

The New Language of Assimilation: A Brief Analysis of ILO Convention 169

*Sharon Venne**

For nearly five hundred years, the Eurocentric legal systems have denied us our rights as indigenous peoples. The recent revision by the International Labour Organisation (ILO) of its Convention 107 of June 1957, concerning the Protection and Integration of Indigenous and Other Tribal and Semitribal Populations in Independent Countries (hereafter referred to as Convention 107), in effect continues the Eurocentric framework.

It is still an encumbrance upon us, the indigenous peoples, to prove our rights. The revised text of the ILO Convention concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries (hereafter referred to as Convention 169) represents the ILO's stated intention to remove the assimilationist language of the earlier Convention 107. However, in twenty-two years, only the language of assimilation has changed. Convention 169 is still assimilationist and far more destructive than its predecessor.

* Sharon Venne is an attorney and author who concentrates on the analysis of legal and constitutional issues affecting indigenous peoples. A member of the Cree nation, Ms. Venne works in the Treaty Six area of western Canada.

The revision was begun with a meeting of experts in 1986. As a result of this meeting, a decision was taken by the ILO to initiate a revision process, and the conclusions of the experts' deliberations were tabled before the plenary of the ILO in June 1989. During the preceding two-year revision process, indigenous peoples were present at the meetings to provide input into the process, but they were not successful, due to the nature of the ILO. Consequently, there was no meaningful participation by the indigenous peoples at the ILO, a matter which will be discussed below.

Convention 169

We indigenous peoples have been subjected to an unprecedented assault upon our resources and lands by the invaders. This is especially true of the encroachment of Europeans in the Americas, New Zealand, Australia and the Pacific. Europeans viewed indigenous peoples not as human beings, but as savages without the benefit of a Christian soul. In the development of policies instituted to exploit our lands and resources, the European settlers did not recognize our governments, nor our legal right to our lands and resources. As a result, the Europeans in the Americas and elsewhere exploited our lands and resources without having ownership of them.

Indigenous peoples worldwide have a distinct relationship to the land. In our languages, we call ourselves by a name which associates us directly with the land. Our whole worldview centers on our relationship with the land, the animals, the fish, the plants, the lakes and rivers. Our ceremonies and our laws involve our total world. In our legal system, it is a responsibility to care for the earth which nourishes us. We do not view ourselves as being separate and distinct from the world around us. In discussions with other indigenous peoples, we find a similar worldview about mother earth. In contrast, the non-indigenous peoples tend not to view the earth as central to their existence, but only as something to exploit. These different worldviews are difficult to reconcile when drafting new standards. This reconciliation process requires a change in attitude on both sides, in order to come to some agreement. The nonindigenous peoples must recognize that indigenous peoples have a symbiotic relationship to the earth. "To destroy the earth is to destroy mankind" is not simply a saying, but the very basis of our worldview.

The whole of the ILO document is a failure to recognize our worldview. It demonstrates an underlying predisposition to write the convention from the nonindigenous point of view.

“Populations” and “Peoples”

Convention 169 refers to peoples; Convention 107 referred to populations. What is the distinction between peoples and populations? There is a tendency among the international community to refer to us as populations, but what is a population? A population has no juridical significance in international law. There are many ways to use the term “populations”: it can refer to the number of persons living within a certain area, the number of animals in a park, and to a whole host of other things. However, the term “peoples” has a distinct meaning in international law.

Peoples have human rights. We have our own identity and characteristics, which define our existence. We have our own territory, which we inhabit. In many instances, our people have been dispossessed of our lands by the colonists, but nonetheless we still maintain our relationship to the territory. We have our own governments, legal systems, languages, religions, cultures and economic systems.

Within our territory, prior to the arrival of the nonindigenous people, we maintained our own government. We were sovereign in our territory. However, upon the arrival of the nonindigenous people, neither our legal systems nor our sovereign governments were recognized due to a racial bias against us. However, we still maintain our right to call ourselves peoples, under our own forms of government, using our own legal systems which we never relinquished.

