

Like Mother, Like Daughters? Campaigns for Tribal Peoples' Rights in the Commonwealth

STEPHEN CORRY

Survival International, London, UK

ABSTRACT *Intent on stealing land and plundering resources, the British Empire labelled its tribal subjects as 'backward' and used the excuse of bringing them 'civilisation' to appropriate their land and resources. This study examines the development of campaigns for tribal peoples' rights in various Commonwealth countries since independence. It shows how methods of campaigning have been largely consistent since the birth of the indigenous rights movements, involving the public in letter-writing, demonstrations and vigils, and using publications and the press to raise awareness of rights violations and abuses. It illustrates how many Commonwealth governments today, like the former imperial rulers, believe in the 'backwardness' of their tribal citizens, but today it is 'development' not 'civilisation' that lies behind the theft of their lands and resources.*

KEY WORDS: tribal peoples, dispossession, 'civilisation', Declaration of Barbados, Upper Mazaruni, Jummas, Penan, Hadza, Gana and Gwi 'Bushmen', Dongria Kondh, 'development'

Introduction

Part of the British Empire's objective was to impose her rule over the places and peoples she believed would advance her financial and military interests—and to prevent other imperial powers enriching themselves. This meant turning formerly independent peoples into her subjects so that their land, resources and labour could be exploited. That, at least, was the benign option: some were simply wiped out, by killing, disease, or both. Prior to their subjugation by empire, many were largely self-sufficient 'tribal peoples',¹ and Britain was ultimately responsible for the destruction of more of them than almost any other power.²

According to imperial thinking, the self-sufficiency of these peoples was, in itself, 'backward', 'unchristian', and to be abolished through 'integration' into wider markets and societies. People had to start producing what the empire wanted—and pay taxes on what they might receive for doing so. Not everyone needed to be turned into a 'worker', of course: often the empire was not after yet more cheap labour, but only

Correspondence Address: Stephen Corry, Director, Survival International, 6 Charterhouse Buildings, London EC1M 7ET, UK. Email: director@survivalinternational.org; gordonbennett355@gmail.com

what was on, or under, tribal territory—as well as the land itself. The indigenous peoples were thought not to be using it in a ‘civilised’ way; they were too ‘backward’. This outline of course simplifies a complex history, with thousands of local variants. But this does not alter the fact that the imperial endeavour was primarily and overwhelmingly rooted in self-interest.

This was not how it was presented to her millions of subjects, including Britons themselves, who were schooled to believe that empire’s function was primarily altruistic: she was bringing the enlightened benefits of British morality, law and commerce to those benighted souls who did not realise what they had been missing. Britain’s role in the world—‘to go and civilise’—was never questioned.

Locals who objected to their ever-shrivelling status were branded ‘traitors’ or ‘mutineers’. The 1857 War of Independence is well known, for example, as the ‘Indian mutiny’. Another common trick was to criminalise locals for going about their daily business. For example, it is little known that when the British introduced ‘conservation’ zones in East Africa (often to ‘conserve’ big game for their own sport hunting) those tribes who had lived by hunting were labelled ‘poachers’, and thrown into prison, or worse. At one stage, about a third of Waliangulu men from Kenya’s newly formed Tsavo Park were suffering in prison. The tribe did not survive.

More important than the hue and shape of the lens through which we view the past is the degree to which the Commonwealth—daughter of Empire—has come to terms with its historical treatment of tribal peoples. What does it mean now, and for tomorrow? Have attitudes changed over the last century, or have the same views simply been edited into a more ‘politically correct’ lexicon?

This article primarily describes some of Survival International’s work aimed at improving the treatment of tribal peoples in the Commonwealth over the last few decades. Those peoples who *did* ‘integrate’ and, as a result, have now disappeared as definable ‘peoples’, are not considered. I also ignore the wealthier countries, such as Australia, Canada and New Zealand, where the descendants of indigenous peoples (distinct from the narrower category of ‘tribal’, which is my focus here³) now face severe and growing problems that result from their dispossession, and the concomitant erosion of their self-sufficiency and self-esteem. Such issues may be well known to specialists, but they—and the history that engenders them—still cry out for wider acknowledgement, especially in the schoolroom: it remains largely airbrushed from national consciousness that countries such as those above (and the United States, of course) are built on the lands and graves of countless tribal peoples, who died in vast numbers as a direct result of their invasion.

