Global Honors Theses   Global Honors Program

Spring 6-7-2024

From Colonialism to Collaboration: A History of U.S. Environmentalism with Indigenous Communities

Catherine Rawlings
crawl24@uw.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.tacoma.uw.edu/gh_theses

Part of the Environmental Studies Commons

FROM COLONIALISM TO COLLABORATION: A HISTORY OF U.S. ENVIRONMENTALISM WITH INDIGENOUS COMMUNITIES

Catherine Rawlings
Environmental Sustainability: Environmental Education
May, 2024

Faculty Adviser: Dr. Danica Miller

FROM COLONIALISM TO COLLABORATION: A HISTORY OF U.S. ENVIRONMENTALISM WITH INDIGENOUS COMMUNITIES

Catherine Rawlings
Environmental Sustainability: Environmental Education
May, 2024

Faculty Adviser: Dr. Danica Miller

Essay completed in partial fulfillment of the requirements for graduation with Global Honors, University of Washington, Tacoma

Approved:

DMiller	6.8.24
Faculty Adviser	Date

signature	6/11/2024
Executive Director of Programs, IIGE	Date

Introduction

Over the past few decades, the mainstream environmental movement has undergone a transformation, expanding its focus beyond the preservation and conservation of resources, habitats, and species to encompass principles of social justice and equity which is found in public school lessons (McLean 355). Within this equitable lens, the concept of "white environmentalism" is viewed as a byproduct of settler colonialism (van Holstein and Head 42). White environmentalism has attempted to disregard the rich history of Indigenous communities prior to and after colonialization, instead focusing on Western scientific methods and interests for conservation purposes (Carlin 1064). The latter part is like settler colonialism, which is "…violence that disrupts human relationships with the environment" (Whyte 128).

These two concepts, especially when intertwined, marginalizes the voices, knowledge, and rights of Indigenous peoples, whose deep connections to land, water, and traditional ecological knowledge are integral to their cultural identities and survival. This is like how some countries in the Global North were founded – wealthy white people erasing Indigenous culture and traditions so they could buy and sell resources on the backs of Indigenous peoples. The legacy of this history persists in contemporary environmental and conservation efforts, where Indigenous voices are often sidelined or disregarded in decision-making processes. White environmentalism, rooted in Western ideologies of conservation and preservation, tends to prioritize the protection of wilderness areas over the rights and livelihoods of Indigenous communities. This perpetuates a narrative of Indigenous peoples as obstacles to conservation rather than partners in environmental stewardship. Now, in the 21st century, echoes of settler colonialism are apparent, since modern environmentalism is predominately dominated by wealthy white people. It doesn't allow Indigenous communities to exercise their treaty rights

entirely (Stevens 124), which according to many Kluane First Nations members, the ways that they interact with environment is either more sustainable or benevolent compared to mainstream environmentalism (Nadasdy 322).

Understanding the relationship between white environmentalism and Indigenous communities is complex, nonetheless it is essential because it paints a modern picture on colonialization. This isn't history from centuries ago; it is happening now, and Indigenous livelihoods are at stake. There is a lot of existing literature on how white environmentalism affects other traditionally marginalized communities, like the Black community, but seldom exists on the first people in the United States and Canada. Historically, white environmentalism has perpetuated a narrative of conservation that often disregards Indigenous perspectives, knowledge, and rights to land and resources. This legacy of environmental exploitation and dispossession has had devastating consequences for Indigenous communities, undermining their sovereignty, cultural integrity, and traditional ways of life.

White environmentalism and Indigenous communities are rooted within the rise of modern veganism; Indigenous communities aren't getting the recognition for their traditional sustainable lifestyle. Both groups value nonhuman animals, but the difference is *how* they do so, of which they have conflicting opinions on (Legge and Taha 65).

The complex relationship of white environmentalism and Indigenous communities will be examined chronologically. First, a broad overview Indigenous environmentalism will be succinctly examined. Next, the colonization of the New World by European settlers will be explored. Then, specific examples of the colonizer mindset harming Indigenous livelihoods will be analyzed. Lastly, a theoretical collaborative pathway between colonizers and indigenous

communities will be brought forth, which could allow traditional Indigenous environmentalism practices to be more mainstream.

One final thing to note is that the terms "white environmentalism", "U.S. environmentalism", and "colonial environmentalism" are all used interchangeably.