In the process of revising Convention 107, debate in the ILO over the term “peoples” versus “populations” was extensive. Much opposition to the term “peoples” emanates from a fear among non-indigenous peoples that, if indigenous peoples were recognized as peoples, then we would assert our own right to self-determination. Self-determination is a universal right which is applicable to all peoples. This fundamental right is included in both United Nations Covenants on Human Rights which expressly state:

All peoples have the right to self-determination. By virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development.*

As a result of the fear of self-determination, the ILO in the revision process added a qualifier to the term “peoples.” Article 1, subsection 3 of Convention 169 reads:

* See discussion of self-determination and the right of peoples in Erica-Irene A. Daes, “On the Relations between Indigenous Peoples and States,” in this issue of *Without Prejudice—Ed.*

The use of the term "peoples" in this convention shall not be construed as having any implications as regards the rights which may attach to the term under international law.

Through ILO Convention 169, the nonindigenous world has informed us that our right to self-determination does not exist in the international law regime. As an indigenous person, I wonder: does an organization have the right to tell over three hundred million indigenous peoples that they do not have a right to self-determination? It seems to be very racially oriented to have nonindigenous peoples inform us of our rights. Is it not contrary to the spirit of the United Nations to deny whole peoples their right to existence as peoples?

It has been expressed to me by many "experts" in the international law community that our rights as peoples cannot be recognized, because we would assert a right to self-determination by ceding from the nation-state. This is presumption. Where would indigenous peoples move their territory, which was obviously in existence prior to the establishment of the new state? This argument is merely used as an excuse by the colonists to deny us our right to self-determination.

Then whose rights are being protected: those of the indigenous peoples or of the nonindigenous peoples? We did not invade the nonindigenous territories. We do not impose our values, laws, cultures, languages and educational systems upon the nonindigenous peoples. It appears to me, as an indigenous person, that the ILO revision is meant to protect the nonindigenous peoples from the indigenous peoples. Perhaps the revised convention should be called the Convention concerning Nonindigenous Peoples in Indigenous Peoples' Territories and Their Right to Exist in Those Territories.

ILO Convention 169, in this regard, contravenes the work of the United Nations in the field of human rights as it applies to the term "peoples." In the Charter of the United Nations, the term "peoples" is used a number of times. It seems clear that the Charter and covenants of the United Nations use the term to include the right to self-determination. Consistent with the principal of self-determination, this would mean that a people possesses the inalienable right freely to determine its own political, economic and social system, and its own international status. It is not for someone else to predetermine our rights, or to consider what we are going to do with our status. The right of self-determination is ours, and how we exercise that right becomes a matter of discussion between the indigenous nations and the nonindigenous peoples. In Canada, for example, many of the indigenous nations have entered into treaties with the nonindigenous

peoples to regulate our relationship with the nation-state. Such political agreements have been the subject of many debates between indigenous peoples and nonindigenous peoples in an attempt to subvert the will of our people. Canada clearly does not want to recognize our right to enter into treaties, while we remain adamant.

In Convention 169, the term "peoples" has been qualified to have no significance in international law. We do not accept this decision of the ILO. We still maintain our right to call ourselves peoples. Furthermore, we have the right to self-determination to determine our own international status.

False Assumptions

In light of the above, article 3 of the Convention 169 is a mockery.

Indigenous and tribal peoples shall enjoy the full measure of human rights and fundamental freedoms without hindrance or discrimination. The provisions of the convention shall be applied without discrimination to male and female members of these peoples.

What human rights are being referred to here? What fundamental freedoms? If one cannot look to the other international instruments for guidance, then one is forced to look within the ILO document for guidance.

Article 3 then would have to be read in light of article 2, which states that our rights must be placed "on an equal footing" with the "national laws and regulations granted to other members of the population." The concluding part of article 2, subparagraph 2(c), suggests that the governments assist "the members of the peoples concerned to eliminate socioeconomic gaps that may exist between indigenous and other members of the national community." Here are a number of underlying assumptions.

First, it is assumed that we want to be on an equal footing with the nonindigenous peoples; secondly, that the national laws and regulations constitute the proper system to ensure our rights; and thirdly, that our status within the socioeconomic order is one which we find a need to correct. This last assumption carries with it the racial prejudice that our lifestyle is inferior and unacceptable by implying a need to abandon our lifestyle to adopt the nonindigenous socioeconomic system. We have been in this very situation since the arrival of the nonindigenous peoples in our territories. We have always felt a push to assimilate us into the nonindigenous socioeconomic order. True development cannot occur with one system trying to

override another peoples' way of life.

Consent v. Consultation

The conflict between indigenous and nonindigenous values is highlighted in article 6, which addresses the concept of consulting indigenous peoples through "appropriate procedures" when a government prepares to enact legislative and administrative measures on matters which directly affect us. What does the term "consult" mean?

