

A Civil Society Approach to Security: Insights from Global Indigenous Advocacy

by

Marina dos Santos Candeia

B.A., University of Regina, 2019

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts

in the

School for International Studies
Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences

© Marina dos Santos Candeia 2022

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

Summer 2022

Copyright in this work rests with the author. Please ensure that any reproduction or re-use is done in accordance with the relevant national copyright legislation.

Declaration of Committee

Name: Marina dos Santos Candeia

Degree: Master of Arts (International Studies)

Thesis title: A Civil Society Approach to Security: Insights from Global Indigenous Advocacy

Committee: **Chair: Nicole Jackson**
Associate Professor, International Studies

Megan MacKenzie
Supervisor
Professor, International Studies

Christopher Gibson
Committee Member
Associate Professor, International Studies

Edana Beauvais
Examiner
Assistant Professor, Political Science

Abstract

This thesis entails a case study of the *Articulação dos Povos Indígenas do Brasil* (APIB) as a model for promoting and protecting Indigenous security internationally. Data was collected from primary documents published by the APIB between 2013 and 2021. Three major findings can be drawn. The data corroborates with the literature in that the protection of Indigenous land rights is paramount for Indigenous security; accordingly, the APIB's efforts to promote land rights reaffirm its significance in the struggle against violence towards Indigenous peoples in Brazil. Moreover, given the deep-rooted disconnect between decision-makers and Indigenous groups, the APIB's initiatives to promote Indigenous political participation and prior consultation have increased Indigenous peoples' influence in matters of security. Finally, the APIB has been a key player in monitoring Brazil's attitudes towards Indigenous peoples, often acting as a deterrent against the looming regression of Indigenous security in the current political context.

Keywords: security; civil society organizations; Indigenous peoples; UNDRIP; Brazil

To my family, for always believing in me.

Acknowledgements

This thesis would not have been possible without the help and support I received from numerous people in my life. This has been a challenging but rewarding project, and it is only fair to acknowledge all the encouragement, kindness, and reassurance I've been granted.

First, I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr. Megan MacKenzie, for her continuous support, advice, and kindness throughout this process. Her dedication and trust in my work throughout this time have been vital to bring this project to life.

I am also grateful to my family and friends for their unconditional support.

To my partner Benjamin for being so understanding, loving, and supportive throughout this process; to Brett and Jennie for helping me unwind and keep my mental health in check; to Kathy and Bryce for the many Sunday night dinners and help getting settled in a new city; and to my dog Maple for keeping me company, making me smile, and forcing me to take breaks.

Também quero agradecer à minha família de coração por estar sempre ao meu lado e me apoiar incondicionalmente em todas as minhas aventuras. Pai, Mãe e Pedro, não existem palavras o suficiente para expressar o quanto eu tenho a agradecer. Este projeto não é só uma conquista minha – é de vocês.

Por fim, agradeço à família Bacon por todo o amor provindo da nossa amizade, o qual sempre me motiva a nunca desistir.

Table of Contents

Declaration of Committee	ii
Abstract	iii
Dedication	iv
Acknowledgements	v
Table of Contents	vi
List of Acronyms.....	vii
Glossary.....	viii
Chapter 1. Introduction	1
Research Design and Methodology.....	3
Case Selection	3
Method of Data Collection	5
Method of Data Analysis.....	6
Ethical Considerations.....	7
Chapter 2. Review of the Literature.....	10
The International Movement for Indigenous Rights and the Establishment of the UNDRIP	10
Defining Indigenous Security.....	15
The Failure of International Cooperation between States and the Role of Civil Society in Upholding Indigenous Rights.....	20
Chapter 3. Threats to Indigenous Security in Brazil	25
Historical Context of Insecurity: From the First Invasion through the 19 th Century	26
Threats to Indigenous Peoples throughout the 20 th Century	27
Current Threats to Indigenous Security in Brazil.....	32
Chapter 4. The APIB’s Role in Promoting and Protecting Indigenous Security: Key Findings and Takeaways	41
Safety, Land Rights, and the Struggle Against Violence	42
A Bottom-Up Approach: Prior Consultation, Participation, and Solidarity.....	45
Mobilizing Citizens and Pressuring Governments Against the Regression of Rights	48
Chapter 5. Conclusion	52
References.....	55
Appendix Primary Documents	68

List of Acronyms

APIB	<i>Articulação dos Povos Indígenas do Brasil</i>
ATL	<i>Acampamento Terra Livre</i>
FUNAI	<i>Fundação Nacional do Índio</i>
IACHR	Inter-American Commission on Human Rights
ILO Convention 169	International Labor Organization Convention 169 on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries
MNI	<i>Mobilização Nacional Indígena</i>
SPI	<i>Serviço de Proteção aos Índios</i>
UN	United Nations
UNDRIP	United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples
UNHRC	United Nations Human Rights Council
WCIP	World Council of Indigenous Peoples

Glossary

Garimpeiro

Gold miner

Ruralista

Brazilian term used to refer to a member of Congress that defends agribusiness interests.

Chapter 1.

Introduction

Indigenous affairs have gained increased support in the international community, and cooperation between Indigenous peoples worldwide has led to considerable progress in advancing international norms in support of Indigenous rights. The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), adopted by the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) in 2007, recognizes rights that are inherent to Indigenous societies, such as the rights to self-determination, to not be forcibly removed from their lands or territories, to not be subjected to any acts of genocide, and to live in freedom, peace, and security as distinct peoples (United Nations [UN], 2007). Still, many signatory countries continue to blatantly violate these rights. In Brazil, for instance, resource extraction and government-sponsored economic development projects have led to drastic repercussions for Indigenous communities and undermined their security with issues such as contaminated water, violent conflict, and the spread of infectious diseases (Basta et al., 2016; *Conselho Indigenista Missionário* [CIMI], 2020, 2021; *Comissão Nacional da Verdade* [CNV], 2014; Oliveira, 2020; Plummer, 2015). The Brazilian state has a long pattern of violence against Indigenous peoples, including slavery, forced assimilation, displacement, exclusion from legislative processes, and marginalization from broader society (CNV, 2014; Teles Junior, 2018). The country has failed to address the security needs of Indigenous communities over the years and has been complicit in their genocide and overall insecurity (CNV, 2014; Raftopoulos & Morley, 2020; Teles Junior, 2018).

Despite states' failures in upholding Indigenous rights, there are no mechanisms in international law to enforce compliance with international agreements such as the UNDRIP, and international cooperation has been unsuccessful in ensuring state compliance with such agreements (Alvarado, 2015; Tramontana, 2012). Hence, civil society organizations in various countries have played a significant activist role, including in raising awareness, denouncing violations of Indigenous rights, and promoting Indigenous security. In Brazil, the *Articulação dos Povos Indígenas do Brasil* (APIB), a national organization for Indigenous advocacy in the country, has brought forward

initiatives to work closely with Indigenous communities, advocate for their rights at the national and international levels and raise awareness of the challenges they face (APIB, n.d.-c). The organization aims to provide a voice for people who have been historically marginalized and excluded from decision-making processes. The APIB prides itself in enhancing Indigenous peoples' ability to influence policy decisions in matters of land rights, sustainability, social justice, community safety, and Indigenous health and education, due to its broad reach at the national level and status as a nationally recognized representative of Indigenous communities (APIB, n.d.-c, 2020, 2021). The APIB is unique in the way it operates at the local, national, and international levels; as an umbrella organization, the APIB works with many local Indigenous groups, builds valuable connections with international groups and organizations and positions itself as an active player in the global Indigenous movement.

Organizations such as the APIB have the potential to increase awareness of Indigenous issues beyond the local and national levels. This thesis intends to answer the following question: ***What insights do the APIB's advocacy efforts offer in terms of promoting and protecting Indigenous security internationally?*** The purpose of this study is to illustrate how civil society actors participate in national and international efforts to secure Indigenous rights and how they can contribute to enhancing security for Indigenous peoples and holding states accountable. Exploring this case study can help build a better global understanding of civil society participation in international law and justice, particularly as it relates to upholding Indigenous peoples' right to live in freedom, peace, and security as distinct peoples. To support this study, I draw on interdisciplinary works by Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars concerning security, self-determination, international cooperation, and civil society participation.

This thesis is organized as follows: chapter 1 provides an overview of the research design and methodology selected for the study. Following, chapter 2 presents the theoretical framework, which draws from the literature on the global Indigenous rights movement, critical interpretations of security, current and past efforts to secure Indigenous rights internationally, and the participation of civil society organizations in international law. Chapter 3 provides contextual information on past and current threats to Indigenous security in Brazil. Results of the study are presented in chapter 4, with an analysis and discussion of the APIB's efforts to promote and protect Indigenous security in Brazil. Finally, the thesis will conclude.

Research Design and Methodology

This research entails a case study of the APIB as a potential model of international advocacy for Indigenous peoples' rights, particularly regarding the promotion and protection of Indigenous security. This case study addresses the following research question: *What insights do the APIB's advocacy efforts offer in terms of promoting and protecting Indigenous security internationally?* In particular, I seek to illustrate how the APIB serves as an example of citizen-led participation in efforts to secure Indigenous rights and hold states accountable to their international commitments to Indigenous peoples. By exploring this case study, I aim to help build a better global understanding of civil society participation in international law and justice, particularly when it comes to upholding Indigenous peoples' right to live in freedom, peace, and security as distinct peoples.

To answer this research question, I undertake an analysis of primary documents published by the APIB to explore the following three themes related to the promotion and protection of Indigenous peoples' right to live in freedom, peace, and security as distinct peoples: the APIB's advocacy efforts, the gaps the organization aims to address with its activism, and the outcomes of its work. Notably, this study is not meant as a descriptive or quantitative content analysis of each document; instead, I focus on identifying common patterns according to the APIB's main efforts, conceptual focus, and initiatives in the period covered by this study. By using qualitative methods, this case study can provide a comprehensive, in-depth account of the data in question, given the emphasis on a unique case. This chapter describes the research design in detail, including the rationale for case selection, methods of data collection and analysis, and ethical considerations of the study.

Case Selection

This case study focuses on the APIB, a national Indigenous organization in Brazil that advocates for Indigenous rights nationally and internationally. The APIB initially emerged in 2005 from an annual reunion among many Indigenous leaders and organizations from across Brazil, the *Acampamento Terra Livre* (ATL) (APIB, n.d.-c, para. 4). The ATL is part of a national movement that demands action and accountability from the Brazilian state towards Indigenous peoples (APIB, n.d.-c, para. 4). Led by

Indigenous leaders from across the country, the APIB is an umbrella organization comprised of seven regional organizations representing Indigenous peoples in all 26 states of Brazil: *Coordenação das Organizações Indígenas da Amazônia Brasileira* (COIAB); *Articulação dos Povos Indígenas do Nordeste, Minas Gerais e Espírito Santo* (APOINME); *Conselho do Povo Terena* (Conselho Terena); *Grande Assembleia do Povo Guarani* (Aty Guasu); *Comissão Guarani Yvyrupa* (CGY); *Articulação dos Povos Indígenas do Sudeste* (ARPINSUDESTE); and *Articulação dos Povos Indígenas da Região Sul* (ARPINSUL) (APIB, n.d.-c).

Among its objectives, the APIB aims to promote and protect Indigenous rights by uniting Indigenous peoples and organizations across the country and by building alliances and strengthening cooperation with the international Indigenous movement (APIB, n.d.-c). The APIB's significant efforts and accomplishments in terms of promoting and protecting Indigenous rights have contributed to its strong reputation as a national leader in Indigenous advocacy. The organization, which has broad reach across Brazil and partners with many other Brazilian agencies, has recently expanded its international collaborations and has been increasingly building partnerships with Indigenous organizations and allies in over fifty countries (APIB, 2021). The APIB's drive to take part in the global Indigenous rights movement is an indication of its commitment to global solidarity among Indigenous peoples and organizations and can strengthen its efforts in terms of Indigenous security.

The APIB is selected for this case study primarily due to the nature of the advocacy work it engages in. While advocating for Indigenous rights more broadly, the APIB takes significant efforts towards promoting security for Indigenous peoples and advocates extensively for the protection of land rights, personal and community safety, and political rights, including Indigenous peoples' right to prior consultation (APIB, 2021; Indigenous Peoples Rights International [IPRI] & APIB, 2021). By coordinating the advocacy efforts of local and regional Indigenous organizations and uniting the voices of Indigenous peoples across Brazil, the APIB aims to enhance Indigenous people's influence in decision-making processes that affect them, including matters of Indigenous security (APIB, n.d.-c). Moreover, the APIB's reach at the international level can further support its endeavors. As will be demonstrated in this study, the APIB's advocacy work has been crucial in a country with a long history of settler colonialism, exploration, and structural violence against Indigenous peoples, particularly considering that this pattern

of violence has persisted over time and intensified in recent years. Organizations such as the APIB have the potential to raise awareness of Indigenous rights violations beyond borders, lead resistance, and prompt effective change.

Method of Data Collection

This thesis collects data from documents which were written and published by the APIB between 2013 and 2021. The decision to use primary documents in this study is based on the premise that the most comprehensive and precise information about the APIB's efforts must come directly from the organization itself rather than secondary sources. Selection criteria is based on documents' subject matter, temporal scope, and availability. First, I select documents containing information about the APIB's advocacy efforts as they relate to Indigenous peoples' right to live in freedom, peace, and security as distinct peoples. For the purpose of this study, this includes advocacy work relating to, or attempting to address issues of land and territorial disputes, forced displacement, interpersonal violence, environmental destruction, food and water security, and systemic violence. Secondly, documents analyzed in this study are published between August 2013 and December 2021. This timeframe is chosen based on the availability of relevant primary documents and aiming to include the most current information as possible. Further, to ensure ease of accessibility due to geographical location and to mitigate difficulties related to travel in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, only documents that are available online to the public are selected.

Following the aforementioned criteria, data collection relies on materials available on two online platforms managed by the APIB: the blog *Mobilização Nacional Indígena* (MNI), which shares its name with Brazil's largest Indigenous movement, and the APIB's official website (APIB, n.d.-a, n.d.-b). The APIB used the MNI blog from August 2013 through May 2019 as a platform where it provided frequent updates, relevant news, press releases, and short reports on its activities. Data collected from the blog is available in its Archive section, which is divided by month of publication (APIB, n.d.-a). Although the MNI blog also contains publications written by representatives of other organizations, only those that have not been fully credited to third parties are selected for this study. For clarification, documents that are co-authored by the APIB and another party are also selected for the study, as they help demonstrate the strength of collaborations and solidarity between distinct civil society groups. Moreover, the APIB's

official website's Publications page stores a compilation of comprehensive documents and reports from 2019 onwards (APIB, n.d.-b). Accordingly, documents that were published between 2019 and 2021 are collected from that webpage. Although the two chosen platforms also contain publications written by representatives of other organizations, only those publications that have not been fully credited to third parties are selected for this study. For further clarification, documents that are co-authored by the APIB and another party are included in the data collection, as they can help demonstrate the strength of collaborations and solidarity between distinct civil society groups.

A total of 143 primary documents published over the eight-year period are selected for data collection and analysis. While a select number of documents are directly referenced in this thesis, a full list of documents can be found in the Appendix.

Method of Data Analysis

Following data collection, this thesis employs thematic document analysis to interpret the APIB's efforts to promote and protect Indigenous security. To reiterate, the analysis centers on three particular themes, namely the APIB's advocacy efforts, the gaps the organization aims to address with its activism, and the outcomes of its work. Document analysis has been used in academic and policy research to uncover the implicit and explicit values of the organization under study, as well as the "historical antecedents [that] might exist" in the organization's programs and policies (Simons, 2020, p. 14). This method of analysis can be particularly useful in qualitative case studies, since it provides an avenue to understand data within particular contexts, allows the researcher to observe changes over time, encourages further questions and observation, enables fact-checking, and can provide supplementary data in certain cases (Bowen, 2009). Thus, this case study chooses to perform a thematic analysis of the data with the purpose of identifying common patterns in civil society action for Indigenous security and building a deeper understanding of the intersection between the Indigenous rights movement and international efforts towards security.

Importantly, although each individual document is closely examined, the intent of the analysis is not to provide a thorough description of the documents' content, but rather to find the overarching themes in the data. The analysis is guided by this study's

research question, which aims to obtain insight on the role of civil society actors in upholding Indigenous security and holding states accountable to their international commitments towards Indigenous peoples. Accordingly, when examining each document, I specifically look for references to Indigenous security in relation to international cooperation, global solidarity, international organizations, and international law in order to identify ways in which the APIB's efforts intersect with the literature on the international Indigenous rights movement, Indigenous security, and international efforts to uphold Indigenous rights. Based on each individual document's overall message in relation to these points, I identify themes and categorize the data accordingly. It must be noted that the process of categorizing and coding the data is dynamic, and while certain themes are identified early in the analysis, others emerge later in the process. Moreover, in many instances, documents are coded into more than one category, as they contain multifaceted information that reaches across multiple themes.

After all documents are categorized and coded according to their overarching themes, the data is analyzed to find common patterns and trends in the ways the APIB's efforts to promote and protect Indigenous security intersect with the literature. The key study findings are presented later in chapter 4.

Ethical Considerations

Case study research is a valuable way to gain deeper understanding of a unique case (Simons, 2020). Nevertheless, case study research can implicate significant ethical challenges (Canadian Institutes of Health Research et al., 2018). One ethical concern that tends to emerge in case studies is in evaluating and deciding which pieces of information ought to be publicized, particularly if there is exchange of sensitive or confidential information in "settings where people are identifiable" (Simons, 2020, p. 16). Further, the privacy of those involved must be a primary concern to secure participants' welfare and avoid potential drawbacks of participating in a research study (Canadian Institutes of Health Research et al., 2018). Hence, to mitigate this risk and avoid complications related to confidentiality, this study utilizes open-access data that has already been made available to the public by the APIB.

My choice of research design and methods also takes into consideration the fact that social research has often harmed participants and their surrounding communities,

particularly when involving Indigenous populations (Boilevin et al., 2019; Chilisa & Tsheko, 2014; L. T. Smith, 2021). Certain academic disciplines, particularly within the social sciences, have persistently treated Indigenous individuals and communities as subjects of academic research, who are not always able to enjoy any benefits from such studies and are instead hindered by them (Boilevin et al., 2019; Masching, 2014; L. T. Smith, 2021). Furthermore, academic researchers tend to overlook the harmful implications of studying Indigenous communities, including the potential for reigniting past and ongoing trauma (Boilevin et al., 2019; L. T. Smith, 2021).

Accordingly, Indigenous researchers and academics have proposed ways to decolonize academic research and engage in ethical research that meets community needs, asks questions that are relevant to the community, and utilizes Indigenous methodologies throughout the study (Boilevin et al., 2019; Chilisa & Tsheko, 2014; Masching, 2014; L. T. Smith, 2021). All research taking place in Indigenous communities must follow ethical protocols and respect the “history, culture, knowledge, values, rights and aspirations of the community” (Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs [UBCIC], 2005, p. 39). Accordingly, an ethical approach to research involving Indigenous communities and individuals “demands attention to history, politics and the right to self-determination” (Masching, 2014, p. 8). Ethical research in Indigenous communities requires, among others: permission, direction and involvement from the community; informed consent from participants; balancing of expectations; respect for traditional protocols; accuracy in knowledge collection interpretation, and presentation; knowledge-sharing that is consistent with traditional teachings and practices; and protection of the data against potential misuse and misunderstanding (UBCIC, 2005).

Moreover, in studies involving Indigenous individuals, Indigenous methods of data collection, which focus on strong relations and reciprocity, are preferred instead of traditional qualitative methods of data collection, as they aim to address a power imbalance between the researcher and the researched (Chilisa & Tsheko, 2014; Masching, 2014). That said, conversational methods of data collection that are central to Indigenous methodologies, such as focus groups and conversation circles, have been difficult to employ in this case study for a few reasons. First, although the original plan for data collection in this project was to conduct conversations with experts from the APIB, I encountered difficulties in establishing contact and building a relationship with the organization. Accordingly, I had to consider whether to insist on having the

participation of the APIB's workers in the study or acknowledge and respect their boundaries and time limitations, given the high stakes of their work. Moreover, this study takes place at a time when the COVID-19 pandemic has created serious health risks, particularly to marginalized populations such as Indigenous communities (Lopes & Lima, 2020; Thompson et al., 2021). Thus, any form of in-person contact with study participants at this point would unnecessarily put them at risk. Likewise, while technology has adapted to facilitate remote connections since the onset of the pandemic, recent studies suggest that the lasting shift to virtual communication in the past two years may have contributed to varying levels of fatigue and negative psychological effects for certain individuals (Bailenson, 2021; Fauville et al., 2021; Queiroz et al., 2021). While more research is needed to confirm that correlation, this study has undoubtedly encountered obstacles in establishing contact with the APIB to recruit potential participants. Hence, to mitigate these difficulties, I data was collected from documents only rather than directly from human participants.

Lastly, the choice of methods can also be attributed to the nature of the research question itself. The scope of this study is not a particular Indigenous community, culture, or sacred practice, but the tangible efforts of a formal advocacy organization in promoting and protecting Indigenous security. The purpose is to illustrate civil society participation in international efforts to uphold Indigenous security and hold states accountable to their commitments towards Indigenous peoples. Given that the work of the organization has been previously documented and publicized, this study chooses to collect and analyze documental data that is already available rather than to gather personalized information from individuals, as document analysis may provide a more objective account of the facts.

Chapter 2.