Indigenous Environmentalism

Let's start with an overview of Indigenous environmentalism. Broadly speaking, Indigenous environmentalism is a dynamic lifestyle that has been practiced by Indigenous communities worldwide since time immemorial. These practices are adapted to the specific geographies of Indigenous communities (Magni 440). Since this lifestyle is dynamic, it can be adapted for changes in the ecosystem. Some examples include prescribed burning, resource management, and changing species (Magni 441). Such practices are learned by doing instead of being directly taught by a wiser person.

Traditional Ecological Practices

The first fish ceremony is a common practice of Indigenous tribes in the Pacific Northwest in North America. Though it is different across tribes, the ceremony has the same three phases: "… (1) welcoming of the salmon as it was brought to shore, (2) the butchering, cooking, and consumption of the fish, and (3) the return of its remains to the river or sea" (Amoss 56-57). These three steps highlight how Indigenous tribes respect and honor the fish's life. The Salish people do not fish until the first fish has taken part in the ceremony. Either the oldest tribesperson or children wait on the shore to obtain the fish from the fishermen. Then, the fish is placed on ferns, and women remove the flesh, which is then cooked over a fire or simply boiled. The officiant would pray that the fish would gaze upon members and return tenfold (Amoss 57).

Most people would consume the fish, and what is not consumed is returned to the ecosystem, which Indigenous peoples believed "…that the salmon would come to life again and lead their fellows to the fishing sites" (Amoss 58). This strongly held belief allowed tribes members to receive a lot more fish, though they would not partake in overconsumption of resources.

Prescribed burning is an example of a non-Western sustainability practice increasing in popularity amongst Western scientists. But for Indigenous peoples, fire has been a tool for thousands of years. As mentioned previously, Indigenous environmentalism is a changing lifestyle, so Indigenous peoples altered the ecosystem to foster more productivity. This allowed changes in species of flora and fauna, which produced greater species biodiversity. Controlled burning also modified ecosystems as a whole. Burning an ecosystem changes the landscape and non-animal species which grow in it. This in turn, changes the food source for local communities (Eisenberg et al. 2).

Western scientific studies, often in collaboration with Indigenous communities have noted the lasting impacts of Indigenous controlled fire practices (Long et al. 2). Though wildfires are seen as bad from a Western scientific perspective, Indigenous peoples relied on prescribed ones to improve ecosystems (Eisenberg et al. 2). Campaigns, like Smoky the Bear and his famous saying "Only *you* can prevent wildfires" are part of the United States Forest Service's preventative measure to prevent the effects of wildfires. Uncontrolled wildfires can be the deadliest, but Indigenous communities knew that controlled wildfires could improve climate effects, aid in farming practices, and clearing land for community members and buildings (Long et al. 2).

"This evolving science demonstrates the importance of engaging with tribes to interpret records and understand implications of research" (Long et al. 2). Traditional ecological knowledge enhances scientific research by providing a holistic understanding of ecosystems, grounded in long-term observations and cultural practices. Incorporating Indigenous perspectives helps interpret historical records and offers innovative, sustainable resource management techniques.

Colonization

Beginning after Christopher Columbus explored the New World in the 17th century, European settlers began colonizing Plymouth County in modern New England. These colonizers, known by historians as "Pilgrims" set out to settle the New World away from religious oppression (Doane 4). When the European settlers first stepped foot in the Americas, they believed that that the natural world was empty, when it was the exact opposite (Done 4). This is because of propaganda perpetuated by colonizers, allowing them to justify the genocide of Indigenous communities.

In the discourse known as settler colonialism, historical accounts are told by the "winners." Indigenous peoples have been erased and are viewed as less than a civilized person with this lens (Doane 2). "It was not a simple matter of conquest, land theft, and genocide, but incorporated a series of practices such as forced assimilation and 'statistical extermination'" (Doane 2). Though settler colonialism has led to the death of thousands of Indigenous peoples, it has also caused the alive ones to "blend in" with the colonizer population. Further, this concept is employed to describe states and regions outside the United States, namely, Canada, New Zealand, and Australia. It also consists of Israel, South Africa, and the majority of Latin America (Doane 2)

Indigenous peoples died both directly and indirectly to the European colonization. Eisenberg et al. explains that they died due to disease that the white colonizers brought in, of which they had no immunity to (2). Events like Tisquantum's (Squanto's) kidnapping and exploitation "…undoubtedly explain the suspicious and hostile reaction of indigenous peoples when they met the Plymouth settlers…" (Doane 8). Even today in the 21st century, Indigenous tribes do not trust the federal or state government, or even other groups of actors to manage natural resources. Rather, they only trust fellow tribe members to do so (Pickering Sherman et al. 517).