In Canada, the federal government customarily will mail letters to the chiefs, notifying them of new administrative or legislative changes, often without allowing them enough time to conduct an appropriate and thorough analysis of these changes. If the chiefs do not answer these letters within a certain time limit, the government proceeds. When we complain about these changes, we are told that the letter itself was the only form of consultation. This is not consultation. Consultation involves discussion between the parties in an attempt to reach an understanding.

Another method of consultation involves the provision of funds to select groups of indigenous organizations which are not community based. These organizations are required to transmit options and data. Then the government attempts to implement the policy changes or legislative enactments based upon these contractual arrangements. This also is not consultation.

Another popular method of consultation in Canada is to mandate a committee of the House of Commons in the Canadian parliament to convene a hearing on a certain issue. Such hearings are held in Ottawa, Ontario. The majority of the indigenous peoples live in western Canada, which is a three-to-five-hour plane trip to Ottawa. Thus, indigenous peoples are invited to participate in this forum—if we can get to Ottawa. There is no specific exclusion; however, when our people come from the poorest of the poor in Canada, this method of consultation is an obstacle.

As is clearly demonstrated, the term "consult through appropriate measures," for the most part, is a concept predetermined by the governments. They determine the topic, the method, and the people to be consulted. In the final analysis, it is, therefore, also for the governments to determine what does and does not affect us directly.

"Consulting" results in the government having a built-in excuse not to heed our position on any matter. It is used as an alibi to say that they did ask us, but there is no requirement to implement our position. This is one subtle way in which the language of assimilation

has changed since the 1957 convention. What is needed, rather, is language to recognize our right to consent to changes in the legislative and administrative arrangements affecting us. Anyone can consult, but it is very different to reach a measure of consent, as consent implies mutual understanding and acceptance of the arrangement prior to the implementation of the changes.

Article 6, subsection 1(b) refers to the free participation of indigenous peoples in the decision-making process at the elective and administrative levels. This is a very interesting concept. We can freely join in their nonindigenous system; however, participation involves the acceptance of their system. We have experience with such participation in their system. In many instances, our people have become involved in the administrative framework of the government. The result has been that our own people become the tools of assimilation, and these assimilated indigenous persons promote the administrative and legislative changes among our people.

When an indigenous person is elected within the political framework of the nonindigenous system, an onus is placed on that person to follow "the rules of the game," a game which has historically involved our dispossession. It has been suggested to us on a number of occasions that the route out of our predicament is to have our own people within the system. This is not a solution for us. For to be included in their way is the ultimate goal of assimilation. To the indigenous peoples, this process means to be consumed and integrated totally in the foreign body.

Under article 6, subsection 2, the convention suggests that consultation take place "in good faith and in a form appropriate to the circumstances, with the objective of achieving agreement or consent...." What can be made of this subsection? It contains no reference to government obligations to engage in a form of consultation whereby the indigenous peoples would freely participate. If one does not help draft the rules of the game, one is hardly in a position to criticize—or approve—the game, once in progress. It is better for indigenous peoples, in the long run, to ignore the consultation game and leave one side unplayed. We indigenous peoples insist on consent as a prerequisite to any project that affects our life, livelihood or environment. Anything short of this minimum will be rejected.

In general, the language of Convention 169 is negative toward indigenous peoples. For example, article 7 deals presumptuously with the issue of development, implying that indigenous peoples are backward and underdeveloped. Therefore, development and acceptance of

the nonindigenous systems are the preferred way of "progress." In the rush towards development, indigenous peoples could have a right "to exercise control, to the extent possible," according to the language of article 7. Again, someone else—the multinationals and governments who are going to exploit our lands and resources—will determine when and if we are ready to participate in "development." We recognize this as a fundamental defect in the formulation of this subsection. Is it assumed that indigenous peoples want to destroy the land in order to fuel a foreign economic system? A historic, paternalistic attitude is conveyed in article 7, one which considers indigenous peoples incapable of taking care of ourselves and deciding our own future.

Conflicting Legal Systems

One of the most difficult tasks that an indigenous person undertakes in articulating our rights is the discussion concerning our legal system. The nonindigenous peoples immediately refer to custom, or the customary legal system. Our legal systems may be built upon custom, but so, too, are most other peoples' legal systems. For example, no one refers dismissively to the English parliamentary system as a customary system. The British have no written constitution. Likewise, our legal system is not written, and our laws are just as valid and principled as the nonindigenous laws.