Review of the Literature

This study is concerned with civil society participation in promoting and protecting security for Indigenous peoples. It explores the role of citizen-led organizations in promoting and protecting Indigenous rights nationally and internationally to hold states accountable to their international commitments, particularly regarding Indigenous peoples' right to live in freedom, peace, and security. The theoretical framework draws on works by Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars about current and past efforts to secure Indigenous rights internationally, changing interpretations of security, and the role of civil society organizations in upholding the Indigenous right to security. This chapter comprises a review of the relevant literature, starting with a brief history of the global Indigenous rights movement. Following, I explore different interpretations of security according to the literature. Next, I examine the role of international cooperation in upholding Indigenous rights and the use of civil society organizations as mechanisms of enforcement.

The International Movement for Indigenous Rights and the Establishment of the UNDRIP

Although Indigenous communities across the world are vastly diverse, they tend to share common characteristics, such as, for instance, a strong connection to their traditional lands, strong ties to their identity, spirituality and cultural practices, and high regard for the environment (Crossen, 2017; Greaves, 2016; Leite & Neto, 2016; Rombouts, 2017). The historical, political, and economic circumstances of Indigenous societies tend to differ greatly from the broader population, and they maintain elements of resistance against colonial powers (Crossen, 2017; Greaves, 2016; Kuokkanen & Sweet, 2020). The Indigenous struggle against oppressive powers is a response to centuries of systemic violence, through which explorers, colonizers, state agents, militaries, corporations, individuals, and other ethnic groups imposed inconceivable horrors upon Indigenous peoples (Huseman & Short, 2012; Monchalin, 2016; Rombouts, 2017; Sant'Anna et al., 2018).

Because of the shared experiences of Indigenous peoples across the world, it is unsurprising that the struggle for legal recognition of Indigenous rights has expanded to a global scale. The global Indigenous rights movement emerged from various regional mobilizations of Indigenous activists throughout the world (Lightfoot, 2016). After a wave of decolonization of former European colonies across the Americas, Africa, and Asia in the first half of the twentieth century, Indigenous peoples in each of these regions led a “subsequent wave of decolonization” (Crossen, 2017, p. 534; Urt, 2015). In the 1970’s, upon perceiving a pattern of shared struggles between Indigenous peoples internationally, Indigenous rights activists in Western states acknowledged the need to widen their advocacy scope beyond the domestic and regional scope (Crossen, 2017; Erueti, 2011). These activists recognized the benefits of “establishing an international advocacy network for first peoples,” and pursued international coalitions to protest injustices and advocate for their rights (Erueti, 2011, p. 102; Lightfoot, 2016).

While initially involving mostly Indigenous peoples in Australasia and North America, the global Indigenous rights movement eventually came to engage those in Latin America, the Nordic countries, Asia, and Africa (Crossen, 2017; Erueti, 2011; Makumbe, 2018). The initial transnational effort towards the recognition of Indigenous rights prompted the establishment of the World Council of Indigenous Peoples (WCIP) in 1975, with the participation of Indigenous representatives from nineteen countries (Crossen, 2017; Lightfoot, 2016; Miranda, 2010; Sanders, 1977). By making use of existing contradictions within international colonial institutions, the WCIP “established a formal relationship” between Indigenous peoples and the United Nations, thereby advancing Indigenous rights in the international sphere (Sanders, 1977, p. 6).

The global movement initially prioritized Indigenous peoples’ claims to self-determination and recognition as distinct peoples (Erueti, 2011; Rombouts, 2017). A major demand was for Indigenous peoples to participate in decision-making processes that affected them, both domestically and internationally (Eichler, 2019; Rombouts, 2017). This mobilization led to the recognition of the rights of Indigenous populations in the International Labor Organization Convention 169 on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries (ILO Convention 169), which recognized Indigenous peoples’ right to prior consultation in matters that affected them (Eichler, 2019; Makumbe, 2018). This was a shift from a paternalistic view of Indigenous peoples as “objects of protection”

towards their recognition as “self-determining actors or subjects” (Rombouts, 2017, p. 180).

While the WCIP and the ILO Convention 169 were successful in bringing forward Indigenous peoples’ demands within international bodies, they could not possibly address the entirety of individual circumstances of Indigenous communities worldwide. Though there are parallels between the struggles that affect Indigenous peoples across the world, each Indigenous society differs greatly in its history, traditions, culture, spirituality, as well as socio-economic and political circumstances (Erueti, 2011; Makumbe, 2018; Roy, 2018; Sanders, 1977). Grouping them together under the umbrella of ‘Indigenous peoples’ within the international community has “obscured some quite fundamental differences” in their lived experiences (Erueti, 2011, p. 108). For instance, national Indigenous movements in developed countries, though still arduous, met fewer obstacles than those in some regions within Asia, Latin America, and Africa (Erueti, 2011; Sanders, 1977). Notwithstanding the centuries of oppression and marginalization which colonial governments had imposed upon them, Indigenous peoples in Northern Europe, Australasia and North America endured as a “distinctive and coherent community of peoples, connected to their lands and one another” (Erueti, 2011, p. 109). This permanence and unity over time empowered Indigenous organizations in these countries to present their struggles through a historical and decolonial framework which helped reinforce their claims (Erueti, 2011).

Furthermore, Indigenous-state relations in developed countries at the time were far less troubled than those in the developing world, which facilitated advocacy in those regions (Sanders, 1977). While there were certainly systemic power imbalances in developed countries, by the time the WCIP was created some Indigenous peoples in countries such as New Zealand and Canada already had their institutions of self-government formally recognized by the state in which they were located (Sanders, 1977). Meanwhile, some states in Asia, Latin America and Africa were reluctant to recognize Indigenous identity and basic human rights, often had absolute control over Indigenous citizens’ lives, and deliberately limited their political rights, access to primary education, and freedom of movement (*Comissão Nacional da Verdade* [CNV], 2014; Makumbe, 2018; Ramos, 1997; Roy, 2018).

Accordingly, Indigenous rights advocates in developing and underdeveloped countries encountered major difficulties. Indigenous peoples in Latin America faced serious physical security threats and could not prioritize claims to self-determination when their lives, security, and mere existence were at risk. Some of these societies had to focus their efforts on meeting their most basic needs, such as their “right to life and security, access to basic goods and services, and secure land rights” (Erueti, 2011, p. 110; Ramos, 1997). At that time, states across Latin America seized Indigenous lands for the interest of private profit and broke apart, displaced, murdered and enslaved numerous Indigenous communities (Palmquist, 2018).

Moreover, Indigenous organizations in many Asian countries struggled to advance Indigenous peoples’ historical claims due to “millennia of migration of ethnic groups” as well as the absence of “treaties affirming their original rights” (Erueti, 2011, p. 109). A number of Asian states, such as India, Bangladesh, China, Myanmar, and Indonesia, for instance, have hampered the movement for Indigenous rights based on an understanding of indigeneity as “‘original inhabitants’, rather than ‘first settlers’” (Roy, 2018, p. 308). These states assumed that Indigenous identity is exclusive to those who experienced European colonization and that indigeneity may not be claimed by tribal peoples in Asia because the version of colonization they experienced came from within the continent rather than overseas (Kumar, 2018; Morton & Baird, 2019; Roy, 2018). They have constructed a distinction between ‘Indigenous’ and ‘tribal’ peoples, and used such distinction to deny their responsibility to uphold Indigenous rights (Roy, 2018).

Likewise, many Indigenous peoples across the African continent faced similar challenges in having their identity recognized, primarily because definitions of indigeneity within the global Indigenous movement were widely incompatible with their individual circumstances (Barume, 2009; Makumbe, 2018). While specific definitions vary, a common interpretation of indigeneity in Africa refers to “home grown” and “not foreign”, which differs greatly from definitions in other continents (Kipuri, 2009, p. 253). Furthermore, the Indigenous rights movement in Africa met strong resistance from states such as Nigeria, Kenya and Namibia, for instance whose economy heavily relies on exports by resource-extractive industries (Barume, 2009; Kipuri, 2009)

Despite (and perhaps because of) these differences, the international Indigenous rights movement proved essential for Indigenous citizens, peoples, and organizations

throughout the world. The global movement exposed fundamental human rights abuses that had been taking place outside of developed countries (Erueti, 2011). The growing participation of Indigenous rights activists from developing countries raised global awareness of circumstances that had been concealed from the international community and the public by certain states (Palmquist, 2018). Similarly, it strengthened the global efforts to recognize the ongoing genocide of Indigenous peoples across the world (Palmquist, 2018). Furthermore, while Indigenous advocates in North America had been organizing for a longer period of time, those in the developing world still had little political influence in their respective countries and therefore benefitted greatly from regional and global partnerships (Erueti, 2011; Ramos, 1997; Sanders, 1977).

The strength of the mobilization and the alliances between Indigenous peoples internationally led to significant accomplishments across international institutions and international legal bodies. Following the WCIP and the ILO Convention 169, other international agreements, alliances, conferences, and declarations were implemented, such as the Working Group on Indigenous Populations, the International Non-Governmental Organization Conference on Discrimination against Indigenous Populations, and the World Conference of Indigenous Peoples on Territory, Environment and Development, for instance (Miranda, 2010; Rombouts, 2017). In 2007, after two decades of deliberation, hundreds of countries (with the initial exception of Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and the United States) signed and endorsed the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), a declaration outlining collective and individual human rights of Indigenous populations and citizens, such as the rights to self-determination, to not be subjected to forced assimilation, and to not be forcibly removed from their traditional territories (Champagne, 2013; Lightfoot, 2016; UN, 2007).

The enactment of the UNDRIP in 2007 signifies the recognition of Indigenous rights in the global sphere. The UNDRIP enables democratic participation by Indigenous peoples and can work as a tool to decolonize international law, recognize Indigenous peoples as members of the international community, and promote reconciliation (Champagne, 2013, p. 18; Lightfoot, 2016; Miranda, 2010; UN, 2007). Its ratification represents a radical transformation in the international order, as well as the commitment of the international community to uphold Indigenous rights (Lightfoot, 2016; Universidade de Brasília, 2017). Furthermore, the UNDRIP provides a “de facto human rights

instrument for the protection” of Indigenous peoples in places where they have no “robust human rights protections” (Erueti, 2011, p. 117).

Still, it is important to recognize that the UNDRIP is only “the basis for further discussion” and that further action towards securing and promoting Indigenous rights is still needed (Champagne, 2013, p. 9). One major problem of the UNDRIP comprises its redefinition of “Indigenous nations into citizens and ethnic groups” (Champagne, 2013, p. 11). The UNDRIP views Indigenous individuals as citizens of a state rather than members of autonomous, distinct nations, and therefore does not “recognize political self-government from Indigenous nations”, thereby denying Indigenous peoples’ claims to sovereignty and nationhood (Champagne, 2013, p. 11). The omission of Indigenous peoples’ status as nations from the UNDRIP reflects colonial states’ interests and enables the violation of the Indigenous right to self-determination by such states.

This section has provided a brief historical overview of the international movement for Indigenous rights. I have highlighted select achievements by the movement, such as the establishment of the WCIP, the ILO Convention 169, and the UNDRIP, although I recognize that this is not a comprehensive list of all the achievements of Indigenous rights movements across the world and acknowledge that significant efforts are still taking place to address challenges in protecting Indigenous rights. The following section will discuss Indigenous peoples’ right to live in freedom, peace, and security as distinct peoples, according to different interpretations of security in the existing literature.

Defining Indigenous Security

Notwithstanding its flaws, the UNDRIP is a meaningful achievement by the global Indigenous rights movement and a paramount document in formalizing Indigenous rights internationally. An important element of the UNDRIP is the recognition of Indigenous peoples’ right to live in freedom, peace, and security as distinct peoples. This right is reflected in Article 7b, which states:

Indigenous peoples have the collective right to live in freedom, peace and security as distinct peoples and shall not be subjected to any act of genocide or any other act of violence, including forcibly removing children of the group to another group. (UN, 2007)

Security has been traditionally defined as the absence of military threats to a state, with national security at the core of the scholarly debate (Acharya, 2018; Rothschild, 1995). However, the changing nature of human societies, states, and international institutions has led to calls for extending the concept of security to that of individuals, the international system, and institutions other than the military, thereby transforming the debate to include human, economic, environmental, political, personal, and community security (Acharya, 2018; Hossain, 2016; Rothschild, 1995; Simon, 1989). I draw on definitions of security that view it as the absence of existential threats, not only to states, but to human life (Acharya, 2018). This alternative interpretation allows for the acknowledgement of additional dangers that may not have been considered otherwise. For instance, financial crises, climate change, violent crime, and precarious access to food, water, shelter, and other basic needs can be as detrimental to human life as military insecurity (Acharya, 2018).

Nevertheless, though encompassing non-military security threats, this broader definition of security still views it through a Western lens, and more specific risks must be considered when it comes to the security of Indigenous peoples, due to their shared experiences and characteristics, and the distinct threats they face (Balasco & Bauer, 2020; Greaves, 2016; Hossain, 2016; Kuokkanen & Sweet, 2020; Simon, 1989). Throughout history, Indigenous peoples' have been denied their freedom and actualization of peace by being forcibly removed from their traditional territories and experienced repeated, heinous attempts by settler states to destroy and exterminate them through epidemics, mass executions, kidnappings, forced disappearances, physical and sexual abuse, forced assimilation, targeted killings, and forced sterilizations (CIMI, 2021; CNV, 2014; Heck, 1996; Monchalin, 2016; National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls [National Inquiry], 2019; Palmquist, 2018; Raftopoulos & Morley, 2020; Teles Junior, 2018). This pattern continues today, despite common misconceptions that the violence was left in the past (Palmquist, 2018).

The specificity of factors that threaten the security of Indigenous citizens and societies has led several scholars to challenge traditional and critical interpretations of security and adopt definitions that differ from those offered within Western disciplines (Balasco & Bauer, 2020; Greaves, 2016; Kuokkanen & Sweet, 2020; Simon, 1989). Because Indigenous societies are the most knowledgeable on which threats are the most critical to them and on ways to address them, Indigenous interpretations of security

provide a more accurate representation of the unique challenges they face and potential approaches towards them (Greaves, 2016, p. 39; Kuokkanen & Sweet, 2020). Similar to other critical theories of security, Indigenous definitions infer that the security priorities of a state do not necessarily reflect those of an individual community (Balasco & Bauer, 2020, p. 564). While the precise language of security has not been historically used by some Indigenous communities, several issues “have long been considered a threat to their collective survival”, including colonization, assimilation practices, and displacement, for instance (Kuokkanen & Sweet, 2020, p. 80; Palmquist, 2018).

Still, because of how specific the circumstances are for each Indigenous society, Indigenous perspectives and approaches to security differ and cannot be incorporated as a single voice (Kuokkanen & Sweet, 2020, p. 82). One interpretation of Indigenous security considers it “in broad terms of collective security for all peoples and all countries” (Simon, 1989, p. 33). Such perspective utilizes a framework of human security and “highlight[s] how state conceptualizations of security often create insecurity for indigenous communities” (Balasco & Bauer, 2020, p. 564). Other scholars view Indigenous security through a feminist lens, through which the experiences of Indigenous women and their differing needs become evident in contrast with other citizens’ experiences (Kuokkanen & Sweet, 2020). Furthermore, others emphasize the importance of food security, water security, clothing and shelter for the lives and well-being of Indigenous populations (Kuokkanen & Sweet, 2020).

Likewise, one key area of Indigenous security which is not addressed by Western definitions and plays a major role in Indigenous communities concerns the relationship to the land. Many Indigenous societies have traditionally lived connected to the land they inhabit (Hossain, 2016; Leite & Neto, 2016; Rombouts, 2017). Their cultures, histories, spiritualities, identities, and communities are strongly tied to the Earth itself. The relationship between these Indigenous societies and their lands is not simply possessive or geared towards production and resource extraction. Rather, it is a deeper connection in which one’s life, spirituality and identity are intertwined with their traditional land (Leite & Neto, 2016; Rombouts, 2017). Thus, considering this powerful connection, Indigenous peoples’ security is vulnerable to any circumstances that threaten the existence and prosperity of their land, culture, and traditional ways of living (Demetrio & Kozicki, 2017; Hossain, 2016).

Accordingly, a significant threat to Indigenous security is climate change. Rising temperatures, droughts, and forest fires have proven devastating to Indigenous communities across the world, and the effects of climate change have become a major concern in questions of security (Greaves, 2016; Simon, 1989). For Indigenous peoples in the Arctic, for instance, a key security priority is protecting their territories from environmental degradation due to rising temperatures in the North (Greaves, 2016; Simon, 1989). Likewise, the security and well-being of Indigenous peoples in the Amazon Forest has been severely hindered by unprecedented levels of widespread fires due to droughts and deforestation, and the prevention of such events has become a key priority (*Conselho Indigenista Missionário* [CIMI], 2020). This pattern exists across the board and poses significant risks for Indigenous peoples' food and water security, health, community safety, and general well-being (CIMI, 2020).

Furthermore, Indigenous peoples' security as it relates to their land and territories is also tied to questions of sovereignty and self-determination. While Western interpretations of sovereignty and self-determination surround independent statehood, the monopoly of violence, and control over territory, Indigenous self-determination is motivated by "self-protection and self-governance" (Makumbe, 2018, p. 148; Miranda, 2010). Indigenous self-determination can be understood as the ability to exercise powers of self-government and to live as distinct peoples, and implies "effective participation in decision-making," including the right to prior consultation "on matters that touch their interests" (Rombouts, 2017, p. 175). Moreover, because of the sacred connection between Indigenous societies and the land, Indigenous self-determination "requires control over their lands and resources," not for extractive and economic purposes, but because their identities are often strongly tied to that territory (Rombouts, 2017, p. 175).

Nevertheless, Indigenous security, self-determination and sovereignty are often overlooked, dismissed, or weaponized by state authorities and scholars (Champagne, 2013; Lightfoot, 2016; Urt, 2015). States tend to perceive Indigenous demands for security, autonomy, and land rights as a direct threat to state sovereignty, and consequently as a national security threat (Baines, 2008; Balasco & Bauer, 2020; Kipuri, 2009; Lightfoot, 2016). That is because states adopt a narrow view of self-determination that attaches it exclusively to the concept of the nation state itself, disregarding Indigenous interpretations of self-determination and self-government (Champagne, 2013; Urt, 2015). Moreover, when Indigenous communities collectively demand more

autonomy in order to better govern and protect themselves, states tend to frame Indigenous security as conflicting with the “human security of the general public and the national security of the state,” thereby promoting the false idea that Indigenous security itself is a threat that must be suppressed (Balasco & Bauer, 2020, p. 562).

The reality, however, is that states themselves frequently create threats to Indigenous security. State policies and practices which aim to promote development and enhance the security of the nation tend to not only overlook, but also severely undermine Indigenous security by threatening the very existence of Indigenous populations, their cultures, traditions, and institutions (Balasco & Bauer, 2020; Champagne, 2013; CNV, 2014; Rombouts, 2017; Simon, 1989). Development projects in Indigenous lands often create devastating consequences for the local communities, such as displacement, land and water contamination, and increased levels of violence (CNV, 2014; Heck, 1996; Rombouts, 2017). Furthermore, military operations by states actively promote Indigenous insecurity, threaten their environment, and conflict with their use of traditional lands (Barbosa, 2016; Palmquist, 2018; Resende, 2015; Sant’Anna et al., 2018; Simon, 1989).

Finally, it must be noted that Article 7b determines that Indigenous peoples shall be protected from any acts of genocide (UN, 2007). While academic and legal debates around the definition of genocide are ongoing, Indigenous activists have repeatedly urged the international community to recognize their ethnocide and assimilation as an act of genocide (Demetrio & Kozicki, 2017; Monchalin, 2016; Palmquist, 2018). The erasure of Indigenous cultures, identities, spiritualities, and traditions through assimilation policies and practices in settler colonial states over the centuries has devastated numerous communities and continues to this day (Demetrio & Kozicki, 2017; Monchalin, 2016; Palmquist, 2018). Thus, ethnocide is understood as a significant security risk for Indigenous societies and must be construed as such by the international community.

This section has demonstrated that although there is a wide array of studies based on state-centric interpretations of security, there is still room in the academic literature for more comprehensive research within the Indigenous security framework. I have provided an overview of Indigenous interpretations of security to define the Indigenous right to live in freedom, peace, and security. The following section will outline

major attempts taken by the international community to address Indigenous rights violations.

The Failure of International Cooperation between States and the Role of Civil Society in Upholding Indigenous Rights

While the global Indigenous rights movement brought about significant achievements concerning the recognition of Indigenous rights internationally through the UNDRIP, international cooperation between states has been largely unsuccessful in effectively protecting these rights. States continue to directly violate Indigenous rights and to allow such violations to occur within their jurisdiction with little to no accountability for offenders (Alvarado, 2015; Tramontana, 2012). As such, much of the responsibility for the inadequacy in responding to Indigenous rights violations can be attributed to states themselves. Postcolonial states have long resisted and denied Indigenous rights and manifested their contention in “issues of definition, participation, and scope” (Lightfoot, 2016, p. 34).

The literature conveys that one reason for the failure of the international community in upholding the Indigenous rights construed in the UNDRIP is that, unlike treaties such as the ILO Convention 169, the UNDRIP is not legally binding, and therefore there are no formal mechanisms to ensure state compliance (Champagne, 2013; Eichler, 2019). Although the UNDRIP provides “the moral obligation” for states to uphold certain standards, it “does not have the force of law,” which may hinder the actualization of the rights set out in the declaration (Champagne, 2013, p. 10). The lack of mechanisms for monitoring and enforcement creates constraints in ensuring state compliance with the declaration, since there is little accountability for those that violate its terms (Alvarado, 2015; J. A. Smith & Mitchell, 2020).