By the mid to late 19th century, the ecosystem began to change. Many settlers began to feel a calling to venture west, a period known as Manifest Destiny. Three factors, capitalism, Christianity, and American republicanism "…became mechanisms through which American settlers in the West viewed and transformed the environment and Indians they encountered" Eisenberg et al. (2) corroborate that the colonizers modified the natural world, saying, "Less than 5% of pre-Euro-American colonization prairie remains (Knapp et al. 1999)". This is quite alarming, as traditional ecological knowledge would allow the ecosystem to be maintained for generations to come.

By the mid to late 19th century, the westward expansion driven by Manifest Destiny significantly altered North America's ecosystem. Settlers, influenced by capitalism, Christianity, and American republicanism, exploited natural resources for economic gain, justified the domination and conversion of Indigenous peoples, and promoted land privatization, leading to the displacement of native communities (Dobson 47). Eisenberg et al. (2) corroborate that the colonizers modified the natural world, saying, "Less than 5% of pre-Euro-American colonization prairie remains (Knapp et al. 1999)". This ecological devastation is particularly concerning

because Indigenous peoples have long used traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) to sustainably manage their homelands.

The settlers' disregard for TEK resulted in environmental degradation and the loss of Indigenous cultural practices, highlighting the profound impact of this period on both the natural world and Indigenous societies.

White Environmentalism

White environmentalism, also referred to as colonial environmentalism, U.S. environmentalism, or modern environmentalism, is a byproduct of settler colonialism. It prioritizes conservation and sustainability from a predominantly white, Western scientific perspective, often ignoring Indigenous knowledge and practices that have sustainably managed ecosystems for millennia (Bacon 61). This form of environmentalism historically involves the displacement of Indigenous communities, viewing wilderness as untouched land needing protection, thus perpetuating colonial ideologies, and erasing Indigenous environmental stewardship.

"Histories of US environmentalism often begin with the conflict between conservationists and preservationists. While these two approaches to the environment differed in important ways, both were deeply entrenched in settler-colonial ideologies and practices" (Bacon 61).

Despite their ideological differences, both the conservation and preservation movements shared a common foundation in settler-colonial practices. They marginalized Indigenous peoples by displacing them from their lands and disregarding their environmental knowledge, perpetuating colonial narratives that separated humans from nature and justified settler control over Indigenous territories. These shared colonial underpinnings reveal how mainstream environmentalism has historically been complicit in the erasure and oppression of Indigenous

communities, highlighting the need for a more inclusive and justice-oriented approach that acknowledges and incorporates Indigenous stewardship (Bacon 63).

By failing to integrate environmental justice principles, white environmentalism can perpetuate existing power dynamics and economic disparities, ultimately leading to ineffective or harmful outcomes for marginalized communities (Bacon 63).

Makah Whaling

For over a thousand years, the Makah Tribe in northwestern Washington State have hunted the California Gray Whale (Stevens 100), also known as the Eastern North Pacific gray whale (Khoury 298). "Makah religion in fact instructs that Thunderbird, a 'flying wolflike god, delivered a whale to their shores to save them from starvation'" (Stevens, 100). For this very reason, the Makah viewed the gray whale as a holy animal. It has been part of cultural objects, for example, art pieces and dances (Stevens 100). The Makah only "…hunted for subsistence and cultural purposes" (Khoury 297), and "did not engage in commercial whaling" (Khoury 297). Hunting the gray whale provided the community with nearly 80% of their resources and allowed the entire community to get involved (Khoury 297-298).

In 1855, the Makah signed the Treaty of Neah Bay with the United States government, which allowed them "…the continued right to whale" (Khoury 298), in exchange for them "…relinquishing most of their land" (Khoury 298) to the United States Government. This is another example of settler colonialism; the Makah losing their land at the hands of the white majority. Surrendering their land to the US government shows that though their land that they occupied for time immemorial, was important for them in many ways, their sacred animal was even more important for them.