As an indigenous person trained in the nonindigenous legal system, I have concluded that the nonindigenous society indeed has no laws. It maintains many rules and regulations, but no laws; and these rules and regulations change with the circumstances. In indigenous society, all our laws are based upon four fundamental principles which do not change. The immutable principles of sharing, respect, love and honor provide indigenous people with the moral grounding which defines relationships and guides action in all aspects of life. Knowing these four principles allows us to maintain a legal system by which people know their roles and behave accordingly.

Under article 8, lip service is given to our legal system. Convention 169 allows for customs and institutions "where...not incompatible with fundamental rights defined by the national legal system...." If the bases for legal systems are rooted in two different needs and concerns, there is very little compatibility. For example, the national (state) system may require a law which justifies the destruction of a whole river system in order to produce hydroelectric power. In contrast, indigenous law would require the maintenance of the river system for

the animals, fish, people and land. In this scenario, the indigenous legal system would be incompatible with the state's goals. The assumption underlying the language of article 8 is that the state legal system is intrinsically good, and any possible alternative or contradiction to it is evil. This language represents a Eurocentric view of the world, which is assimilationist and racist.

The remainder of subsection 2, dealing with "internationally recognized human rights," is a mystery. Considering the convention's first article denying that we are a people, what is the purpose of the wording in articles 7 through 9? It seems to be nothing more than shameless rhetoric.

The Land and Its Resources

The hypocrisy of Convention 169 is blatant in the articles dealing with land in Part II. Article 13, subsection 1, refers to our cultural and spiritual values in relationship to our land and territories. In the article immediately following, the convention only speaks about lands which we "occupy or otherwise use." That is in the present or in the future. This article does not refer to our lands which we traditionally occupied. In many instances, our peoples have been dispossessed of our lands. Thus, under Convention 169, we have no recourse to restore to us the lands of our ancestors. If we indigenous peoples want to regain our lands, we must appeal to the nation-state's legal system to make our case.

In Canada, the land-claims process has been set in place by the federal government. It is not sufficient to assert the claim; in this process, a prejudice is applied against the people making the claim. In order to claim our land, the indigenous peoples must prove to the satisfaction of the federal government that the claim is valid. The documentation must be based upon the requisites of Euro-Canadian law. Once the claim has been researched, the claims department sends the whole claim to the Department of Justice for evaluation. If the claim is deemed invalid, the indigenous peoples retain the option of filing a legal case against the federal government to enforce the claim. However, by complying with such procedures, the indigenous peoples have already presented the total package to the federal claims department which, in effect, hands over all the judicial arguments to the government prior to commencing any legal action. Even if the Department of Justice rules that there exists a valid legal claim, it remains within the province of the government to negotiate. In many instances, claims negotiations have been ongoing for fifty or more

years.

Moreover, without addressing such inequitable state practices, article 14, subsection 3 also fails to recognize the indigenous peoples' rights to claim their ancestral lands. This article is another example of the assimilationist language which has crept into the convention, and it has proved to be more cunning than the previous language of Convention 107.

The language of article 15 on the rights to natural resources is truly shameful. Enshrined in Convention 169 is the concept of *terra nullius*; that is, our lands were uninhabited and uncultivated, free for the taking. Article 15, subsection 2 states:

In cases in which the state retains the ownership of mineral or subsurface resources or rights to other resources pertaining to lands, governments shall establish or maintain procedures through which they shall consult these peoples, with a view of ascertaining whether and to what degree their interests would be prejudiced, before undertaking or permitting any programs for the exploration or exploitation of such resources pertaining to their lands. The peoples concerned shall wherever possible participate in the benefits of such activities, and shall receive fair compensation for any damages which they may sustain as a result of such activities.

This language contains no provision for the indigenous peoples' ownership of the resources of their lands. In addition, compensation to indigenous peoples is to be provided only "wherever possible" to share in the wealth of their resources. It is left entirely to the government's discretion to compensate our people for the loss of land or the destruction of the environment. In one instance in Canada, a multinational company involved with heavy oilsands extraction told a group of indigenous trappers and hunters that their lifestyle was not changed by the development. One of the indigenous hunters responded by asking how the animals could survive a leap over a man-made pit one mile wide? How do you compensate a people for the total destruction of their livelihood and environment? Such unconscientious development of resources, in many instances, involves not only the destruction of the environment, but of a whole way of life. The result is that indigenous peoples are thrown onto the ash heap, while their only recourse for daily survival remains to live off social assistance controlled by the state. All around us, development proceeds unchecked without any benefits to us.