The suppression of this story is surely a contributing factor in history failing to inform the future, and thereby failing to improve it; were it openly acknowledged, perhaps it could help reform the dismal policies that have not only repeatedly failed to reduce the severe, and growing, problems faced by these peoples today, but also often made things worse. Such problems include: extreme poverty; low life expectancy; high rates of substance abuse, domestic violence, suicide and imprisonment; extreme rates of obesity, with resultant amputations; and many further horrors. Such a tragic scenario, a direct result of having lost more or less everything they valued, is easily observable in many Aboriginal ‘townships’ and Canadian Indian⁴ reservations. But many opinion-formers throughout the world still turn a blind eye, parroting that ‘civilisation’ brings benefits which it would be cruel to ‘deny’ those tribal peoples who have so far

escaped its clutches. Such a view remains prevalent in the corridors of government, and remains at the heart of the problem faced by indigenous peoples today. It is, of course, exactly what the European colonists thought.

Barbados

A good place to start describing some of the attempts to help tribal peoples protect their fundamental rights is with a Commonwealth country—Barbados—which ‘disappeared’ its own indigenous people hundreds of years ago, but has, nevertheless, played a catalytic though somewhat accidental role in two of the last century’s most important developments in tribal rights.

It was in Barbados that a group of anthropologists working with South American Indians met in 1971 to draw up the ‘Declaration of Barbados’.⁵ It laid a foundation for much of the indigenous peoples’ support movement that followed and put the blame for the destruction of American Indians squarely at the feet of governments and religious missions (without sparing criticism of those anthropologists who deliberately detached themselves from the welfare of those they studied).

Sixty years before, Britain was the centre of the attacks on the depravities of the South American ‘rubber boom’, partly because the key company (Anglo Peruvian Amazon Rubber Co.) was registered on the London stock exchange, but also because British citizens from Barbados were employed to oversee the Amazon Indian slaves. The opposition was driven by American traveller Walter Hardenberg, who went to London to enlist the Aborigines’ Protection Society to his cause. After much lobbying in press and parliament, in 1910 the British government asked Roger Casement to go to Amazonia to investigate. He reported that the atrocities committed by rubber barons and their henchmen—rapes, savage and wanton killings including of children and babies, mutilations, and random butchery seen as ‘entertainment’—were as appalling as any from the bloody colonial history of South America.

Although, ultimately, economic forces brought about the end of the rubber boom, it still seems unlikely that the rubber company would have been able to continue annihilating its workforce:⁶ thanks to the public campaign, general outrage had eventually grown overwhelming. It is worth noting that the company’s initial reaction to this was to state that it was bringing the benefits of civilisation to the region—a retort still common today.

Sixty years lapsed between the ‘rubber boom’ campaign and the Declaration of Barbados, largely because the world wars and subsequent ‘Cold War’ pushed many humanitarian issues off all agendas: it was only in the late 1950s and 1960s that indigenous rights movements grew more vociferous, and began again to gather international traction and support.

Campaigns

When it did, its main focus was still Amazonian South America. A campaign in the 1970s targeted Guyana, where the newly independent government planned a major dam on the upper Mazaruni River, which would have destroyed the lands of 4,000 Akawaio Indians. An anthropologist⁷ expert on the region enlisted the help of international

non-governmental organisations (NGOs) to oppose it successfully. This was achieved though the publication of reports⁸ and press articles, as well as lobbying both the Guyanese and British governments, and the World Bank, over a period of several years. The dam has not been built, but the project is now back on the table, nearly 40 years later.

Around the same time, Bangladesh started encouraging Bengali settlers into the Chitragong Hills, homeland to 600,000 tribal people, collectively known as Jummas. The resultant conflict has continued ever since, with settlers (backed by the army and police) periodically attacking and burning tribal villages, and killing and raping many hundreds of Jummas. Government policy was widely condemned as genocidal by NGOs,⁹ and there is no doubt the authorities wanted the people out so that mainstream Bangladeshis could take over the area. The ongoing campaign in support of the Jumma has lasted much longer, and been more vigorous, than that to stop the Mazaruni dam, and uses similar techniques, as well as the inclusion of victims' testimonies, petitions and demonstrations at high commissions and embassies worldwide.¹⁰ When a peace accord was eventually signed in 1997, the Jumma acknowledged the influence the international campaign had in stopping massacres becoming more widespread. This agreement committed the government to ensuring stolen land be returned to the Jumma and further land theft prevented. It also required the removal of temporary military camps. Unfortunately, despite the accord, human rights violations and land grabbing continue and many of the government's commitments have yet to be met.

