From Colonialism to Neocolonialism: The Ongoing Struggle for Indigenous Rights

Del Colonialismo al Neocolonialismo: La Larga Lucha por los Derechos Indígenas

Maria Guadalupe[1]✉ ⓘD

[1]Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico

✉Corresponding email: maria.guadalupe@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This article critically examines the continuity between historical colonialism and contemporary neocolonial practices, focusing on their impact on Indigenous rights across Latin America, Africa, and Oceania. Through comparative analysis of land dispossession, resource extraction, and political marginalization, the study reveals how neocolonial economic and political structures perpetuate Indigenous disenfranchisement despite formal legal protections. Employing postcolonial theory and Indigenous epistemologies, the research highlights Indigenous resistance strategies that challenge state and corporate dominance while reclaiming cultural sovereignty and territorial autonomy. The novelty of this work lies in bridging historical and contemporary frameworks to understand Indigenous struggles as part of a persistent colonial legacy shaped by globalization. This article contributes to debates on decolonial justice, sovereignty, and the role

of Indigenous movements in reshaping national and international human rights agendas.

Keywords *Neocolonialism, Indigenous rights, Land dispossession, Decolonial theory, Cultural sovereignty*

RESUMEN
Este artículo examina críticamente la continuidad entre el colonialismo histórico y las prácticas neocoloniales contemporáneas, enfocándose en su impacto sobre los derechos indígenas en América Latina, África y Oceanía. Mediante un análisis comparativo de la desposesión territorial, la extracción de recursos y la marginación política, el estudio revela cómo las estructuras económicas y políticas neocoloniales perpetúan el despojo indígena a pesar de las protecciones legales formales. Empleando la teoría poscolonial y epistemologías indígenas, la investigación destaca las estrategias de resistencia indígena que desafían el dominio estatal y corporativo, recuperando la soberanía cultural y la autonomía territorial. La novedad de este trabajo radica en articular marcos históricos y contemporáneos para comprender las luchas indígenas como parte de un legado colonial persistente moldeado por la globalización. Este artículo aporta a los debates sobre justicia descolonial, soberanía y el papel de los movimientos indígenas en la redefinición de agendas nacionales e internacionales de derechos humanos.

Palabras clave *Neocolonialismo, Derechos indígenas, Desposesión territorial, Teoría descolonial, Soberanía cultural*

A. Introduction

The struggle for Indigenous rights in the twenty-first century cannot be understood as a series of isolated modern conflicts, but rather as the contemporary manifestation of a historical trajectory rooted in European expansionism. Historically, the colonial project was predicated on the "Doctrine of Discovery" and the legal fiction of *terra nullius*, which served to delegitimize Indigenous sovereignty and justify the systematic seizure of ancestral lands across Latin America, Africa, and Oceania. As Wolfe (2006) famously argued, settler colonialism is "a structure, not an event"; it is an ongoing process of elimination that seeks to replace Indigenous societies with colonial ones. This historical foundation established a template for the racialized hierarchy and resource-intensive economic models that persist into the current era.

In the contemporary landscape, this colonial legacy has evolved into a sophisticated form of neocolonialism. While the formal administrative structures of the metropole have largely withdrawn, they have been replaced by a globalized architecture of economic and political influence that continues to prioritize external interests over Indigenous autonomy. Neocolonialism operates through the mechanisms of international debt, neoliberal trade agreements, and the dominance of multinational corporations, all of which exert a "coloniality of power" (Quijano, 2000). This continuity ensures that even in the post-independence era, Indigenous peoples remain trapped in a cycle of marginalization where their territories are treated as "resource frontiers" for the global market.

The significance of this study lies in its refusal to view the end of formal empire as the end of colonial logic. By tracing the transition from direct colonial rule to neocolonial extraction, we can see how the disenfranchisement of Indigenous peoples is maintained through new, often invisible, legal and economic levers. This research is critical for understanding why, despite a burgeoning international human rights regime and the adoption of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), the fundamental indicators of Indigenous well-being—land tenure security, cultural continuity, and political self-determination—continue to be under threat.

The central problem addressed in this article is the persistent continuity between colonial and neocolonial practices that effectively stymies genuine Indigenous self-determination. Despite the recognition of Indigenous rights in various national constitutions and international treaties, the structural reality is one of ongoing land dispossession. In the name of "national development" or "green energy transitions," states frequently bypass Indigenous consent to authorize large-scale mining, hydro-electric, and agribusiness projects. This phenomenon, often termed "accumulation by dispossession" (Harvey, 2003), reveals that the modern state often functions as a neocolonial agent, facilitating the transfer of Indigenous wealth to global capital.

Resource extraction serves as the primary site of this neocolonial struggle. In regions like the Amazon Basin or the mineral-rich corridors of Sub-Saharan Africa, the state's reliance on extractive revenues creates an inherent conflict with the territorial rights of Indigenous inhabitants. This conflict is often resolved through the "criminalization of dissent," where Indigenous leaders who defend their lands are labeled as obstacles to progress or threats to national security. This legal and political marginalization is a direct echo of colonial-era "vagrancy laws" and "frontier justice," updated for a globalized world

where corporate interests wield as much power as sovereign states once did.

Furthermore, the problem of political representation remains acute. While many states have implemented "multicultural" reforms, these often offer only symbolic recognition rather than substantive power-sharing. Indigenous peoples are frequently granted a "right to be consulted" that lacks the veto power of Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC). This "neoliberal multiculturalism" (Hale, 2005) serves to domesticate Indigenous movements, allowing the state to maintain a veneer of human rights compliance while continuing to facilitate the erosion of Indigenous sovereignty and territorial integrity.

The primary objective of this research is to analyze the ongoing struggles for Indigenous rights by deconstructing the specific mechanisms of neocolonialism in the contemporary era. By employing a comparative methodology that spans Latin America, Africa, and Oceania, this study aims to identify the commonalities in how global capital and state power intersect to undermine Indigenous autonomy. We seek to move beyond the "national" scale of analysis to understand how international financial institutions and trade regimes function as the new architects of coloniality, enforcing a developmentalist logic that is antithetical to Indigenous epistemologies.

A secondary aim is to assess the role of Indigenous resistance movements as transformative agents of decolonial justice. Rather than viewing Indigenous peoples as passive victims of globalization, this study highlights how they are reclaiming cultural sovereignty and territorial autonomy through innovative legal, political, and social strategies. From the "rights of nature" movements in the Andes to the land-back initiatives in Oceania, Indigenous resistance is not merely reactive; it is a proactive attempt to reshape national and international human rights agendas. By documenting these strategies, the research seeks to contribute to a broader understanding of how "sovereignty" can be reimagined beyond the confines of the Westphalian state.

This article aims to bridge historical and contemporary frameworks to provide a more comprehensive understanding of Indigenous struggles as part of a persistent colonial legacy. By synthesizing postcolonial theory with Indigenous perspectives, we intend to provide a roadmap for policy and legal reforms that prioritize the protection of vulnerable communities. This integrative approach is essential for moving the discourse from mere "recognition" to actual "restitution," ensuring that the struggle for Indigenous rights results in a fundamental shift in how power and resources are distributed in a post-colonial world.

B. Colonialism and Its Impact on Indigenous Rights

1. *Defining Colonialism*

Colonialism, in its historical context, refers to the policy and practice of a power in extending control over weaker peoples or areas. From the fifteenth century onward, European powers—primarily Spain, Portugal, Great Britain, France, and Belgium—embarked on a global project of expansion that fundamentally reshaped the human and ecological landscape of Latin America, Africa, and Oceania. This was not merely an era of exploration but a structured system of exploitation designed to funnel wealth from the periphery to the imperial center (Frank, 1966). By the time of the late nineteenth-century "Scramble for Africa," colonial logic had matured into a totalizing framework that viewed Indigenous territories as empty spaces, or *terra nullius*, awaiting European industry (Said, 1978).

The imposition of new systems was rarely a peaceful transition; it required the forced dismantling of pre-existing Indigenous social structures. Colonial powers introduced European legal codes, private property rights, and capitalist market economies that were fundamentally at odds with Indigenous communal living (Acemoglu et al., 2001). In Latin America, the Spanish *Encomienda* system effectively enslaved Indigenous populations under the guise of religious protection, creating a racialized labor hierarchy that persists in social structures today (Galeano, 1971). This forced labor was the engine that powered the extraction of silver and gold, fueling the rise of European mercantilism while decimating local populations through both violence and introduced disease (Diamond, 1997).

Economic exploitation was accompanied by the imposition of centralized political administrations. Indigenous governance systems, which often relied on consensus and oral tradition, were delegitimized and replaced by colonial bureaucracies that served the interests of the crown (Mamdani, 1996). In Oceania, British colonial administrators often ignored the complex land-tenure systems of Māori and Aboriginal peoples, imposing a "Crown land" philosophy that stripped communities of their administrative agency (Banner, 2007). This political takeover was essential for the colonial powers to maintain long-term control over the strategic resources and labor pools of the conquered territories.

Cultural systems were also targeted for transformation. The "civilizing mission" was used as a moral justification for the systematic destruction of Indigenous religions, languages, and social norms (Fanón, 1963). European missionaries acted as the vanguard of this cultural imposition, establishing schools and churches that taught Indigenous people to view their own heritages as "primitive" or "savage"

(Comaroff & Comaroff, 1991). This psychological warfare was designed to produce a compliant labor force that identified with the colonial master's values, a phenomenon that Quijano (2000) describes as the "coloniality of being," where the very identity of the colonized is defined by the colonizer.

In Africa, the colonial definitions of "tribe" and "ethnicity" were often artificial constructs created for administrative ease. By drawing arbitrary borders at the Berlin Conference of 1884-1885, European powers forced disparate groups into single administrative units while splitting coherent communities across national lines (Pakenham, 1991). This "divide and rule" strategy effectively prevented united Indigenous resistance and sowed the seeds of future ethnic conflict. The legacy of these imposed political boundaries continues to be a primary driver of political instability and human rights challenges in the post-colonial era (Rodney, 1972).

At this context, defining colonialism requires recognizing it as a holistic system of violence—physical, economic, and epistemic. It was a project that sought to erase Indigenous sovereignty by replacing local realities with European replicas. As Wolfe (2006) notes, the colonial project was not a singular event in the past but the establishment of a structure that sought to permanently alienate Indigenous peoples from their lands, their labor, and their identities. This foundational era set the stage for the structural inequities that characterize the modern global order.