More Relocation/Dislocation

The relocation provisions in article 16 are truly a work of art. There is an underlying presumption that allows continued dispossession of indigenous peoples from their land to make way for state-sponsored and state-approved development. Article 16, subsection 1 contains very nice language about not removing us from our lands which we occupy. However, in the next subsection, relocation under "exceptional circumstances" will be permitted. Of course, there is a right to consent, but if consent is not obtainable, then the national government can implement "appropriate procedures" to effect relocation.

Under article 16, subsection 4 deals with the need to relocate after exploitation has taken place. When the lands have been completely destroyed and no value can be obtained by having the peoples return, the convention makes available three options: return, transfer to alternative land, or compensation. Of these, transfer to lands of quality "at least equal to" the lands previously occupied can be provided to indigenous peoples for our present needs and future development. In spite of the general recognition in article 13 concerning our relationship to the land, there is no proscription against changing the location of the people. Does no one realize that our relationship to the land is to a particular place? There seems to be an assumption that any land will be adequate. In our worldview, the land which identifies us does not change like the wind. Removing us from our land base is, in fact, to take away our lifeforce.

In the instances where indigenous peoples have been relocated by development, there has been a destruction of the people's lifestyle, causing them to become disoriented and disquieted. If there is a legal need for the state to move a people from land, what is the purpose of then stating that land will be given in lieu of the land taken? Is it merely legal protection, a stalling tactic until the next time the state government needs the land for development and exploitation? It appears that the number of times a people could be relocated would be endless.

With regard to compensation, the government and the multinationals can salve their consciences by providing monetary compensation to the people. But again, we return to the essential question: how much compensation can be paid to a people for the loss of their way of life? Can a lifestyle be returned to a people once it is destroyed? The assimilationist mode would suggest that compensation, either in cash or kind, is sufficient to justify the removal of the peoples from

their lands. At present, there is a case before the UN Subcommission on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities concerning the Hopi-Navajo peoples in the southwestern United States.* In this case, the land is rich in natural resources which the federal government and corporate interests claim to need. Thus, the government has adopted legislation to remove the people from their lands without their consent. In spite of the numerous attempts to remove them, the traditional people maintain their right to stay on the land, citing reasons that removal would effectively destroy them as a people. Nonetheless, the United States Government insists upon their removal. The recommended solution which may come from the UN subcommission will indeed be of interest to all indigenous peoples.

ILO Revision Process

Indigenous peoples were present at the ILO revision process in June 1989. The ILO is composed of a tripartite group: workers, employers and governments. Within the drafting group, the vote on the revised convention was split three ways. However, the plenary allowed the governments to cast half of the votes. Where were the indigenous peoples in the process? For the most part, indigenous peoples were in the halls commenting upon the discussions which were occurring behind closed doors. On all the major provisions of Convention 169, the negotiations took place out of public view. Decisions were then merely reported to the meetings.

When the ILO reached a decision concerning the term "peoples," many indigenous peoples left Geneva, disillusioned. They felt that no justice could be achieved in an organization which did not even recognize us as "peoples."

When the debate over the use of the terms "consent" versus "consult" was decided in favor of "consult," the disillusionment grew. However, we already knew that the convention was aimed at total assimilation when we were informed about the provisions on the land and resources. As a result of the decisions made in the revision process, a speech was delivered to the plenary of the ILO on behalf of the representatives of the indigenous peoples.**

* See Anita Parlow, "Cry, Sacred Ground: Big Mountain, U.S.A.," in *Without Prejudice* Vol. II, No. 1, 15-39—Ed.

** The transcript of the speech by Sharon Venne to the ILO plenary is published by the *International Labour Conference Provisional Record*, No. 31, Seventy-sixth Session (Geneva: ILO, 1989), [unbound edition] 6-7—Ed.

Indigenous Preparatory Meeting

During the week of 25 July 1989, indigenous peoples from around the world met in Geneva to review the latest developments in the area of human rights. As a result of the meeting following discussions on Convention 169, the representatives of indigenous peoples adopted a resolution to reject the convention. This resolution was tabled with the UN Working Group on Indigenous Populations (*sic*), meeting in Geneva the following week.*

Each year, the working group includes an agenda item on recent developments in the establishment of human rights standards. Indigenous peoples were aware that a representative of the ILO would be present at the working group to submit a report,** and the indigenous peoples were ready to demonstrate their disgust at Convention 169. During the presentation by the ILO representative, over three hundred indigenous people left their seats and walked out of the conference room in protest.