The case of the Penan in Malaysian Borneo has become relatively well known in recent years, undoubtedly partly due to their gentle, forest-nomad demeanour, which has attracted visitors, journalists and film-makers. Hounded by Malaysian loggers, exporting much of their wood to Japan, most of the nomadic Penan's forests have been logged, and the game they depend on diminished.

The Penan's innate desire to avoid conflict has also meant they have found it difficult to maintain much organised resistance to the logging. They have, however, occasionally blockaded roads for days, sometimes weeks, at a time and refused to let the timber trucks through. Such action has brought declarations of support, with the usual international petitions and so forth, though it has had relatively little impact in lessening the timber extraction, fuelled as it is by profits accruing to the Sarawak elite.¹¹

Although one of their leaders disappeared in 2007, possibly murdered as a result of their resistance, it is likely that the international attention has helped protect Penan from higher levels of violence. Most Penan have now been driven from the forest interior to settle in permanent dwellings near the rivers, lamenting the life they have left behind. They often express envy of the few hundred who remain forest nomads still living in temporary shelters, now largely roofed with tarpaulins rather than thatch.

A majority of Tanzania's Hadza still lead a nomadic hunter-gatherer life, having survived several attempts—first by the British, then by the Tanzanian government—to settle them forcibly. In 2006, a safari company representing clients from the United Arab Emirates (UAE) secured a deal to manage and hunt game on Hadza land, so threatening their livelihood. However, the company soon surrendered the rights after campaign groups contacted the governments of Tanzania and UAE, and the UN Office for Human Rights, and successfully spread the story in the international press.¹²

Between 2002 and 2007, the situation faced by the Gana and Gwi 'Bushmen'¹³ in Botswana featured in tens of thousands of press articles in dozens of countries. It was undoubtedly the most publicised case that any specific tribal people has ever achieved, as well as being Botswana's biggest ever international news story.

The Bushmen's problems began in 1982 when diamonds were discovered on their lands in the Central Kalahari Game Reserve. The government declared its intention of removing them from the area, but faced with representations from the Bushmen, supported by international NGOs, actually did nothing for over 15 years. Then, in 1997, it moved the 800 inhabitants of the largest and newest Bushman community, Xade, 70 km away to a government camp: 'New' Xade was devoid of good hunting or gathering opportunities, or even water, which had to be piped at huge expense from a source near 'old' Xade.

The Bushmen in the camp immediately became dependent on food 'rations' and soon fell into boredom and apathy, relieved only by drink. Some women turned to prostitution; the rate of HIV soared. As the authorities ratcheted up the pressure on the remaining 750 individuals to leave the reserve as well, the international work opposing this was also stepped up. It consisted of letter-writing campaigns—thousands of messages were sent—and frequent NGO representations to the government, including meetings in the Botswana High Commission in London.

The Bushmen remaining in the reserve successfully resisted attempts to move until 2002, when President Mogae ordered their rounding up by armed guards and enforced trucking out, to New Xade and other 'relocation' sites. Bushman houses were destroyed, their water supplies emptied, and their water borehole sealed shut. As the NGO campaign in opposition sought increasing press attention, the Botswana government and De Beers diamond company employed London public relations firms to fight back.

Although the Bushmen had often been told that they had to move because of the diamonds, the government now put forward several different reasons to justify its actions.¹⁴ Protection of the reserve from human habitation, bringing the benefits of civilisation to the Bushmen, and prevention of disease among wildlife populations, were successively trotted out.

The UK parliament was lobbied by both sides. Nigel (later Lord) Jones formed an All-Party Parliamentary Group for Botswana, recruiting MPs for all-expenses-paid 'fact-finding' trips to the area. None went into the reserve, where a dozen or so Bushmen had escaped eviction, but they visited what had become the 'show case' relocation camp of New Xade, which now boasted a new clinic and school—better than facilities available in most of Botswana. Interaction between UK parliamentarians and the Bushmen—which rarely lasted more than a couple of hours—was controlled by government translators who pretended that life in the relocation camps was much improved over what it had been inside the reserve. Few of these MPs had any relevant experience to help them assess the situation. Some had never previously been to Africa, and many were drawn from the anti-hunting lobby, as the Botswana government was now vigorously, but falsely, alleging that the Bushmen were 'poaching' with high-powered rifles from trucks. The EU even sent prominent MEP Glenys Kinnock, who was helicoptered in for an hour or so. Such visits benefited no one except the MPs, though far from everyone was fooled.¹⁵