The Makah were forced to move to smaller areas, known as reservations, but this was not easy for the colonizer mindset. Governor Issac Stevens explained to them that "…the United States government did not 'intend to stop them from marine hunting and fishing but in fact would help them to develop these pursuits'" (Stevens 101). The Treaty of Neah Bay allowed the Makah to continue practicing whaling in 1855, but only on the reservations. It was discussed in English, then translated into Chinook Jargon, which was finally translated to Makah. This process was reversed, so the English colonizers could exploit the Makah land and culture (Stevens 101).

So, the Makah people continued whaling on reservations for about 70 more years after signing the Treaty. However, they willingly stopped because of threats of mass extinction, because of commercial whaling practices in the 1920s (Khoury 295). The Whaling Convention Act as well as the Marine Mammal Protection Act was passed in the 1960s and 70s, effectively banning whale hunting (Khoury 295). In the mid-1980s, the International Whaling Commission "…made an exception for aboriginal subsistence whaling" (Khoury 295), as part of its restriction on industrial whaling practices.

Starting in mid-1994, the population of gray whale "…recovered to near its estimated original population size and [was] neither in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range, nor likely to again become endangered within the foreseeable future throughout all or a significant portion of its range'" (Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Rule to Remove the Eastern North Pacific Population of the Gray Whale From the List of Endangered Wildlife, as cited in Stevens 104). The Makah decided to ask permission from the Department of Commerce of the American federal government, "…specifically, the

NOAA which Congress had tasked with the promulgation of regulations to implement the Whaling Convention Act" (Stevens 104).

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) reached a negotiation. This allowed NOAA to provide a formal request to the International Whaling Commission about the quantity of gray whales that could be used for subsistence by the Makah. (Stevens 104). However, two associations, submitted a letter to NOAA 'alleging that the United States Government had violated National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) by authorizing and promoting the Makah whaling proposal without preparing an' (National Environmental Policy Act, as cited in Stevens, 104) Environmental Assessment (EA) or an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)" (Stevens, 104). Shortly after this commotion, on October 13, 1997, NOAA and the Makah reached a new agreement mandating that the Makah confine their hunting activities to the Pacific Ocean. In response, just four days later, NOAA issued a Finding of No Significant Impact (Stevens 104).

Great Bear Rainforest

The Great Bear Rainforest (GBR) in the province of British Columbia, Canada is home to dozens of Indigenous tribes, including the Kitasoo/Xai'xais (Tran et al. 923). "Unlike elsewhere in Canada, in British Columbia most First Nations have never signed treaties with the government. This means that much of British Columbia is still under claim by First Nations" (Low and Shaw). The GBR ecosystem is maintained by Indigenous stewardship practices, so "… the territory remains minimally impacted from increasing development pressures" (Tran et al. 923). Further, the Kitasoo/Xai'xais' way of life continues to be intimately connected to their lands, as a result of their economic reliance on ecotourism to a degree (Tran et al. 923), (Curran 844).

"During the late 1990s, conflict over GBR land use arose due to substantial increases in industrial logging. Led by Indigenous Nations within the GBR, over two decades of negotiations among Indigenous and Canadian governments and international environmental nonprofits, the forestry industry generated several agreements in 2006 and 2009" (Tran et al. 924).

These agreements provided new approaches to best manage the ecosystem, such as generating Conservancies under the *Park Act* of the province, and as well as advocating for the enactment of the Great Bear Rainforest (Forest Management) Act and *Great Bear Rainforest (Land Use) Order*. These are praised as steps forward in how the environment is managed in the region. They ensure that there is funding for First Nation monitoring and planning in their territories, focused on managing ecosystems, and officially designated many protected areas across the region (Tran et al. 924).

To be an ecosystem-based management operating area, the GBR "…must 'provide for an appropriate balance of social, economic and environmental benefits' (LUO Reg. as cited in Curran 839), and its importance must outweigh 'any adverse impact on opportunities for timber harvesting or forage use within or adjacent to the area that will be affected' (Ibid, as cited in Curran, 839)" (Curran 839). The province has the authority to establish customized forestry regulations for specific regions. In the case of the Great Bear Rainforest (GBR), these regulations are guided by standards aimed at safeguarding old-growth forests. This implies that forestry operations within the GBR must comply with rules designed to protect these ancient ecosystems. By instituting region-specific guidelines and integrating measures for old-growth forest preservation, the province seeks to harmonize economic activities with the imperative of conserving the GBR's exceptional natural heritage, ensuring its long-term sustainability (Curran 839).

