

(A) 1. When Joanne Barker says "...the making ethnic or ethnicization of indigenous peoples has been a political strategy of the nation-state to erase the sovereign from the indigenous" she is referring to making them just like other minority groups. To take away that special element (sovereignty). The goal is to boil out cultural differences, national jurisdictions and territorial boundaries by the use of boarding schools, citizenship, adoption, etc. "This incomprehensibility works to collapse indigenous peoples into minority groups that make up the social rainbow of multicultural difference as a means of erasing their unique political status and rights under the precedence of international law" (Barker, 17). All of the myriad social forces of oppression that have racialized (invented) an Indian identity that can be used to usurp indigenous sovereignty. "The real Indian (the mythic full-blood traditionalist born and raised on the reservation in poverty and despair), romanticized as the last vestige of real Indian culture, and the fraud (the mythic mixed-blood urban Indian born and raised without any sense of Indian culture), demonized as the contaminant of all things Indian while serving as testimony to the successes of the colonial project" (Barker, 17).

3. The Maori argument against genetic engineering is related to treaty rights because at "its very heart genetic engineering compromises tino rangatiratanga (sovereignty) as they are no longer able to exercise their kaitiakitanga (guardianship); and are no longer able to maintain their respectful relationship with their environment and ensure balance" (Cram, 55). Maori people have a right to their sovereignty by the Treaty of Waitangi, but there were two versions. Their concerns are based on their belief system and culture, and their relationship with the land. Plus the conservation of flora and fauna for future generations. Maori people are responsible for the genealogies, which every species has; an example is a tree, plants, and essentially all living things. It is their duty, their guardianship. Plus genetic engineering places these genealogies at risk, and they are responsible for them. They feel that it is a cultural offense, and they do see health risks. So now moves are underway to incorporate Maori knowledge and values within the HSNO Act and other acts related to the regulation of genetic engineering. "The assertion by Maori of our tribal rights to full participation in the management of environmental resources reflects indigenous people's calls worldwide" (Cram, 62). "Maori having meaningful control over our own lives and cultural well-being and being able to exercise Kaitiakitanga" (Cram, 62).

4. Hawaii's argument in *Rice v. Cayetano* in that Native Hawaiians' legal position is analogous to that of American Indians fail. Harold Rice attempted to vote in the Hawaii statewide elections for Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA) trustees in 1996 and was turned away. Since trustee elections were limited to residents of Hawaii, who by

blood quantum, are “native Hawaiian” (50% or more) or “Hawaiian” (49% and lower). Even though Rice is a fourth generation Hawaii state resident, he is neither of the blood quantum classifications according to their state constitutional or statutory definitions-- where the terms signify race. So Rice sued the state under the 14th and 15th Amendments. Blood quantum is a major problem for Hawaiians, in regards to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act (HHCA) and the rehabilitation scheme. Where 200,000 acres is set aside for them, but only for agriculture and pastoral purposes. However there is a 50% requirement to lease for a \$1 a year and for only 99 years. This does establish a similarity to Native Americans. The Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA) proceeded in granting a certain percentage of public land for them, this sometimes didn't happen accordingly. There is a real blood logic and racism within the law here. A way it fails to meet with Native Americans is that the Hawaiians lands were never taken by treaty, and since the Constitution says land can only be taken by treaty, it is not the same. Yet there is an Akaka Bill trying to get passed, where it will be similar to Native Americans in the way things are setup.

8. Makah whaling demonstrates the way political sovereignty provides the basis for developing cultural self-determination (autonomy) because they have reserved treaty rights to whale. Whaling for the Makah people is a way to assert their cultural identity as a people, and they can do this by political means because of their reserved treaty rights. It develops their cultural autonomy as a people because it is apart of who they are, and they have a long history of whaling. Since “in their culture whalers were the wealthiest and most honored and respected tribal members, and whaling was the core of the tribe’s culture” (Miller, 128). You can see whaling is of great importance to Makah people because they named their constellations after whales. Whaling was important for survival because whale oil, blubber, and meat were primary food, constituting up to 80% of their diet, and its only important for them now in an attempt to assert their identity, cultural autonomy, and self-determination due to treaty rights; they are binding contracts with the U.S. Yet the International Whaling Commission set an amount of whales that can be taken. Like many other American Indian groups here in the Unites States, they were faced with the assimilation and boarding school era, and termination. However throughout the years the Makah never forgot their whaling culture despite a 70 year hiatus due to depletion (by commercial hunting) of the Gray whale, it remained a crucial and important part of the tribe’s culture.