From having been a rather shadowy company on the public stage (its name did not even figure on its main London offices), De Beers was at the time trying to launch itself as a luxury brand, more than just a diamond mining and sales operation. Its new show-rooms in London's elite Bond Street and New York's Fifth Avenue provided an opportunity for Bushman supporters, who routinely picketed the shops. As the Bond Street store was first being opened, they succeeded in pasting over a huge De Beers billboard of model Iman. Piccadilly's morning rush hour was greeted with the face of a Bushman woman with the new slogan, 'The Bushmen aren't forever', and a photo of the event featured in the *New York Times*.¹⁶

The most significant effect of this long campaign was probably on the Botswana press and its readers. The key NGO involved, Survival International (with which the writer works), had various pieces published in Botswana over several years. The opinions of local journalists and the Botswana public gradually evolved from one of agreeing with the government that the Bushman must be led towards a 'better' life, like it or not, to that of largely siding with the Bushmen and NGOs. It became increasingly acknowledged that the authorities were treating the Bushmen appallingly badly.¹⁷

At no stage, however, did the Botswana government recognise this, and when the case finally came before the High Court, its strategy seemed to be to drag it out as long as possible, which of course gave the campaign more opportunities to get the media on to its side. The most extraordinary development occurred a few days after one of the many adjournments when a few dozen Bushmen tried to leave New Xade to re-enter the reserve. They were stopped and shot at (with baton rounds) by an army detachment directed personally by Sydney Pilane, the government's attorney in the legal cases!¹⁸

Finally, four years after the evictions, the judges ruled in favour of the Bushmen, citing the government's actions as unlawful and unconstitutional. Four years later, in 2010, the Bushmen sued again, this time to try and reopen the borehole the government had welded shut. Initially, they lost, but then won on appeal when the court characterised the government as guilty of 'degrading treatment' and described the case as 'a harrowing story of human suffering and despair'.¹⁹

At the time of writing, harassment of Bushmen in the reserve is growing again, but many have now returned and they have a functioning borehole once more. As predicted by the NGOs, the diamond mine is now being built.

Support for tribal peoples in India has followed a different pattern from elsewhere. There are many local and national activists in the country who largely support tribal rights, but the voice of the people themselves is often less prominent. An important case in the late 1980s and 1990s was the attempt to stop a series of dams on the Narmada River from flooding the lands of an estimated 300,000 tribespeople in the states of Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra and Gujarat.²⁰ Although considerable international support was mobilised, the dams' impacts were devastating. One estimate²¹ is that 40 million individuals, of whom at least 40% are tribal, have been displaced by this and other dams in India.²²

Another case concerns the Dongria Kondh in Orissa. Early in the 2000s, a British company, Vedanta Resources, planned to build a bauxite mine on a Dongria sacred site, to supply a refinery in the plains below. By 2005 the refinery had displaced over 100 Majhi Kondh families, and a case had been launched in the Supreme Court to challenge

the project on environmental grounds. The Dongria declared their intention to defend their land, with their lives if necessary, and began to blockade some of the miners' access roads.

NGOs around the world took up the tribe's cause: to gain press interest, the Dongria were compared to the Na'vi of the Hollywood blockbuster 'Avatar', and demonstrations were held at successive Vedanta AGMs, when token shareholdings enabled opponents of the mine to question the directors. When the film 'Mine—Story of a Sacred Mountain'²³ was released online, it quickly went viral, attracting over a half million viewers. Support from celebrities such as Arundhati Roy, 'Avatar' director James Cameron, and British actors Joanna Lumley and Michael Palin, kept the Dongria in the spotlight over several months.

Individuals within the government—including the environment minister—have acted independently to try and help protect Dongria rights, but on the whole the machinery of the state clearly demonstrated its alliance with industry rather than the community. However, the first steps towards a mine in Niyamgiri were made in 1997, and the fact that one has still to be built can only be ascribed to the tenacity of the Dongria and Majhi Kondhs, and their supporters worldwide.