However, despite these positive changes, there are still some gaps in putting the GBR agreements into action. This has sparked interest in developing Indigenous Protected and Conserved Areas (Tran et al. 924). Low and Shaw corroborate this, explaining that "…the ambition expressed in the Agreements is substantial, and, although implementation efforts have also been substantial, struggles are likely to continue.

For now, it is too soon to assess the success or failure of the Agreements, but close attention to implementation processes is essential." This means that these positive changes are large-scale and should be recognized as important, but only time will tell if they are promising in better management/stewardship of the Great Bear Rainforest.

Standing Rock

Initially, the phrase "Standing Rock" only referred to a physical location – "the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation, home to the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe" (Braun 147), located between the states of North Dakota and South Dakota in the United States (Braun 147). The roots of the "Standing Rock" moniker (which will be further discussed) can be traced back to 2016, near the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation. While it had a physical existence in and beyond the confines of the reservation, its essence truly flourished in the digital space. It eventually became popular worldwide due to its existence on social media (Braun 147).

Following the inauguration of then President Donald Trump in 2017, many demonstrations occurred from varying American communities, each advocating for their inclusion in shaping both American democracy and environmental agendas (Cappelli 1). "One such protest was the NODAPL movement, which arose in March 2016 in response to Energy Transfer Partners, L.P US$3.8 billion construction of the Dakota Access Pipeline, which proposes to stretch 1,100 miles from North Dakota to a river port in Illinois" (Cappelli 1).

"NODAPL" is an acronym for "No Dakota Access Pipeline." Standing Rock Tribal Leaders took part in the NODAPL protest, and directly countered the building of the Dakota Access Pipeline because they believed it was nearby the Standing Rock ancestral resting sites. It would also make the water less sustainable now and for future generations, putting this valuable resource in danger (Cappelli 1).

In the context of the Standing Rock Reservation, the United States government's actions indeed reflect a historical pattern of colonialism and land dispossession experienced by Indigenous peoples across the country. Similar to the plight of the Makah people, the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe faced encroachments on their land and resources driven by a colonialist mindset that prioritizes economic interests over Indigenous sovereignty and rights.

However, what sets the Standing Rock protests apart is the unprecedented level of solidarity and unity among Indigenous communities. The participation of Indigenous peoples from at least 90 different communities during the April protest underscores the broad-reaching impact of the movement and the shared experiences of colonization and marginalization that Indigenous peoples face (Capelli 1).

This widespread Indigenous solidarity not only highlights the significance of the issues at stake but also demonstrates the resilience and strength of Indigenous communities in asserting their rights and protecting their lands. By coming together in solidarity, Indigenous peoples across different nations and tribes amplify their voices and leverage collective power to challenge oppressive systems and demand justice.

In this way, while the historical context of land dispossession and colonialism is similar to that of the Makah example, the scale and depth of Indigenous solidarity at Standing Rock represent a powerful and transformative aspect of the movement. It reflects a paradigm shift

towards greater unity and collaboration among Indigenous peoples in their ongoing struggle for

sovereignty, self-determination, and justice.

"The camp grew exponentially and protesters, activists, and indigenous rights defenders

extended their camp across the river onto land titled to the Army Corps of Engineers. Tribal

leaders confirm that the Standing Rock…Indigenous leaders and environmental activists

employed social Internet platforms to mobilize non-indigenous peoples" (Cappelli 1). Social

media played a pivotal role in the differing levels of attention between Standing Rock in the 21st

century and Makah's struggle in the 19th and 20th centuries. The instantaneous and widespread

reach of platforms such as Twitter and Facebook allowed Standing Rock to gain global visibility,

while Makah's plight lacked such tools, relying on slower traditional media channels like

newspapers and radio. Social media enabled real-time dissemination of information, organizing

efforts, and engagement, amplifying the voices of activists and drawing broader support for the

cause.

Braun (148) claims, "Standing Rock became a last stand for multiple agendas, from tribal

sovereignty to environmental justice, from climate protection to the legacy of the Occupy

movement, from anticapitalism to antiglobalization to anti-Trumpism. This was why people

came from many places, why they stayed, why they fought, and why they endured. For many

people on the other side, Standing Rock was about Manifest Destiny, the power of private

property, capitalism and free enterprise, the continuity of American economics and values, and

about the enforcement of these powers against a counterculture."