(B) Part 3: Throughout the Amazon, indigenous peoples are in the midst of undeclared resource wars, their lands either threatened or devastated by transnational corporations. Plus they are backed by complicit nation-states and the rules and pressures of the WTO, the IMF, and World Bank, global corporate interests are driving new roads, pipelines, dams, and power lines deep into forest frontiers to exploit the remaining reserves of oil, minerals, and timber. These projects snake through without thinking of the consequences of the land (long term effects). These have brought devastating consequences to indigenous peoples in the area. In result, they are rising up in battle for cultural, social and economic rights. The U’wa people of Colombia, the Achuar and

Shuar of Ecuador and Peru, and others are rejecting the interventions of economic globalization while demanding basic and universal rights: self-determination, land preservation, cultural integrity, and respect for the earth.

The Inuit and other northerners are already experiencing the direct impacts of human-induced climate change, and we face dramatic problems and social and cultural dislocation in coming years. They rely on their hunting for food, which include whales, walrus, seals, and polar bears. They even say that when they can no longer hunt on the sea ice and eat what they hunt, they will no longer exist as a people. Several Inuit villages have already been so damaged by global warming that relocation, at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars, is now the only option. Yet all they are saying is that governments must develop their economies using appropriate technologies that limit significantly emissions of greenhouse gases.

Worldwide consumption of water is doubling every twenty years, and may be very serious by 2025. Water is crucial for industrial enterprises, and is pretty much soaking up all the water, even human consumption comes in third compared to enterprises. "Given the increased scarcity of water, a global race to privatize and commodity the planet's remaining water is already well under way, with billions of dollars at stake" (Juhasz, 109). The waters of indigenous peoples have been stolen for centuries, through colonialism, imperialism, and globalization. Invaders usually took the most fertile and water-rich areas. The trend is still obvious today; Masai of East Africa are restricted to an every-dwindling fraction of their former supply. The water rich lands of indigenous peoples have provided billions of dollars in income to corporations and governments that have used it primarily for unsustainable, water-intensive industrial agriculture and environmentally destructive resource-extractive industries. Indigenous people are fighting back and joining alliances with local people like peasants, workers, environmentalists, human rights activists in for example Cochabamba. The WTO, World Bank and IMF are those who are working fast to force the privatization of freshwater supplies.

Part 4: Royal Dutch Shell has waged ecological and economic war against the peoples of the Niger Delta for over sixty years, in collaboration with successive Nigerian regimes that have violently and murderously sought to suppress their own peoples. "In response, the Ogoni and other peoples of Nigeria are waging nonviolent resistance against Shell, one of the most powerful multinational corporations in the world, as well as against the International Monetary Fund and the oil rich, corrupt Nigerian government--to reclaim our lands, our livelihoods, and our homes" (Okonta, 153). Oil production activities, such as gas flaring, oil spillage, construction of canals, and waste dumping, have already brought the ecosystem of the Niger Delta to near collapse. The people receive no money with the vast oil resources of the Niger Delta only Shell and the corrupt government. Indigenous people are suffering from air pollution, poisonous gases, water pollution, and soil and land pollution. In result, the Ogoni launched the Movement for the Survival of the Ogoni People (MOSOP) in 1990, to put a stop to this regime of ecological devastation and economic exploitation. This provided an umbrella to a mass mobilization of Ogoni youth groups, etc. It also issued a 30 day ultimatum to pay back rent, royalties and

compensation for oil-devastated lands or leave. The government gave permission for Shell to arm itself, and killed many Ogoni people. Nigeria's indigenous population is speaking out, demanding self-determination and insisting on a new Nigeria informed by true federalism, equality, justice, and negotiated cooperation.

The Philippines is another country rich in mineral resources, and it is a major producer of gold and copper. Under the Philippine Mining Act, only the government may grant mining rights to individuals and corporations. Mining companies, both foreign and local, are given rights to use water and forest resources without permission from indigenous peoples living on the land being mined. So companies have abused the principle of free and prior informed consent and used coercion, deception, and co-optation to gain the consent and participation of indigenous communities. Liberalization of the mining industry has resulted in legalized land grabbing by mining corporations, which has deprived indigenous peoples of their ancestral domain rights. Numerous cases of serious human rights violations against local communities have been reported to the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Yet it was clear from the testimonies of indigenous peoples at the conference that they are opposed to mining corporations and to any extractive industry on their lands.