International Moves

Obviously, these examples are just a few illustrations of a deep-seated and widespread problem. Despite the success of the campaign for Bushmen rights in Botswana, the Commonwealth as a whole still remains well behind the curve in supporting tribal peoples. Commonwealth nations such as India and Bangladesh refuse to recognise the existence of indigenous peoples among their population, and can therefore be resistant to campaign efforts. Recommendations of international bodies such as the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UNPF) are often rejected, with countries either ignoring suggestions²⁴ or challenging the UNPF's legitimacy in discussing matters indigenous.^{25,26}

When the UN General Assembly first considered its 'Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples',²⁷ several African countries (notably Botswana, Kenya, Namibia and Nigeria) began by opposing it. An advisory opinion was sought from the African Commission, which responded to the objections raised, some changes were made, and the countries finally voted in favour. When the UN voted on the final draft in 2006, only four countries opposed it: Australia and New Zealand, the USA and Canada—of course, all were once British colonies, and three remain in the Commonwealth (subsequent governments in all these countries have now supported the Declaration). The UN Declaration is (supposed to be) a statement of intent, but it has no legal 'teeth', and no enforcement mechanism. The key international text that does is the International Labour Organisation's (ILO) 1989 Convention 169, 'Indigenous and Tribal Peoples', which is a substantial redraft of an earlier instrument.²⁸ ILO conventions are an important sector of international law. Individual countries can choose whether to ratify them and, if they do, they are supposed to become part of that country's legislation.

The most important component of both the ILO Convention and the UN Declaration is their affirmation of indigenous and tribal peoples' ownership over their territo-

ries and resources. According to the Declaration, these cannot be exploited by others without the 'free, prior and informed consent' of the owners. The earlier Convention makes the same point: 'The peoples concerned shall have the right to decide their own priorities for the process of development as it affects their ... lands they occupy or otherwise use.' Such stipulations would of course have outlawed the growth of European empires. Equally, they render illegal many 'development' projects affecting indigenous land: a good deal of the work of miners, loggers, hydro-dam construction, oil and gas companies and so forth are in flagrant breach of the Convention. So, it is perhaps not surprising that it has so far been agreed to by only two of the 54 Commonwealth nations (Dominica and Fiji). Campaigns to push for ratification in some EU countries, such as Spain and the Netherlands, have succeeded, but in Britain the Convention has been repeatedly rebuffed with the claim that the UK cannot agree to it because there are no indigenous peoples there (though that did not worry Spain or the Netherlands).²⁹ Those involved in campaigns for tribal peoples' rights, including this writer, believe such evasion is more to do with trying to protect British companies and the UK overseas aid programme: both routinely violate the Convention by bringing destructive 'development' to tribal areas irrespective of the wishes of the rightful landowners.

Conclusion

In many ways, campaigns for tribal peoples' rights have not changed that much in the last 100 years, or more. Activism against the cruelty of the Amazonian rubber boom once employed pamphlets, public meetings and the press to bring onside a groundswell of public opinion, coupled with parliamentary lobbying to try and move politicians. They were the same tactics used by the movement to abolish slavery 100 years earlier. The means of communicating them have now evolved of course, particularly since the ubiquity of the web. On one hand, this enables material such as reports and films to be accessed at less cost, and so it greatly extends the reach of campaigns. On the other hand, making all campaigns harder are the many thousands of disparate 'causes'—some extremely deserving—all in competition in their clamour for widespread support. To gain public sympathy for any requires technological know-how, flair and skills that barely existed even a decade ago, and no one knows how the new medium will evolve in the future.

What is certain is that those tribal areas which have been a focus for public concern *have* seen a significant improvement in how tribal peoples are treated, and that the former ethnocentrism—that 'our' society is at the pinnacle of human achievement—rings increasingly hollow. At the same time, the problems faced by tribal peoples are growing, as resource extraction reaches ever deeper into the areas where they have survived, as business and profit gain increasing dominance over politicians and 'ideology', and as the fairly recent notion of 'human rights' is diluted from its fundamentals (such as the protection of life and liberty), and commandeered by myriad causes, many of rather less consequence.

Indigenous Land Rights in the Courts

Much of the struggle for indigenous land rights has been played out in courts in the old 'settler colonies'. In the United States, these rights have been regarded as a part of the law of nations. In Canada they were originally thought to arise from the Royal Proclamation 1763 but now depend on exclusive occupation. In Australia and New Zealand, native titles derive from traditional laws and customs.