The Standing Rock protests were a multifaceted phenomenon, embodying a convergence

of diverse agendas and ideologies that resonated on both local and global scales. At its core, the

movement represented a poignant stand for tribal sovereignty, environmental justice, and climate

protection. Indigenous peoples, alongside environmental activists, rallied against the construction

of the Dakota Access Pipeline, which threatened not only their land but also sacred sites and

water sources.

Inspired by the legacy of movements like Occupy, participants from various backgrounds

found common ground in their opposition to capitalist exploitation and globalization. They

advocated for alternative economic models that prioritize sustainability, community well-being,

and Indigenous rights. The protests served as a platform for voicing broader discontent with the

Trump administration's policies, particularly regarding environmental regulations and Indigenous

rights, highlighting systemic injustices and the need for change.

On the other hand, supporters of the DAPL framed their stance within the context of

Manifest Destiny and the sanctity of private property. Manifest Destiny asserted the inherent

right of the United States to expand westward and conquer new territories. This expansionist

ideology often justified the displacement and marginalization of Indigenous peoples in the

pursuit of economic growth and national progress.

Within this framework, proponents of the DAPL project viewed the pipeline as a symbol

of American ingenuity and progress, representing a step towards greater energy independence

and economic prosperity. They championed capitalist principles and free enterprise, arguing that

the pipeline would create jobs, stimulate economic development, and reduce reliance on foreign

oil imports. From their perspective, the construction of the pipeline was a rational decision

driven by market demands and the imperative to secure America's energy future.

The sanctity of private property rights also played a significant role in shaping the

discourse surrounding the DAPL project. Proponents emphasized the rights of landowners to use

their property as they saw fit, framing opposition to the pipeline as an infringement on individual

freedoms and property rights. This narrative resonated with many Americans who valued the principles of private enterprise and limited government intervention.

However, this ideological clash underscored deeper tensions surrounding authority, control, and competing visions for America's future. At its core, the debate over the DAPL project reflected broader questions about the balance between economic development and environmental conservation, corporate power and grassroots activism, and Indigenous sovereignty and settler colonialism.

The clashes at Standing Rock provided more awareness of Indigenous communities as well as the importance of listening to Indigenous communities and respecting their tribal sovereignty. It highlighted the urgent need for meaningful consultation and consensual processes before undertaking projects that could have significant impacts on Indigenous lands and ecosystems.

Ultimately, the clashes at Standing Rock protests served as a catalyst for broader conversations about environmental justice, Indigenous rights, and the intersectionality of social movements in the 21st century. They underscored deeper tensions surrounding authority, control, and the competing visions for America's future. While the Standing Rock protests highlighted the opposing views in the government, it also brought forth the need to listen to Indigenous communities before modifying an ecosystem, especially their homelands and sacred sites.

Collaborative Pathway

The imperative for establishing collaborative pathways between settlers and Indigenous communities is deeply intertwined with the historical legacies of settler colonialism and the pervasive influence of white environmentalism. This journey towards reconciliation is not

merely a matter of bridging cultural differences, but also confronting entrenched power dynamics and addressing systemic injustices that have long marginalized Indigenous peoples.

Settler colonialism, characterized by the forced displacement and subjugation of Indigenous populations, laid the foundation for the domination of Indigenous lands, resources, and knowledge systems by settler societies. This history of dispossession and exploitation continues to reverberate through contemporary Indigenous experiences, shaping their relationship with settler communities and the broader environment. White environmentalism, often rooted in Eurocentric ideologies of conservation and preservation, has historically perpetuated colonial narratives that prioritize the interests of settler populations while marginalizing Indigenous voices and knowledge.

Acknowledging and appreciating the rich cultural heritage, traditions, and knowledge systems of Indigenous peoples is thus not only a matter of cultural sensitivity but also a fundamental aspect of dismantling the structures of settler colonialism and white environmentalism. Settlers must actively confront and dismantle their own preconceived notions and privileges, recognizing the inherent value and validity of Indigenous perspectives and histories. This requires settlers to critically examine their own privileges and complicity in systems of oppression, while centering Indigenous voices and perspectives in environmental decision-making processes. Collaborative initiatives should prioritize the recognition of Indigenous sovereignty, the honoring of treaty rights, and the promotion of Indigenous-led conservation and land management practices.

By acknowledging the historical legacies of settler colonialism and white environmentalism, settlers can work towards building relationships based on trust, respect, and mutual benefit. This entails listening to Indigenous knowledge holders, advocating for

Indigenous rights, and actively challenging the narratives of dominance and superiority that underpin colonialism and environmental exploitation.