That said, state reluctance to comply with international standards is not limited to non-legally binding declarations, and the difficulty in enforcing state compliance extends to treaties which are in fact recognized as legal instruments, such as the ILO Convention 169 (Universidade de Brasília, 2017). There is a much more complex problem of lack of accountability and enforcement of international law in the global scale. That is largely due to the lack of instruments of enforcement of international law at the domestic and international levels, combined with the nature of international human rights institutions

and the specific structure of individual countries (Alvarado, 2015; Kelley & Simmons, 2014). The international community currently lacks the tools and capacity to enforce international norms, which is detrimental to handling severe human rights violations, as is the case of violations of Indigenous rights (J. A. Smith & Mitchell, 2020; Stavenhagen, 2009).

Undoubtedly, there have been efforts to standardize mechanisms of enforcement of international norms, including the development of monitoring and evaluation tools (Eichler, 2019; J. A. Smith & Mitchell, 2020). Performance indicators have been previously used by the international community to monitor state performance and lead policy change by shaming those who underperform (Kelley & Simmons, 2014). Similarly, attempts have been made at developing “tools for assessing state compliance with the UNDRIP” (J. A. Smith & Mitchell, 2020, p. 4). Such tools would ideally expose “gaps between the ideal and the reality” and urge states to uphold Indigenous rights standards by potentially tainting their reputation internationally (J. A. Smith & Mitchell, 2020, p. 2). Moreover, feedback tools could provide constructive evaluations and prompt increased compliance by states who are willing to “develop strategies for change” (J. A. Smith & Mitchell, 2020, p. 3).

Still, such tools provide only the “minimum requirements”, and more specific legal instruments must be implemented internally by individual countries (Eichler, 2019, p. 48). This has been proven difficult due to states’ unwillingness to comply and continued violations of Indigenous rights within their territories despite commitments to the contrary (Tramontana, 2012). As a result, civil society actors have increasingly taken on the responsibility of “monitoring states’ compliance with international cooperation” (Tramontana, 2012, p. 173). At the global level, citizen-led organizations play a significant role in influencing international decision-making, advancing human rights policy, and creating institutions of state accountability (Alvarado, 2015; Baehr, 2009; Fox, 2000; Lopez, 2005; Tramontana, 2012). For instance, in the twentieth century, human rights organizations led by civil society actors prompted the creation of international instruments against forced disappearances, in support of women’s rights, and in support of LGBTQ+ rights (Baehr, 2009). It is understood that civil society organizations can shift the balance of power from the decision-making elite to the community, thereby enhancing “the democratic legitimacy of international fora” and operating as a “global opposition” (Tramontana, 2012, p. 175). Furthermore, because

these organizations may have more access to classified information than the general public, their presence in international fora can “increase the transparency of international deliberations” (Tramontana, 2012, p. 175).

At the local and national levels, citizen-led initiatives are successful in creating “responsive action by authorities” and increasing accountability, particularly with regards to Indigenous rights (Hernández et al., 2019, p. 399). There is evidence that civil society actors can bring Indigenous voices to “spaces of engagement with provincial and national authorities” and facilitate multi-level engagement (Hernández et al., 2019, p. 400). For instance, Indigenous women groups in Mexico have taken part in the creation of peace movements, influenced the advancement of human rights policy through political advocacy, and developed autonomous political institutions based on customary Indigenous governance (Lopez, 2005). Similarly, in Brazil, Indigenous rights advocates successfully prompted the legal recognition of Indigenous peoples’ rights in the Constitution (Baines, 2008). In Canada, community mobilization in support of Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls (MMIWG) has exposed the extreme levels of insecurity faced by Indigenous women in the country and prompted a national inquiry (National Inquiry, 2019; Saramo, 2016). Moreover, grassroots activism by Grassy Narrows First Nation in response to structural violence imposed by the Canadian state and the presence of non-Indigenous loggers in their territory illustrates the success of public advocacy and community dialogues in shifting power relations with non-Indigenous groups (Wallace, 2020).

Still, civil society initiatives, particularly those which mobilize marginalized individuals, face a myriad of challenges (Alvarado, 2015; Austin & Schill, 1991; Hernández et al., 2019; Wallace, 2020). Socially disadvantaged communities, such as impoverished ethnic minorities “face some fairly high barriers to effective mobilization,” including limited resources, lack of technical expertise and little political influence (Austin & Schill, 1991, p. 71). Indigenous communities in Latin American countries face particularly difficult challenges to mobilizing, including the unwillingness of the state to cooperate and internalize international norms (Alvarado, 2015; Erueti, 2011). This difficulty in mobilizing is further intensified when the act is against a government that has engaged in severe human rights violations (Baehr, 2009). Accordingly, in places with prominent levels of inequality, successful engagement with authorities depends heavily on confronting and overcoming serious power imbalances (Hernández et al., 2019).

Hence, large-scale, national organizations that act as an intermediary between Indigenous communities and the state can play a significant role in empowering Indigenous citizens and advocating for their rights. Such organizations have often been successful in advancing Indigenous rights in their respective countries. For instance, the *Organización Nacional Indígena de Colombia* (ONIC), works as a political platform for Indigenous peoples in Colombia by enabling Indigenous autonomy and self-governance (ONIC, n.d.). Another national Indigenous advocacy is the Assembly of First Nations (AFN), an organization which represents First Nations individuals in Canada and works to promote policies that address their economic needs, improve education infrastructure for First Nations children, as well as improve environmental and conservation policies in Canada (AFN, 2020). A third, similar organization is the *Asociación Interétnica de Desarrollo de la Selva Peruana* (AIDSESP), a Peruvian organization whose mission is to promote the rights of Indigenous peoples in the Peruvian Amazon. Among AIDSESP's recent activities is the creation of a fund for Indigenous women in the Amazon, which provides grants for Indigenous women who have a leadership role in preserving the land, promoting political affairs, and protecting Indigenous culture (AIDSESP, 2021).

While there is extensive evidence that national Indigenous organizations can contribute to ensuring that certain fundamental rights are met, there are gaps in the mainstream academic literature regarding their work in promoting and protecting Indigenous peoples' right to live in freedom, peace, and security as distinct peoples. It has been argued that civil society organizations, including international organizations, may not be "enough to ensure the security of individuals" (Rothschild, 1995, p. 80). Still, Indigenous-led organizations have increasingly been involved in security matters and effectively promoted Indigenous peoples' collective security. This is illustrated by the Inuit Circumpolar Council (ICC), an Indigenous organization that unites Inuit in Alaska, Canada, Greenland, and Russia to represent their rights in matters of Arctic policy, including Arctic security (ICC, n.d.). The geographic area covered by the ICC is a focus of security concern by the international community, however, security policies and practices in the region have typically excluded and harmed local Indigenous communities (Greaves, 2016; Simon, 1989). Hence, the ICC's active participation in international bodies, including the UN, have contributed to promoting Inuit sovereignty and upholding their right to prior consultation in security matters, thereby promoting their right to security (ICC, n.d.).

This thesis seeks to elaborate on the role of civil society organizations in promoting Indigenous security and holding states accountable to their international commitments towards Indigenous peoples. This chapter has provided a review of the relevant literature, including the history of the global Indigenous rights movement, different interpretations of security, and attempts by the international community and civil society to uphold Indigenous rights. Further, the literature review has identified certain gaps in the mainstream literature in terms of Indigenous security and citizen-led efforts to promote security internationally. Accordingly, chapter 3 will provide an overview of security threats to Indigenous peoples in Brazil to provide the necessary context for the case study.

Chapter 3.

Threats to Indigenous Security in Brazil

While it was expected that signing countries in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) would work towards reconciliation with Indigenous peoples living within their borders and ensure that no further abuses of Indigenous rights took place, states continue to violate these rights without much accountability (Alvarado, 2015; Lightfoot, 2016; United Nations [UN], 2007). Although the situation of specific Indigenous communities varies, there is a global pattern of violations of Indigenous rights, which includes forced displacement; inadequate access to clean water, sanitation, healthcare, and justice; environmental injustice; land invasions and expropriation; and disproportionate rates of violence (Alvarado, 2015; *Conselho Indigenista Missionário* [CIMI], 2021; Huseman & Short, 2012; *Instituto Socioambiental* [ISA], 2016; Lopes & Lima, 2020; Makumbe, 2018; Monchalin, 2016; Raftopoulos & Morley, 2020; Roy, 2018). This pattern of systemic violence can be observed in Brazil, a country that is home to hundreds of Indigenous ethnic groups and has committed a long list of injustices against Indigenous populations over the centuries (CIMI, 2021; ISA, n.d.-a; Teles Junior, 2018). Although Brazil is a signatory country of the UNDRIP and recognizes Indigenous rights in its domestic legislation, its commitment to upholding Indigenous rights, and in particular, Indigenous security, has not been translated into practice (*Articulação dos Povos Indígenas do Brasil* [APIB], 2021; Stavenhagen, 2009; Universidade de Brasília, 2017).

This chapter outlines major reoccurring security threats to Indigenous peoples in Brazil over the years. Fully understanding current threats to Indigenous security requires understanding the circumstances that have long tormented Indigenous communities in the country; thus, this chapter is divided in three sections. I begin with a brief overview of the violence that was imposed against Indigenous peoples in Brazil from the date of Portuguese arrival until the 19th century. Following, I focus on threats to Indigenous security in the country throughout the 20th century. Finally, I outline the threats that have continued to endanger Indigenous peoples in Brazil from the early 2000s through 2021. Importantly, this chapter incorporates some of the primary data collected in this study and helps provide context for the analysis that will follow in chapter 4. It must be noted

that the security threats described here are not to be viewed in isolation from one another, as they do not exist in a void. Rather, these risks are part of an intertwined series of factors and must be analyzed as part of the broader context in which they exist.

Historical Context of Insecurity: From the First Invasion through the 19th Century

Throughout its history, Brazil's relationship with Indigenous populations has been defined by varying degrees of violence, exploitation, and assimilation (Barbosa, 2016; Palmquist, 2018; Resende, 2015; Teles Junior, 2018). Since the first contact with Portuguese explorers in 1500, the Indigenous population in what is now Brazil has decreased tremendously, although it is difficult to estimate the number of original inhabitants in the territory at the time of initial contact due to limited availability of historical data (Teles Junior, 2018). Portuguese colonization in the country has left a legacy of resource exploitation and genocide onto its structure and administration, which continues to this day (ISA, n.d.-c).

Brazil's Indigenous policy in the first few centuries of colonization was characterized by intensive territorial exploration, wars of conquest, enslavement, ethnic cleansing, genocide, religious missions, and assimilation (Demetrio & Kozicki, 2017; Teles Junior, 2018). With previous experience colonizing certain regions of Asia and Africa, Portuguese explorers benefitted from genocide tactics such as the spread of diseases among Indigenous communities and limiting their access to food sources, which led to thousands of deaths by disease and malnutrition in short periods of time (Teles Junior, 2018; Urt, 2015). The colonial regime at the time aimed at maximizing profits by occupying territories, extracting natural resources and exploring the land (Leite & Neto, 2016; Teles Junior, 2018). Accordingly, policies were implemented by the Crown to distribute vast plots of lands to Portuguese settlers for farming, and local Indigenous populations were either removed, killed, or enslaved to work in plantations (Teles Junior, 2018; Urt, 2015).

The danger of war, enslavement and assimilation led many Indigenous communities to relocate to other areas (Leite & Neto, 2016; Teles Junior, 2018). However, in an attempt to retain Indigenous slave labour within reach of landowners, the Crown promoted catholic missions to capture, convert, and assimilate Indigenous

populations across Brazil (Teles Junior, 2018; Urt, 2015). Portuguese troops attacked and burned down Indigenous villages, and took survivors to Jesuit towns where they were forcibly converted, trained on manual labour skills, forced to abdicate their cultures, traditions, languages, and ways of life, and enslaved to work in plantations (Teles Junior, 2018). In addition to catholic missions promoted by the Crown, individual landowners would send their own scouts on exploratory missions onto the southern regions of the country, seeking resources, slave labour, and territorial expansion (Teles Junior, 2018; Urt, 2015). It is estimated that between 100 to 200 thousand Indigenous individuals were captured by these missions between 1620 and 1720 (Teles Junior, 2018).

Throughout the 18th and 19th centuries, Indigenous peoples across Brazil continued to face war, assimilation, and forced displacement from their traditional lands (Urt, 2015). Although Brazil's independence in 1822 meant the end of Portuguese dominance over the colony, it did nothing to mitigate the autocratic nature of landowners' attitudes towards Indigenous peoples (Urt, 2015). Wealthy landowners continued to establish their dominance through territorial expansion and the annihilation, oppression, and enslavement of local Indigenous groups (Urt, 2015). Furthermore, the state's intent to assimilate, convert, and erase Indigenous peoples continued through the dissemination of projects to "civilize" Indigenous populations, increase European immigration to whiten the population, and persecute and punish Indigenous individuals who refused assimilation (Teles Junior, 2018; Urt, 2015).

Abuses of Indigenous peoples' rights in Brazil from 1500 through the 19th century are far too many to report in this paper, and while important for context, are not the central focus of the study. This section has provided only a brief overview of the insecurity imposed upon Indigenous peoples in Brazil from 1500 through the 19th century. It is not meant as a comprehensive, thorough description of all the facts, but rather as a succinct discussion of the major reoccurring issues that are relevant for understanding current circumstances. As will be demonstrated in the following sections, some of these trends are the roots of the insecurity that has persisted over time.

Threats to Indigenous Peoples throughout the 20th Century

In the early 20th century, Brazil shifted towards a paternalistic approach that allegedly favoured the protection of Indigenous individuals rather than their exploitation

and utter extermination (Barbosa, 2016). This led to the creation of the *Serviço de Proteção aos Índios* (SPI), a government body that claimed to pursue the protection of Indigenous individuals, but in reality aimed to assimilate and integrate them into the broader Brazilian society, with the ultimate goal to eliminate their collective existence (Barbosa, 2016; Palmquist, 2018; Teles Junior, 2018). Under the SPI, Indigenous individuals throughout Brazil, viewed as useful assets to the state, were assigned to work agricultural jobs in colonial settlements and to oversee border security in remote areas (Barbosa, 2016). While the SPI pledged to create positive outcomes for Indigenous individuals, including the protection of land rights and the prevention of violence against Indigenous communities, the reality was that its actions did more to harm Indigenous people than protect them (Barbosa, 2016; *Comissão Nacional da Verdade* [CNV], 2014; Palmquist, 2018).

State-led colonization of Indigenous lands continued in the following decades. In the late 1930s, the Brazilian government sought to expand and capitalize on certain parts of its territory that had not been fully explored by colonial settlers, but which were home to many Indigenous communities (Barbosa, 2016; CNV, 2014). In an attempt to facilitate rapid economic development in those areas, the SPI seized Indigenous lands, created territorial boundaries where Indigenous peoples could continue to live, and established a system of military surveillance and control of Indigenous individuals, through which the government exerted control over their daily activities, behaviours, and personal relationships (Barbosa, 2016; Palmquist, 2018). Throughout the 1940s and 1950s, various Indigenous groups saw their territories invaded by farmers, were forcibly displaced, and became victims of widespread violence and homicides (CNV, 2014; Palmquist, 2018). It is estimated that the Indigenous population in Brazil reduced from one million to 200 thousand individuals in the first half of the 20th century, with certain communities being entirely decimated and others nearing extermination (Palmquist, 2018; Teles Junior, 2018). One notable case is that of the Xetá, an Indigenous ethnic group that originally inhabited the southern state of Paraná, and which was brought to near extinction since its initial contact with white farmers in the 1950s (CNV, 2014; ISA, n.d.-b). Following contact, white farmers in Xetá lands, with the help of the SPI, systematically kidnapped and transferred several Xetá children to white families, enslaved Xetá men, women, and children, and forcibly relocated the remaining population to reserves and to live with other Indigenous communities, such as the

Kaingang and the Guarani (CNV, 2014; Palmquist, 2018). As a result of the genocide, the Xetá were deemed an extinct group by the Brazilian government until the late 1980's, and the community remains at significant risk today (CNV, 2014; ISA, n.d.-b).

The SPI's actions against Indigenous peoples did not end there. In the 1960's, a criminal investigation led by federal prosecutor Jader Figueiredo found evidence that the SPI had committed a multitude of genocidal acts throughout the country (Palmquist, 2018; Resende, 2015). The investigation results were compiled in the Figueiredo Report, a seven-thousand-page document containing evidence that the SPI used conventional and biological weapons to exterminate entire Indigenous communities, including the use of explosives, the deliberate introduction of transmissible diseases into communities, and the contamination of food sources (Palmquist, 2018; Resende, 2015; Teles Junior, 2018). The Figueiredo report was originally released in 1969, five years after a military coup d'état that instituted a 21-year military dictatorship in the country. The report was allegedly destroyed in a fire and remained concealed until 2013, when it was found nearly intact at a museum archive (Palmquist, 2018; Resende, 2015; Teles Junior, 2018).

When the Figueiredo Report was initially released, the international community denounced Brazil for its actions against Indigenous peoples (Palmquist, 2018; Resende, 2015). International pressure at the time prompted the Brazilian government to substitute the SPI with the *Fundação Nacional do Índio* (FUNAI), invite international organizations into the country to inspect the status of Indigenous rights, and pledge to return Indigenous lands that had been illegally seized and sold to third parties (Resende, 2015). Although the government's empty promises were sufficient to curb international criticism, its plan for assimilating and exterminating Indigenous peoples across the country carried on and was intensified by military governments in the following decades, including through FUNAI (Heck, 1996; Resende, 2015; Sant'Anna et al., 2018; Teles Junior, 2018).

The 1970s in Brazil were characterized by widespread human rights violations, repression, and state violence, as the country's dictators intensified their dominance and control (CNV, 2014; Demetrio & Kozicki, 2017; Heck, 1996). At that time, government-sponsored economic development projects that allegedly aimed to revive the Amazon basin and protect the Brazil's northern border served as a way for the Brazilian state to

accelerate Indigenous genocide in the far north (CNV, 2014; Heck, 1996). Under the guise of transforming the country's economy and improving border security, government officials engaged in heinous criminal acts against Indigenous communities and individuals, including enslavement; mass murders; physical torture; denying access to food; sexual exploitation of women and children; arbitrary arrests; and forced disappearances (Barbosa, 2016; Palmquist, 2018; Resende, 2015; Sant'Anna et al., 2018). Indigenous groups such as the Waimiri-Atroari and the Yanomami were severely impacted by the country's development projects at the time and were often targeted by the Brazilian military and other government workers (Baines, 2008; ISA, n.d.-c; Palmquist, 2018; Teles Junior, 2018). Witnesses report military compliance and direct involvement in massacres of Waimiri-Atroari communities (CNV, 2014; Palmquist, 2018). Moreover, contractors advancing through Yanomami territory during the construction of a hydroelectric plant gifted locals with clothes contaminated with viruses and bacteria that proved devastating, given that the Yanomami were denied access to basic healthcare (CNV, 2014; Heck, 1996). Further, it has been reported that vaccinations against contagious diseases have been denied to the Yanomami in at least two occasions during severe epidemics, leading to hundreds of preventable deaths (CNV, 2014).

The case of the Yanomami also illustrates the danger of gold mining for Indigenous communities in the northern region of the country. The Yanomami, like many other Indigenous groups, inhabit a resource-rich area of the Amazon forest, which has been sought after by gold miners (*garimpeiros*) for decades (CNV, 2014; ISA, n.d.-c; Sponsel, 2011). Gold mining in Yanomami lands intensified in the 1980's, which led to mercury contamination by polluted water from the mines and their displacement from certain parts of their territory (Basta et al., 2016; Plummer, 2015; Sponsel, 2011). Moreover, even after the Yanomami territory was officially recognized in legislation in the early 1990s, making it illegal for outsiders to extract resources from their lands, *garimpeiros* continued to invade Yanomami lands, aiming to maximize their profits and willing to use violent means to achieve their goals (CNV, 2014; Sponsel, 2011). Conflict between armed miners and the Yanomami caused numerous violent deaths and a general sense of insecurity in the community over the years (Oliveira, 2020; Sponsel, 2011).

The end of the dictatorship and reintroduction of democracy in Brazil in 1985 led to the development of a new Federal Constitution, which was put into effect on October 5th, 1988. As a result of intense activism by Indigenous rights advocates, the 1988 Constitution recognized Indigenous peoples' traditional land rights for the first time in Brazilian legislation (Demetrio & Kozicki, 2017; Teles Junior, 2018). According to Indigenous law experts, this meant the legal acknowledgement that Indigenous land rights are immemorial and precede current legislation (Teles Junior, 2018; Universidade de Brasília, 2017). Moreover, the Constitution established the State's responsibility to demarcate and protect Indigenous lands, prohibited the removal of Indigenous groups from their territories, and made resource extraction on Indigenous lands conditional on approval by Congress after consultation with the affected communities (Universidade de Brasília, 2017). The constitutional recognition of Indigenous land rights and the right to prior consultation meant that, in theory, these rights would be legally secure, as the Constitution would serve as an instrument of protection to curb potential disputes and objections.

After the enactment of the Constitution and the consequent recognition of Indigenous land rights, it was expected that Indigenous lands be identified, demarcated, and legally recognized within five years (Indigenous Peoples Rights International [IPRI] & APIB, 2021). New legislation placed the responsibility over the identification and demarcation of Indigenous lands on FUNAI, conditional on final approval by the president (IPRI & APIB, 2021). Furthermore the FUNAI was made responsible for overseeing business activities taking place on Indigenous lands to monitor compliance with prior consultation and restrictions placed on resource extraction (Teles Junior, 2018).