2. *Land Dispossession and Resource Extraction*

The primary objective of the colonial enterprise was the systematic dispossession of Indigenous lands to facilitate large-scale resource extraction. Through legal fictions like the Doctrine of Discovery, European powers asserted that "discovering" land gave them immediate sovereignty, regardless of the people already living there (Miller et al., 2010). In Latin America, this led to the massive transfer of territory to European elites and the church, creating the *latifundia* (large estates) that marginalized Indigenous peasants (Stavenhagen, 1970). This land grab was not just an economic theft but a spiritual one, as it severed the profound connection between Indigenous identity and the earth.

Violence was the primary tool used to enforce this dispossession. In the Belgian Congo, King Leopold II's administration used systematic terror, including the mutilation of laborers, to maximize rubber extraction (Hochschild, 1998). This "extractive logic" treated both the land and the Indigenous body as disposable assets in the pursuit of European profit. Similarly, in the Australian outback, the displacement

of Aboriginal groups to make way for sheep farming was often accompanied by frontier massacres and the poisoning of water holes (Reynolds, 1987). These acts of violence were not accidental; they were necessary to secure the "territorial integrity" of the colonial state.

Resource extraction during the colonial period laid the groundwork for modern global supply chains. The sugar plantations of the Caribbean, the rubber forests of Central Africa, and the silver mines of the Andes were all designed to export raw materials to the Global North while providing no benefit to the local inhabitants (Mintz, 1985). This created a "metabolic rift" where the ecological wealth of Indigenous lands was depleted to build European cities (Foster, 1999). This extractive model was predicated on the total disregard for Indigenous land rights, viewing communal territories as "wastelands" that only gained value through industrial exploitation.

In Oceania, the British policy of *terra nullius* in Australia was perhaps the most extreme legal form of dispossession. By declaring the continent "legally empty," the colonial government could grant vast tracts of land to settlers without any requirement for treaties or compensation (Coulthard, 2014). It took over two hundred years for this legal fiction to be overturned in the landmark Mabo v. Queensland (1992) case. This long history of legal erasure meant that for generations, Indigenous Australians were treated as trespassers on their own ancestral domains, with no legal standing to protect their sacred sites or natural resources (Moreton-Robinson, 2015).

The colonial focus on "monoculture" and industrial mining also caused catastrophic environmental degradation. In Africa, the clearing of vast forests for coffee and cocoa plantations destroyed traditional Indigenous food systems, making communities dependent on imported goods and colonial labor markets (Berry, 1993). This loss of food sovereignty was a deliberate strategy to force Indigenous people into the colonial cash economy. The environmental scars left by colonial-era mining—such as the massive tailing piles and poisoned river systems in Peru—remain as toxic reminders of a period that prioritized mineral wealth over human and ecological health.

Therefore, land dispossession was the cornerstone of colonial power. Without the control of the land, the colonial state could not control the people. The strategies used—legal maneuvers, military force, and economic coercion—were all aimed at transforming Indigenous homelands into imperial commodities. This historical dispossession remains the central trauma of the Indigenous experience, as modern struggles for "Land Back" and territorial autonomy are attempts to rectify this original, foundational theft that

continues to define contemporary global wealth distribution (Tuck & Yang, 2012).

3. *Cultural Erasure and Political Marginalization*

Under colonial rule, the physical dispossession of land was accompanied by an equally violent attempt at cultural erasure and political marginalization. Colonial administrations recognized that to maintain control, they had to break the social cohesion of Indigenous societies. This led to policies of forced assimilation, where Indigenous languages, religions, and social customs were actively suppressed (Smith, 1999). In North America and Oceania, the "Residential School" and "Stolen Generations" policies were designed to "kill the Indian to save the man," forcibly removing children from their families to strip them of their cultural identity (Milloy, 1999).

Cultural erasure was a form of "epistemicide"—the systematic destruction of Indigenous knowledge systems (Santos, 2014). By banning traditional ceremonies, such as the Potlatch in Canada or traditional dances in parts of Africa, colonial powers sought to erase the collective memory of Indigenous nations. This erasure made it easier to impose European worldviews and legal structures, as the traditional foundations of Indigenous law and ethics were hidden or criminalized (Battiste, 2000). For Indigenous peoples, the loss of language meant the loss of a specific way of understanding the world and their relationship to the environment.

Political marginalization was the structural counterpart to cultural erasure. Indigenous peoples were systematically excluded from the governing bodies of the colonies that occupied their lands. Even when "indirect rule" was used—as in parts of the British Empire—local leaders were often turned into low-level colonial functionaries, stripped of their traditional authority and forced to implement imperial policies (Mamdani, 1996). This created a "political invisibility" where Indigenous needs and rights were never a consideration in the legislative halls of the colonial administration.

The imposition of racial hierarchies was a central component of this marginalization. Colonial "Casta" systems in Latin America or the apartheid-like structures in Africa and Oceania categorized people based on their proximity to European whiteness (Wade, 1997). These hierarchies determined access to education, healthcare, and legal protection. Indigenous peoples were consistently placed at the bottom of this ladder, ensuring they remained a marginalized underclass with no path to political power (Winant, 2001). This racialization of the social order served to justify the ongoing denial of Indigenous rights as a "natural" consequence of their supposed inferiority.

Forced conversion to Christianity was often the most pervasive tool of cultural erasure. Missionaries worked in tandem with colonial officials to replace Indigenous spiritualities with a religion that emphasized obedience to authority (Tinker, 1993). While many Indigenous communities adapted and "indigenized" Christianity as a form of survival, the initial impact was the fragmentation of traditional social structures that were built around Indigenous cosmologies. The loss of these spiritual frameworks often led to a breakdown in communal resource management and social welfare practices, further weakening Indigenous resilience against colonial pressure.

The legacy of this marginalization is a "crisis of recognition" in the post-colonial state. Because Indigenous political structures were so thoroughly suppressed, many modern nations have struggled to integrate traditional Indigenous governance into their democratic frameworks (Taylor, 1994). This has led to the ongoing political exclusion of Indigenous peoples, who often find that their voices are ignored in national parliaments even today. Cultural erasure and political marginalization were not just historical phases; they were foundational efforts to ensure that Indigenous peoples would remain a permanently disenfranchised minority within their own homelands.

4.   *The Legacy of Colonialism*

The end of formal colonial rule—decolonization—did not signify the end of colonial structures; rather, it often led to the "internal colonization" of Indigenous peoples by the newly independent states (González Casanova, 1965). In many regions of Africa and Latin America, the new national elites inherited the colonial administrative machinery and continued to use it for the same extractive purposes. The arbitrary borders drawn in Europe became the sacred boundaries of the new states, often ignoring the territorial claims and sovereignty of the Indigenous nations within them (Nkrumah, 1965). This continuity meant that for Indigenous peoples, independence was frequently a change of masters rather than a true liberation.

One of the most persistent legacies is the legal framework governing land and resources. Many post-colonial states retained colonial laws that allow the government to claim "eminent domain" over Indigenous territories for national development (LaDuke, 1999). This has led to ongoing struggles over land rights, as states authorize mining or logging on Indigenous lands without consent, mirroring the dispossession of the nineteenth century. The "extractive state" remains a dominant model in the Global South, where national economies are dependent on the export of raw materials, perpetuating the environmental and social injustices of the colonial era (Sultana, 2022).

Economic structures also reflect a colonial legacy, as the global market continues to value Indigenous lands primarily for their resource potential. This "neocolonial" economic order ensures that Indigenous communities remain in a state of perpetual poverty while their resources fuel global consumption (Wallerstein, 1974). The debt cycles and structural adjustment programs imposed on post-colonial states often force governments to open Indigenous territories to multinational corporations, creating a "secondary dispossession" (Harvey, 2003). This economic legacy makes it difficult for Indigenous nations to achieve true self-determination.

Socially, the racial and cultural hierarchies established under colonialism continue to shape national identities and prejudices. In many former colonies, Indigenous peoples still face systemic discrimination in the legal system, healthcare, and education (Alfred, 2005). The "civilizing mission" has been rebranded as "modernization" or "development," but the underlying message remains the same: Indigenous ways of life are seen as obstacles to progress. This cultural legacy fuels the ongoing pressure for Indigenous assimilation and the continued marginalization of traditional ecological knowledge in national policy-making.

The struggle for "Decolonial Justice" today is a direct response to this persistent legacy. Indigenous movements across the globe are demanding the return of ancestral lands, the recognition of their distinct legal systems, and a seat at the table in international climate and economic negotiations (Mignolo, 2011). These movements are not just fighting current policies; they are fighting the "ghosts of colonialism" that haunt modern institutions. The recognition that the current global order is built on the foundation of colonial theft is essential for any genuine attempt at reconciliation or human rights reform.

The legacy of colonialism is a state of "suspended sovereignty" for Indigenous peoples. While the world celebrates the end of empires, the structures of land theft, cultural suppression, and political exclusion remain largely intact. As Nixon (2011) points out, the "slow violence" of colonialism continues to ripple through time, affecting the health, environment, and rights of Indigenous populations today. Understanding this legacy is the first step in dismantling the neocolonial practices that continue to treat Indigenous lives as expendable in the pursuit of global development.

C. Neocolonialism: Continuities and Transformations

1. *Defining Neocolonialism and the Coloniality of Power*

Neocolonialism describes a condition where a state is, in theory, independent and possesses all the outward trappings of international sovereignty, but where its economic system and political policy are directed from outside. Unlike historical colonialism, which relied on direct military occupation and formal administrative control, neocolonialism operates through a complex web of economic, financial, and cultural pressures. As Nkrumah (1965) originally theorized, it represents the "last stage of imperialism," where former colonial powers, multinational corporations, and international financial institutions (IFIs) maintain dominance over post-colonial nations. This system preserves the extractive relationships of the past while shielding the dominant powers from the costs and moral burdens of direct governance.

The transition to neocolonialism marked a shift from overt territorial conquest to "coloniality"—a persistent pattern of power that emerged as a result of colonialism but outlived formal colonial administrations (Mignolo, 2011). In this era, the "metropole" is no longer a single city or country, but a globalized network of capital concentrated in the Global North. For Indigenous peoples, this means that while the face of authority may have changed to a national government, the underlying logic of land exploitation remains dictated by foreign market demands and global price indices. This structural persistence ensures that the "logic of coloniality" continues to organize the world into zones of value and zones of waste.