Ultimately, collaborative pathways between settlers and Indigenous communities must be grounded in principles of justice, equity, and solidarity. By working together as allies, settlers and Indigenous peoples can address the root causes of environmental degradation and social injustice, forging a more inclusive and sustainable future for all. Open dialogue and transparent communication channels serve as crucial mechanisms for challenging existing power dynamics and fostering genuine collaboration.

By creating spaces where both settlers and Indigenous communities can freely voice their needs, concerns, and aspirations, collaborative efforts can move beyond tokenistic gestures towards meaningful engagement grounded in mutual respect and benefit. Through partnership building informed by principles of decolonization and Indigenous sovereignty, settlers and Indigenous communities can identify common goals across various domains, including environmental conservation, economic development, and cultural preservation, and work together to achieve them in ways that honor Indigenous rights and self-determination.

Central to the success of collaborative initiatives is the principle of consent and consultation, rooted in the recognition of Indigenous sovereignty over their lands, resources, and communities. Any projects or initiatives impacting Indigenous territories must undergo meaningful consultation and obtain free, prior, and informed consent from affected Indigenous groups, ensuring that Indigenous voices are not only heard but also respected and valued. Upholding Indigenous rights and sovereignty requires settler communities to actively challenge existing power structures and advocate for policies and laws that promote reconciliation and

address historical injustices, including supporting initiatives related to land rights, treaty agreements, and Indigenous-led governance structures.

Conflicts and tensions may inevitably arise along the way, reflecting the deep-seated disparities and inequalities embedded within settler colonial societies. However, approaching these challenges with patience, empathy, and a commitment to finding mutually acceptable solutions is key to fostering healing and building trust. Reconciliation efforts should prioritize centering Indigenous perspectives, lifestyles, and experiences, recognizing that true reconciliation requires addressing the root causes of historical trauma and systemic injustice.

Education and awareness serve as critical tools for challenging stereotypes and dismantling the narratives of settler colonialism and white environmentalism. Settlers must actively engage in educating themselves and others about Indigenous history, culture, and issues, recognizing the ongoing impacts of colonization and the resilience of Indigenous communities. Additionally, exploring collaborative economic initiatives presents opportunities for both settlers and Indigenous communities to thrive while respecting traditional livelihoods and land use practices, fostering economic empowerment and self-determination for Indigenous peoples.

Building genuine relationships and trust requires sustained effort and commitment from settlers, who must demonstrate a long-term commitment to reconciliation and partnership. This entails prioritizing the well-being and self-determination of Indigenous peoples above short-term gains, challenging existing power structures, and advocating for transformative change. By embracing these principles and practices, settlers and Indigenous communities can co-create a pathway towards genuine collaboration, respect, and reconciliation, enriching both societies and fostering a more equitable and harmonious future for generations to come.

Conclusion

The examination of the complex relationship between white environmentalism and Indigenous communities has shed light on the historical injustices, power dynamics, and potential avenues for collaboration. Through a chronological exploration, we have witnessed the dynamic practices of Indigenous environmentalism, the resilience of Indigenous communities, the devastating impacts of colonization, and the ongoing struggles for Indigenous sovereignty and environmental justice.

By understanding the historical context and contemporary manifestations of this relationship, we can better appreciate the urgency of addressing systemic inequalities and advancing collaborative solutions. Moving forward, it is imperative to center Indigenous voices and knowledge systems in environmental discourse, policymaking, and activism. This entails challenging the dominant narratives of white environmentalism, dismantling colonial structures, and fostering genuine partnerships based on mutual respect, reciprocity, and shared stewardship of the land.

Further research avenues could explore the intersectionality of environmental justice and Indigenous rights, investigate innovative approaches to bridging Indigenous and Western knowledge systems, and analyze the role of international frameworks in supporting Indigenous sovereignty and environmental sustainability. Another area of inquiry could focus on the ways in which veganism intersects with Indigenous food sovereignty and cultural revitalization efforts. Research could examine Indigenous-led initiatives that promote sustainable, plant-based diets rooted in traditional knowledge and local food systems. This could include exploring the role of Indigenous-owned food businesses, community gardens, and cultural revitalization programs in promoting food sovereignty, environmental sustainability, and cultural resilience. Additionally,

research could analyze the implications of international frameworks such as the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) for Indigenous food sovereignty and environmental governance. This research could assess the extent to which these frameworks recognize and protect Indigenous rights to traditional lands, resources, and cultural practices in the face of pressures from globalized food systems and industrial agriculture.