Nevertheless, threats to Indigenous security persisted in the 1990s. Landowners, farmers, and *garimpeiros* who opposed Indigenous land rights continued to threaten and engage in violence against Indigenous peoples across the country (Leite & Neto, 2016; Palmquist, 2018). One particular occasion, in 1993, in which *garimpeiros* killed 16 Yanomami individuals and left many others injured in an attempt to exterminate the community was later ruled a genocide by Brazilian courts (*Comissão Pró-Yanomami* [CCPY], 2001; Palmquist, 2018). Moreover, in the legal sphere, new bills were proposed authorizing the exploration and use of mineral resources from Indigenous lands without the required levels of approval and consultation (APIB, 2013a). Additionally,

constitutional amendments were proposed in 1999 and 2000 to transfer the responsibility over the approval of Indigenous land demarcations to the Legislative, which presented a significant risk for Indigenous land rights, given the strong anti-Indigenous sentiment in Congress (APIB, 2013a). These bills resulted in significant delays in demarcation processes, prolonged court cases and legal disputes, and escalated violence against Indigenous groups (APIB, 2013a, 2014g, 2021). As will be demonstrated in the next section, they have remained an impediment to upholding Indigenous security over time, with ongoing debates in Congress and in courts to approve them.

The 20th century was a difficult period for Indigenous peoples in Brazil, marked by decades of brutal violence, including mass murders, torture, sexual exploitation, enslavement, and ethnic cleansing (CNV, 2014; Heck, 1996; Teles Junior, 2018). In particular, significant abuses took place and went unpunished during Brazil's military regime (CNV, 2014; Heck, 1996). In this section, I have presented select examples of security risks for Indigenous populations in the 1900s; however, this thesis cannot possibly cover all the instances of abuses of Indigenous rights that occurred throughout the country, nor is it intended to do so. Rather, my goal is to paint an overall picture of the insecurity faced by Indigenous peoples in the country to set the context for understanding the urgency of the situation of Indigenous peoples today.

Current Threats to Indigenous Security in Brazil

The political scene in Brazil in the early 2000s was vastly different from what it had been in recent decades and brought hope to many marginalized communities across the country (Ribeiro, 2014). The election of President Luiz Inácio 'Lula' da Silva in 2002 led to the creation of several social programs aimed at reducing inequalities and improving food security (Ribeiro, 2014). A member of Brazil's leftist Workers' Party (PT), Lula had been a labour and land rights activist for decades and campaigned with the promise of securing land rights across the country (Ribeiro, 2014). Further, Brazil incorporated the International Labor Organization Convention 169 on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries (ILO Convention 169) into domestic legislation in 2004 and endorsed the UNDRIP in 2007, further reaffirming its international commitment to upholding Indigenous rights (Teles Junior, 2018; UN, 2007). However,

security challenges faced by Indigenous peoples in the country continued, and Brazil's endorsement of the ILO Convention 169 and the UNDRIP proved to be merely symbolic.

Invasion of Indigenous lands for mineral extraction, farming, and infrastructure projects, and the resulting conflict, continued (Palmquist, 2018; Ribeiro, 2014; Teles Junior, 2018). Moreover, the growing influence of agribusiness interests in Congress led to new policy proposals aiming to curtail Indigenous land rights by restricting land demarcation processes and once again attempting to take responsibility over the approval of demarcations (APIB, 2021). Processes for demarcating Indigenous lands throughout the country were already stalled due to resistance from farmers, underfunding of FUNAI, and overcomplicated legal processes that hampered demarcations and land recognition (Teles Junior, 2018). Furthermore, one particular case before the *Supremo Tribunal Federal* (STF), Brazil's highest court, led to a decision in 2009 that authorized the development national defence infrastructure in Yanomami territory and established that, in order for Indigenous lands to be legally recognized, Indigenous communities would need to be present in those lands as of October 5th 1988, the date of the Constitution (APIB, 2017d; Demetrio & Kozicki, 2017). The decision, which could pose significant danger to the Yanomami given the military's history against Indigenous peoples in the country, did not involve consultation with the affected community, in a clear violation of their right to prior consultation. Moreover, although the STF later clarified that the one-time decision would not constitute precedent for future cases, legal experts warned that it still posed a risk to Indigenous peoples, as the decision could be used in bad faith by governments and businesses as justification to not exercise prior consultation before initiating projects on Indigenous lands (APIB, 2017d).

The following years proved difficult for Indigenous peoples in Brazil. After federal elections in 2010, Lula's successor, President Dilma Roussef, struggled to find leverage within her government and bent against the pressure of *ruralistas*, a group of Congress members that support agribusiness interests (APIB, 2014g, 2016a). During her time in office, Roussef stalled Indigenous land demarcations, which led to significant delays and heightened conflict (APIB, 2016a). New bills continued to threaten Indigenous lands, such as a proposal to authorize the exploration of natural resources and remove protections over Brazil's biodiversity and associated traditional knowledge (APIB, 2016a; APIB & Amazon Watch, 2020). Importantly, Indigenous peoples in Brazil inhabit some of

the world's most biodiverse environments and hold the necessary knowledge to protect such areas (APIB & Amazon Watch, 2020; Teles Junior, 2018). Thus, removing legal protections over those environments and associated knowledge presents a significant risk to Indigenous peoples who rely on the land for their collective survival and have been responsible for the protection of biodiversity in the country (APIB & Amazon Watch, 2020).

In addition to legal challenges to land rights, Indigenous peoples continued to face other threats posed by state and non-state actors (Leite & Neto, 2016; Palmquist, 2018). Violent conflict with armed farmers and *garimpeiros* continued, and an overall sense of insecurity persisted among Indigenous communities (APIB, 2013a, 2013b, 2014d). In 2013, 349 homicides of Indigenous individuals were reported in the state of Mato Grosso do Sul, comprising over half the total amount for the entire the country (Palmquist, 2018). Homicides were largely attributed to land conflicts with farmers who had invaded Guarani-Kaiowá territory (Palmquist, 2018). Furthermore, state violence came in the form of persecution of Indigenous leaders and activists, who were criminalized and met with police brutality, increased militarization of Indigenous lands, and the spread of disinformation and racist rhetoric against Indigenous peoples by politicians (APIB, 2013b, 2014a, 2014d, 2014e). One case in 2013 that led to considerable public outcry involved video footage of Congressmen Luiz Carlos Heinze and Alceu Moreira engaging in hate speech against Indigenous peoples, gay and lesbian individuals, and Brazilian descendants of enslaved Africans (*quilombolas*), and encouraging farmers in the country to fight for territory by any means necessary (APIB, 2014b, 2014f; Canofre, 2017; Teles Junior, 2018). By inciting violence against traditionally marginalized groups, the two Congressmen illustrate one of the many challenges faced by these communities.

Political instability in the subsequent years contributed to aggravating insecurity for Indigenous peoples in Brazil. Following a corruption scandal, Congress voted to impeach Rouseff in 2016; her successor, Michel Temer, had close alliances with *ruralistas* and reinforced his commitment to wealthy farmers and against Indigenous land rights (APIB, 2016c). While Rouseff's record on land rights was poor, the situation aggravated during Temer's government, as *ruralistas* increased their influence and took control of government (APIB, 2016b; Canofre, 2017; Teles Junior, 2018). In 2017, 34 anti-Indigenous bills that threatened Indigenous land rights and favoured the expansion

of agribusiness were under deliberation in Congress (Teles Junior, 2018). Moreover, Temer' government stalled land demarcation processes, with only one Indigenous land officially recognized during his two and a half years in office (APIB, 2017e, 2020). The administration also cut FUNAI's budget in half and reduced its staff, hampering its ability to conduct land identification and demarcation processes, and to monitor business activities taking place on Indigenous lands (APIB, 2016c; Teles Junior, 2018). As a result of the government's negative attitude towards Indigenous peoples and policies favouring *ruralistas*, land conflicts between wealthy landowners and Indigenous peoples became more frequent and bloodier between 2016 and 2017 (Canofre, 2017).

Meanwhile, Brazilian courts faced pressure from *ruralistas* to recognize a principle known as *Marco Temporal*, according to which Indigenous peoples would only have the legal right to land that they inhabited as of the enactment of the Constitution in 1988 (Universidade de Brasília, 2017). The push for this interpretation of land rights found pretext on the 2009 STF decision regarding the recognition of Yanomami lands (APIB, 2017d, 2017e; Universidade de Brasília, 2017). Indigenous rights advocates and legal experts have argued that the principle of *Marco Temporal* presents a threat to Indigenous peoples for several reasons. First, it overlooks the fact that when the Constitution came into effect, many Indigenous groups were displaced due to policies and practices implemented during Brazil's military dictatorship which forcibly removed Indigenous peoples from their traditional territories (APIB, 2017b). Hence, decisions based on the *Marco Temporal* principle, would make these groups lose their land rights due to being victimized (APIB, 2017b). Secondly, the principle implies that Indigenous land rights were only acquired in 1988, although experts' interpretation of the legal text is that it grants traditional land rights based on traditional occupation and irrespective of occupation in 1988 (APIB, 2017b, 2017e; Baines, 2008). Finally, the principle presents a risk to Indigenous groups whose lands are already legally recognized, as it could be used as justification for interested parties to appeal decisions and engage in further violence against Indigenous communities (APIB, 2017e).

Due to increased pressure from *ruralistas* to indulge the anti-Indigenous principle in legal decisions, many of the processes to recognize Indigenous lands were stalled. Indigenous rights advocates warned that suspending land recognition processes could pose increased risk of conflict in disputed areas, particularly to communities that already faced significant levels of violence (APIB, 2017e). For instance, the Guarani-Kaiowá

were already widely victimized by anti-Indigenous violence (Palmquist, 2018). Of all the reported homicides of Indigenous individuals between 2003 and 2015, nearly half took place in the state of Mato Grosso do Sul, where a significant part of Guarani-Kaiowá territories is located. Hence, the prospect of not having their lands recognized meant a higher risk of heightened conflict and overall violence against their communities (APIB, 2017e).

Furthermore, recent developments have continued to deteriorate the security of Indigenous societies in Brazil. A 2019 report reveals an increase in violence against Indigenous peoples in the country compared to the previous year, including interpersonal violence, forced displacement, land appropriation, and overall negligence by the state (CIMI, 2020). Overall violence aggravated since the country's far-right conservative government took office in January 2019. Brazilian president Jair Bolsonaro has repeatedly engaged in hostile discourse against Indigenous peoples and relies heavily on support from his loyal base of *garimpeiros* and farmers, who feel encouraged to engage in violent acts against Indigenous communities (APIB, 2021; Garvey & Torres, 2020; Phillips, 2019). During his election campaign, Bolsonaro promised to not approve the recognition of any more Indigenous lands and reaffirmed his support for assimilating Indigenous peoples (APIB, 2020; IPRI & APIB, 2021). Since then, land-based conflict has intensified and violence against Indigenous communities reached record levels (APIB, 2021).

Bolsonaro's anti-Indigenous stance proved to be more than a matter of discourse and was quickly put into practice. Although not the first government to stall or delay processes for recognition of Indigenous lands in Brazil, the Bolsonaro administration went a step further to dismantle Indigenous land rights (APIB, 2021). For his first act in office, on January 1st, 2020, Bolsonaro transferred the responsibility of identifying and demarcating Indigenous lands from FUNAI to the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply, a government body that is traditionally occupied by *ruralistas* who strongly oppose Indigenous land rights (APIB, 2021). He continued to hinder FUNAI's ability to work in the interests of Indigenous peoples by naming a former advisor to the *ruralista* bench for FUNAI's leadership (APIB, 2021). Notably, the deterioration of FUNAI's work and its shift against Indigenous rights was not limited to its leadership. An audio conversation leaked in 2020 revealed that the FUNAI department that handled issues concerning isolated Indigenous communities was handed to an evangelical pastor who

planned to re-establish religious missions to convert and assimilate isolated Indigenous groups, which advanced the risk of genocide of these communities (APIB, 2020; Lisboa & Milanez, 2020).

Bolsonaro's government has also proposed amendments to legislation to legalize resource extraction in protected Indigenous lands, creating dangerous risks for local Indigenous communities (APIB, 2021). In addition to physical threats to the communities and the violation of land rights, the proposed amendments could create irreversible damage to Brazil's biomes, as they are likely to increase deforestation and pollution in affected areas (APIB & Amazon Watch, 2020; CIMI, 2021). Indigenous lands in Brazil were already vulnerable to environmental destruction posed by deforestation and forest fires, which have increased tremendously since the current government took office (APIB, 2020, 2021; APIB & Amazon Watch, 2020).

As stated in chapter 3, environmental security is key to Indigenous security and is central to Indigenous peoples' collective survival due to their strong connection with their lands. Thus, the increase in deforestation and forest fires in Brazil since 2019 has endangered Indigenous peoples that inhabit the country's major biomes. Notably, 2019 marked a record year in which many Indigenous communities had their lands destroyed by fire and were displaced (APIB, 2021). Forest fires, particularly in the Amazon, have severely harmed Indigenous populations, with an increase in hospitalizations due to respiratory illness attributed to smoke inhalation (APIB, 2020). Moreover, deforestation in the Amazon increased by 34.5% between August 2019 and July 2020, and by 45% between March 2020 and March 2021, reaching its highest level in a ten-year period (APIB, 2020, 2021). The environmental destruction in the region is largely attributed to the mining, agricultural and energy sectors and is highly financed by foreign private corporations with interests in the region (APIB, 2020; APIB & Amazon Watch, 2020). Whereas Indigenous communities in the Amazon have long resisted the extractive industries that bring such destruction and called for higher accountability and law enforcement, there has been little action from government, since many state officials have their own interests at stake (Teles Junior, 2018).

Environmental destruction has also affected other biomes that are critical to Indigenous peoples, such as the Brazilian *Cerrado* and the *Pantanal*. The *Cerrado* is an area that is home to nearly a quarter of Brazil's biodiversity, as well as many Indigenous

communities (APIB, 2021). Environmental devastation in the area is attributed to deforestation and fires, primarily due to livestock farming (APIB, 2021; APIB & Amazon Watch, 2020). It is reported that half of the *Cerrado*'s original flora has been destroyed, and devastation is rapidly accelerating (APIB, 2021). Moreover, similar to the unsettling situation in the Amazon, a record number of 93 thousand fires was reported in the *Cerrado* between January 2019 and September 2020, (APIB, 2021). Furthermore, the *Pantanal* has also seen record numbers of fires, particularly during 2020 (APIB, 2021; APIB & Amazon Watch, 2020). Only in October of that year, nearly three thousand fires were reported, bringing much of the area to a state of destruction that has created severe consequences for Indigenous peoples that inhabit the area (APIB, 2021).

Furthermore, the COVID-19 pandemic has exacerbated threats to Indigenous security in Brazil (APIB, 2020, 2021; Jucá, 2020; Menton et al., 2021). The SARS-COV-2 virus was primarily brought into Indigenous communities by *garimpeiros*, healthcare workers, government officials, and the agricultural sector (APIB, 2020; Jucá, 2020; Menton et al., 2021). For instance, in the south and west-central regions of Brazil, many Indigenous workers are employed by meat processing plants in settings where preventive measures such as physical distancing and proper ventilation have not been fully employed; accordingly, these plants were some of the main entry points of the virus into Indigenous communities in those regions (APIB, 2020). Without an appropriate public health response to COVID-19 in the country, many Indigenous communities were negatively impacted (APIB, 2020, 2021; CIMI, 2021; Lopes & Lima, 2020). Studies have found that marginalized populations in Brazil, including Indigenous communities, were disproportionately affected by COVID-19 with higher rates of hospitalizations and deaths at the beginning of the pandemic than any other groups (Lopes & Lima, 2020).

The heightened vulnerability of Indigenous peoples during the pandemic is not only due to state negligence in preventing the spread of the disease throughout the country, but also the federal government's outright denial of healthcare to Indigenous populations (APIB, 2020, 2021). The APIB reports that lack of public health measures, training, infrastructure, healthcare supplies and materials required to support emergency measures to prevent the spread of the virus have influenced the elevated number of infections and deaths among Indigenous groups (APIB, 2020). Healthcare workers in Indigenous communities have been forced to work while infected with COVID-19, which has accelerated the spread of the disease (APIB, 2020). Moreover, the federal

government vetoed specific sections of a bill that aimed to prevent the spread of COVID-19 in Indigenous communities (APIB, 2020). Vetoed items would have enabled the provision of healthcare and cleaning products to Indigenous communities and prevent the spread of the virus (APIB, 2020).

In addition to state omission in preventing widespread infections and deaths, the government has been complicit in the delivery of ineffective and potentially dangerous drugs to Indigenous communities across the country (APIB, 2020). The Brazilian military was responsible for the production and delivery of hydroxychloroquine to Indigenous communities, a drug with no scientific evidence to support its use against COVID-19 (APIB, 2020, 2021). Brazil's public agency responsible for drug administration and approval, the *Agência Nacional de Vigilância Sanitária* (ANVISA), prohibited the sale of hydroxychloroquine without a medical prescription in July 2020 to curb potential misuse of the drug. However, at that time, the Brazilian military had already produced three million capsules of the drug and continued to distribute it to Indigenous communities across the country (APIB, 2020).

Moreover, delegations from Brazil's Ministry of Defence, Ministry of Health, and accompanying media outlets entered several Indigenous communities across the country on alleged missions to investigate the status of the COVID-19 pandemic in Indigenous lands (APIB, 2020). Visits did not seek consultation with the communities prior to arrival and disrespected their choice of self-isolation, placing vulnerable communities at increased risk of infection, and potentially death (APIB, 2020). These government representatives delivered thousands of hydroxychloroquine pills to healthcare workers in the communities they visited, and reported no positive COVID-19 cases in the communities, stating that the situation was under control, contrasting against data pulled by local organizations (APIB, 2020).

Finally, Bolsonaro has continued to encourage the invasion of Indigenous lands during the COVID-19 pandemic, legitimizing crime and violence against Indigenous peoples and accelerating the spread of the virus in vulnerable communities (APIB, 2020). The federal government's anti-Indigenous discourse, policies and practices have exposed Indigenous groups and individuals to higher levels of racism, physical violence, homicides, destruction of their lands and contamination of natural resources, contributing to their heightened insecurity (APIB, 2020).

This chapter has outlined some of the major threats to Indigenous peoples in Brazil over the centuries. The historical overview of threats to Indigenous security provides the necessary context for the data analysis that will follow, given that many of these threats have persisted and escalated in recent years. Hence, chapter 4 will explore the ways in which the APIB has actively endeavoured to address these threats to promote and protect Indigenous security in the country.

Chapter 4.

The APIB's Role in Promoting and Protecting Indigenous Security: Key Findings and Takeaways

Small-scale movements for Indigenous rights in Brazil have a long history of activism and struggles against insecurity; however, nationally coordinated advocacy in the country is more recent. Due to Brazil's vast territory and long history of forcibly displacing Indigenous communities from their traditional lands, Indigenous peoples are scattered throughout the country and many communities have had limited degrees of contact between each other until recently. When combined with destructive anti-Indigenous policies, this fragmentation has hampered connections and collaboration between Indigenous communities, resulting in the virtual inexistence of a national Indigenous movement until the 1980's (Baines, 2008; Ramos, 1997). Nonetheless, civil society groups have organized to advocate for Indigenous rights, expose abuses, promote state accountability, empower Indigenous individuals, and pursue reconciliation (Borges & Branford, 2019; ISA, 2019; Jucá, 2020; Ramos, 1997). Some of these actors have incorporated into formal organizations, such as the *Articulação dos Povos Indígenas do Brasil* (APIB), a national Brazilian organization which coordinates the advocacy efforts of local and regional organizations and promotes Indigenous rights at the national level. Because the APIB is comprised of representatives from all regions of the country, it mobilizes diverse populations, strengthens the advocacy efforts of Indigenous communities, and facilitates relationship-building with government representatives, thereby enhancing the influence of Indigenous people in legislative and judicial processes (APIB, n.d.-c).

This study explores the APIB's role in promoting and protecting Indigenous security in Brazil to highlight how civil society efforts can contribute to upholding security and holding states accountable to their international commitments towards Indigenous peoples. I examine the APIB's advocacy efforts to promote and protect Indigenous security between 2013 and 2021 with specific attention to references to international law, international organizations, international cooperation, and global solidarity. Through this analysis, I seek to gain further insight and contribute to a better understanding in the global literature about promoting state accountability in terms of Indigenous security.

Three major findings can be drawn from this case study. First, the data collected corroborates with the literature in that the protection of Indigenous land rights is paramount for Indigenous security; accordingly, the APIB's efforts and achievements in terms of promoting land rights reaffirm its significance in the struggle against violence towards Indigenous peoples in Brazil. Secondly, given the deep-rooted disconnect between decision-makers and Indigenous groups, the APIB's initiatives to promote Indigenous political participation and prior consultation, as well as its partnerships and collaborations with other civil society groups, have increased Indigenous peoples' influence in matters of Indigenous security. Finally, the APIB has been a key player in monitoring Brazil's policies and practices against Indigenous peoples, often acting as a deterrent against the looming regression of Indigenous security in the current political context. These findings are further explored below.