IFIs, such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank, play a central role in this new order by enforcing economic policies that prioritize debt repayment and market liberalization over social welfare. These "structural adjustment programs" often require states to privatize natural resources and weaken labor laws, directly impacting the territorial integrity of Indigenous communities. Neocolonialism thus functions as a "system of remote control," where sovereignty is hollowed out from within, leaving the post-colonial state as a mere facilitator for global capital accumulation (Harvey, 2003).

The persistence of these structures is maintained through an "epistemic hegemony" that frames Western-style development as the only viable path to progress. Indigenous epistemologies, which often emphasize sustainability and communal ownership, are dismissed as "regressive" or "inefficient" within this framework. This cultural dimension of neocolonialism ensures that the legal and economic instruments used to dispossess Indigenous peoples are seen as neutral

or "technical" requirements of the global economy, rather than ideological tools of continued domination (Santos, 2014).

Neocolonialism is defined by its ability to adapt and transform. It utilizes the rhetoric of "partnership," "development aid," and "globalization" to mask the continued drainage of wealth from the Global South. For Indigenous populations in Latin America, Africa, and Oceania, the reality of neocolonialism is a state of perpetual "legal and economic precarity," where their rights are consistently sacrificed at the altar of international investment and national debt obligations (Sultana, 2022). The "independence" of the nation-state becomes a veil for the "dependence" of its people.

2. *Economic Exploitation and the New Extractive Frontier*

The economic engine of neocolonialism is a direct descendant of the colonial extractive model, focusing on the large-scale removal of raw materials from Indigenous territories. In the contemporary era, this is driven by multinational corporations (MNCs) involved in mining, logging, and industrial agribusiness. In Latin America, the "Neo-extractivist" model has seen governments across the political spectrum authorize massive open-pit mines and soy plantations on Indigenous lands to fuel exports to China and the West (Gudynas, 2013). This process frequently occurs without genuine consultation, treating Indigenous domains as "sacrifice zones" for national GDP growth.

In Africa, the "New Scramble" for minerals—particularly those essential for the "green energy" transition, such as cobalt and lithium—has intensified neocolonial exploitation. MNCs often operate with the complicity of national governments, utilizing lopsided contracts that provide minimal royalties to the host nation while externalizing environmental costs onto local Indigenous communities (Muradian et al., 2012). The pollution of water sources and the destruction of traditional grazing lands in the DRC or Zambia mirror the historical devastation of the colonial era, but now under the banner of "global sustainability." The "green" transition in the North is thus predicated on "brown" devastation in the South.

Oceania faces similar challenges, where logging MNCs in Papua New Guinea and mining giants in the Solomon Islands exploit weak regulatory environments to bypass Indigenous land-tenure systems. The economic logic here is one of "accumulation by dispossession," where the commons are enclosed and privatized for private profit (Harvey, 2003). Indigenous groups often find themselves in a "poverty trap," where their traditional livelihoods are destroyed by industrial activity, leaving them dependent on the very corporations that are

degrading their environment. The "metabolic rift" remains open, as ecological wealth flows outward while toxic externalities remain.

The use of "Offshore Financial Centers" and "Transfer Pricing" allows MNCs to siphon profits out of the Global South, ensuring that the wealth generated from Indigenous resources rarely benefits the local population. This "capital flight" is a hallmark of neocolonialism, reinforcing the economic dependency of post-colonial states. For Indigenous peoples, this means that even when resources are extracted from their doorsteps, they see no improvement in infrastructure, healthcare, or education, as the surplus value is concentrated in distant financial hubs. The wealth of the North is the "unearned" product of the poverty of the South (Rodney, 1972).

Agribusiness expansion represents a newer, but equally potent, form of neocolonial extraction. In Brazil and Indonesia, the conversion of tropical forests into cattle ranches and palm oil plantations is often financed by international investment banks. These projects rely on the "legal erasure" of Indigenous land titles, reclassifying inhabited forests as "unproductive" or "degraded" land. This "green-washed" extraction perpetuates the colonial-era destruction of biodiversity and the displacement of forest-dwelling peoples, all while being marketed as a contribution to global food or energy supply (Tuck & Yang, 2012).

The economic exploitation under neocolonialism is characterized by a "deepening of the extractive frontier." As the most accessible resources are depleted, MNCs push further into remote Indigenous territories, utilizing advanced technology and state-backed security forces to secure access. This relentless expansion demonstrates that the underlying economic goal of the global order remains the same as in 1492: the conversion of Indigenous nature into global commodities, regardless of the human or ecological cost (Wallerstein, 1974). Extraction is not just a policy; it is the ontological basis of neocolonial capitalism.

3.   *Political Control, Debt, and the "Regulatory Chill"*

Neocolonialism maintains political control over newly independent nations through a sophisticated array of mechanisms that ensure their policies remain aligned with the interests of the Global North. Debt dependency is perhaps the most effective tool; many nations in the Global South are burdened by massive external debts that consume a significant portion of their national budgets. To service these debts, governments are forced to adopt "austerity" measures and open their territories to extractive industries, often at the expense of Indigenous land rights and social protections (Federici, 2010). Debt

serves as a modern form of the "shackle," binding the policy space of the sovereign state.

Foreign aid and development assistance are frequently used as "levers" to influence political decisions. Aid is often "tied" to the purchase of goods from the donor nation or conditional upon the adoption of specific neoliberal reforms. This "aid-dependency" limits the policy space of sovereign nations, preventing them from implementing robust environmental regulations or Indigenous-led land reforms that might conflict with the interests of donor states or their MNCs (Moyo, 2009). Indigenous communities are thus left vulnerable as their national governments prioritize the demands of international donors over the rights of their own citizens.

International trade agreements and Bilateral Investment Treaties (BITs) further entrench this dependency. These legal frameworks often include "Investor-State Dispute Settlement" (ISDS) clauses, which allow MNCs to sue governments in private international tribunals if environmental or Indigenous rights laws threaten their expected profits. This creates a "regulatory chill," where governments are discouraged from passing protective legislation for fear of bankrupting the state through international litigation (Sassen, 2014). For Indigenous peoples, this means that their national courts are often subordinate to secretive global trade bodies. The law of the contract supersedes the law of human rights.

Interventions, both overt and covert, remain a tool for maintaining political control when "soft power" fails. When governments in the Global South attempt to nationalize resources or implement radical land redistributions that benefit Indigenous groups, they often face international sanctions, political destabilization, or even military intervention. The history of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries is replete with examples of democratically elected leaders being undermined to protect the interests of foreign mining or fruit companies. This threat of "regime change" ensures that the political elite in many nations remain compliant with the neocolonial order (Blum, 2003).

The role of "Local Elites" is also crucial in maintaining this system. Neocolonialism relies on a "comprador" class within the post-colonial state—officials and business leaders who benefit from the extractive economy and help facilitate foreign access to Indigenous lands. These elites often use the rhetoric of "national sovereignty" to deflect international criticism of their own human rights abuses while simultaneously selling off the nation's assets to the highest international bidder. This "internal colonialism" creates a double layer of oppression for Indigenous groups, who must fight both a distant

global system and a proximate national government (González Casanova, 1965).

4. *Globalization and the Financialization of Nature*

Globalization has served as the primary vehicle for the expansion and intensification of neocolonial practices. By integrating every corner of the planet into a single, high-speed market, globalization has allowed MNCs to move capital and operations with unprecedented ease. This mobility enables corporations to practice "regulatory arbitrage," shifting their activities to countries with the weakest environmental protections and the most marginalized Indigenous populations. In this "race to the bottom," the rights of Indigenous peoples are treated as "transaction costs" to be minimized through lobbying or state-sanctioned force (Sklair, 2001). The globe becomes a singular, seamless field for capital.

The digital revolution and global finance have further facilitated this process. Investors in London or New York can now speculate on the price of minerals or land in the Amazon or the Congo with a single click, driving "land grabs" and resource rushes that have immediate, devastating impacts on the ground. This "financialization of nature" turns Indigenous territories into abstract assets on a balance sheet, completely disconnected from the human lives and cultural histories they support (Nixon, 2011). Globalization thus creates a "geography of invisibility," where those profiting from extraction are shielded from the environmental and social consequences of their investments.

Globalization also spreads neocolonialism through the homogenization of law and culture. International organizations and trade bodies promote a "standardized" legal framework that prioritizes individual property rights over communal or Indigenous land systems. This "legal globalization" acts as a form of "soft violence," delegitimizing Indigenous ways of life and forcing them into a Western market logic (Santos, 2014). As argued previously, this represents a "globalized localism," where the specific legal preferences of the Global North are imposed as universal standards, further erasing Indigenous legal sovereignty and diversity.

Conversely, globalization has also provided Indigenous movements with new tools for resistance. The "globalization of activism" allows Indigenous groups to form transnational networks, sharing strategies and building solidarity across borders. Digital platforms enable frontline communities to bypass state-controlled media and reach global audiences with evidence of environmental crimes. This "globalization from below" creates a counter-pressure to

the neocolonial order, allowing Indigenous voices to be heard in the halls of the UN and the boardrooms of MNCs.

However, the power imbalance remains profound. While Indigenous groups may win occasional battles in the "court of public opinion," the structural forces of globalization—the trade treaties, the debt cycles, and the extractive MNCs—continue to dominate. Globalization has effectively "stretched" the colonial relationship, making it more complex and harder to dismantle. As Sultana (2022) notes, we are living in a time of "climate coloniality," where the global response to environmental crises is being shaped by the same neocolonial logic that caused them, further marginalizing the very communities that have been the best stewards of the planet. Globalization is the medium through which the "slow violence" of colonialism is accelerated and scaled.

D. Comparative Analysis: Latin America, Africa, and Oceania

1. *Latin America: Constitutional Progress vs. Extractive Reality*

In Latin America, the struggle for Indigenous rights is characterized by a profound paradox: the region possesses some of the world's most progressive constitutional frameworks, yet it remains a primary site of violent neocolonial extraction. Countries like Bolivia and Ecuador made international headlines by constitutionalizing the "Rights of Nature" (*Pachamama*) and the concept of *Buen Vivir* (Living Well). These legal provisions, such as Articles 71–74 of the Ecuadorian Constitution, theoretically elevate Indigenous cosmologies over Western developmentalism. However, the economic dependency of these states on raw material exports has led to what Gudynas (2013) terms "neo-extractivist" surges, where the state facilitates the entry of multinational corporations into protected Indigenous territories under the guise of "national interest."