That demonstration served two purposes. First of all, indigenous peoples are not prepared to accept the decisions of other people as applying to us. Our right to self-determination is central to our ability to analyze and to make critical decisions on matters directly affecting our lives. We object to the wording of Convention 169, which portrays us as objects of assimilation. As indigenous peoples from around the world gathered in Geneva, sharing our collective experiences proved invaluable in the analysis of Convention 169. Secondly, the Working Group on Indigenous Populations (*sic*) is in the process of drafting a new declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples, and we do not want that declaration to resemble Convention 169.

Conclusion

Over three hundred million indigenous people worldwide continue to be on the frontline. At stake are the economic interests of the multinationals and states which view indigenous peoples as a hindrance to development as they perceive it. Historically, the most expedient method of dealing with the "indigenous problem" has been

* A copy of the resolution is attached as an appendix to this essay—Ed.

** The transcript of ILO representative Lee Swepston's report to the UN Working Group on Indigenous Populations is excerpted in the introduction to the text of Convention 169, reprinted as a Special Document in this issue of *Without Prejudice*—Ed.

the elimination of the people. More recently, human rights activists have been looking at the destruction of our people, whereby whole nations have been extinguished by the colonists. These acts of violence and aggression occurred when the nonindigenous people wanted our lands and resources. These acts, of course, are continuing today. However, the colonists have become a little more sophisticated. In many of the so-called First World countries, the language of assimilation has changed, but the actions of assimilation and destruction continue unabated. The results are enshrined within Convention 169.

We indigenous peoples will not go away from our territories. We are the caretakers of mother earth. Once the indigenous peoples have been destroyed, who will care for mother earth? It is a question which haunts us all. I have concluded that greed has no conscience and the colonists will stop at nothing to hoard the resources and land for themselves, even to their own destruction, and the destruction of us all. It is a pity.

Appendix

Resolution of the Indigenous Peoples Preparatory Meeting Relating to the International Labour Organisation's Convention Concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries, Geneva, 28 July 1989.

The Indigenous Peoples Preparatory Meeting, [convening] at the Palais des Nations from 24 through 28 July 1989, after analyzing the Revised International Labour Organisation (ILO) Convention on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries, 1989;

Noting that the ILO has revised its Convention 107 and as a result has adopted the Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989;

Observing that the revision process was paternalistic and racially discriminatory;

Emphasizing that the revision process reduced indigenous peoples to indirect and demeaning levels of participation and that the ILO only wanted indigenous peoples present to lend credibility to the process;

Recalling that the ILO is a most inappropriate forum to determine the rights of indigenous peoples;

Knowing governments and employers cooperated to profit from our lands, territories and resources;

Bearing in mind that the ILO did little to promote understanding or provide information on indigenous rights to workers, employers and governments;

Knowing that we are peoples in international law and that pronouncements by the ILO does not change this status;

Determined that we shall retain our territories despite the ILO's attempts at limiting our territorial rights;

Denouncing the ILO's Eurocentric view of legal systems and knowing that indigenous legal systems which existed prior to any international laws shall continue;

Bearing in mind that indigenous peoples shall view governments ratifying the revised convention as exposing their intentions towards indigenous peoples;

Motivated by our desire to see international law reflect our real aspirations and rights, [hereby]:

1. *Calls upon* indigenous peoples all over the world to seize every opportunity to condemn the ILO and the revision process;
2. *Calls upon* states not to ratify the revised convention;
3. *Calls upon* indigenous peoples to monitor the ILO and governments in the implementation of the convention;
4. *Calls upon* support groups of indigenous peoples to urge states not to ratify the convention and to publish lists of governments who ratify the revised convention;
5. *Calls upon* members of the Working Group [on Indigenous Populations] and the Subcommission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities to condemn the racist revision.
6. *Calls upon* the working group to monitor the implementation of the revised convention.
7. *Calls upon* governments and human rights experts involved in the process of drafting the [Universal] Declaration on Rights of Indigenous Peoples not to repeat the mistake of the ILO.
8. *Calls upon* the working group, the subcommission and governments to disregard the terms of the revised convention in the process of achieving a meaningful development [of] the Declaration on [the] Rights of Indigenous Peoples.