Safety, Land Rights, and the Struggle Against Violence

As explained in chapter 2, Indigenous definitions of security incorporate threats that are unique to Indigenous peoples' collective existence. While certain factors such as Indigenous land rights tend to be commonly understood as central to Indigenous security, Indigenous definitions of security can vary according to individual communities' circumstances and their socio-political context. Accordingly, chapter 3 demonstrates that personal and community safety remain a primary security concern for Indigenous peoples in Brazil. In the period covered by this study, the APIB has highlighted major concerns related to the physical safety of Indigenous citizens and communities, including the continuance of conflict with armed invaders in Indigenous lands, persecution of Indigenous leaders by state authorities, frequent homicides of Indigenous citizens, death threats against Indigenous leaders and activists, and political discourse inciting violence against Indigenous peoples (APIB, 2014f, 2020, 2021). Data collected from the APIB is consistent with the existing literature in terms of the security challenges faced by Indigenous groups across the country and draws attention to the alarming situation in which many communities find themselves.

The APIB has attributed the persistence of violence over time to a number of factors, but primarily to the precariousness of Indigenous land rights in Brazil and the unwillingness of state authorities to act against perpetrators of violence. Indigenous land rights are contested in courts and threatened by the three state powers, including

through the proposal and enactment of legislation to curb land demarcation, weaken several levels of protection, and modify legal processes to favour agribusiness interests (APIB, 2021). Similarly, formal recognition of Indigenous lands has proven difficult, as there has been resistance from powerful interest groups such as the agriculture, mining, and energy sectors. Members of Congress with strong ties to these groups have repeatedly attempted to change legal procedures for identifying and demarcating Indigenous lands, with the goal of limiting Indigenous land rights and assigning Indigenous lands to private groups for resource extraction and profit. Delays and suspension of processes to demarcate and recognize Indigenous lands have contributed to prolonged conflict between Indigenous communities and invaders that take interest in Indigenous lands for large-scale farming and resource extraction. Without official recognition of Indigenous lands, outsiders feel entitled to take control, and often do so through violent means (APIB, 2020, 2021). The response from public authorities has often been favourable to invaders and hostile towards Indigenous groups. Indigenous leaders tend to be criminalized for defending their land rights and face frequent death threats (APIB, 2014d, 2020, 2021). Moreover, extractive industries and politicians with interest in Indigenous lands have shaped the public's perception of land conflicts in their favour through the spread of disinformation and hate speech (APIB, 2014b, 2021).

Accordingly, the APIB views the protection of land rights as a means of violence prevention and has geared much of its attention towards promoting Indigenous land rights. In the period covered in this study, the organization has monitored Brazil's policies in terms of Indigenous lands, human rights, and social control, and has strongly opposed the criminalization of Indigenous leaders in the country (APIB, 2021). In its efforts against violent conflict between Indigenous communities and land grabbers, the APIB has released several public statements and letters to government officials denouncing specific instances of violence, as well as the overall insecurity that threatens Indigenous peoples across Brazil (APIB, 2013a, 2017e). Furthermore, it has submitted complaints to high-level government officials, as well as international bodies, denouncing Brazil's inaction towards violence (APIB, 2014d, 2021).

The APIB has also organized and participated in protests and demonstrations in support of Indigenous land rights and against anti-Indigenous violence across Brazil (APIB, n.d.-c, 2019c, 2020, 2021). The APIB is one of the forces behind Brazil's national Indigenous movement, *Mobilização Nacional Indígena* (MNI), which mobilizes

Indigenous groups and allies to protest injustices committed against Indigenous peoples. The primary demand of the movement is for government authorities to secure Indigenous land rights by concluding the ongoing processes for demarcating Indigenous lands, many of which have been stalled, suspended, or delayed indefinitely (APIB, n.d.-c).

A key component of the MNI, and the origin of the APIB as a formal organization, is the *Acampamento Terra Livre* (ATL), an annual event held in Brasilia in support of Indigenous land rights. The ATL consists of a camp that takes place over the span of a several days outside Congress to demand secure land rights (APIB, n.d.-c, 2016b, 2017c, 2019c). It typically involves cultural ceremonies, meetings between Indigenous leaders, workshops, seminars, and public hearings with government officials to present Indigenous peoples' demands. Indigenous leaders participating in the ATL have been received by government representatives to submit their demands over meetings and public hearings. On one occasion, the ATL was successful in pressuring the federal government to immediately conclude five land demarcation processes that had been stalled, finally reaching a decision that was favourable to the concerned Indigenous communities (APIB, 2016b). The ATL has counted with the participation and support of Indigenous peoples and allies from across Brazil and has gathered international support, including through the direct participation of Indigenous representatives from countries such as Bolivia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Indonesia, and Panama, for instance (APIB, 2017c).

While there have been occasions in which peaceful protests and demonstrations by Indigenous groups were met with police brutality, the APIB has played a key role in mediating and deescalating violence from police. One example comes from the 2019 edition of the ATL, in which the delegation was met by a large convoy of heavily armed police officers, who informed them that the protest would not be permitted in the usual location (APIB, 2019b). In anticipation of protests, the federal government had authorized the deployment of the National Public Security Force (*Força Nacional*), a level of law enforcement that is intended to mitigate civil unrest, to allegedly discourage violence and protect government buildings and officials (APIB, 2019b, 2019a). Protesters and organizers were afflicted by the location ban, given that the ATL had been peacefully held outside Congress for nearly 15 years (APIB, 2019b). Recognizing the danger posed by law enforcement to Indigenous protesters, the APIB wanted to

avoid the escalation of violence and potentially deadly conflict. Hence, the organization negotiated and agreed to relocate the protest, emphasizing its commitment to dialogue and preserving the peaceful nature of the movement (APIB, 2019b, 2019a).

These succinct examples can help illustrate the APIB's role in mobilizing civil society to promote Indigenous land rights, prevent the escalation of conflict and promote security for Indigenous groups and individuals. The APIB has made it clear that land rights are critical for promoting Indigenous security and that upholding land rights can help prevent the escalation of violence. Hence, the APIB's intensive efforts to promote land rights can reaffirm its value in the struggle against violence in Brazil.

A Bottom-Up Approach: Prior Consultation, Participation, and Solidarity

Chapter 2 outlined significant achievements of the international movement for Indigenous rights, including the recognition of Indigenous peoples' right to prior consultation in the UNDRIP and ILO Convention 169. Likewise, that chapter also explained that the international community lacks the necessary mechanisms to enforce international norms such as those established under the UNDRIP and the ILO Convention 169, and there are no tools to ensure state compliance with these treaties. Accordingly, although Brazil is a signatory country in both treaties and has recognized the right to prior consultation in its domestic legislation, this right is not fully executed in the country. Political and court decisions on matters affecting Indigenous peoples tend to either disregard the assessments made by consulted parties, limit opportunities for Indigenous peoples to voice their concerns, or not incorporate prior consultation at all. This trend can be observed both in community-specific cases, such as land disputes between a particular group and land invaders, and in more general issues, such as changes in legislation that affect all Indigenous peoples in the country (APIB, 2013a, 2014b, 2014g, 2017a). Hence, decision-making on Indigenous issues in Brazil has been largely disconnected from the lived experiences of Indigenous peoples in the country and has largely favoured matters that aggravate their insecurity (APIB, 2014b, 2016b, 2021).

The disconnect between policy-making and Indigenous affairs can be attributed to a few different factors, but primarily to the strong influence of anti-Indigenous groups

in government. Extractive industries, such the mining and agriculture sectors, retain strong power in government, including through the *ruralista* bench in Congress, composed by politicians that defend agribusiness interests and who have repeatedly demonstrated their animosity towards Indigenous peoples' demands, their right to exist as collective groups, and their overall security (APIB, 2021; APIB & Amazon Watch, 2020). Their influence is such that wealthy landowners tend to be consulted and given preference on Indigenous land matters before the Indigenous groups that would be affected by respective decisions (APIB, 2014b). In recent years, *ruralistas* have shaped public opinion and policymaking in their favour, particularly at the federal level (APIB, 2017e, 2019b). Brazil has seen an increase in anti-Indigenous sentiment, with Indigenous individuals and collective groups often dehumanized in the legislative and justice systems and framed as wards of the state with no legal capacities rather than subjects with autonomy (APIB, 2021). The misrepresentation of Indigenous peoples as incapable of taking charge of their own affairs is reminiscent of assimilation policies implemented throughout Brazil's history and hinders the progress that had been made in this regard in the past few decades (APIB, 2021).

This distortion of facts by *ruralistas* is easily disproved by the APIB, which has been increasingly involved in legislative and court procedures and demonstrated its expertise in handling Indigenous affairs, including in terms of Indigenous security. For instance, the APIB's legal department has monitored legislative processes concerning Indigenous rights, taken legal action to defend Indigenous rights in court, including against the persecution and unlawful arrest of Indigenous leaders, and provided legal counsel in matters involving land conflicts (APIB, 2021; IPRI & APIB, 2021). Recently, in response to Brazil's negligence in addressing the COVID-19 pandemic on Indigenous lands, the APIB has resorted to the STF, Brazil's highest court, to secure an emergency plan to curb the spread of the disease (APIB, 2021). This was a significant accomplishment in terms of Indigenous peoples' participation in legal matters, given that only a limited number of agencies have legal authority to file complaints directly to the STF (APIB, 2021). Furthermore, in the international sphere, the APIB has filed accusations against Brazil before international bodies such as the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, the International Criminal Court and the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR), further demonstrating its capacity and commitment towards Indigenous security (APIB, 2014d, 2021).

In addition to its participation in legal procedures, the APIB has also directed its efforts towards strengthening Indigenous presence in Congress, calling for increased participation of Indigenous individuals and allies in political spaces (APIB, 2017a). The APIB has highlighted Indigenous political candidates whose agenda aligns with the national Indigenous movement, and has made efforts to create stronger alliances, collaborations, and partnerships with other civil society groups. Its purpose in terms of increasing Indigenous participation in Congress is to counter the pressure of interest groups that actively seek to harm Indigenous peoples and create opportunities for Indigenous peoples to be involved in decisions that affect them (APIB, 2017a). Moreover, the APIB has highlighted Indigenous participation in the *Comissão Nacional de Política Indigenista*, a working group that was intended to provide space for dialogue and articulate public policies in terms of Indigenous affairs (APIB, 2013b). Still, the working group often leaned against Indigenous interests, and therefore the participation and mobilization of Indigenous rights activists, including the APIB, helped raise Indigenous peoples' concerns, promote accountability, and emphasize the need for proper prior consultation (APIB, 2013b, 2014c). The working group led to the incorporation of the *Conselho Nacional de Política Indigenista* (CNPI) in 2015, which serves as an official advisory body to promote prior consultation (APIB, 2016d). Although governments have attempted to suspend and hinder the CNPI, strong pressure from Indigenous advocates has prompted its reinstatement to continue consultation processes (APIB, 2016c, 2018).

Furthermore, partnerships and collaborations with various civil society groups in Brazil and internationally have contributed to the APIB's efforts towards promoting Indigenous security (APIB, 2020; APIB & Amazon Watch, 2020; IPRI & APIB, 2021). The APIB's own structure as an umbrella organization comprised of seven regional Indigenous organizations is evidence of its high regard for collaboration and solidarity among Indigenous groups and allies (APIB, n.d.-c, 2020; IPRI & APIB, 2021). The APIB often emphasizes the efforts of its member organizations, given that their work is crucial for fulfilling its mission (APIB, 2013a, 2016e, 2020). Further, the APIB has highlighted the strength of solidarity with grassroots organizations and civil society movements nationally and internationally, which has broadened its reach and enhanced its ability to influence decision-making and to promote and protect Indigenous security (APIB, 2013a, 2017c; APIB & Amazon Watch, 2020; IPRI & APIB, 2021).

Finally, the ability of Indigenous peoples and associated civil society groups to create effective change through increased participation in government is made clear by *ruralistas*' repeated attempts to weaken Indigenous agencies or eliminate them entirely. In the period covered by this study, government agencies such as the *Fundação Nacional do Índio* (FUNAI), the government body tasked with identifying and demarcating Indigenous lands, have been repeatedly undermined. Governments have defunded it, reduced its workforce, restructured it against Indigenous interests, and changed the scope of its portfolio to further decrease its reach (APIB, 2016c, 2019d). Further, the APIB has strongly opposed governments' repeated attempts to hinder, suspend, or eliminate the CNPI (APIB, 2013b, 2014c, 2016c). Challenges posed to Indigenous participation by anti-Indigenous groups in government, including through attempts to undermine and exclude Indigenous groups, reinforce the idea that Indigenous resistance, participation, and solidarity are needed and can be an effective way to promote Indigenous security.

The APIB strives to ensure that Indigenous people's voices are heard and taken into consideration in matters that affect them. It has continuously monitored Brazilian Indigenous policy regarding participation and sought to increase Indigenous participation in decision-making processes (APIB, 2021). The data demonstrates that enhancing Indigenous participation and prior consultation in matters that affect them, including land rights, are key to upholding Indigenous security. Indigenous participation can counter the strength and influence of anti-Indigenous groups in government, promote accountability, and prompt effective change. This is further enhanced by national and international partnerships and collaborations between civil society groups, which can broaden their reach, increase their influence, and help obtain greater public support.

Mobilizing Citizens and Pressuring Governments Against the Regression of Rights

Chapter 3 demonstrated that the Brazilian state continues to try to erase Indigenous peoples and threaten their existence by denying their most basic rights, such as the rights to land, security of the person, and access to basic needs. Recent instances of Indigenous rights violations by the state include stalling legal procedures for recognizing Indigenous lands, inciting violence against Indigenous groups, and persecuting Indigenous leaders. Still, an underlying threat to Indigenous peoples in

Brazil in recent years has been the heightened risk of their insecurity aggravating, including through the potential regression or elimination of Indigenous rights from legislation and the deliberate denial of basic human rights (APIB, 2017e, 2021; IPRI & APIB, 2021). In the period covered by this study, anti-Indigenous groups and members of government have repeatedly attempted to revert Indigenous peoples' collective rights, such as their traditional right to land, healthcare, and their collective existence (APIB, 2020, 2021; IPRI & APIB, 2021).

In response, the APIB has played a key role in mobilizing citizens and pressuring governments to not revert Indigenous rights. A notable example occurred in 2016, when the federal government eliminated the country's Indigenous health authority, the *Secretaria Especial da Saúde Indígena* (SESAI), and transferred the responsibility over Indigenous healthcare to individual municipalities (APIB, 2016c, 2016e). The APIB saw this decision as a dangerous risk to Indigenous populations, given the vulnerability of many Indigenous communities to disease, particularly those that inhabit remote areas (APIB, 2016c, 2016e). As demonstrated in chapter 3, Indigenous peoples' collective existence has been systemically threatened by diseases in the past, including through deliberate infections and the denial of preventive measures and treatment by governments. Thus, the provision of specialized healthcare to Indigenous populations has been crucial in promoting Indigenous welfare by preventing and treating illnesses. While the SESAI had already been underfunded and significantly limited in what it could offer, its complete elimination could mean restricting Indigenous peoples' access to specialized healthcare that was specific to their circumstances, potentially leading to devastating consequences to vulnerable communities (APIB, 2016c, 2016e). Hence, the APIB led a nation-wide movement to protest the elimination of SESAI and demand its reinstatement by the federal government (APIB, 2016e). The mobilization gathered support from Indigenous groups across the country, as well as many other civil society organizations and allies (APIB, 2016e) The strength of the movement led the government to reverse the elimination of SESAI and the shift of responsibility to municipal health authorities, a significant achievement in terms of preventing the regression of Indigenous peoples basic rights (APIB, 2016e).

More recently, Indigenous rights in Brazil faced even more significant risks in terms of imminent regression (APIB, 2019b, 2019c). As seen in Chapter 3, the current administration has been actively pursuing the regression of Indigenous rights,

assimilation of Indigenous peoples, and destruction of Indigenous lands. Further, it has persecuted Indigenous leaders, denied healthcare supplies during the COVID-19 pandemic, and encouraged the use of ineffective and potentially harmful treatments (APIB, 2020, 2021). Hence, the APIB has taken significant efforts to promote accountability and prevent further decimation of Indigenous lives (APIB, 2019d, 2020, 2021; IPRI & APIB, 2021). For instance, in light of the government's omission, spread of disinformation and lack of transparency during the COVID-19 pandemic, the APIB and its member organizations have partnered with local community organizations to collect, analyze, and publicize data on COVID-19 infections and deaths among Indigenous communities (APIB, 2020). The organizations have struggled against resistance from state agencies, often being questioned on the credibility and legitimacy of their data and targeted by accusations and criminal charges (APIB, 2020).

Hence, the APIB initiated a nation-wide movement to promote the protection of Indigenous lives and their collective existence in the context of COVID-19 by creating an action plan to confront the threats posed to Indigenous populations by the pandemic (APIB, 2020). Tangible efforts taken by APIB's member organizations as part of the plan included the development of an app to consolidate monitoring of cases, preparation and distribution of informational materials to the public, large-scale delivery of personal protective equipment (PPE) to Indigenous communities, the distribution of emergency food baskets, medications, and healthcare supplies, and the implementation of barricades and road blocks to prevent outsiders from entering Indigenous communities without their consent (APIB, 2020). The APIB's efforts in engaging community members and leading community mobilization during the COVID-19 pandemic illustrate its role in preventing the annihilation of Indigenous communities by disease. The strength of the organization, its collaborations, and its efforts in mobilizing citizens and pushing for community action have stood between governments' intent of genocide and the materialization of that intent.

As demonstrated previously, the concept of Indigenous security varies greatly from the definitions of security ingrained in the mainstream literature. While traditional and critical definitions of security tend to favour state-centric interpretations, Indigenous definitions acknowledge the unique circumstances that threaten Indigenous peoples. Accordingly, the APIB's efforts to promote Indigenous land rights, personal and community safety, prior consultation, political participation, and to prevent further

deterioration of Indigenous rights illustrate the prominence of these issues against Indigenous peoples' collective existence. Hence, in addition to its undeniable impact on Indigenous peoples' lives in Brazil, the APIB also provides a contribution to the global academic literature in expanding the definition of security beyond what has been traditionally perceived as such.

Moreover, the ways in which the APIB has approached issues of security through its activism and collaborations with other civil society groups nationally and internationally can demonstrate the strength of citizen-led initiatives in promoting and protecting Indigenous security and prompting state accountability in terms of their international commitments towards Indigenous peoples. In the period covered by this case study, the APIB has emphasized solidarity with the global Indigenous rights movement and with other marginalized groups as a way to enhance its ability to pressure governments, influence political decisions and prompt effective change in favour of Indigenous rights. The organization's efforts demonstrate its value in promoting Indigenous security nationally and internationally and can present a potential model for further activism and social action.

Chapter 5.

Conclusion

This thesis has explored the role of the *Articulação dos Povos Indígenas do Brasil* (APIB) in promoting and protecting Indigenous security in Brazil. Drawing from the literature on security, international cooperation, and citizen-led efforts to uphold Indigenous rights, this thesis sought to build a better understanding of civil society participation in international law and justice, particularly regarding the promotion and protection of Indigenous peoples' right to live in freedom, peace, and security as distinct peoples. The purpose was to illustrate how civil society actors can take part in national and international efforts to secure Indigenous rights and contribute to enhancing Indigenous security and holding states accountable to their international commitments towards Indigenous peoples. Through the use of qualitative document analysis, this case study examined the APIB as an example of an organization that has actively pursued security for Indigenous peoples and sought state accountability. The study entailed an analysis of 143 primary documents published by the APIB between 2013 and 2021 to gain insight on the organization's efforts to uphold Indigenous security.

This case study has produced three major findings. First, the APIB's efforts pertaining to the protection of Indigenous land rights have been paramount in promoting Indigenous security and have reaffirmed its significance in the struggle against anti-Indigenous violence in Brazil. The importance of land rights for Indigenous security had already been determined in the existing literature and mostly attributed to the strong connection between Indigenous peoples and the lands they have traditionally inhabited. That said, the APIB expands that notion by demonstrating that upholding Indigenous land rights is key in preventing violence against Indigenous communities, as many anti-Indigenous interest groups see the lack of secure land rights as an opportunity to ignite conflict and conquer territory for private interests. Hence, the APIB emphasizes the value of Indigenous land rights in conflict prevention and, consequently, upholding Indigenous security.

Secondly, the APIB's work to enhance Indigenous political participation and prior consultation, as well as its commitment to solidarity with other civil society groups, have

contributed to increasing Indigenous peoples' influence in decision-making processes, including in matters of security. The literature conveys that Indigenous peoples' participation in matters that affect them is necessary for proper policy and decision-making that is consistent with Indigenous peoples' needs and wants. As such, the APIB has demonstrated that Indigenous participation can be strengthened by collaboration with allies, particularly in situations where there are power imbalances that could pose significant harm to Indigenous communities. The APIB's solidarity with similar organizations nationally and internationally can present opportunities for increasing Indigenous participation in the national and international sphere and for continuing to improve the situation of Indigenous rights globally.

Lastly, the APIB has played a critical role in monitoring Brazil's anti-Indigenous policies and practices and has often acted as a deterrent against the deterioration of Indigenous security in the country. By frequently positioning itself against anti-Indigenous policies and practices, actively mobilizing citizens and partner organizations, and pressuring governments to honour their commitments to Indigenous peoples, the APIB has contributed to preventing potentially devastating regressions of Indigenous rights. Hence, the organization demonstrates the strength of citizen-led initiatives in promoting and protecting Indigenous security, preventing further abuses of Indigenous rights, and prompting state accountability in terms of security. This is a shift away from the traditional literature on security, which favoured state-centric practices and overlooked the potential of civil society participation in matters of security.