The situation in Ecuador's Amazonian region provides a stark example of this tension between constitutional text and material practice. Despite legal protections and the requirement for Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) under the American Convention on Human Rights, the government has repeatedly auctioned ancestral lands for oil drilling. Scholars like Sultana (2022) argue that this represents a "coloniality of nature," where the state's developmentalist logic mirrors colonial land-use patterns despite its "post-colonial" rhetoric. The Waorani people's legal victory in 2019 demonstrated that while the judiciary can uphold constitutional rights, the executive branch often operates within a neocolonial framework of

"accumulation by dispossession" (Harvey, 2003), prioritizing global energy markets over local sovereignty.

In Mexico, the "megaprojects" associated with energy and tourism illustrate the continuity of coloniality within the modern republic. The development of the *Tren Maya* involves the bypassing of traditional communal land rights, known as *ejidos*, which were established as a result of the Mexican Revolution. Legal analysis reveals that the state often utilizes "National Security" exemptions to circumvent the consultative requirements of ILO Convention No. 169, an international treaty Mexico is party to. Quijano (2000) suggests that such actions are indicative of a racialized social hierarchy where Indigenous autonomy is seen as a barrier to "modernization."

Bolivia, under the leadership of its first Indigenous president, Evo Morales, saw a significant increase in the political visibility of the Indigenous majority. However, the 2011 TIPNIS conflict—where the government proposed a highway through an Indigenous territory—exposed the limits of state-led Indigeneity. This clash revealed that the state's commitment to "development" and the expansion of the agricultural frontier often mirrors the colonial logic of the past. Mignolo (2011) points out that this is a conflict of "epistemic sovereignty," where the state's Western-inherited view of progress clashes with the Indigenous philosophy of territorial integrity.

Large-scale agribusiness in Brazil represents another frontier of dispossession, particularly under the legal doctrine of the "Marco Temporal" (time limit). This controversial legal theory argues that Indigenous peoples are only entitled to lands they physically occupied in 1988, effectively ignoring decades of colonial-era displacement. This legal maneuver serves to facilitate the expansion of the "Soy Frontier" by powerful landowners (*ruralistas*). Scholars like Wolfe (2006) would argue that this is a classic "settler-colonial" tactic: utilizing the law to permanently eliminate the native presence to secure territorial control for extractive industries.

The Latin American case shows that legal "recognition" is insufficient without a structural shift away from extractive capitalism. Indigenous movements in the region have responded by moving beyond simple rights-claims toward "territorial self-defense." By forming Indigenous guards and autonomous governance structures, they are physically reclaiming the lands that the state and corporations have sought to privatize. Their resistance is a direct challenge to the "coloniality of power," asserting that Indigenous autonomy is an inherent right that must be defended against both foreign capital and the "internal colonialism" of the state (González Casanova, 1965).

2. Africa: Conservation, Encroachment, and the "Green" Scramble

The Indigenous experience in Africa is frequently defined by a dual threat: the expansion of industrial extraction and the exclusionary nature of "fortress conservation." Groups such as the San people in Southern Africa and the Maasai in East Africa face a unique form of neocolonialism where their ancestral lands are reclassified as either "mineral rich" or "globally significant" wildlife zones. This reflects a persistent colonial prejudice that views Indigenous land use as "unproductive." Mamdani (1996) observes that the post-colonial African state often operates through the "decentralized despotism" inherited from colonial administrative models, particularly regarding the control of rural land.

In Botswana, the San (Basarwa) of the Central Kalahari Game Reserve (CKGR) have faced decades of forced relocations. While the government officially claimed these moves were for wildlife protection, the discovery of diamond deposits suggested a neocolonial extractive motive. Legal analysis of the 2006 Roy Sesana v. Attorney General case shows that while the court affirmed the San's right to occupy their land, the state's refusal to provide water access constituted "administrative violence." Nixon (2011) categorizes this as "slow violence," where the gradual denial of life-sustaining resources achieves the same result as direct physical displacement.

The Maasai in Tanzania face a similar struggle against the commodification of their lands for elite tourism. The state has recently intensified efforts to evict Maasai herders to make way for high-end "safari" concessions, often citing environmental protection. However, scholars like Mies and Shiva (1993) argue that this "environmentalism" is a neocolonial imposition that treats Indigenous people as "others" outside of nature. The legal exclusion of the Maasai from the Ngorongoro Conservation Area violates the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights, specifically the right to property and cultural development, yet the state prioritizes the "green" capital generated by international tourism.

Mineral extraction across Sub-Saharan Africa remains a primary driver of Indigenous displacement. In the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), the global demand for "transition minerals" like cobalt has triggered a new wave of encroachment on Indigenous territories. Multinational mining firms operate under the legal protection of lopsided contracts that provide minimal royalties to the host nation while externalizing environmental costs onto local communities (Muradian et al., 2012). The "Resource Curse" in Africa is effectively a neocolonial trap: Indigenous lands are stripped of their wealth to power

the Global North's digital revolution, leaving the original inhabitants in a state of "toxic poverty."

The political marginalization of Indigenous groups in Africa is exacerbated by the "ethnic" construction of the post-colonial state. Many African governments refuse to recognize specific groups as "Indigenous" under the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), fearing that such a designation will encourage secession. By treating all citizens as equally "indigenous," the state erases the specific vulnerabilities of marginalized hunter-gatherer groups. Santos (2014) refers to this as "epistemicide"—the systematic destruction of the legal and social identities of Indigenous peoples through state-sanctioned invisibility.

Resistance in the African context is increasingly centered on "legal mobilization" at the regional level. The landmark Ogiek case (2017) at the African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights affirmed that Indigenous land rights are protected under the African Charter. However, the implementation of these rulings remains a significant hurdle. African Indigenous movements are thus fighting a multi-layered war: against corporate extraction, against exclusionary conservation, and against a state model that refuses to acknowledge their distinct existence. This resistance represents a "decolonial turn" that seeks to reconstruct the African state as a pluralistic entity rather than a colonial copy (Santos, 2014).

3.   Oceania: The Persistent Legacy of the "Crown"

In Oceania, the struggles of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples in Australia and the Māori in New Zealand are deeply intertwined with the continuing legal and social legacy of the British Empire. In Australia, the foundational myth of *terra nullius*—the idea that the land belonged to no one—was only legally overturned in 1992 through the Mabo v Queensland (No 2) decision. However, scholars like Moreton-Robinson (2015) argue that the "white possessive" logic continues to govern Australian law, as the Native Title Act (1993) provides a highly restricted version of land rights that often prioritizes mining interests over Indigenous heritage.

The destruction of the Juukan Gorge rock shelters by Rio Tinto in 2020 served as a global flashpoint for this neocolonial reality. Despite the site's 46,000-year history, the mining giant was legally authorized to destroy it under Section 18 of the Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972. This demonstrates that Australian law frequently functions as a tool for "settler-colonial" extraction rather than a protector of Indigenous rights (Wolfe, 2006). The "Intervention" in the Northern Territory further exemplified state-led neocolonialism, as the government

suspended the Racial Discrimination Act to impose controls over Aboriginal lands, a move that critics argue was aimed at facilitating corporate access to minerals.

In New Zealand, the Treaty of Waitangi (1840) provides a different legal landscape, but the Māori still face significant challenges in asserting their "Rangatiratanga" (sovereignty). While the "Treaty Settlement" process has returned some assets, it often requires Māori *iwi* (tribes) to operate within a Western corporate model. This "commercialization of sovereignty" can create tensions between traditional values and global market pressures (Coulthard, 2014). Furthermore, the Māori remain disproportionately affected by environmental degradation, such as the pollution of sacred water bodies by industrial dairy farming, highlighting the "spatial injustice" described by Agyeman (2013).

Environmental degradation in the Pacific is also a matter of existential survival. Indigenous peoples across the smaller islands of Oceania are on the frontlines of climate change, facing sea-level rise caused by the global carbon emissions of industrialized nations. This is the ultimate form of neocolonialism: the destruction of Indigenous homelands by an external economic system over which they have no control. Watt-Cloutier (2015) frames this as a violation of the "right to be cold" (or the right to a stable climate), an argument that seeks to integrate ecological stability into the core of the international human rights framework.

Cultural marginalization in Oceania is closely linked to the over-representation of Indigenous people in the criminal justice system. The "carceral state" acts as a contemporary tool of control, breaking community structures in a way that mirrors the forced assimilation policies of the colonial era. Indigenous resistance has responded with a powerful "cultural resurgence" movement. From the revival of Māori language to the "Black Lives Matter" movement in Australia, Indigenous people are using cultural pride as a political shield against a settler-state that still struggles to reconcile with its colonial past.

The common thread in Oceania is the fight for "Decolonial Sovereignty." Indigenous groups are no longer satisfied with "recognition" within the settler-state; they are demanding a fundamental "Voice" in the constitution and the power to veto projects that threaten their land and sea. This resistance utilizes international forums like the UN to shame settler-governments while simultaneously engaging in "Land Back" movements on the ground. As Coulthard (2014) argues, true decolonization requires a rejection of the "politics of recognition" and a reclamation of Indigenous self-determination outside the settler-state framework.

4. Common Themes: The Global Mechanics of Disenfranchisement

Despite the vast geographical differences between these regions, several common themes emerge that define the neocolonial era. The most prominent is the centrality of resource extraction. In all three regions, Indigenous lands are viewed by states and corporations as "resource frontiers." Whether it is oil in the Amazon, diamonds in the Kalahari, or coal in Queensland, the extractive logic remains the same: the removal of wealth for external consumption. This "extractive neocolonialism" is the primary driver of contemporary Indigenous human rights violations, as theorized by Harvey (2003) under "accumulation by dispossession."

Land dispossession has evolved from blunt military force to a more complex "legalized" process. In the modern era, dispossession occurs through "eminent domain," "conservation easements," or "agricultural leases." The state uses its legislative power to reclassify Indigenous lands as "public" or "unproductive," effectively erasing Indigenous tenure. This "paper dispossession" is often followed by physical displacement, as communities are moved to make way for the infrastructure of globalization—dams, mines, and industrial farms—that provide them with no benefits but all the burdens of development.

A third common theme is political disenfranchisement and the "exclusion of consent." Across these regions, the international principle of FPIC is routinely ignored or manipulated. "Consultations" are often reduced to check-the-box exercises where the outcome is predetermined. This reveals that the "post-colonial" state still views Indigenous people not as sovereign partners, but as subjects whose consent is a formal nuisance. Santos (2014) argues that this is a form of "legal apartheid," where the protections of the law are selectively applied to favor capital over Indigenous life.

