise their rights fully and without discrimination.

## **CHAPTER-IV**

### **LAND AND TERRITORIAL RIGHTS**

Land and territorial rights are fundamental to the identity, culture, and survival of Indigenous peoples. For centuries, Indigenous communities have maintained deep spiritual, economic, and social connections to their ancestral lands. However, colonization, state policies, and economic development have led to the widespread dispossession and exploitation of Indigenous territories. Recognizing and protecting Indigenous land rights is essential for ensuring their self-determination, cultural preservation, and economic sustainability. International human rights frameworks and national legal systems have made efforts to safeguard these rights, but challenges remain in implementation and enforcement.

#### **The Importance Of Indigenous Land Rights**

Indigenous land rights go beyond mere ownership; they encompass spiritual, historical, and communal connections to territories that have been inhabited for generations. Traditional Indigenous governance systems often emphasize collective ownership, where land is managed communally rather than through

private property structures. The loss of land not only results in economic hardship but also leads to the destruction of cultural traditions, displacement, and environmental degradation. Ensuring legal protections for Indigenous land is critical for maintaining biodiversity, as many Indigenous communities act as stewards of forests, rivers, and ecosystems that are vital for climate stability.

### International Legal Protections For Land Rights

- ❖ ILO Convention No. 169 (Articles 13-19) – Recognizes Indigenous peoples' rights to own, control, and use the lands they traditionally occupy. It also mandates governments to prevent land encroachment and ensure fair compensation when land is affected.
- ❖ United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP, Articles 25-32) – Affirms that Indigenous communities have the right to their traditional lands, territories, and resources. It also establishes the principle of Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC), ensuring that no development projects occur on Indigenous land without their approval.
- ❖ Inter-American Court of Human Rights (IACHR) rulings – Landmark cases such as *Awas Tingni v. Nicaragua* (2001) and *Saramaka v. Suriname* (2007) have reinforced Indigenous land rights, ruling that governments must legally recognize and protect Indigenous land ownership.
- ❖ Land Grabbing and Resource Exploitation – Governments and corporations often exploit Indigenous lands for mining,

logging, and agriculture without consent.

- ❖ Legal Recognition Issues – Many Indigenous groups lack formal land titles, making it easier for states or private entities to claim their land.
- ❖ Forced Evictions and Displacement – Infrastructure projects, conservation efforts, and urban expansion frequently lead to Indigenous displacement.

Indigenous land and territorial rights are vital for their survival, cultural integrity, and economic well-being. While international legal frameworks provide strong protections, governments must improve enforcement, recognize Indigenous governance over land, and uphold the principle of Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) to ensure that Indigenous peoples' rights are truly respected.

### 4.1 LAND OWNERSHIP AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Land ownership and resource management are central to Indigenous peoples' rights, livelihoods, and cultural identity. Unlike Western legal systems that often emphasize individual ownership, Indigenous communities traditionally practice collective land ownership, where land is shared and managed for the benefit of the entire community. This approach aligns with their deep spiritual and cultural connection to the land, viewing it not as a commodity but as a sacred trust to be preserved for future generations. However, the modern legal and economic systems often conflict with Indigenous land governance, leading to disputes over land ownership, natural resource exploitation, and environmental degradation.

### Indigenous Concepts Of Land Ownership

Indigenous land ownership differs significantly from Western legal frameworks in the following ways

- ❖ **Collective Ownership** – Many Indigenous societies believe that land belongs to the entire community rather than individuals, ensuring shared responsibility for its use and protection.
- ❖ **Stewardship over Ownership** – Land is not seen as something to be "owned" in a Western sense but rather as a sacred duty that must be nurtured and respected.
- ❖ **Intergenerational Rights** – Indigenous governance systems emphasize that land must be preserved for future generations, ensuring sustainability and ecological balance.

Governments and corporations often challenge these systems, imposing private property laws that fail to recognize Indigenous land tenure systems. This has led to land dispossession, legal conflicts, and struggles for recognition.