These differences matter, because the source of an indigenous title largely determines its content. In Canada, for example, Indian titles have been held to include oil and gas rights even if title holders made no use of these resources in the past. Aboriginal communities in Australia, on the other hand, can claim mineral rights only if they form part of their own laws and customs. The source of the title may also affect the level and standard of proof required by the courts, although judicial reluctance to accord oral traditions the same weight as written material has been another important factor.

African claimants face all these problems and a host of their own. The indirect rule favoured by the British ensured a separation of state and individual titles from customary tenure which persists in many countries. A new elite has inherited the individual titles, and sees no reason to alter the system. Statutory regimes of trust or tribal territories have afforded at least a measure of security to tribal peoples who practice a strong agricultural economy; but pastoralists and hunter-gatherers have invariably been treated as squatters on someone else's land, repeatedly forced to make way for national parks and other projects. These communities now look increasingly to the courts and other tribunals for relief.

In the last few months alone I have drafted a petition to the African Human Rights Commission about Mursi land rights in Ethiopia, advised Samburu pastoralists on ongoing litigation against Kenyan Wildlife, and formulated new claims for Kalahari Bushmen who can already point to a clutch of courtroom victories in Botswana. In India too, tribal communities have become more alive to the legal possibilities. In the last couple of years I have been actively involved in claims by the Dongria Kondh to keep miners off their land, and to keep tourists away from tribal reserves in the Andaman Islands. Both cases have ended up in the Indian Supreme Court.

But litigation should always be a weapon of last resort. Quite apart from its enormous cost, trials may drive the parties further apart when their interests would be better served by a sensible accommodation. If the Commonwealth ever wants to address the plight of its most beleaguered communities—and it would not be before time—it might set up and fund a simple mediation service. This would not decide the legal rights of anyone, but would offer a chance to resolve the land grievances of pastoralists and hunter-gatherers in an informal and confidential setting. Why not start with a pilot scheme?

Gordon Bennett

[Gordon Bennett is a barrister of Lincoln's Inn and has given legal advice to Survival International for more than 30 years. He represented the Bushmen in their Central Kalahari Game Reserve cases and has advised tribal communities elsewhere in Africa, India and South America.]

Notes

1. Like the International Labour Organisation (ILO), I use 'tribal' to mean one sector of the wider category of 'indigenous' peoples. Worldwide, tribal peoples comprise about 150 million individuals, some 40% of