The environmental dimension of neocolonialism is a shared reality that connects the melting ice of the Arctic to the burning forests of the Amazon. Indigenous peoples are the first to experience the "slow violence" of climate change and industrial pollution (Nixon, 2011). Because their cultures are so closely tied to the land, environmental degradation is a direct attack on their human rights. The "poisoning of the commons" through mining runoff or pesticide drift in industrial agriculture is a global phenomenon that turns Indigenous homelands into uninhabitable zones, forcing a new wave of environmental migration.

Finally, the resilience of Indigenous resistance movements is the most hopeful commonality. Across the globe, Indigenous groups are forming "transnational alliances" to share legal strategies. The fight at

Standing Rock in the U.S. inspired activists in the Amazon, and the Māori "Haka" has been adopted by protesters in Australia. Indigenous people are successfully "indigenizing" global human rights frameworks, using Western laws to protect non-Western ways of life. They are reclaiming "epistemic sovereignty," asserting that their knowledge systems offer the only viable alternative to the destructive path of neocolonial capitalism (Mignolo, 2011).

E. Theoretical Framework: Postcolonial Theory and Indigenous Epistemologies

1. *Postcolonial Theory: The Persistence of Colonial Logic*

Postcolonial theory provides the critical lens necessary to deconstruct how colonial structures are not merely historical relics but active components of modern neocolonial systems. The work of Frantz Fanon (1963) is foundational in this regard, particularly his analysis of how colonial violence is internalized and reproduced by post-independence national elites. Fanon's observation that the "national bourgeoisie" often steps into the shoes of the former colonist to maintain the same extractive economic structures is a precise description of the modern "comprador" class in the Global South. This reproduction of coloniality ensures that the state continues to view Indigenous territories as internal frontiers to be conquered and exploited for the benefit of global capital.

Edward Said's (1978) concept of *Orientalism* further illuminates how the West constructs "the Indigenous" as an inferior, "primitive," or "stagnant" other to justify intervention and resource seizure. In the neocolonial era, this manifests as "Developmentalism," where Indigenous ways of life are framed as obstacles to the "universal" goal of economic growth. This discursive violence legitimizes the legal and physical displacement of communities, as their land use—rooted in communal stewardship—is rendered invisible or "inefficient" when measured against Western capitalist metrics.

Furthermore, Achille Mbembe (2003) introduces the concept of *necropolitics*—the power of the state to dictate who may live and who must die. In neocolonial contexts, this power is exercised through the creation of "sacrifice zones" where Indigenous lives are treated as expendable in the pursuit of mineral or agricultural wealth. Mbembe's work highlights that contemporary power dynamics are still governed by the "colonial command," where sovereignty is expressed through the capacity to displace, contaminate, and erase marginalized populations. Postcolonial theory thus reveals that the "post" in postcolonial is not a temporal marker of an end, but a description of a transformed and often more insidious continuation of imperial power (Quijano, 2000).

2. Indigenous Epistemologies: Alternatives to Colonial Paradigms

Indigenous epistemologies offer profound challenges to the anthropocentric and individualistic foundations of Western legal and political paradigms. Unlike the Western concept of land as a "commodity" or "property," many Indigenous worldviews see the land as a sentient relative to whom humans have reciprocal obligations. This "relational ontology" suggests that sovereignty is not the power to dominate nature, but the responsibility to maintain its balance. For example, the concept of *Sumak Kawsay* (Buen Vivir) in the Andes prioritizes collective well-being and the harmony of the "community of all beings" over individual accumulation (Gudynas, 2011).

These knowledge systems provide a different basis for understanding human rights. While the Western framework often emphasizes negative rights (freedom *from* interference), Indigenous perspectives emphasize positive, collective rights tied to territory and culture. This includes the right to maintain traditional governance structures that operate outside the binary of the state and the market. By asserting that the "Right to Water" or the "Right to Seeds" is inseparable from the "Right to Ancestral Territory," Indigenous epistemologies challenge the fragmentation of rights inherent in international law and advocate for a more holistic, integrative approach to justice.

Furthermore, Indigenous governance models often utilize consensus-based decision-making and long-term temporal horizons (such as the "Seven Generations" principle). These models offer a direct critique of the short-termism of neoliberal democracy, which often sacrifices future ecological stability for immediate corporate profit. Indigenous epistemologies argue that true sovereignty is found in "territorial self-determination"—the ability of a community to define its own path of development based on its unique historical and spiritual relationship with its environment. This is what Coulthard (2014) identifies as a "grounded normativity," where ethical and political codes are derived from the land itself.

3. Decolonial Justice: Dismantling the Structures of Oppression

Decolonial justice goes beyond the liberal goal of "inclusion" or "recognition" within existing systems; it calls for the fundamental decolonization of legal, political, and economic structures. As Tuck and Yang (2012) famously asserted, "decolonization is not a metaphor." It requires the actual restitution of land and the dismantling of the

"coloniality of power" (Quijano, 2000) that continues to organize the world into racialized hierarchies. Decolonial justice recognizes that the current international human rights regime is often complicit in oppression when it prioritizes state sovereignty and private property over the collective survival of Indigenous peoples.

To achieve decolonial justice, legal systems must move toward "legal pluralism," where Indigenous law is recognized as having equal standing with state law. This involves moving from a "monological" legal system, which only speaks the language of the state, to a "dialogical" one that respects diverse juridical traditions. In practice, this means that the principle of Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) must be treated not as a procedural hurdle, but as an expression of Indigenous veto power. Decolonial justice requires that the "slow violence" of contamination and dispossession be addressed through reparations and the restoration of Indigenous jurisdiction over traditional lands (Nixon, 2011).

In the economic sphere, decolonial justice demands a transition away from the "extractive logic" that treats the Global South as a mine for the Global North. This involves challenging the debt cycles and trade agreements that force post-colonial states to sacrifice Indigenous territories to satisfy international creditors. By connecting postcolonial theory with decolonial justice, we see that the struggle for Indigenous rights is central to the broader project of "delinking" from a global system that equates "civilization" with ecological destruction and human exploitation (Mignolo, 2011).

4. *Reclaiming Sovereignty and Cultural Autonomy*

Indigenous movements are increasingly using their own epistemologies as the foundation for reclaiming cultural sovereignty and territorial autonomy. This is not a return to a "pre-colonial past," but a forward-looking "resurgence" (Alfred, 2005) that uses traditional values to navigate contemporary struggles. For example, the "Land Back" movement in North America and Oceania is about more than just acreage; it is about reclaiming the authority to manage land according to Indigenous ecological and spiritual laws. This reclaiming of sovereignty is a direct act of resistance against the neocolonial state's attempts to commodify Indigenous identity.

Resistance strategies are often rooted in "cultural autonomy," where the revival of language, ceremony, and traditional education becomes a political shield. By strengthening the "bonding social capital" within the community, Indigenous groups build the resilience necessary to withstand state and corporate pressure. In Latin America, the formation of "Indigenous Guards"—unarmed community members

who patrol their territories to prevent illegal logging and mining—is a practical application of Indigenous sovereignty that bypasses the ineffective or complicit state security apparatus. These movements position themselves as the vanguard of a global movement for "Planetary Justice."

These struggles are repositioning Indigenous movements as key actors in reshaping international agendas. By bringing "Rights of Nature" arguments into the UN and international courts, Indigenous people are forcing a global conversation about the limits of Western law. Their resistance demonstrates that "sovereignty" is not a static property of the state, but a lived relationship between people and their environment. Reclaiming sovereignty is thus the ultimate decolonial act: it is the refusal to be a "subject" of the colonial or neocolonial state and the assertion of being a "steward" of the earth (Sultana, 2022).

F.   Indigenous Resistance Strategies
1.   *Direct Action and Legal Resistance*

Indigenous resistance against neocolonial encroachment is characterized by a sophisticated blending of "extra-legal" direct action and strategic litigation. In Latin America, the Zapatista Army of National Liberation (EZLN) in Mexico redefined resistance by seizing territory in 1994 to protest the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), which they termed a "death sentence" for Indigenous agricultural communities. The Zapatistas established autonomous municipalities (*caracoles*) that operate outside state jurisdiction, demonstrating that territorial occupation can serve as a permanent structural alternative to state dependency. Scholars like Holloway (2002) argue that such movements represent a "crack" in the capitalist hegemony, creating spaces where Indigenous social relations can be practiced autonomously.

In the United States, the Standing Rock protests against the Dakota Access Pipeline (DAPL) in 2016-2017 catalyzed a global shift in Indigenous direct action. By positioning themselves as "Water Protectors" (*Mni Wiconi*), the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe framed their resistance not merely as a property dispute, but as an existential defense of the sacred and the ecological. This movement utilized "frontline" resistance—physical blockades and prayer camps—to disrupt the flow of capital, while simultaneously pursuing legal injunctions based on the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and treaty rights. This dual strategy forced a global conversation on the role of corporate extraction in violating Indigenous sovereignty.

Legal resistance has also seen significant triumphs through the use of national courts to enforce international standards. In the

Canadian context, the Delgamuukw (1997) and Tsilhqot'in (2014) decisions by the Supreme Court recognized that Indigenous title is a collective right to the land itself, which includes the right to proactively manage and profit from it. These legal challenges serve to delegitimize the colonial doctrine of *terra nullius* and force states to negotiate as equals rather than as benevolent overseers. However, as Coulthard (2014) warns, legal resistance within the state's court system can sometimes lead to a "politics of recognition" that domesticates radical Indigenous demands into manageable legal categories.

Direct action often extends to the monitoring of lands where the state is absent or complicit. In the Brazilian Amazon, "Indigenous Guards" use drone technology and traditional tracking skills to intercept illegal loggers and miners. This form of "territorial self-defense" is a practical assertion of sovereignty that bypasses the "slow violence" of state bureaucracy (Nixon, 2011). By physically removing extractive agents from their territories, Indigenous groups assert that their laws are not merely moral suggestions but enforceable jurisdictional realities.

The effectiveness of these strategies lies in their ability to create "political crises" for neocolonial actors. When Indigenous groups block a highway, occupy a mine, or win a surprise injunction, they increase the "political risk" for international investors. This economic pressure is a vital component of modern resistance, as it challenges the "security of investment" that multinational corporations rely on. Through these actions, Indigenous peoples move from being passive victims of globalization to being "gatekeepers" of the extractive frontier.