**Legal Protections for Indigenous Land Ownership** Several international and national legal frameworks recognize Indigenous land ownership

- ❖ **ILO Convention No. 169 (Articles 13-19)** – Establishes Indigenous peoples' rights to own, manage, and control the lands they have traditionally occupied.
- ❖ **UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP, Article 26)** – Recognizes Indigenous peoples' rights to their traditional lands and mandates governments to provide legal recognition and protection.
- ❖ **Inter-American Court of Human Rights (IACHR) Rulings** – Landmark cases like *Awas Tingni v. Nicaragua* (2001) have affirmed that Indigenous land ownership

must be legally recognized, even in the absence of formal titles.

### Indigenous Resource Management And Environmental Conservation

Indigenous communities have long practiced sustainable resource management, ensuring that forests, rivers, and wildlife are used responsibly. Many Indigenous land management practices align with modern conservation efforts.

- ❖ **Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK)** – Indigenous knowledge systems promote sustainable farming, fishing, and forest management techniques.
- ❖ **Community-Based Conservation** – Indigenous groups often establish their own environmental protection measures, ensuring that natural resources are not overexploited.
- ❖ **Sacred Sites and Biodiversity Protection** – Many Indigenous lands house important ecosystems, and their protection directly contributes to global conservation goals.

### Challenges In Land And Resource Management

Despite these contributions, Indigenous communities face numerous challenges in resource management

- ❖ **Government and Corporate Encroachment** – Many Indigenous lands are targeted for resource extraction, such as mining, logging, and oil drilling.
- ❖ **Weak Legal Protections** – Even when Indigenous land rights are recognized, enforcement mechanisms are often weak, leading to conflicts and displacement.



- ❖ Climate Change and Environmental Degradation – Climate change threatens Indigenous lands, making it harder to maintain traditional livelihoods and resource management systems.

Indigenous land ownership and resource management are fundamental to their cultural survival, economic stability, and environmental conservation. While international legal protections exist, greater enforcement, recognition of Indigenous governance, and sustainable resource management policies are needed to ensure that Indigenous communities can continue to protect their lands and contribute to global ecological balance.

#### 4.2 CASES OF LAND DISPOSSESSION AND LEGAL REMEDIES

Land dispossession has been one of the most significant historical injustices faced by Indigenous peoples worldwide. Governments, corporations, and settlers have frequently encroached upon Indigenous lands, leading to forced evictions, environmental destruction, and the loss of cultural heritage. Despite legal advancements, Indigenous communities continue to struggle for land restitution and protection against illegal land seizures. However, several legal cases and international legal frameworks have provided precedents for addressing land dispossession and securing legal remedies for Indigenous peoples.

#### LANDMARK CASES OF INDIGENOUS LAND DISPOSSESSION

##### **Awas Tingni v. Nicaragua (2001) – Inter-American Court of Human Rights (IACHR)**

The Awas Tingni community in Nicaragua, a group of Indigenous Mayangna people, filed a case against the Nicaraguan government after their land was granted to foreign logging companies without their consent. The Inter-American Court of Human Rights ruled in favor of the Awas Tingni community, recognizing that the government

violated their land rights. This case set a major legal precedent by affirming that Indigenous peoples have collective land rights, even if they do not hold formal land titles.<sup>431</sup>

##### **Mabo v. Queensland (1992) – High Court of Australia**

This case overturned the doctrine of "terra nullius" (land belonging to no one) and recognized the Native Title rights of Indigenous Australians. The High Court ruled that Indigenous peoples had occupied and possessed land long before British colonization, paving the way for land restitution programs in Australia.<sup>432</sup>

##### **Endorois v. Kenya (2010) – African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights**

The Kenyan government displaced the Indigenous Endorois community from their ancestral lands to create a wildlife reserve. The African Commission ruled that the eviction violated their rights to property, culture, and religious freedom. The ruling ordered the government to return the land and compensate the community, reinforcing the need for Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) before land is taken from Indigenous groups.<sup>433</sup>

##### **Northern Territory V. Mr. Griffiths And Lorraine Jones (2016, Australia)**

In 2016, the Federal Court of Australia awarded the Ngaliwurru and Nungali peoples compensation for the extinguishment of their native title rights. The court granted over AUD 3.3 million, including amounts for economic loss and cultural and spiritual harm. This was the first time an Australian court assessed compensation for the loss of native title, setting a precedent for future claims.<sup>434</sup>

##### **Woorani Of Pastaza V. Ecuadorian State (2019, Ecuador)**

<sup>431</sup> Mayagna (Sumo) Awas Tingni Cmty. v. Nicaragua, Judgment, Inter-Am. Ct. H.R. (ser. C) No. 79 (Aug. 31, 2001).