- the 370 million indigenous individuals in total. The ILO defines them as ‘Peoples ...whose social, cultural and economic conditions distinguish them from other sections of the national community, and whose status is regulated wholly or partially by their own customs or traditions or by special laws or regulations’. I would rather posit a degree of self-sufficiency—particularly in food and housing—as their key defining factor, and therefore suggest as a definition ‘Tribal peoples are those which have followed ways of life for many generations that are largely self-sufficient, and are clearly different from the mainstream and dominant society’.
2. It is thought that nearly 10 million died in North America alone as a result of its annexation by European powers.
 3. The focus of Survival International—and this article—is restricted to tribal peoples, as opposed to the wider category of indigenous peoples. Many of the governments of the countries in which we work dispute the presence of ‘indigenous’ peoples among their population, or claim ‘everyone’ is indigenous.
 4. Although it is sometimes stated that ‘Indians’ is not an acceptable term for the indigenous peoples of North America, this is not in fact the case.
 5. International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA) (1971) *Declaration of Barbados* (IWGIA) (text reproduced: www.nativeweb.org/paper/statements/state/barbados1.php).
 6. One tribe, the Andoke, was reduced from an estimated 10,000 to just a few dozen; others were exterminated altogether.
 7. Dr Audrey Colson.
 8. William Henningsgaard (1981) *The Akawaio, the Upper Mazaruni Hydroelectric Project, and National Development in Guyana* (New Hampshire, USA: Cultural Survival); Gordon Bennett, Dr Audrey Colson and Stuart Wavell (1978) *The Damned: The Plight of the Akawaio Indians of Guyana* (London, UK: Survival International).
 9. Anonymous member of Chakma tribe (1984) “‘We want the land and not the people’”: genocide in the Chittagong Hill Tracts’, *Survival International Annual Review* (1983), 43, pp. 7–25; Chittagong Hill Tracts Commission (1991) *‘Life is Not Ours’ Land and Human Rights in the Chittagong Hill Tracts Bangladesh* (IWGIA). Updates 1992, 1994, 1997 and 2000; Survival International (1991) *Bangladesh: Mission Witnesses Horrors of Genocide* (Survival International).
 10. Survival International held a monthly vigil outside the Bangladesh High Commission in London from 1993 until 1997. In 2011, other organisations, including the International Jumma Organisation and Friends of Chittagong Hill Tracts, demonstrated at the UN in New York.
 11. Daniel Faeh (2011) *Development of Global Timber Tycoons in Sarawak, East Malaysia* (Bruno Manser Fund).
 12. Survival International (2007) ‘Hadzabe celebrate land victory’, *Survival International*, 6 November, <http://www.survivalinternational.org/news/2579>. [Accessed 13 December 2012].
 13. The term ‘San’ is not used in Botswana, and is no less pejorative than the term ‘Bushmen’. Survival prefers to use the latter as it is better known by the international community that Survival’s campaign addresses.
 14. Statement published online by Botswana Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation, October 2006, http://www.mofaic.gov.bw/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=57:background&catid=2&Itemid=89. [Accessed 13 December 2012].
 15. In particular, Lord Pearson of Rannoch both saw through the pretence and went on to raise several questions about the way the Bushmen were treated in Parliament. Diane Abbott MP was also supportive.
 16. Alan Cowell (2002) ‘Bumpy start for De Beers’s retail diamond venture’, *New York Times*, November, WB1 and p. 7.
 17. Dan Moabi (2005) ‘Survival International war is not serving Batswana’, *Mmegi*, 24 November, <http://allafrica.com/stories/200511280938.html>. [Accessed 13 December 2012].
 18. Tozoh Mosenyi (2005) ‘Botswana arrests Kalahari Bushmen protestors’, *Reuters*, 26 September, <http://www.khoisanpeoples.org/news/san-news-05-09-29.htm>. [Accessed 13 December 2012].
 19. Judgement of the Court of Appeal of the Republic of Botswana held at Lobatse, Botswana, and delivered on 27 January 2011. Court of Appeal Civil Appeal No. CACLB-074-10, High Court Civil Case No. MAHLB-000393-09.
 20. Estimates of the number of people affected vary, but about half a million people are thought to be displaced directly by the largest dam, of whom 50–60% are tribal. More families will be affected by the larger project.

21. N. C. Saxena of India's National Advisory Council, quoted in Arundhati Roy's essay 'Narmada, The Common Good', April 1999, <http://www.narmada.org/gcg/gcg.html>. [Accessed 13 December 2012].
22. Given that only 8% of India's total population is tribal, it shows how these projects have centred on tribal lands.
23. Survival International (2009) 'The Real Avatar: Mine—story of a sacred mountain', *YouTube*, March, www.youtube.com/watch?v=R4tuTFZ3wXQ. [Accessed 13 December 2012].
24. In 2009, UN Special Rapporteur James Anaya visited Botswana and recommended that the government 'fully and faithfully implement' the 2006 High Court ruling and facilitate 'the return of all those removed from the reserve who wish to do so, allowing them to engage in subsistence hunting and gathering in accordance with traditional practices, and providing them the same government services available to Botswana citizens elsewhere, including, most immediately, access to water'. Today, the government continues to ignore the provisions of the ruling, to prevent Bushmen from hunting, and to deny them services.
25. Although many of the suggestions of former UN Special Rapporteur Lars-Anders Baer were adopted by the UN Permanent Forum as recommendations for the CHT Accord of 1997, the Bangladeshi government refutes the existence of indigenous peoples in Bangladesh and therefore claimed that the UNPF had no *locus standi* in discussing issues related to the CHT.
26. Many countries have laws similar to ILO 169, but none guarantees security for tribal and indigenous peoples. As this article was in press, the inhabitants of Isseneru, Guyana, lost a court case brought against them by a miner. Although they had thought they had received title in 2007, the High Court ruled that mining permits issued prior to the Amerindian Act, 2006, are not bound by its provisions.
27. United Nations (2008) *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*, http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS_en.pdf.
28. International Labour Organisation (1959) *Convention Concerning Indigenous and Tribal Populations* (ILO).
29. Rather oddly, this is exactly the same excuse used by some countries (e.g. Indonesia) where there obviously *are* such peoples: governments such as Botswana routinely claim either that *all* citizens are indigenous, or that none are.