Ultimately, direct action and legal resistance are two sides of the same decolonial coin. While direct action secures the physical presence of the community on the land, legal resistance seeks to codify that presence into a permanent right. This synergy is essential for confronting the "coloniality of power," as it challenges both the physical and the legal manifestations of neocolonialism. As Simpson (2017) notes, these acts of "refusal" to comply with state dictates are foundational to the project of Indigenous freedom.

2. *International Advocacy and Global Legal Frameworks*

International advocacy has become a primary pillar of Indigenous resistance, providing a "boomerang effect" where local struggles gain leverage by appealing to global norms. The adoption of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) in 2007 marked a watershed moment, establishing a comprehensive framework for the minimum standards of survival, dignity, and well-being. Article 32 of UNDRIP, which enshrines the right to Free, Prior,

and Informed Consent (FPIC), has become the "gold standard" for Indigenous advocacy, even in states that have not fully integrated the declaration into domestic law.

The UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UNPFII) and the Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples provide crucial platforms for documenting human rights abuses that are often suppressed at the national level. By presenting evidence of state-sanctioned land theft or environmental contamination to these bodies, Indigenous leaders can embarrass states on the global stage, affecting their diplomatic standing and their ability to secure international development loans. This "shaming" mechanism is a vital tool for communities in the Global South facing authoritarian or neocolonial regimes.

The Inter-American Court of Human Rights (IACHR) and the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights have also played transformative roles. In cases like *Saramaka People v. Suriname*, the IACHR ruled that states must not only consult Indigenous peoples but must obtain their consent for large-scale projects that affect their survival. This "jurisprudence of life" connects property rights to cultural integrity, effectively "indigenizing" international law. Such rulings provide Indigenous movements with "legal capital" that they can use to challenge national laws that prioritize extractive contracts over human rights.

However, international advocacy faces the challenge of "implementation gaps." While the language of Indigenous rights is prevalent in global forums, the enforcement mechanisms remain weak. Many states sign international declarations while simultaneously passing domestic laws that undermine them. Scholars like Anaya (2004) emphasize that international advocacy must be paired with domestic political mobilization to ensure that global norms are translated into local protections. The "global-local" nexus is where the true power of international law is tested.

Furthermore, Indigenous groups are increasingly participating in global climate negotiations, such as the COP (Conference of the Parties) summits. By framing themselves as the "Guardians of Biodiversity," Indigenous advocates challenge the neocolonial "green-washing" of climate policy. They argue that climate justice is impossible without the recognition of Indigenous land tenure, as Indigenous territories contain the vast majority of the world's remaining carbon sinks and biodiversity hotspots. This shift from "victims of climate change" to "leaders of climate solutions" is a significant strategic evolution in international advocacy.

International advocacy provides a layer of "symbolic sovereignty" that bolsters the physical struggles on the ground. It allows Indigenous peoples to bypass the state and speak directly to the global community, asserting that their rights are inherent and universal rather than granted by the state. This global presence is a direct rebuttal to the colonial project of "native elimination," as it ensures that Indigenous voices remain a permanent and influential fixture of the twenty-first-century international order.

3. *Cultural and Spiritual Revitalization as Resistance*

For many Indigenous nations, the act of maintaining and revitalizing culture is, in itself, a radical form of political resistance. In a neocolonial system that seeks to homogenize populations for easier labor and resource management, the persistence of a distinct Indigenous identity is a profound act of defiance. The revitalization of Indigenous languages is a prime example; language is not just a tool for communication but a "repository of ecological and spiritual law." By teaching youth their ancestral tongues, communities are reclaiming a worldview that is fundamentally incompatible with the extractive logic of the state.

Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK) is also being reasserted as a superior alternative to Western industrial management. In Oceania, the revival of traditional navigational and fishing techniques is being used to combat coral reef degradation and rising sea levels. In Africa, the return to traditional pastoralist grazing patterns is proving more resilient to drought than Western-style intensive ranching. This "reclaiming of the mind" allows Indigenous communities to reject the "civilizing mission" of neocolonial development and assert the validity of their own scientific and social systems.

Art and rituals serve as powerful tools for "symbolic resistance" and community mobilization. The use of the Māori Haka in New Zealand or the Sun Dance in North America provides a visible and visceral assertion of presence and power. These practices build "internal sovereignty"—the psychological and spiritual strength required to withstand years of legal and physical conflict. As Alfred (2005) argues, decolonization must begin with a "warrior's spirit" that is nurtured through cultural practice, as it provides the ontological security needed to resist the "coloniality of being."

Furthermore, cultural revitalization is often a direct response to "epistemicide"—the destruction of Indigenous knowledge systems (Santos, 2014). By documenting oral histories and mapping sacred sites, communities are creating "counter-archives" that challenge official state narratives of land ownership. These cultural maps are increasingly

being used in court cases to prove "immemorial occupation," turning spiritual knowledge into legal evidence. The revitalization of culture thus provides the "epistemic foundation" for all other forms of resistance.

The role of women in cultural revitalization is particularly significant. In many Indigenous societies, women are the primary keepers of language and the traditional healers. Their leadership in "mothering the movement" ensures that resistance is not just about political power but about the long-term survival of the community. Feminist Indigenous scholars like Maracle (1996) point out that the decolonization of gender roles is essential for a holistic resistance, as the colonial project relied heavily on the imposition of patriarchal structures to weaken Indigenous social cohesion.

Cultural and spiritual revitalization ensures that the "struggle" is not just a reaction to external threats but a proactive project of "world-making." It ensures that if the land is eventually returned, the community will still have the language, the laws, and the spiritual connection necessary to govern it. Cultural resistance is the "slow fire" of the decolonial movement, providing the warmth and light that sustains Indigenous nations through the long winter of neocolonialism.

4. *Building Alliances and Transnational Solidarity*

Indigenous movements are increasingly moving out of isolation by building strategic alliances with other social justice movements, creating a "broad-based decolonial front." Alliances with Environmental Justice organizations have been particularly fruitful, as both groups share a common enemy in unregulated extractive industries. In the struggle against mining in Latin America or logging in Southeast Asia, Indigenous groups provide the moral authority and "territorial frontline," while environmental NGOs provide the legal resources and global media reach. This "blue-green" alliance (referring to water and land) scales up local resistance into a global movement.

Solidarity with Feminist and Gender Justice movements has also intensified, as Indigenous women highlight the "intersectional" nature of their oppression. They argue that the violence of the extractive state is mirrored in the violence against Indigenous women's bodies. Movements like Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women (MMIW) in North America have built strong ties with global feminist organizations, framing the defense of the land as inseparable from the defense of the body. This alliance "humanizes" the struggle for land rights, making it a matter of global social conscience.

Transnational Indigenous solidarity is perhaps the most potent form of alliance-building. The Global Alliance of Territorial

Communities, which represents Indigenous and local communities across the Amazon, the Congo Basin, and Indonesia, allows leaders to coordinate strategies against global commodity chains. By sharing information on the tactics of specific multinational corporations, these groups can anticipate and preempt neocolonial maneuvers. This "South-South" solidarity bypasses the traditional mediation of Northern NGOs, allowing Indigenous peoples to set their own global agenda.

Labor movements and Indigenous groups are also finding common ground, particularly in the Global South. When mining or agribusiness workers—many of whom are themselves Indigenous or displaced peasants—strike for better conditions, they often find support from the territorial defenders. This alliance challenges the state's attempt to use "jobs" as a wedge issue to divide local populations. By uniting the "struggle of the worker" with the "struggle for the land," these movements create a powerful counter-hegemonic force that can paralyze the extractive economy.

The use of Digital Technology has facilitated a "digital alliance" where global citizens can support frontline struggles through crowdfunding, online petitions, and real-time monitoring. This "globalization from below" ensures that no Indigenous community is truly isolated. When a forest defender is threatened in the Amazon, the news can reach millions in seconds, triggering international pressure on the relevant government or corporation. While digital solidarity is not a substitute for physical resistance, it provides a vital "protective canopy" for activists on the ground.

Therefore, building alliances is not just a tactical choice but a theoretical necessity for decolonial justice. It acknowledges that the "coloniality of power" is a global system that affects all marginalized groups. By linking their struggles with those of others, Indigenous peoples are not diluting their cause but are positioning it at the heart of a universal struggle for a more just and sustainable world. As Mignolo (2011) suggests, these "border-linkages" are the key to imagining a "world where many worlds fit," challenging the "one-world" logic of neocolonial globalization.

G. The Role of Global and National Legal Frameworks

1. International Human Rights Law: Recognition and Evaluation

International human rights law serves as the primary external normative framework used by Indigenous movements to challenge the domestic excesses of neocolonial states. The most significant instrument in this regard is the United Nations Declaration on the

Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), adopted in 2007. UNDRIP shifted the international legal paradigm from a "minority rights" focus to a "self-determination" focus, asserting that Indigenous rights are inherent rather than granted by the state. Specifically, Article 3 affirms the right of Indigenous peoples to freely determine their political status, while Article 26 recognizes their right to the lands and resources they have traditionally owned or occupied.

Scholars like Anaya (2004) argue that these provisions represent a "substantive equality" approach, acknowledging that Indigenous peoples require specific protections to overcome the legacy of colonial dispossession. However, the effectiveness of UNDRIP is often hampered by its status as a "declaration" rather than a treaty, meaning it lacks a direct enforcement mechanism. This "soft law" nature allows states to express rhetorical support for Indigenous rights in international forums while failing to implement the necessary legislative changes at home, a phenomenon often described as "decoupling" between global norms and local practices.

The International Labour Organization (ILO) Convention No. 169 remains the only legally binding international treaty open for ratification that deals exclusively with Indigenous rights. Its core strength lies in the mandate for Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC). Unlike UNDRIP, ILO 169 creates specific reporting obligations for ratifying states. Yet, legal analysis by Wiessner (2008) suggests that even this treaty is often interpreted narrowly by states, who view "consultation" as a procedural box to be checked rather than a substantive veto power held by Indigenous communities.

Critiques of international law from a postcolonial perspective, such as those by Coulthard (2014) and Moreton-Robinson (2015), suggest that these frameworks still operate within a "statist" logic. By requiring Indigenous peoples to frame their claims within the language of Western international law, these instruments may inadvertently reinforce the authority of the very states that dispossessed them. This "politics of recognition" can domesticate radical Indigenous demands, transforming a struggle for total territorial sovereignty into a request for limited "cultural rights" that do not threaten the global capitalist order.