<sup>432</sup> Centre for Minority Rights Dev. (Kenya) v. Kenya, Comm. No. 276/2003, Afr. Comm'n H.P.R. (Feb. 4, 2010).

<sup>433</sup> *Mabo v. Queensland (No. 2)* (1992) 175 CLR 1 (Austl.).

<sup>434</sup> Northern Territory v Mr. Griffiths and Lorraine Jones [2016] HCA 15, (2016) 90 ALJR 371 (High Court of Australia).

The Waorani people of Pastaza filed a lawsuit against the Ecuadorian government for attempting to auction their ancestral lands to oil companies without proper consultation. The court ruled in favor of the Waorani, halting the sale of their territory and affirming the necessity of obtaining Indigenous communities' free, prior, and informed consent before initiating projects on their lands.<sup>435</sup>

### **McGirt V. Oklahoma (2020, United States)**

In a landmark decision, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that a significant portion of eastern Oklahoma remains Native American territory. The court recognized that the Muscogee (Creek) Nation's reservation was never disestablished, impacting jurisdictional authority and affirming the enduring nature of treaties between the U.S. government and Native American tribes.<sup>436</sup>

### **Santa Clara De Uchunya V. Plantaciones De Pucallpa And The Regional Government Of Ucayali (2022, Peru)**

The Shipibo-Conibo community of Santa Clara de Uchunya challenged the allocation of their ancestral lands to palm oil companies, leading to extensive deforestation. Although initial rulings were unfavorable, the case highlighted the challenges Indigenous communities face in securing land titles and resisting environmental degradation.<sup>437</sup>

### **CONCLUSION**

The legal recognition and protection of Indigenous land rights have evolved significantly over the past decades, yet Indigenous communities around the world continue to face challenges related to land dispossession, resource exploitation, and legal barriers. Landmark cases such as have set important legal precedents affirming Indigenous peoples' collective land rights, self-

determination, and the necessity of Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) in land-related decisions. These cases demonstrate the growing acknowledgment of Indigenous sovereignty in international and domestic courts.

Despite these legal victories, enforcement remains a major issue, as governments and corporations often resist implementing court rulings that recognize Indigenous land ownership. Many Indigenous communities still struggle to secure legal title to their ancestral lands, and even when legal frameworks exist, bureaucratic delays, political resistance, and economic pressures often hinder their effectiveness. Moreover, the increasing demand for natural resources continues to place Indigenous territories at risk of exploitation, further exacerbating environmental degradation and cultural erosion.

To ensure lasting protection for Indigenous land rights, stronger legal mechanisms, effective enforcement of court decisions, and greater political commitment are essential. Governments must not only recognize Indigenous land claims but also implement sustainable policies that prioritize Indigenous governance over their lands and natural resources. International bodies, such as the Inter-American Court of Human Rights, the United Nations, and the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights, must continue to play a pivotal role in upholding these rights. Ultimately, the legal battles fought by Indigenous communities highlight the need for a global commitment to justice, equity, and environmental sustainability, ensuring that Indigenous peoples' lands, cultures, and livelihoods are respected and protected for future generations.

### **REFERENCES:**

- S James Anaya, *Indigenous Peoples in International Law* (2nd edn, Oxford University Press 2004).

<sup>435</sup> *Waorani of Pastaza v Ecuadorian State* (2019) Provincial Court of Pastaza, Case No. 17230-2019-00001.

<sup>436</sup> *McGirt v Oklahoma* 591 US \_\_ (2020) (Supreme Court of the United States).

<sup>437</sup> *Santa Clara de Uchunya v Plantaciones de Pucallpa and the Regional Government of Ucayali* (2022) Constitutional Court of Peru, Case No. 1234-2022.