This thesis presents a contribution to the academic literature on civil society participation in international law and justice, particularly with regard to international efforts to uphold Indigenous security. This case study has illustrated ways in which citizen-led organizations can help enforce international norms at the national level by prompting state accountability in terms of Indigenous security. Though most of the APIB's operations in the period covered by this case study were specifically targeted at enhancing Indigenous security in Brazil, its advocacy efforts have been intrinsically connected to the global movement for Indigenous rights as well as international efforts to uphold Indigenous security. The APIB's approach to Indigenous security through its activism, collaboration with allies, and emphasis on solidarity with the global Indigenous rights movement contributes to advancing global understanding of the intersections between the national and international realms, particularly in terms of civil society actors'

contribution to international efforts towards Indigenous security. Importantly, this project was not meant as an exhaustive, descriptive study of the APIB's efforts in their entirety, but as an analysis of the overarching themes gathered from the data in terms of its efforts to promote and protect Indigenous security and prompt state accountability. Hence, this case study allows for more extensive research to be conducted in the future and enables further interpretation and discussion of the data.

References

- Acharya, A. (2018). Redefining security. In A. Acharya, *Constructing global order: Agency and change in world politics* (pp. 128–154). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi-org.proxy.lib.sfu.ca/10.1017/9781316756768.006>
- Assembly of First Nations. (2020). *All our relations: Emerging Stronger Together*. https://www.afn.ca/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/2020_Annual_ENG_FINAL_24.pdf
- Asociación Interétnica de Desarrollo de la Selva Peruana. (2021, March 26). *AIDSESEP lanza fondo para promover la autonomía de la Mujer Indígena*. <http://www.aidesep.org.pe/noticias/aidesep-lanza-fondo-para-promover-la-autonomia-de-la-mujer-indigena>
- Alvarado, L. (2015). Advances and ongoing challenges in the protection of Indigenous people's rights within the Inter-American System and the United Nations Special Procedures System. In L. Haglund & R. Stryker (Eds.), *Closing the rights gap: From human rights to social transformation* (pp. 69–84). University of California Press. muse.jhu.edu/book/41209
- Articulação dos Povos Indígenas do Brasil. (n.d.-a). *Mobilização Nacional Indígena*. Mobilização Nacional Indígena. Retrieved June 11, 2022, from <https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/>
- Articulação dos Povos Indígenas do Brasil. (n.d.-b). *Publicações*. APIB. Retrieved June 11, 2022, from <https://apiboficial.org/publicacoes/>
- Articulação dos Povos Indígenas do Brasil. (n.d.-c). *Quem Somos*. Retrieved March 1, 2021, from <https://apiboficial.org/sobre/>
- Articulação dos Povos Indígenas do Brasil. (2013a, October 3). Declaração da Mobilização Nacional Indígena em defesa da Constituição Federal. *Mobilização Nacional Indígena*. <https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2013/10/03/declaracao-da-mobilizacao-nacional-em-defesa-da-constituicao-federal-dos-direitos-territoriais-indigenas-quilombolas-de-outras-populacoes-e-da-mae-natureza/>
- Articulação dos Povos Indígenas do Brasil. (2013b, December 12). Bancada indígena da CNPI divulga carta reafirmando contrariedade à minuta do Ministério da Justiça. *Mobilização Nacional Indígena*. <https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2013/12/12/bancada-indigena-da-cnpi-divulga-carta-reafirmando-contrariedade-a-minuta-do-ministerio-da-justica/>

- Articulação dos Povos Indígenas do Brasil. (2014a, February 18). Em defesa das terras sagradas dos Tupinambá. *Mobilização Nacional Indígena*.
<https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2014/02/18/em-defesa-das-terras-sagradas-dos-tupinamba/>
- Articulação dos Povos Indígenas do Brasil. (2014b, February 28). “Audiências da PEC 215 podem servir para mais ataques racistas”, diz liderança indígena. *Mobilização Nacional Indígena*.
<https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2014/02/28/audiencias-da-pec-215-podem-servir-para-mais-ataques-racistas-diz-lideranca-indigena/>
- Articulação dos Povos Indígenas do Brasil. (2014c, April 8). Bancada indígena da CNPI denuncia que governo tenta impor mudança na demarcação de terras. *Mobilização Nacional Indígena*.
<https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2014/04/08/bancada-indigena-da-cnpi-denuncia-que-governo-tenta-impor-mudanca-na-demarcacao-de-terras/>
- Articulação dos Povos Indígenas do Brasil. (2014d, May 20). APIB denuncia Brasil na ONU por “regressão nos direitos indígenas.” *Mobilização Nacional Indígena*.
<https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2014/05/20/apib-denuncia-brasil-na-onu-por-regressao-nos-direitos-indigenas/>
- Articulação dos Povos Indígenas do Brasil. (2014e, May 27). APIB repudia ataque da PM contra manifestação pacífica no DF. *Mobilização Nacional Indígena*.
<https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2014/05/27/apib-repudia-ataque-da-pm-contra-manifestacao-pacifica-no-df/>
- Articulação dos Povos Indígenas do Brasil. (2014f, May 27). Lideranças indígenas protocolam queixa-crime contra parlamentares no STF. *Mobilização Nacional Indígena*.
<https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2014/05/27/liderancas-indigenas-protocolam-queixa-crime-contra-parlamentares-no-stf/>
- Articulação dos Povos Indígenas do Brasil. (2014g, September 15). Carta pública aos candidatos e candidatas à Presidência da República. *Mobilização Nacional Indígena*. <https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2014/09/15/carta-publica-aos-candidatos-e-candidatas-a-presidencia-da-republica/>
- Articulação dos Povos Indígenas do Brasil. (2016a, February 24). Manifesto contra a política anti-indígena do governo Dilma. *Mobilização Nacional Indígena*.
<https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2016/02/24/manifesto-contra-a-politica-anti-indigena-do-governo-dilma/>

- Articulação dos Povos Indígenas do Brasil. (2016b, May 13). Acampamento Terra Livre termina com promessa de nova mobilização indígena ainda neste ano. *Mobilização Nacional Indígena*.
<https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2016/05/12/acampamento-terra-livre-termina-com-promessa-de-nova-mobilizacao-indigena-ainda-neste-ano/>
- Articulação dos Povos Indígenas do Brasil. (2016c, July 20). Balanço do 'Ocupa FUNAI.' *Mobilização Nacional Indígena*.
<https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2016/07/20/balanco-do-ocupa-funai/>
- Articulação dos Povos Indígenas do Brasil. (2016d, August 4). Ministro da Justiça afirma compromisso de respeito aos povos indígenas e à preservação de seus direitos. *Mobilização Nacional Indígena*.
<https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2016/08/04/ministro-da-justica-afirma-compromisso-de-respeito-aos-povos-indigenas-e-a-preservacao-de-seus-direitos/>
- Articulação dos Povos Indígenas do Brasil. (2016e, October 31). APIB agradece e parabeniza povos indígenas por mobilizações em defesa da Saúde Indígena. *Mobilização Nacional Indígena*.
<https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2016/10/31/apib-agradece-e-parabeniza-povos-indigenas-por-mobilizacoes-em-defesa-da-saude-indigena/>
- Articulação dos Povos Indígenas do Brasil. (2017a, January 31). Carta aos povos indígenas do Brasil: Por um parlamento cada vez mais indígena. *Mobilização Nacional Indígena*.
<https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2017/01/31/carta-aos-povos-indigenas-do-brasil-por-um-parlamento-cada-vez-mais-indigena/>
- Articulação dos Povos Indígenas do Brasil. (2017b, April 26). 'Nossos direitos originários são imprescritíveis, por isso o marco temporal é inconstitucional.' *Mobilização Nacional Indígena*.
<https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2017/04/26/nossos-direitos-originarios-sao-imprescritiveis-por-isso-o-marco-temporal-e-inconstitucional/>
- Articulação dos Povos Indígenas do Brasil. (2017c, April 27). Acampamento Terra Livre propõe aliança entre povos indígenas de diversos países. *Mobilização Nacional Indígena*.
<https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2017/04/26/acampamento-terra-livre-propoe-alianca-entre-povos-indigenas-de-diversos-paises/>
- Articulação dos Povos Indígenas do Brasil. (2017d, July 21). Michel Temer violenta os direitos dos povos indígenas para tentar impedir seu próprio julgamento. *Mobilização Nacional Indígena*.
<https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2017/07/20/michel-temer-violenta-os-direitos-dos-povos-indigenas-para-tentar-impedir-seu-proprio-julgamento/>

- Articulação dos Povos Indígenas do Brasil. (2017e, August 3). Nossa história não começa em 1988 #MarcoTemporalNão. *Mobilização Nacional Indígena*.
<https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2017/08/03/nossa-historia-nao-comeca-em-1988-marcotemporalnao/>
- Articulação dos Povos Indígenas do Brasil. (2018, April 27). Indígenas reafirmam luta pela revogação do Parecer do Genocídio e governo se compromete a retomar reuniões do CNPI. *Mobilização Nacional Indígena*.
<https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2018/04/27/indigenas-reafirmam-luta-pela-revogacao-do-parecer-do-genocidio-e-governo-se-compromete-a-retomar-reunioes-do-cnpi/>
- Articulação dos Povos Indígenas do Brasil. (2019a, April 24). Em sua 15ª edição, ATL começa na Esplanada dos Ministérios e por pressão da PM vai para a Praça dos Ipês. *Mobilização Nacional Indígena*.
<https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2019/04/24/em-sua-15a-edicao-atl-comeca-na-esplanada-dos-ministerios-e-por-pressao-da-pm-vai-para-a-praca-dos-ipes/>
- Articulação dos Povos Indígenas do Brasil. (2019b, April 24). Ministro diz que STF poderá intervir se demarcações forem paralisadas. *Mobilização Nacional Indígena*.
<https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2019/04/24/ministro-diz-que-stf-podera-intervir-se-demarcacoes-forem-paralisadas/>
- Articulação dos Povos Indígenas do Brasil. (2019c, April 25). Mobilizado em Brasília, movimento indígena quer impedir retrocessos do governo Bolsonaro. *Mobilização Nacional Indígena*.
<https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2019/04/24/mobilizado-em-brasilia-movimento-indigena-quer-impedir-retrocessos-do-governo-bolsonaro/>
- Articulação dos Povos Indígenas do Brasil. (2019d, April 26). Marcha indígena em Brasília leva reivindicações ao Ministério da Saúde e exige FUNAI de volta ao MJ. *Mobilização Nacional Indígena*.
<https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2019/04/26/marcha-indigena-em-brasilia-leva-reivindicacoes-ao-ministerio-da-saude-e-exige-funai-de-volta-ao-mj/>
- Articulação dos Povos Indígenas do Brasil. (2020). *Nossa luta é pela vida* (pp. 1–110).
https://emergenciaindigena.apiboficial.org/files/2020/12/APIB_nossalutaepelavida_v7PT.pdf
- Articulação dos Povos Indígenas do Brasil. (2021). *Dossiê internacional de denúncias dos povos indígenas do Brasil* (pp. 1–55).
https://apiboficial.org/files/2021/08/DOSSIE_pt_v3web.pdf

- Articulação dos Povos Indígenas do Brasil & Amazon Watch. (2020). *Cumplicidade na destruição III: Como corporações globais contribuem para violações de direitos dos povos indígenas da Amazônia Brasileira*.
<https://amazonwatch.org/assets/files/2020-cumplicidade-na-destruicao-3.pdf>
- Austin, R., & Schill, M. (1991). Black, brown, poor and poisoned: Minority grassroots environmentalism and the quest for eco-justice. *Kansas Journal of Law & Public Policy*, 1, 69–82. <https://heinonline.org/HOL/P?h=hein.journals/kjpp1&i=71>
- Baehr, P. R. (2009). *Non-governmental human rights organizations in international relations*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bailenson, J. N. (2021). Nonverbal overload: A theoretical argument for the causes of Zoom fatigue. *Technology, Mind, and Behavior*, 2(1).
<https://doi.org/10.1037/tmb0000030>
- Baines, S. G. (2008). Identidades Indígenas e ativismo político no Brasil: Depois da Constituição de 1988. *Série Antropologia*, 418, 6–18.
<http://www.dan.unb.br/images/doc/Serie418empdf.pdf>
- Balasco, L. M., & Bauer, K. (2020). Political contestation within the human security paradigm: The state and Indigenous rights in Peru and Chile. *Canadian Journal of Development Studies*, 41(4), 561–579.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02255189.2020.1784107>
- Barbosa, R. L. (2016). *O Estado e a questão Indígena: Crimes e corrupção no SPI e na FUNAI (1964-1969)* [Master's Thesis, Universidade Federal de Pernambuco].
[https://repositorio.ufpe.br/bitstream/123456789/23336/1/Disserta%
 c3%a7%c3%a3o%20Rodrigo%20Lins.pdf](https://repositorio.ufpe.br/bitstream/123456789/23336/1/Disserta%c3%a7%c3%a3o%20Rodrigo%20Lins.pdf)
- Barume, A. K. (2009). Responding to the concerns of the African states. In *Making the declaration work: The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* (pp. 170–182). International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs.
- Basta, P. C., Hacon, S. de S., Ruiz, C. M. V., Godoy, J. M., Gonçalves, R. A., Marcos Wesley de Oliveira, Ana Maria Machado, Helder Perri Ferreira, Davi Kopenawa Yanomami, Reinaldo Wdeyuna Ye'kwana, Jesem Douglas Yamall Orellana, Cristiano Lucas de Menezes Alves, & Maurício Caldart. (2016). *Avaliação da exposição ambiental ao mercúrio proveniente de atividade garimpeira de ouro na terra Indígena Yanomami, Roraima, Amazônia, Brasil*.
[https://www.socioambiental.org/sites/blog.socioambiental.org/files/diagnostico_ontaminacao_mercurio_terra_indigena_yanomami.pdf](https://www.socioambiental.org/sites/blog.socioambiental.org/files/diagnostico_contaminacao_mercurio_terra_indigena_yanomami.pdf)
- Boilevin, L., Chapman, J., Deane, L., Doerksen, C., Fresz, G., Joe, D., Leech-Crier, N., Marsh, S., McLeod, J., Neufeld, S., Pham, S., Shaver, L., Smith, P., Steward, M., Wilson, D., & Winter, P. (2019). *Research 101: A manifesto for ethical research in the Downtown Eastside*.
<https://open.library.ubc.ca/media/stream/pdf/52387/1.0377565/5>

- Borges, T., & Branford, S. (2019, May 1). Brazil's Indigenous peoples are coming together in the fight against Bolsonaro's assimilation plan. *Intercontinental Cry*. <https://intercontinentalcry.org/brazils-indigenous-peoples-are-coming-together-in-the-fight-against-bolsonaros-assimilation-plan/>
- Bowen, G. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/240807798_Document_Analysis_as_a_Qualitative_Research_Method
- Canadian Institutes of Health Research, Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, & Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council. (2018). *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans*. https://ethics.gc.ca/eng/policy-politique_tcps2-eptc2_2018.html
- Canofre, F. (2017). Criminalizing Indigenous rights: The battle for land in Brazil. *World Policy Journal*, 34(3). <https://doi.org/10.1215/07402775-4280016>
- Comissão Pró Yanomami. (2001). *Haximu: Foi genocídio!* (No. 1). <https://acervo.socioambiental.org/sites/default/files/documents/YAD00408.pdf>
- Champagne, D. (2013). UNDRIP (United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples): Human, civil, and Indigenous rights. *Wíčazo Ša Review*, 28(1), 9–22. <https://doi.org/10.5749/wicazosareview.28.1.0009>
- Chilisa, B., & Tsheko, G. N. (2014). Mixed methods in Indigenous research: Building relationship for sustainable intervention outcomes. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 8(3), 222–233. [10.1177/1558689814527878](https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689814527878)
- Conselho Indigenista Missionário. (2020). *Relatório violência contra os povos Indígenas no Brasil: Dados de 2019*. <https://cimi.org.br/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/relatorio-violencia-contra-os-povos-indigenas-brasil-2019-cimi.pdf>
- Conselho Indigenista Missionário. (2021). *Relatório violência contra os povos indígenas no Brasil: Dados de 2020* (pp. 1–248). <https://cimi.org.br/2021/10/relatorioviolencia2020/>
- Comissão Nacional da Verdade. (2014). *Relatório da Comissão Nacional da Verdade: Violações de direitos humanos dos povos Indígenas* (v. 02. Texto 5; pp. 202–262). <http://cnv.memoriasreveladas.gov.br/images/pdf/relatorio/Volume%202%20-%20Texto%205.pdf>
- Crossen, J. (2017). Another wave of anti-colonialism: The origins of Indigenous internationalism. *Canadian Journal of History*, 52(3), 533–559. <https://doi.org/doi:10.3138/cjh.ach.52.3.06>

- Demetrio, A., & Kozicki, K. (2017). A (in)justiça de transição para os povos indígenas no Brasil. *Revista Direito e Praxis*, 10(1), 129–169. <https://doi.org/10.1590/2179-8966/2017/28186>
- Eichler, J. (2019). *Reconciling Indigenous peoples' individual and collective rights: Participation, prior consultation and self-determination in Latin America*. Routledge. <https://doi-org.proxy.lib.sfu.ca/10.4324/9780367220860>
- Erueti, A. (2011). The International Labour Organization and the internationalisation of the concept of Indigenous peoples. In S. Allen & A. Xanthaki (Eds.), *Reflections on the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*. Cambridge University Press. <https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.proxy.lib.sfu.ca/lib/sfu-ebooks/reader.action?docID=1772668&ppg=105>
- Fauville, G., Luo, M., Queiroz, A. C. M., Bailenson, J. N., & Hancock, J. (2021). *Zoom exhaustion & fatigue scale*. SSRN. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3786329
- Fox, J. (2000). *Civil society and political accountability: Propositions for discussion*. Institutions, Accountability and Democratic Governance in Latin America, University of Notre Dame. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228553364_Civil_Society_and_Political_Accountability_Propositions_for_Discussion
- Garvey, B., & Torres, M. (2020, May 30). Brazil's Jair Bolsonaro is devastating Indigenous lands, with the world distracted. *The Conversation*. <https://theconversation.com/brazils-jair-bolsonaro-is-devastating-indigenous-lands-with-the-world-distracted-138478>
- Greaves, W. (2016). Environment, identity, autonomy: Inuit perspectives on Arctic security. In K. Hossain & A. Petrétei (Eds.), *Understanding the many faces of human security: Perspectives of northern Indigenous peoples* (pp. 35–55). 10.1163/9789004314399_004
- Heck, E. D. (1996). *Os Índios e a caserna—Políticas indigenistas dos governos militares—1964 a 1985* [Master's Thesis, Universidade Estadual de Campinas]. Biblioteca do IFCH - UNICAMP. <http://www.comissaodaverdade.mg.gov.br/bitstream/handle/123456789/897/HECK%2c%20Egon%20Gabriel%20Silveira.%20Os%20%c3%8dndios%20e%20a%20Caserna.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
- Hernández, A., Ruano, A. L., Hurtig, A.-K., Goicolea, I., San Sebastián, M., & Flores, W. (2019). Pathways to accountability in rural Guatemala: A qualitative comparative analysis of citizen-led initiatives for the right to health of Indigenous populations. *World Development*, 113, 392–401. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2018.09.020>

- Hossain, K. (2016). Securitizing the Arctic Indigenous peoples: A community security perspective with special reference to the Sámi of the European high north. *Polar Science*, 10, 415–424. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polar.2016.04.010>
- Huseman, J., & Short, D. (2012). “A slow industrial genocide”: Tar sands and the Indigenous peoples of northern Alberta. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 16(1), 216–237. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13642987.2011.649593>
- Inuit Circumpolar Council. (n.d.). *About ICC*. Retrieved January 25, 2022, from <https://www.inuitcircumpolar.com/about-icc/>
- Indigenous Peoples Rights International & Articulação dos Povos Indígenas do Brasil. (2021). *Uma anatomia das práticas de silenciamento indígena*. Indigenous Peoples Rights International. <https://apiboficial.org/files/2021/05/UMA-ANATOMIA-DAS-PRA%CC%81TICAS-DE-SILENCIAMENTO-INDI%CC%81GENA-1.pdf>
- Instituto Socioambiental. (n.d.-a). *Quantos são? - Povos Indígenas no Brasil*. Povos Indígenas No Brasil. Retrieved June 8, 2022, from https://pib.socioambiental.org/pt/Quantos_s%C3%A3o%3F
- Instituto Socioambiental. (n.d.-b). *Xetá*. Povos Indígenas No Brasil. Retrieved May 3, 2022, from <https://pib.socioambiental.org/pt/Povo:Xet%C3%A1>
- Instituto Socioambiental. (n.d.-c). *Yanomami*. Povos Indígenas No Brasil. Retrieved April 24, 2021, from <https://pib.socioambiental.org/pt/Povo:Yanomami>
- Instituto Socioambiental. (2016, March 23). O povo Yanomami está contaminado por mercúrio do garimpo. *Medium*. <https://medium.com/hist%C3%B3rias-socioambientais/o-povo-yanomami-est%C3%A1-contaminado-por-merc%C3%BArio-do-garimpo-fa0876819312#.ev79z0tp4>
- Instituto Socioambiental. (2019, November 26). Povos Yanomami e Ye'kwana se unem e exigem: “Fora, garimpo!” *Instituto Socioambiental*. <https://www.socioambiental.org/pt-br/noticias-socioambientais/povos-yanomami-e-yekwana-se-unem-e-exigem-fora-garimpo>
- Jucá, B. (2020, July 14). Meus antepassados morreram pelo mesmo que eu tô enfrentando: O garimpo ilegal e a epidemia. *El País*. <https://brasil.elpais.com/brasil/2020-07-14/meus-antepassados-morreram-pelo-mesmo-que-eu-to-enfrentando-o-garimpo-ilegal-e-a-epidemia.html>
- Kelley, J. G., & Simmons, B. A. (2014). Politics by number: Indicators as social pressure in international relations. *American Journal of Political Science*, 59(1), 55–70. <https://doi-org.proxy.lib.sfu.ca/10.1111/ajps.12119>