Despite these limitations, international law provides a vital "boomerang effect" in advocacy. When domestic legal avenues are exhausted or biased, Indigenous groups can appeal to UN bodies or regional courts, such as the Inter-American Court of Human Rights. These bodies have increasingly utilized the "pro-persona" principle to interpret treaties in ways that protect Indigenous communal property. This creates a "global-local" legal pressure that can force neocolonial

governments to pause extractive projects or renegotiate land use agreements.

Furthermore, the role of "Special Rapporteurs" and international monitoring bodies has been crucial in documenting the "slow violence" of environmental contamination and land encroachment. These reports serve as authoritative evidence in domestic courts and international media, challenging the state's monopoly on "truth" regarding development projects. While international law may not provide a total solution to neocolonialism, it functions as a critical "shield" that allows Indigenous communities to survive and contest the expansion of the extractive frontier.

2. *National Legal Frameworks: Constitutionalism and Land Law*

National legal systems are the primary battlegrounds where Indigenous rights are either codified into meaningful protections or curtailed to facilitate national development. In Bolivia, the 2009 Constitution redefined the state as "Plurinational," formally recognizing Indigenous jurisdictions and the concept of *autonomía indígena*. This was a monumental legal shift, moving away from the monist colonial state model toward a pluralist one that grants Indigenous legal systems equal standing with ordinary law. This constitutionalization of Indigenous rights was intended to dismantle the "internal colonialism" that has historically marginalized the Indigenous majority.

However, the implementation of these rights is often subordinated to national land laws that prioritize the "Social Economic Function" (FES) of land. In practice, the Bolivian state frequently interprets FES as industrial agriculture or resource extraction, leading to conflicts where constitutional rights to "territorial integrity" are ignored in favor of mining or gas projects. Scholars like Gudynas (2013) point out that this creates a "fragmented sovereignty," where the state grants symbolic cultural rights while maintaining total control over the subsoil and the macro-economic trajectory of the country.

In New Zealand, the legal framework is uniquely centered on the Treaty of Waitangi (Te Tiriti o Waitangi). The establishment of the Waitangi Tribunal allowed for a quasi-judicial process to address colonial grievances and land theft. While this has led to significant "settlements" and the return of some ancestral lands, it operates within a "settler-constitutional" framework that maintains the ultimate sovereignty of the Crown. Moreton-Robinson (2015) notes that such frameworks often perform a "reconciliatory" function that stabilizes the state's title to land while offering limited "recognition" to the

Indigenous dispossessed, often requiring them to manage returned lands as corporate entities.

South Africa offers a distinct case of post-colonial legal transformation through its 1996 Constitution and the Restitution of Land Rights Act. These laws aimed to rectify the racialized dispossession of the Apartheid era. For Indigenous groups like the Khomani San, legal victories have resulted in the return of land within national parks. Yet, these victories are often "encumbered," meaning the groups are forced into co-management agreements with the state that limit their traditional hunting and gathering practices. This demonstrates that even when land is legally returned, the "coloniality of power" persists through administrative regulations.

The Australian legal system, following the landmark Mabo (1992) decision, created the Native Title Act. While this overturned the doctrine of *terra nullius*, it introduced a "frozen in time" requirement for Indigenous claimants. To win a case, Aboriginal groups must prove they have maintained a "continuous connection" to their land since the time of European settlement. Wolfe (2006) argues that this is a "repressive authenticity" requirement; the law punishes Indigenous groups for the very displacement and cultural disruption that the colonial state itself inflicted upon them.

Ultimately, national legal frameworks often act as "filtering mechanisms" for neocolonialism. They allow for the recognition of "cultural" rights—such as language or dress—while remaining rigidly resistant to "territorial" rights that include the power to veto extractive industry. This creates a state of "neoliberal multiculturalism" (Hale, 2005), where the state celebrates Indigenous diversity as a brand for tourism while simultaneously authorizing the destruction of the physical lands that make that diversity possible.

3. *Limitations and Failures of Legal Protections*

Despite the proliferation of "rights-based" discourse, legal systems frequently fail to provide meaningful protection for Indigenous communities against the pressures of neocolonialism. The primary failure lies in the fundamental tension between Indigenous title and state sovereignty. Under the doctrine of *eminent domain* (or compulsory acquisition), most national legal systems allow the state to override Indigenous land rights if a project is deemed to be in the "national interest." Because "national interest" is almost always defined in terms of GDP growth and resource extraction, Indigenous land rights are consistently treated as secondary.

Harvey (2003) describes this as "accumulation by dispossession" made legal, where the state uses its monopoly on law to facilitate the

transfer of assets from the communal to the private sector. Furthermore, the "burden of proof" in legal systems is almost always placed on Indigenous communities. To claim land rights, groups must often prove "continuous occupation" and "cultural authenticity" in courts that use Western definitions of history and evidence. This excludes groups that were forcibly displaced or those whose cultures have adapted to survive colonial violence, a process Smith (1999) identifies as "epistemic violence."

Corporate power further undermines legal protections through the use of Investor-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS) clauses found in international trade agreements. These allow multinational corporations to sue states in private tribunals if environmental or Indigenous rights laws interfere with their "legitimate expectations" of profit. This creates a "regulatory chill," where states hesitate to enforce Indigenous protections for fear of massive financial penalties. As Sassen (2014) argues, these "transnational legalities" create a parallel justice system that prioritizes the rights of capital over the rights of humans, rendering Indigenous legal claims effectively moot.

The failure of legal protections is also evident in the lack of "enforcement capacity" in remote Indigenous territories. Even when Indigenous groups win a court injunction against a mining company, the state often lacks the will—or the police resources—to remove the company from the land. Conversely, when the state wants to enforce an extractive project, it can mobilize significant military and police force. This "asymmetric enforcement" reveals that the law is not a neutral arbiter but a tool that is selectively applied to favor the interests of neocolonial elites.

Furthermore, the legal system often fails to account for the "cumulative impact" of industrial development. Courts typically evaluate projects on an individual basis rather than looking at the total degradation of an Indigenous ecosystem. This "salami-slicing" of the landscape allows for the gradual destruction of Indigenous territories through a series of legally authorized projects, none of which are deemed "catastrophic" on their own, but which collectively result in the total loss of traditional livelihoods. Nixon (2011) describes this as the "slow violence" that the law is structurally unable to see or prevent.

While legal frameworks have provided Indigenous peoples with a new vocabulary for struggle, they remain deeply embedded in the structures of the states and global markets that drive dispossession. State sovereignty and corporate power operate as "meta-rules" that consistently undermine Indigenous legal claims. True decolonial justice, therefore, cannot be found within the law alone; it requires a

fundamental reordering of power that places Indigenous jurisdiction and the "Rights of Nature" above the "rights of capital."

H. Recommendations for Decolonizing Sovereignty and Indigenous Rights

1. *Strengthening Indigenous Governance*

The transition from neocolonial dependency to genuine self-determination requires a fundamental shift in how the state and international bodies recognize authority. Strengthening Indigenous governance is not a matter of "granting" power, but of recognizing the inherent jurisdiction that predates the modern state. This requires a transition toward legal pluralism, where Indigenous legal systems and decision-making bodies—such as council of elders, traditional assemblies, and community guards—are granted equal standing with national judiciaries. States must move away from the "delegation" of power and toward the "recognition" of autonomous Indigenous governance zones where communal laws on land use, education, and social justice are primary (Alfred, 2005).

Supporting self-governance also necessitates the protection of Indigenous land stewardship. This involves institutionalizing traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) as a valid scientific and regulatory framework for environmental management. Rather than imposing Western "expert" models of conservation, policy frameworks should support Indigenous-led management plans that view humans as integrated components of the ecosystem. To be effective, these governance structures must be backed by fiscal autonomy, ensuring that Indigenous nations have direct access to funding and resource revenues without being subject to the paternalistic oversight of state bureaucracies (Coulthard, 2014).

2. *Reforming International Law*

To move beyond the limitations of "soft law," international human rights instruments must be reformed to include stronger enforcement mechanisms. A primary recommendation is the elevation of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) from a declaration to a legally binding International Covenant. This would subject states to periodic reviews and a formal complaints procedure through a dedicated treaty body. Furthermore, the principle of Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) must be refined to explicitly include the right of refusal, or "veto power," over any project affecting Indigenous territories, ensuring that "consultation" is not merely a procedural formality for corporate entry (Anaya, 2004).

Reforms must also address the "regulatory chill" caused by international trade law. It is recommended that a "Human Rights Superiority Clause" be integrated into all bilateral and multilateral investment treaties, stipulating that Indigenous land rights and environmental protections take legal precedence over corporate profit expectations. This would involve reforming or abolishing the Investor-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS) mechanisms that currently allow multinational corporations to sue states for enacting Indigenous protections. International law should move toward a "polycentric" model where Indigenous nations can directly access international courts as sovereign subjects, bypassing the state entirely when the state is the primary violator of their rights (Santos, 2014).

3. Land and Resource Justice

True decolonial justice is impossible without the material restitution of land. Land restitution programs must go beyond symbolic gestures and address the structural "land hunger" caused by colonial and neocolonial enclosures. This requires the creation of independent, well-funded national land commissions with the power to adjudicate ancestral claims and return lands that were seized without consent. In cases where physical restitution is impossible, "reparative justice" must be enacted through the provision of alternative lands of equal value or permanent, inflation-indexed annuities derived from the resources extracted from those lands (Tuck & Yang, 2012).

Beyond restitution, resource justice requires a radical restructuring of the extractive economy. This includes the implementation of "Resource Sovereignty" models where Indigenous communities have a controlling interest and a direct share in the profits of any industrial activity on their lands. Furthermore, global policy should shift toward supporting Indigenous-led conservation initiatives—often referred to as "Indigenous Protected and Conserved Areas" (IPCAs). These initiatives replace the "fortress conservation" model with a stewardship model that protects biodiversity through Indigenous presence rather than exclusion, recognizing that Indigenous territories contain the vast majority of the world's remaining carbon sinks (Sultana, 2022).

4. Supporting Indigenous Movements

Strengthening the capacity of Indigenous movements is essential for holding both states and corporations accountable. This involves providing strategic capacity building that equips Indigenous leaders with the legal, financial, and digital skills necessary to navigate the complexities of global finance and international law. Access to "pro

bono" international legal support is vital, as many frontline communities lack the resources to fight multi-year court battles against well-funded multinational corporations. Global foundations and NGOs should shift their focus from "speaking for" Indigenous peoples to providing the "infrastructure of resistance" that allows these groups to speak for themselves.