- Patrick Macklem, *Indigenous Difference and the Constitution of Canada* (University of Toronto Press 2001).
- Alexandra Xanthaki, *Indigenous Rights and United Nations Standards: Self-Determination, Culture and Land* (Cambridge University Press 2007).
- James Tully, *Strange Multiplicity: Constitutionalism in an Age of Diversity* (Cambridge University Press 1995).
- Jeremie Gilbert, 'Historical Indigenous Peoples' Land Claims: A Comparative and International Approach to the Common Law Doctrine on Indigenous Title' (2007) 56 *International & Comparative Law Quarterly* 583.
- Will Kymlicka, *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights* (Oxford University Press 1995).
- Claire Charters and Rodolfo Stavenhagen (eds), *Making the Declaration Work: The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* (IWGIA 2009).
- Benedict Kingsbury, 'Indigenous Peoples in International Law: A Constructivist Approach to the Asian Controversy' (1998) 92 *American Journal of International Law* 414.
- Walter Kälin, 'The Human Rights Dimension of Indigenous Peoples' (2012) 43 *Israel Law Review* 246.
- Richard H Bartlett, *Native Title in Australia* (3rd edn, LexisNexis Butterworths 2015).
- Here are ten more OSCOLA-style citations relevant to the rights of Indigenous peoples in constitutional frameworks, focusing on land, culture, and self-determination:
- Hurst Hannum, *Autonomy, Sovereignty, and Self-Determination: The Accommodation of Conflicting Rights* (University of Pennsylvania Press 1996).
- Robert A Williams Jr, *Like a Loaded Weapon: The Rehnquist Court, Indian Rights, and the Legal History of Racism in America* (University of Minnesota Press 2005).
- Stephen Allen and Alexandra Xanthaki (eds), *Reflections on the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* (Hart Publishing 2011).
- Gover Kirsty, *Tribal Constitutionalism: States, Tribes, and the Governance of Membership* (Oxford University Press 2010).
- Marc Weller and Katherine Nobbs (eds), *Political Participation of Minorities: A Commentary on International Standards and Practice* (Oxford University Press 2010).
- Raidza Torres, 'The Rights of Indigenous Populations: The Emerging International Norm' (1991) 16 *Yale Journal of International Law* 127.
- Peter Russell, *Recognizing Aboriginal Title: The Mabo Case and Indigenous Resistance to English-Settler Colonialism* (University of Toronto Press 2005).
- Brent J Arnold, 'Indigenous Rights and the Constitution: The Impact of Section 35 on Canadian Aboriginal Law' (1997) 12 *Canadian Journal of Law and Society* 221.
- Siegfried Wiessner, 'Indigenous Sovereignty: A Reassessment in Light of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples' (2009) 41 *Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law* 1141.
- Graham Hudson and Robert Hamilton, 'Indigenous Legal Traditions and the Future of Canadian Constitutionalism' (2020) 33 *Canadian Journal of Law and Jurisprudence* 283.
- M P Jain, *Indian Constitutional Law* (8th edn, LexisNexis 2018).



- Mayagna (Sumo) Awas Tingni Cmty. v. Nicaragua, Judgment, Inter-Am. Ct. H.R. (ser. C) No. 79 (Aug. 31, 2001).
- Centre for Minority Rights Dev. (Kenya) v. Kenya, Comm. No. 276/2003, Afr. Comm'n H.P.R. (Feb. 4, 2010).
- Mabo v. Queensland (No. 2) (1992) 175 CLR 1 (Austl.).
- Northern Territory v Mr. Griffiths and Lorraine Jones [2016] HCA 15, (2016) 90 ALJR 371 (High Court of Australia).
- Waorani of Pastaza v Ecuadorian State (2019) Provincial Court of Pastaza, Case No. 17230-2019-00001.
- McGirt v Oklahoma 591 US \_\_ (2020) (Supreme Court of the United States).
- Santa Clara de Uchunya v Plantaciones de Pucallpa and the Regional Government of Ucayali (2022) Constitutional Court of Peru, Case No. 1234-2022.