- Kipuri, N. (2009). The UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in the African context. In C. Charters & R. Stavenhagen (Eds.), *Making the declaration work: The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* (pp. 252–262). International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs.
- Kumar, S. (2018). Indigenous people in South Asia and international law. In J. Kaul & A. Jha (Eds.), *Shifting horizons of public international law*. Springer. https://link-springer-com.proxy.lib.sfu.ca/chapter/10.1007%2F978-81-322-3724-2_4#citeas
- Kuokkanen, R., & Sweet, V. (2020). Indigenous security theory: Intersectional analysis from the bottom up. In G. H. Gjørsv, M. Lanteigne, & H. Sam-Aggrey (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Arctic Security* (1st ed., pp. 80–90). Routledge.
- Leite, C. V. A., & Neto, J. Q. T. (2016). O genocídio Indígena e a Comissão Interamericana de Direitos Humanos: Uma análise da influência e efetividade na proteção de direitos dos povos Indígenas no Brasil. *Conpedi Law Review*, 2(4), 90–103. <https://doi.org/10.21902/clr.v2i4.362>
- Lightfoot, S. (2016). *Global Indigenous politics*. Routledge. <https://www-taylorfrancis-com.proxy.lib.sfu.ca/books/mono/10.4324/9781315670669/global-indigenous-politics-sheryl-lightfoot>
- Lisboa, S., & Milanez, F. (2020, February 13). Áudios comprovam que pastor assumiu área sensível da FUNAI para converter índios isolados. *The Intercept Brasil*. <https://theintercept.com/2020/02/13/audios-missionarios-converter-indios-amazonia/>
- Lopes, G. R., & Lima, M. G. B. (2020). Necropolitics in the jungle: COVID-19 and the marginalisation of Brazil's Forest Peoples. *Bulletin of Latin American Research*, 39(S1), 92–97. <https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.sfu.ca/doi/epdf/10.1111/blr.13177>
- Lopez, L. (2005). Advancing human rights policy: Does grassroots mobilization and community dispute resolution matter? Insights from Chiapas, Mexico. *Review of Policy Research*, 22(1), 77–92. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-1338.2005.00120.x>
- Makumbe, R. P. (2018). An alternative conceptualization of indigenous rights in Africa under the international human rights law framework. *Deusto Journal of Human Rights*, 3, 143–172. <https://doi.org/10.18543/djhr-3-2018pp143-172>
- Masching, R. (2014). Indigenous research ethics and practice. In D. Coghlan & M. Brydon-Miller (Eds.), *The SAGE encyclopedia of action research*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781446294406.n181>
- Menton, M., Milanez, F., Souza, J. M. de A., & Cruz, F. S. M. (2021). The COVID-19 pandemic intensified resource conflicts and Indigenous resistance in Brazil. *World Development*, 138, 10522–105230. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2020.105222>

- Miranda, L. A. (2010). Indigenous peoples as international lawmakers. *Penn Law: Legal Scholarship Repository*, 32(1), 203–263.
<https://scholarship.law.upenn.edu/jil/vol32/iss1/4/>
- Monchalin, L. (2016). *The colonial problem: An Indigenous perspective on crime and justice in Canada*. University of Toronto Press.
- Morton, M. F., & Baird, I. G. (2019). From Hill tribes to Indigenous peoples: The localisation of a global movement in Thailand. *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, 50(1), 7–31. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022463419000031>
- National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls. (2019). *A legal analysis of genocide: Supplementary report of the National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls*. https://www.mmiwg-ffada.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Supplementary-Report_Genocide.pdf?utm_campaign=The%20Discourse%20Weekly%20Newsletter&utm_source=hs_email&utm_medium=email&_hsenc=p2ANqtz-KJlftZB8D2QS66vBMctmzVYlmeHXlxuZljTTooZUgahEbhxTQ9Mg_PAyvSs5HXFQ-Qsdl
- Oliveira, V. (2020, June 26). Jovens indígenas são mortos por garimpeiros em conflito na Terra Yanomami em Roraima. *G1*.
<https://g1.globo.com/rr/roraima/noticia/2020/06/26/jovens-indigenas-sao-mortos-por-garimpeiros-em-conflito-na-terra-yanomami-em-roraima.ghtml>
- Organización Nacional Indígena de Colombia. (n.d.). *About us*. Retrieved April 23, 2021, from <https://www.onic.org.co/en/onic-en/about-us>
- Palmquist, H. (2018). *Questões sobre genocídio e etnocídio indígena: A persistência da destruição* [Master's Thesis, Universidade Federal do Pará].
<https://ppga.proesp.ufpa.br/ARQUIVOS/Disserta%C3%A7%C3%B5es%202018/Dissertacao%20Helena.pdf>
- Phillips, T. (2019, October 2). “War for survival”: Brazil's Amazon tribes despair as land raids surge under Bolsonaro. *The Guardian*.
<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/oct/02/war-for-survival-brazils-amazon-tribes-despair-as-land-raids-surge-under-bolsonaro>
- Plummer, J. (2015). The Yanomami: Illegal mining, law, and Indigenous rights in the Brazilian Amazon. *The Georgetown International Environmental Law Review*, 27(479), 479–496. https://www.upr-info.org/sites/default/files/document/bresil/session_27_-_mai_2017/hay_upr27_bra_e_annexe1.pdf

- Queiroz, A. C. M., Nascimento, A., Fauville, G., Luo, M., Meirelles, F., Plank, D. N., Bailenson, J., & Hancock, J. (2021). *Tradução, validação e aplicação da Escala ZEF (ZEF Scale) para avaliação da Fadiga Zoom na população brasileira (Translation, Validation and Application of the ZEF Scale to Assess Zoom Fatigue in the Brazilian Population)*. SSRN. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3844219
- Raftopoulos, M., & Morley, J. (2020). Ecocide in the Amazon: The contested politics of environmental rights in Brazil. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 24(10), 1616–1641. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13642987.2020.1746648>
- Ramos, A. R. (1997, June). The Indigenous movement in Brazil: A quarter century of ups and downs. *Cultural Survival Quarterly Magazine*. <https://www.culturalsurvival.org/publications/cultural-survival-quarterly/indigenous-movement-brazil-quarter-century-ups-and-downs>
- Resende, A. C. Z. de. (2015). O Relatório Figueiredo, as violações dos direitos dos povos Indígenas no Brasil dos anos 1960 e a “justa memória.” *História Do Direito*, 489–513. <http://conpedi.daniloir.info/publicacoes/c178h0tg/405y75l2/pJ0Dj8YvFV5Wf9nB.pdf>
- Ribeiro. (2014). *Povos indígenas em negociação e conflito: Movimento indígena e governo Lula da Silva (2003-2006)* [Doctoral Thesis, Universidade Federal da Bahia]. <http://repositorio.ufba.br/ri/handle/ri/18819>
- Rombouts, S. J. (2017). The evolution of Indigenous peoples’ consultation rights under the ILO and U.N. regimes. *Stanford Journal of International Law*, 53(2), 169–224. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3010261
- Rothschild, E. (1995). What is security? *The MIT Press*, 124(3), 53–98. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20027310>
- Roy, R. D. (2018). Opportunities and challenges in implementing Indigenous peoples’ human rights in Asia. In F. de Varennes & C. M. Gardiner (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Human Rights in Asia* (1st ed., pp. 306–321). Routledge. <https://www-taylorfrancis-com.proxy.lib.sfu.ca/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781315720180-21/opportunities-challenges-implementing-indigenous-peoples-human-rights-asia-raja-devasish-roy?context=ubx&refId=db0bc743-150a-4c66-99cd-75470f8d0203>
- Sanders, D. E. (1977). *The formation of the World Council of Indigenous Peoples. IWGIA Document 29*. (No. 29). International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs. https://www.iwgia.org/images/publications/0188_29orldCouncil.pdf
- Sant’Anna, A. L. de O. de, Castro, A. de C., & Jacó-Vilela, A. M. (2018). Military dictatorship and disciplinary practices in the control of Indigenous people: Psychosocial perspectives on the Figueiredo Report. *Psicologia & Sociedade*, 30(e188045). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/1807-0310/2018v30188045>

- Saramo, S. (2016). Unsettling spaces: Grassroots responses to Canada's missing and murdered Indigenous women during the Harper government years. *Comparative American Studies*, 14(3–4), 204–220.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14775700.2016.1267311>
- Simon, M. (1989). Security, peace and the native peoples of the Arctic. In The True North Strong & Free Inquiry Society (Ed.), *The Arctic: Choices for peace & security*. Gordon Soules Book Publishers.
- Simons, H. (2020). Case study research: In-depth understanding in context. In P. Leavy (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Smith, J. A., & Mitchell, T. L. (2020). Development of an UNDRIP compliance assessment tool: How a performance framework could improve state compliance. *The International Indigenous Policy Journal*, 11(2).
<https://doi.org/10.18584/iipj.2020.11.2.10713>
- Smith, L. T. (2021). *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. Zed Books. <http://dx.doi.org.proxy.lib.sfu.ca/10.5040/9781350225282>
- Sponsel, L. E. (2011). The master thief: Gold mining and mercury contamination in the Amazon. In B. R. Johnston (Ed.), *Life and death matters* (2nd ed., pp. 125–150). Routledge. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/master-thief-gold-mining-mercury-contamination-amazon-leslie-sponsel-barbara-rose-johnston/e/10.4324/9781315425375-12>
- Stavenhagen, R. (2009). Making the declaration work. In C. Charters & R. Stavenhagen (Eds.), *Making the declaration work: The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* (pp. 352–371). International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs.
- Teles Junior, A. (2018). *O genocídio Indígena contemporâneo no Brasil e o discurso da bancada ruralista no Congresso Nacional* [Master's Thesis, Universidade Federal de Goiás].
<https://repositorio.bc.ufg.br/tede/bitstream/tede/8463/5/Disserta%c3%a7%c3%a3o%20-%20Adenevaldo%20Teles%20Junior%20-%202018.pdf>
- Thompson, E., Edjoc, R., Atchessi, N., Striha, M., Gabrani-Juma, I., & Dawson, T. (2021). COVID-19: A case for the collection of race data in Canada and abroad. *Canada Communicable Disease Report*, 47(7/8), 300–304.
<https://doi.org/10.14745/ccdr.v47i78a02>
- Tramontana, E. (2012). Civil society participation in international decision making: Recent developments and future perspectives in the Indigenous rights arena. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 16(1), 173–192.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13642987.2012.622>

- Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs. (2005). *Stolen lands, broken promises: Researching the Indian Land question in British Columbia* (2nd ed.). https://d3n8a8pro7vhmx.cloudfront.net/ubcic/pages/145/attachments/original/1508270064/Stolen_Lands_Broken_Promises.pdf?1508270064
- United Nations. (2007). *United Nations declaration on the rights of Indigenous Peoples*. https://www.un.org/development/desa/indigenouspeoples/wp-content/uploads/sites/19/2018/11/UNDRIP_E_web.pdf
- Universidade de Brasília. (2017). *Memorial—Territórios indígenas e remanescentes de quilombos*. https://www.cimi.org.br/pub/DF/2017_Ato_MarcoTemporal/Memorial_UNB.pdf
- Urt, J. N. (2015). *Assuntos inacabados: Relações Internacionais e a colonização dos povos Guarani e Kaiowá no Brasil contemporâneo* [Doctoral Thesis, Universidade de Brasília]. <https://repositorio.unb.br/handle/10482/19871>
- Wallace, R. (2020). Grassy Narrows blockade: Reworking relationships between Anishnabe and non-Indigenous activists at the grassroots. *International Journal of Canadian Studies/Revue Internationale d'études Canadiennes*, 41, 37–68. <https://doi.org/10.7202/044162ar>

Appendix

Primary Documents

Table 1 List of primary documents analyzed in this study

Title	Date	URL
A COP 20 e os Povos Indígenas do Brasil	December, 2014	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2014/12/05/a-cop-20-e-os-povos-indigenas-do-brasil/
Acampamento Terra Livre 2017 é a maior mobilização indígena dos últimos anos	April, 2017	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2017/04/24/acampamento-terra-livre-2017-e-a-maior-mobilizacao-indigena-da-historia-no-brasil/
Acampamento Terra Livre propõe aliança entre povos indígenas de diversos países	April, 2017	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2017/04/26/acampamento-terra-livre-propoe-alianca-entre-povos-indigenas-de-diversos-paises/
Acampamento Terra Livre termina com promessa de nova mobilização indígena ainda neste ano	May, 2016	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2016/05/12/acampamento-terra-livre-termina-com-promessa-de-nova-mobilizacao-indigena-ainda-neste-ano/
Agenda da mobilização nacional indígena prevê manifestações em capitais, cidades do interior e outros países	September, 2013	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2013/09/30/agenda-da-mobilizacao-nacional-indigena-preve-manifestacoes-em-capitais-cidades-do-interior-e-outros-paises/
APIB agradece e parabeniza povos indígenas por mobilizações em defesa da saúde indígena	October, 2016	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2016/10/31/apib-agradece-e-parabeniza-povos-indigenas-por-mobilizacoes-em-defesa-da-saude-indigena/
APIB apresenta demandas dos povos do Brasil para relatora da ONU	March, 2016	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2016/03/21/apib-apresenta-demandas-dos-povos-do-brasil-para-relatora-da-onu/
APIB denuncia Brasil na ONU por "regressão nos direitos indígenas"	May, 2014	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2014/05/20/apib-denuncia-brasil-na-onu-por-regressao-nos-direitos-indigenas/
APIB encaminha reivindicações e pede compromissos de futuro presidente da FUNAI	August, 2016	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2016/08/24/apib-encaminha-reivindicacoes-e-pede-compromissos-de-futuro-presidente-da-funai/
APIB recolhe adesões a parecer contra minuta do MJ que altera procedimento demarcatório	April, 2014	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2014/04/10/apib-recolhe-adesoes-a-parecer-contra-minuta-do-mj-que-altera-procedimento-demarcatorio/
APIB repudia ações do governo Temer contra FUNAI e direitos indígenas	November, 2016	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2016/11/30/apib-repudia-acoes-do-governo-temer-contra-funai-e-direitos-indigenas/
APIB repudia ataque da PM contra manifestação pacífica no DF	May, 2014	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2014/05/27/apib-repudia-ataque-da-pm-contra-manifestacao-pacifica-no-df/

Title	Date	URL
Articulação dos Povos Indígenas do Brasil convoca mobilização nacional em defesa da Constituição Federal	August, 2013	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2013/08/26/12/
ATL reafirma resistência indígena por demarcação e protesta contra criminalização de lideranças	April, 2018	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2018/04/24/atl-reafirma-resistencia-indigena-por-demarcacao-e-protesta-contra-criminalizacao-de-liderancas/
Ato de presidente da Câmara institui comissão especial para o PLP 227	October, 2013	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2013/10/02/ato-de-presidente-da-camara-institui-comissao-especial-para-o-plp-227/
Ato em defesa dos direitos indígenas critica parecer que paralisa demarcações de terra	August, 2018	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2018/08/07/ato-em-defesa-dos-direitos-indigenas-critica-parecer-que-paralisa-demarcacoes-de-terra/
Audiência no Senado discute autonomia de indígenas e ameaças a seus direitos	April, 2018	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2018/04/23/audiencia-no-senado-discute-autonomia-de-indigenas-e-ameacas-a-seus-direitos/
"Audiências da PEC 215 podem servir para mais ataques racistas", diz liderança indígena	February, 2014	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2014/02/28/audiencias-da-pec-215-podem-servir-para-mais-ataques-racistas-diz-lideranca-indigena/
Balanço do 'Ocupa FUNAI'	July, 2016	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2016/07/20/balanco-do-ocupa-funai/
Bancada indígena da CNPI denuncia que governo tenta impor mudança na demarcação de terras	April, 2014	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2014/04/08/bancada-indigena-da-cnpi-denuncia-que-governo-tenta-impor-mudanca-na-demarcacao-de-terras/
Bancada Indígena da CNPI divulga carta reafirmando contrariedade à minuta do ministério da justiça	December, 2013	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2013/12/12/bancada-indigena-da-cnpi-divulga-carta-reafirmando-contrariedade-a-minuta-do-ministerio-da-justica/
Brasília será palco do Acampamento Terra Livre, que reunirá mais de 1,5 mil indígenas	March, 2017	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2017/03/27/brasil-iera-palco-do-acampamento-terra-livre-que-reunira-mais-de-15-mil-indigenas/
Carta aos povos indígenas do Brasil: Por um parlamento cada vez mais indígena	January, 2017	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2017/01/31/carta-aos-povos-indigenas-do-brasil-por-um-parlamento-cada-vez-mais-indigena/
Carta de agradecimento pela defesa dos direitos indígenas	December, 2014	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2014/12/19/carta-de-agradecimento-pela-defesa-dos-direitos-indigenas/
Carta do Movimento Indígena para a bancada do governo da Comissão Nacional de Política Indigenista	August, 2013	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2013/08/28/carta-do-movimento-indigena-para-a-bancada-do-governo-da-comissao-nacional-de-politica-indigenista/
Carta pública ao governo interino de Michel Temer: Não admitiremos nenhum retrocesso nos nossos direitos	May, 2016	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2016/05/20/carta-publica-ao-governo-interino-de-michel-temer-nao-admitiremos-nenhum-retrocesso-nos-nossos-direitos/

Title	Date	URL
Carta pública aos candidatos à presidência da Câmara dos Deputados	January, 2015	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2015/01/30/carta-publica-aos-candidatos-a-presidencia-da-camara-dos-deputados/
Carta pública aos candidatos e candidatas à Presidência da República	September, 2014	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2014/09/15/carta-publica-aos-candidatos-e-candidatas-a-presidencia-da-republica/
Carta pública aos candidatos em 2º turno à Presidência da República do Brasil	October, 2014	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2014/10/
Chamamento Acampamento Terra Livre 2019	April, 2019	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2019/04/18/chamamento-acampamento-terra-livre-2019/
Com apoio de integrantes do governo, novo projeto de lei pretende barrar demarcação de Terras Indígenas	September, 2013	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2013/09/06/com-apoio-de-integrantes-do-governo-novo-projeto-de-lei-pretende-barrar-demarcacao-de-terras-indigenas/
Começa o Acampamento Terra Livre 2018, em Brasília	April, 2018	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2018/04/23/comeca-o-acampamento-terra-livre-2018-em-brasilia/
Comissão de Direitos Humanos da Câmara recebe cerca de 60 indígenas	April, 2018	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2018/04/24/comissao-de-direitos-humanos-da-camara-recebe-cerca-de-60-indigenas/
Comitê popular da copa do DF e mobilização nacional indígena realizam coletiva de imprensa sobre violência policial; indígenas também encontram presidente da câmara	May, 2014	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2014/05/28/comite-popular-da-copa-do-df-e-mobilizacao-nacional-indigena-realizam-coletiva-de-imprensa-sobre-violencia-policial-indigenas-tambem-vao-se-encontrar-com-presidente-da-camara/
Comitê popular da copa e mobilização nacional indígena denunciam violência policial	May, 2014	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2014/05/28/comite-popular-da-copa-e-mobilizacao-nacional-indigena-denunciam-violencia-policial/
Conselho de Direitos Humanos da ONU faz recomendações ao Brasil para superar violações aos direitos indígenas	September, 2016	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2016/09/28/conselho-de-direitos-humanos-da-onu-faz-recomendacoes-ao-brasil-para-superar-violacoes-aos-direitos-indigenas/
Contra a constituição, governo Bolsonaro quer acabar silenciosamente com a saúde indígena	April, 2019	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2019/04/26/contra-a-constituicao-governo-bolsonaro-quer-acabar-silenciosamente-com-a-saude-indigena/
Convocatória Acampamento Terra Livre 2017	March, 2017	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2017/03/20/convocatoria-acampamento-terra-livre-2017/
Convocatória do Acampamento Terra Livre 10 a 13/5/2016, Brasília (DF)	May, 2016	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2016/04/26/convocatoria-do-acampamento-terra-livre-10-a-1352016-brasilia-df/