Finally, Indigenous movements must continue to build transnational strategic partnerships with other global social justice movements. By aligning with environmental justice, climate action, and feminist movements, Indigenous struggles can amplify their demands and frame their local battles as part of a universal struggle for a livable planet. These alliances create a "global safety net" for land defenders, where international visibility can act as a deterrent against state violence. Supporting the "resurgence" of Indigenous identity through the revitalization of language and culture is not just a social endeavor but a political one, as it ensures that the movement is anchored in a decolonial worldview that offers a genuine alternative to the destructive path of neocolonial globalization (Simpson, 2017).

I. Conclusion

1. *Summary of Key Findings*

This paper has argued that the transition from historical colonialism to contemporary neocolonialism does not represent an end to oppression, but rather a sophisticated transformation of its mechanisms. Through the lens of postcolonial theory, we have seen that the "coloniality of power" persists through the dominance of multinational corporations, the conditionalities of international financial institutions, and the structural dependency created by national debt. As Nkrumah (1965) predicted, neocolonialism allows the "metropole" to continue the extraction of resources from Indigenous lands in Latin America, Africa, and Oceania without the administrative costs of direct occupation. This "accumulation by dispossession" (Harvey, 2003) is facilitated by national legal frameworks that frequently prioritize corporate interests and state developmentalism over the inherent sovereignty of Indigenous nations.

The ongoing struggles for Indigenous rights reveal that while international instruments like UNDRIP have provided a new normative vocabulary, they often fail to disrupt the "slow violence" of environmental degradation and territorial encroachment (Nixon, 2011). The comparative analysis demonstrated that whether through "fortress conservation" in Africa or "settler-colonial" land laws in Australia, Indigenous peoples remain the primary targets of an extractive global order. However, the resilience of Indigenous resistance—ranging from

the Zapatista autonomous zones to Māori cultural resurgence—highlights that decolonial justice is not merely a theoretical ideal but a lived practice. By asserting their own epistemologies and relational ontologies, Indigenous movements offer a fundamental challenge to the Western paradigms of land as property and nature as a commodity.

2.   *Call to Action*

There is an urgent need for policymakers, international organizations, and civil society to move beyond the "politics of recognition" and toward the "politics of restitution." Policymakers must move to decolonize national legal systems by recognizing Indigenous jurisdiction as a primary and non-negotiable legal authority over ancestral territories. This requires the institutionalization of Free, Prior, and Informed Consent (FPIC) as a binding veto power, rather than a consultative formality. International organizations must reform trade and investment laws to ensure that the rights of capital do not supersede the rights of Indigenous life and ecological integrity.

Furthermore, Indigenous movements must continue to be supported in their efforts to build transnational solidarity. The global community must prioritize the protection of land defenders, who currently face unprecedented levels of violence for resisting neocolonial expansion. Decolonizing efforts should not be viewed as an elective policy choice but as a requirement for global survival. Upholding Indigenous sovereignty and cultural autonomy is the most effective strategy for preserving the world's remaining biodiversity and challenging the destructive logic of perpetual growth that threatens the planetary ecosystem.

3.   *Future Research Directions*

The evolution of neocolonialism necessitates new avenues of academic and practical inquiry. First, further research is required into the intersection of climate change and neocolonialism, specifically how "green energy" transitions may trigger a new wave of resource extraction on Indigenous lands (the "Green Scramble"). Scholars must analyze how "climate coloniality" (Sultana, 2022) manifests in global carbon markets and whether these mechanisms perpetuate or alleviate Indigenous dispossession.

Second, the role of Indigenous women in resistance movements deserves dedicated focus. As the primary keepers of traditional knowledge and communal social structures, Indigenous women are often at the vanguard of territorial defense, yet their contributions are frequently marginalized in both state and patriarchal historical narratives. Finally, there is a significant opportunity to explore how

Indigenous knowledge systems (TEK) can be scaled to influence global governance models. Research should investigate how "Earth-centered" legal frameworks, inspired by Indigenous epistemologies, can provide the blueprint for a post-extractive international order that ensures justice for both the human and non-human worlds.

J. References

Acemoglu, D., Johnson, S., & Robinson, J. A. (2001). The Colonial Origins of Comparative Development. *The American Economic Review*, 91(5).

Agyeman, J. (2013). *Introducing Just Sustainabilities: Policy, Planning, and Practice*. Zed Books.

Alfred, T. (2005). *Wasáse: Indigenous Pathways of Action and Freedom*. University of Toronto Press.

Anaya, S. J. (2004). *Indigenous Peoples in International Law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Banner, S. (2007). *Possessions: Indigenous Art/Colonial Culture*. ANU Press.

Banner, S. (2007). *Possessions: Indigenous Art/Colonial Culture*. Australian National University Press.

Battiste, M. (2000). *Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Vision*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Benoit, N., et al. (2023). Human rights and climate change. *International Environmental Agreements*, 23(2).

Berry, S. (1993). *No Condition is Permanent: The Social Dynamics of Agrarian Change in Sub-Saharan Africa*. University of Wisconsin Press.

Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. London & New York: Routledge.

Blum, W. (2003). *Killing Hope: U.S. Military and CIA Interventions Since World War II*. Common Courage Press.

Boyd, D. R. (2012). *The Environmental Rights Revolution*. UBC Press.

Coulthard, G. S. (2014). *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Diamond, J. (1997). *Guns, Germs, and Steel: The Fates of Human Societies*. W. W. Norton & Company.

Escobar, A. (2008). *Territories of Difference: Place, Movements, Life, Redes*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Fanon, F. (1963). *The Wretched of the Earth*. Translated by Constance Farrington. New York: Grove Press.

Federici, S. (2010). *The Debt Crisis, Africa, and the New Enclosures*. Common Courage Press.

Foster, J. B. (1999). Marx's Theory of Metabolic Rift. *American Journal of Sociology*, 105(2).

Galeano, E. (1971). *Open Veins of Latin America: Five Centuries of the Pillage of a Continent*. Monthly Review Press.

González Casanova, P. (1965). Internal Colonialism and National Development. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 1(4).

Gudynas, E. (2011). Buen Vivir: Today's Tomorrow. *Development*, 54(4), 441–447.

Gudynas, E. (2013). Transitions to post-extractivism: Directions, options, and areas of action. *Indigenous Peoples and Human Rights*.

Hale, C. R. (2005). Neoliberal Multiculturalism: The Remaking of Cultural Rights and Racial Hierarchies in Central America. *PoLAR: Political and Legal Anthropology Review*, 28(1), 10–12.

Harvey, D. (2003). *The New Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hochschild, A. (1998). *King Leopold's Ghost*. Houghton Mifflin.

Holloway, J. (2002). *Change the World Without Taking Power: The Meaning of Revolution Today*. London: Pluto Press.

Knox, J. H. (2018). *Framework Principles on Human Rights and the Environment*. United Nations.

Kovach, M. (2009). *Indigenous Methodologies: Characteristics, Conversations, and Contexts*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

LaDuke, W. (1999). *All Our Relations: Native Struggles for Land and Life*. South End Press.

Mamdani, M. (1996). *Citizen and Subject: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Maracle, L. (1996). *I Am Woman: A Native Perspective on Sociology and Feminism*. Vancouver: Press Gang Publishers.

Mbembe, A. (2003). Necropolitics. *Public Culture*, 15(1), 11–40.

Mies, M., & Shiva, V. (1993). *Ecofeminism*. Zed Books.

Mignolo, W. D. (2011). *The Darker Side of Western Modernity: Global Futures, Decolonial Options*. Duke University Press.

Miller, R. J., et al. (2010). *Discovering Indigenous Lands: The Doctrine of Discovery in the English Colonies*. Oxford University Press.

Moreton-Robinson, A. (2015). *The White Possessive*. University of Minnesota Press.

Moyo, D. (2009). *Dead Aid: Why Aid Is Not Working and How There is a Better Way for Africa*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Muradian, R., et al. (2012). Ecological economics and a "just" transition. *Ecological Economics*.

Nixon, R. (2011). *Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor*. Harvard University Press.

Nkrumah, K. (1965). *Neo-Colonialism, the Last Stage of Imperialism*. Thomas Nelson.

Quijano, A. (2000). Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America. *Nepantla: Views from South*, 1(3), 533–580.

Quijano, A. (2000). Coloniality of Power. *Nepantla*.

Rodney, W. (1972). *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*. London: Bogle-L'Ouverture Publications.

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Santos, B. de S. (2014). *Epistemologies of the South: Justice Against Epistemicide*. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers.

Sassen, S. (2014). *Expulsions: Brutality and Complexity in the Global Economy*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Schlosberg, D. (2007). *Defining Environmental Justice*. Oxford University Press.

Simpson, L. B. (2017). *As We Have Always Done*. University of Minnesota Press.

Sklair, L. (2001). *The Transnational Capitalist Class*. Blackwell.

Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London: Zed Books.

Spivak, G. C. (1988). *Can the Subaltern Speak?* Macmillan.

Stavenhagen, R. (2008). *The Emergence of Indigenous Peoples*. Berlin: Springer.

Sultana, F. (2022). The unbearable heaviness of climate coloniality. *Political Geography*, 99, 102637.

Tauli-Corpuz, V. (2016). *Report of the Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*. United Nations General Assembly.

Tsosie, R. (2007). Indigenous peoples and environmental justice. *Environmental Law Reporter*, 37.

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 1(1), 1–40.

United Nations. (2007). *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*. New York: UN General Assembly.

Vanderheiden, S. (2008). *Atmospheric Justice*. Oxford University Press.

Veracini, L. (2010). *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wallerstein, I. (1974). *The Modern World-System*. Academic Press.

Watt-Cloutier, S. (2015). *The Right to Be Cold*. Toronto: Allen Lane.

Whyte, K. P. (2017). Indigenous Climate Change Studies: Indigenizing Futures, Decolonizing the Anthropocene. *English Language Notes*, 55(1-2), 153–162.

Wiessner, S. (2008). The Cultural Rights of Indigenous Peoples: Achievements and Continuing Challenges. *European Journal of International Law*, 19(5), 1165–1181.

Wolfe, P. (2006). Settler colonialism and the elimination of the native. *Journal of Genocide Research*, 8(4), 387–409.

Young, I. M. (1990). *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

***

Conflicting Interest Statement

The authors state that there is no conflict of interest in the publication of this article.

Publishing Ethical and Originality Statement

All authors declared that this work is original and has never been published in any form and in any media, nor is it under consideration for publication in any journal, and all sources cited in this work refer to the basic standards of scientific citation.

Generative AI Statement

N/A