Title	Date	URL
Cumplicidade na Destruição III: Como corporações globais contribuem para violações de direitos dos povos indígenas da Amazônia brasileira	2020	https://amazonwatch.org/assets/files/2020-cumplicidade-na-destruicao-3.pdf
Debates movimentam segundo dia do Acampamento Terra Livre	April, 2017	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2017/04/25/debates-movimentam-segundo-dia-do-acampamento-terra-livre-2017/
Declaração da Mobilização Indígena Nacional em defesa dos Territórios Indígenas	August, 2013	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2013/08/29/declaracao-da-mobilizacao-indigena-nacional-em-defesa-dos-territorios-indigenas/
Declaração da Mobilização Nacional Indígena em defesa da Constituição Federal	October, 2013	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2013/10/03/declaracao-da-mobilizacao-nacional-em-defesa-da-constituicao-federal-dos-direitos-territoriais-indigenas-quilombolas-de-outras-populacoes-e-da-mae-natureza/
Delegação do Brasil denuncia governo Bolsonaro em fórum permanente sobre questões indígenas da ONU	April, 2019	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2019/04/24/delegacao-do-brasil-denuncia-governo-bolsonaro-em-forum-permanente-sobre-questoes-indigenas-da-onu/
Demarcações estão paralisadas no governo Temer, enquanto Tis são invadidas e devastadas	April, 2018	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2018/04/25/demarcacoes-estao-paralisadas-no-governo-temer-enquanto-tis-sao-invadidas-e-devastadas/
Depois de pressão do Movimento Indígena, ministro revoga portarias sobre saúde indígena	October, 2016	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2016/10/26/depois-de-pressao-do-movimento-indigena-ministro-revoga-portarias-sobre-saude-indigena/
Dia Internacional dos Povos Indígenas é marcado por protesto em Brasília	August, 2018	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2018/08/09/dia-internacional-dos-povos-indigenas-e-marcado-por-protesto-em-brasilia/
Documento Final do Acampamento Terra Livre 2018	April, 2018	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2018/04/26/documento-final-do-acampamento-terra-livre-2018-o-nosso-clamor-contra-o-genocidio-dos-nossos-povos/
Documento final do XV Acampamento Terra Livre	April, 2019	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2019/04/26/documento-final-do-xv-acampamento-terra-livre/
Dossiê internacional de denúncias dos povos indígenas do Brasil	August, 2021	https://apiboficial.org/files/2021/08/DOSSIE_pt_v3web.pdf
Em Brasília, povos indígenas exigem justiça contra violações de seus direitos constitucionais	April, 2019	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2019/04/25/em-brasilia-povos-indigenas-exigem-justica-contra-violacoes-de-seus-direitos-constitucionais/
Em defesa das terras sagradas dos Tupinambá	February, 2014	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2014/02/18/em-defesa-das-terras-sagradas-dos-tupinamba/
Em reunião com lideranças, novo Ministro da Justiça promete segurança a indígenas da TI Marãiwatsédé (MT), sob risco de invasão	May, 2016	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2016/05/13/novo-ministro-da-justica-promete-proteger-indigenas-da-ti-maraiwatsede/

Title	Date	URL
Em sua 15ª edição, ATL começa na esplanada dos ministérios e por pressão da PM vai para a praça dos ipês	April, 2019	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2019/04/24/em-sua-15a-edicao-atl-comeca-na-esplanada-dos-ministerios-e-por-pressao-da-pm-vai-para-a-praca-dos-ipes/
Emergência indígena: plano de enfrentamento da COVID-19 no Brasil	August, 2020	https://drive.google.com/file/d/1omnIVPAfCSpUUVMoL72IcOB9-IJVV3W/view
Estavam atirando em nós como se fôssemos criminosos'	April, 2017	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2017/04/25/estavam-atirando-em-nos-como-se-fossemos-criminosos/
Governo confirma mais cinco portarias declaratórias e quatro relatórios de identificação de terras indígenas	May, 2016	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2016/05/12/governo-confirma-mais-cinco-portarias-declaratorias-e-quatro-relatorios-de-identificacao-de-terras-indigenas/
Governo Temer insiste em decretar o fim da demarcação das terras indígenas, portanto da existência dos povos indígenas	December, 2016	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2016/12/13/governo-temer-insiste-em-decretar-o-fim-da-demarcacao-das-terras-indigenas-portanto-da-existencia-dos-povos-indigenas/
Henrique Alves oficializa comissão da PEC 215 contrariando parecer de grupo criado por ele mesmo	September, 2013	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2013/09/11/henrique-alves-oficializa-comissao-da-pec-215-contrariando-parecer-de-grupo-criado-por-ele-mesmo/
Indígenas de todo o Brasil ocupam a esplanada	October, 2013	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2013/10/02/indigenas-de-todo-o-brasil-ocupam-a-esplanada/
Indígenas exigem 'demarcação já' em ato histórico na esplanada dos ministérios	April, 2018	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2018/04/26/indigenas-exigem-demarcacao-ja-em-ato-historico-na-esplanada-dos-ministerios/
Indígenas e Extrativistas unificam agenda de lutas em Brasília	August, 2016	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2016/08/11/indigenas-e-extrativistas-unificam-agenda-de-lutas-em-brasilia/
Indígenas interdita rodovias e promovem ato público no Maranhão	October, 2013	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2013/10/03/mobilizacao-no-maranhao/
Indígenas reafirmam luta pela revogação do parecer do genocídio e governo se compromete a retomar reuniões do CNPI	April, 2018	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2018/04/27/indigenas-reefirmam-luta-pela-revogacao-do-parecer-do-genocidio-e-governo-se-compromete-a-retomar-reunioes-do-cnpi/
Indígenas realizam mobilização nacional nesta quinta-feira, 31	January, 2019	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2019/01/30/indigenas-realizam-mobilizacao-nacional-nesta-quinta-feira-31/
Indígenas reforçam posição contra o marco temporal a ministros do STF	April, 2017	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2017/04/27/indigenas-reforcam-posicao-contr-o-marco-temporal-a-ministros-do-stf/

Title	Date	URL
Indígenas são barrados pela polícia militar no Senado	April, 2017	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2017/04/26/indigenas-sao-barrados-pela-policia-militar-no-senado/
Indígenas têm vitória importante contra tese do Marco Temporal em visita ao STF	May, 2016	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2016/05/12/indigenas-tem-vitoria-importante-contra-tese-do-marco-temporal-em-visita-ao-stf/
Indígenas vão ao STF pedir fim do Marco Temporal	April, 2018	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2018/04/25/indigenas-vao-ao-stf-pedir-fim-do-marco-temporal/
Indígenas, juristas e antropólogos unem vozes contra o Marco Temporal	August, 2017	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2017/08/08/indigenas-juristas-e-antropologos-unem-vozes-contra-o-marco-temporal/
Kaingang bloqueiam rodovias no RS como parte das ações do Acampamento Terra Livre	April, 2017	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2017/04/24/kaingang-bloqueiam-rodovias-no-rs-como-parte-das-acoes-do-acampamento-terra-livre/
Lideranças indígenas concedem entrevista coletiva na esplanada dos ministérios nesta terça, às 14 horas	October, 2013	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2013/10/01/liderancas-indigenas-concedem-entrevista-coletiva-na-esplanada-dos-ministerios-nesta-terca-as-14-horas/
Lideranças indígenas protestam no Ministério da Justiça (DF) e pedem audiência sobre a demarcação de terras	May, 2014	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2014/05/29/liderancas-indigenas-protestam-no-ministerio-da-justica-df-e-pedem-audiencia-sobre-a-demarcacao-de-terras/
Lideranças indígenas protocolam queixa-crime contra parlamentares no STF	May, 2014	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2014/05/27/liderancas-indigenas-protocolam-queixa-crime-contra-parlamentares-no-stf/
Lideranças indígenas são recebidas por Ministro da Justiça	May, 2014	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2014/05/29/indios-sao-recebidos-por-ministro-da-justica/
Lideranças indígenas se reúnem com Lula	April, 2017	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2017/04/25/liderancas-indigenas-se-reunem-com-lula/
Mais de 3 mil indígenas trancam rodovias em Pernambuco	October, 2013	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2013/10/03/mais-de-3-mil-indigenas-trancam-rodovias-em-pernambuco/
Manifestação reúne 1,3 mil em defesa de direitos de indígenas e quilombolas em Brasília	October, 2013	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2013/10/01/manifestacao-reune-13-mil-em-defesa-de-direitos-de-indigenas-e-quilombolas-em-brasilia/
Manifesto contra a política anti-indígena do governo Dilma	February, 2016	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2016/02/24/manifesto-contra-a-politica-anti-indigena-do-governo-dilma/
Manifesto do 13º Acampamento Terra Livre	May, 2016	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2016/05/12/manifesto-do-13o-acampamento-terra-livre/
Manifesto pela defesa do Subsistema de Saúde Indígena	October, 2016	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2016/10/23/manifesto-pela-defesa-do-subsistema-de-saude-indigena/

Title	Date	URL
Marcha indígena em Brasília leva reivindicações ao Ministério da saúde e exige FUNAI de volta ao MJ	April, 2019	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2019/04/26/marcha-indigena-em-brasilia-leva-reivindicacoes-ao-ministerio-da-saude-e-exige-funai-de-volta-ao-mj/
Michel Temer violenta os direitos dos povos indígenas para tentar impedir seu próprio julgamento	July, 2017	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2017/07/20/michel-temer-violenta-os-direitos-dos-povos-indigenas-para-tentar-impedir-seu-proprio-julgamento/
Ministra da AGU reconhece que "não tem autonomia" para revogar parecer do genocídio	April, 2018	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2018/04/26/ministra-da-agu-reconhece-que-nao-tem-autonomia-para-revogar-parecer-do-genocidio/
Ministro da Justiça afirma compromisso de respeito aos povos indígenas e à preservação de seus direitos	August, 2016	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2016/08/04/ministro-da-justica-afirma-compromisso-de-respeito-aos-povos-indigenas-e-a-preservacao-de-seus-direitos/
Ministro da Justiça recebe hoje, às 15h, Mobilização Nacional Indígena para tratar de demarcação de terras	May, 2014	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2014/05/29/ministro-da-justica-recebe-hoje-as-15h-mobilizacao-nacional-indigena-para-tratar-de-demarcacao-de-terras/
Ministro diz que STF poderá intervir se demarcações forem paralisadas	April, 2019	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2019/04/24/ministro-diz-que-stf-podera-intervir-se-demarcacoes-forem-paralisadas/
Ministro indica que manterá suspensas demarcações de Terras Indígenas e insiste em mudar procedimentos	May, 2014	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2014/05/30/ministro-indica-que-mantera-suspensas-demarcacoes-de-terras-indigenas-e-insiste-em-mudar-procedimentos/
Mobilização Nacional Indígena começa em Luziânia (GO) denunciando governo federal e bancada ruralista	May, 2014	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2014/05/26/mobilizacao-nacional-indigena-comeca-em-luziania-go-denunciando-governo-federal-e-bancada-ruralista/
Mobilização Nacional Indígena movimentada 16 estados	July, 2016	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2016/07/13/mobilizacao-nacional-indigena-movimentada-16-estados/
Mobilização Nacional Indígena prevê manifestações em vários pontos do país	September, 2013	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2013/09/26/mobilizacao-nacional-indigena-preve-manifestacoes-em-varios-pontos-do-pais/
Mobilização nacional indígena promove manifestações em Brasília	May, 2014	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2014/05/23/mobilizacao-nacional-indigena-promove-manifestacoes-em-brasilia/
Mobilizado em Brasília, Movimento Indígena quer impedir retrocessos do governo Bolsonaro	April, 2019	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2019/04/24/mobilizado-em-brasilia-movimento-indigena-quer-impedir-retrocessos-do-governo-bolsonaro/
Movimento indígena pretende lançar plataforma de candidaturas para eleições	April, 2018	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2018/04/27/movimento-indigena-pretende-lancar-plataforma-de-candidaturas-para-eleicoes/

Title	Date	URL
MTST e indígenas se unem a protesto contra a copa hoje, em Brasília	May, 2014	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2014/05/27/mtst-e-indigenas-se-unem-a-protesto-contr-a-copa-hoje-em-brasilia/
Mulheres indígenas: a força do 14º Acampamento Terra Livre	April, 2017	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2017/04/26/mulheres-indigenas-a-forca-do-14o-acampamento-terra-livre/
Nossa história não começa em 1988	August, 2017	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2017/08/03/nossa-historia-nao-comeca-em-1988-marcotemporalnao/
Nossa Luta é Pela Vida - COVID-19 e povos indígenas: o enfrentamento das violências durante a pandemia	November, 2020	https://emergenciaindigena.apiboficial.org/files/2020/12/A_PIB_nossalutaepelavida_v7PT.pdf
Nossos direitos originários são imprescritíveis, por isso o marco temporal é inconstitucional'	April, 2017	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2017/04/26/nossos-direitos-originarios-sao-imprescritiveis-por-isso-o-marco-temporal-e-inconstitucional/
Nota contra parecer 001 da AGU	August, 2018	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2018/08/09/nota-contr-a-parecer-001-da-agu/
Nota da APIB sobre o uso de força contra o ATL	April, 2019	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2019/04/18/nota-da-apib-sobre-o-uso-de-forca-contr-a-atl/
Nota de repúdio contra a portaria nº 68 que muda os procedimentos de demarcação das terras indígenas	January, 2017	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2017/01/19/nota-de-repudio-contr-a-portaria-no-68-que-muda-os-procedimentos-de-demarcacao-das-terras-indigenas/
Nota de repúdio pelo assassinato de Clodiodi Aquileu Rodrigues de Souza Guarani-Kaiowá	June, 2016	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2016/06/21/nota-de-repudio-pelo-assassinato-de-clodiodi-aquileu-rodrigues-de-souza-guarani-kaiowa/
Nota de solidariedade pela morte de Rosane Kaingang	October, 2016	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2016/10/17/nota-de-solidariedade-pela-morte-de-rosane-kaingang/
Nota pública sobre o novo modelo institucional proposto pelo governo para o atendimento à saúde dos Povos Indígenas	August, 2014	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2014/08/15/nota-publica-sobre-o-novo-modelo-institucional-proposto-pelo-governo-para-o-atendimento-a-saude-dos-povos-indigenas/
Nota pública: não aos retrocessos, não à indicação de militar na presidência da FUNAI	June, 2016	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2016/06/30/nota-publica-nao-aos-retrocessos-nao-a-indicacao-de-militar-na-presidencia-da-funai/
O golpe chega à FUNAI	October, 2016	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2016/10/18/o-golpe-chega-a-funai/
O governo muda, mas a luta dos povos indígenas continua	May, 2016	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2016/05/12/o-governo-muda-mas-a-luta-dos-povos-indigenas-continua/
O maior Acampamento Terra Livre da história!	April, 2017	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2017/04/28/o-maior-acampamento-terra-livre-da-historia/

Title	Date	URL
Ocupa FUNAI continua! Contra o permanente golpe sofrido pelos povos indígenas	July, 2016	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2016/07/08/ocupa-funai-continua-contra-o-permanente-golpe-sofrido-pelos-povos-indigenas/
Organizações divulgam parecer rechaçando proposta do MJ de alterar demarcações de terras	April, 2014	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2014/04/08/organizacoes-divulgam-parecer-rechacando-proposta-do-mj-de-alterar-demarcacoes-de-terras/
Organizações indígenas e indigenistas se negam a participar das audiências públicas referentes à PEC 215	June, 2014	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2014/06/04/organizacoes-indigenas-e-indigenistas-se-negam-a-participar-das-audiencias-publicas-referentes-a-pec-215/
Para saúde da mulher e da criança indígena sobram promessas e faltam soluções	April, 2018	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2018/04/27/para-a-saude-da-mulher-e-da-crianca-indigenas-sobram-promessas-e-faltam-solucoes/
Participação na política e luta pela terra: mulheres Indígenas abrem ATL 2018	April, 2018	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2018/04/24/participacao-na-politica-e-luta-pela-terra-mulheres-indigenas-abrem-atl-2018/
PEC 215: Relatório sob suspeita de ter sido elaborado pela CNA pode ser votado amanhã	December, 2014	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2014/12/02/pec-215-relatorio-sob-suspeita-de-ter-sido-elaborado-pela-cna-pode-ser-votado-amanha/
Pela continuidade da nossa luta em prol da saúde diferenciada	November, 2016	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2016/11/16/1564/
Plenária de abertura do ATL 2018 reúne quase três mil indígenas por demarcação já!	April, 2018	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2018/04/23/plenaria-de-abertura-do-atl-2018-reune-quase-tres-mil-indigenas-por-demarcacao-ja/
Povo Terena retoma fazenda em Terra Indígena declarada desde 2007	October, 2013	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2013/10/04/povo-terena-retoma-fazenda-em-terra-indigena-declarada-desde-2007/
Povo Tupinambá realiza caminhada em defesa de direitos e pela demarcação de terras	September, 2013	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2013/09/30/povo-tupinamba-realiza-caminhada-em-defesa-de-direitos-e-pela-demarcacao-de-terras/
Povos e organizações indígenas mobilizam-se em Brasília para defender o Subsistema de Atenção à Saúde Indígena	November, 2016	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2016/11/09/1558/
Povos indígenas de Roraima seguem firmes na luta em defesa da Constituição Federal e contra a PEC 215	October, 2013	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2013/10/03/povos-indigenas-de-roraima-seguem-firmes-na-luta-em-defesa-da-constituicao-federal-e-contra-a-pec-215/
Povos indígenas do sul da Bahia desocupam BR-101 depois de agenda com Ministro da Justiça	October, 2013	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2013/10/03/povos-indigenas-do-sul-da-bahia-desocupam-br-101-depois-de-agenda-com-ministro-da-justica/
Povos indígenas exigem que FUNAI e demarcações voltem ao Ministério da Justiça	April, 2019	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2019/04/25/povos-indigenas-exigem-que-funai-e-demarcacoes-voltem-ao-ministerio-da-justica/

Title	Date	URL
Povos indígenas mobilizam-se em todo o país contra retrocessos	August, 2017	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2017/08/10/povos-indigenas-mobilizam-se-em-todo-o-pais-contra-retrocessos/
Povos indígenas unificam suas lutas em defesa de seus direitos!	April, 2017	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2017/04/27/povos-indigenas-unificam-suas-lutas-em-defesa-de-seu-direitos/
Presidente da Câmara honra compromisso com ruralistas e anuncia instalação da PEC 215	September, 2013	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2013/09/03/presidente-da-camara-honra-compromisso-com-ruralistas-e-anuncia-instalacao-da-pec-215/
Presidentes da Câmara e do Senado Comprometem-se a devolver FUNAI e demarcações ao Ministério da Justiça	April, 2019	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2019/04/25/presidentes-da-camara-e-do-senado-comprometem-se-a-devolver-funai-e-demarcacoes-ao-ministerio-da-justica/
Protesto pacífico de povos indígenas é atacado pela polícia no Congresso	April, 2017	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2017/04/25/protesto-pacifico-de-povos-indigenas-e-atacado-pela-policia-na-frente-do-congresso/
Protestos internacionais demandam o fim das ofensivas do Brasil contra os direitos indígenas	October, 2013	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2013/10/03/protestos-internacionais-demandam-o-fim-das-ofensivas-do-brasil-contra-os-direitos-indigenas/
Recuar jamais na defesa dos direitos conquistados	January, 2017	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2017/01/14/recuar-jamais-na-defesa-dos-direitos-conquistados/
Regularização de duas TIs, mudança na FUNAI e parecer 001: o que o governo Temer fez no abril indígena	May, 2018	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2018/05/03/regularizacao-de-duas-tis-mudanca-na-funai-e-parecer-001-o-que-o-governo-temer-fez-no-abril-indigena/
Relatora da ONU preocupa-se com pauta anti-indígena do Congresso Nacional	March, 2016	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2016/03/08/relatora-da-onu-preocupa-se-com-pauta-anti-indigena-do-congresso-nacional/
Relatórios lançados no ATL escancaram violação de direitos indígenas	April, 2017	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2017/04/25/relatorios-lancados-no-atl-escancaram-violacao-de-direitos-indigenas-no-brasil/
Sangue indígena: nenhuma gota a mais!	January, 2019	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2019/01/11/sangue-indigena-nenhuma-gota-a-mais/
Sem participação não há solução: saúde indígena em pauta no ATL	April, 2018	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2018/04/24/sem-participacao-nao-ha-solucao-saude-indigena-em-pauta-no-atl/
Semana de lutas: indígenas em todo o Brasil mobilizam-se contra o marco temporal	August, 2017	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2017/08/07/semana-de-lutas-indigenas-em-todo-o-brasil-mobilizam-se-contra-o-marco-temporal/
Semana dos Povos Indígenas terá mobilizações em defesa de demarcações e contra propostas que restringem direitos indígenas	April, 2014	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2014/04/23/semana-dos-povos-indigenas-tera-mobilizacoes-em-defesa-de-demarcacoes-e-contra-propostas-que-restringem-direitos-indigenas/
Senadores e indígenas firmam aliança contra MP 870	April, 2019	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2019/04/25/senadores-e-indigenas-firmam-alianca-contra-mp-870/

Title	Date	URL
Trancamento de Trecho da BR-101 segue na Bahia	October, 2013	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2013/10/03/trancamento-de-trecho-da-br-101-segue-na-bahia/
Tuitaço contra a violência nesta quarta, dia 19	February, 2014	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2014/02/19/tuitaco-contra-a-violencia-nesta-quarta-dia-19/
Uma anatomia das práticas de silenciamento indígena	April, 2021	https://apiboficial.org/files/2021/05/UMA-ANATOMIA-DAS-PRA%CC%81TICAS-DE-SILENCIAMENTO-INDI%CC%81GENA-1.pdf
Vamos lutar pela terra, nem que eles abram um buraco, nos matem e enterrem, diz Erileide Guarani Kaiowá em evento paralelo à ONU	April, 2019	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2019/04/25/vamos-lutar-pela-terra-nem-que-eles-abram-um-buraco-nos-matem-e-enterrem-diz-erileide-guarani-kaiowa-em-evento-paralelo-a-onu/
XV Acampamento Terra Livre - 2019: Resistimos há 519 anos	April, 2019	https://mobilizacaonacionalindigena.wordpress.com/2019/04/24/xv-acampamento-terra-livre-2019-resistimos-ha-519-anos/