Ultimately, by embracing Indigenous perspectives and practices, we can strive towards a more inclusive, equitable, and sustainable future for all. Within this journey, lies the recognition of the profound wisdom inherent in Indigenous knowledge systems, offering holistic approaches to environmental stewardship and community well-being. It involves confronting the historical injustices of settler colonialism, striving for reconciliation, restitution, and the affirmation of Indigenous rights and sovereignty.

Through active support of Indigenous-led initiatives for sustainable development, cultural revitalization, and environmental conservation, Indigenous communities are empowered as guardians of their ancestral lands, fostering resilient ecosystems for future generations. By prioritizing Indigenous voices in decision-making processes, environmental policies and practices can be rooted in respect, reciprocity, and solidarity.

Works Cited

Amoss, Pamela. "The Fish God Gave Us: The First Salmon Ceremony Revived." *Arctic Anthropology*, vol. 24, no. 1, Jan. 2016, pp. 56–66. Accessed 14 May 2024.

Bacon, J. M. "Settler Colonialism as Eco-Social Structure and the Production of Colonial Ecological Violence." *Environmental Sociology*, vol. 5, no. 1, May 2018, pp. 59–69, https://doi.org/10.1080/23251042.2018.1474725.

Braun, Sebastian Felix. "The Meaning of Standing Rock: On Imperialism, Indigeneity, Industrialization, and Imagination." *Great Plains Quarterly*, vol. 42, no. 1-2, Jan. 2022, pp. 147–57, https://doi.org/10.1353/gpq.2022.0006.

Cappelli, Mary Louisa. "Standing with Standing Rock: Affective Alignment and Artful Resistance at the Native Nations Rise March." *SAGE Open*, vol. 8, no. 3, Apr. 2018, p. 215824401878570, https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244018785703.

Carlin, Alan. "Modern Environmentalism: A Longer Term Threat to Western Civilization." *Energy & Environment*, vol. 24, no. 6, Sept. 2013, pp. 1063–72, https://doi.org/10.1260/0958-305x.24.6.1063.

Curran, Deborah. "'Legalizing' the Great Bear Rainforest Agreements: Colonial Adaptations toward Reconciliation and Conservation." *McGill Law Journal*, vol. 62, no. 3, 2017, pp. 815–60, https://doi.org/10.7202/1042775ar.

Doane, Ashley (Woody). "From the 'Beginning': Anglo-American Settler Colonialism in New England." *Genealogy*, vol. 5, no. 97, Nov. 2021, pp. 1–23, https://doi.org/10.3390/genealogy5040097.

Dobson, Darren. "Manifest Destiny and the Environmental Impacts of Westward Expansion."

    Flinders Journal of History & Politics, vol. 29, Jan. 2013, pp. 41–69.

Eisenberg, Cristina, et al. "Out of the Ashes: Ecological Resilience to Extreme Wildfire,

    Prescribed Burns, and Indigenous Burning in Ecosystems." *Frontiers in Ecology and*

    Evolution, vol. 1-12, Nov. 2019, pp. 1-, https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2019.00436.

Khoury, Monder. "Whaling in Circles: The Makahs, the International Whaling Commission, and

    Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling." *Hastings Law Journal*, vol. 67, no. 1, Jan. 2015, pp.

    293–322. Accessed 14 May 2024.

Legge, Marissa Marie, and Rasha Taha. "'Fake Vegans': Indigenous Solidarity and Animal

    Liberation Activism." Journal of Indigenous Social Development, vol. 6, no. 1, 2017, pp.

    63–81.

Long, Jonathan W., et al. "The Importance of Indigenous Cultural Burning in Forested Regions

    of the Pacific West, USA." *Forest Ecology and Management*, vol. 500, Nov. 2021,

    https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2021.119597. Accessed 14 May 2024.

Low, Margaret, and Karena Shaw. "First nations rights and environmental governance: lessons

    from the Great Bear Rainforest." BC Studies, no. 172, winter 2011, p. 9. Gale Academic

    OneFile, link.gale.com/apps/doc/A284015781/AONE?u=wash_main&sid=bookmark-

    AONE&xid=4eb5b7e4. Accessed 14 May 2024.

McGee, Gordon, et al. "A New Model for Sustainable Development: A Case Study of the Great

    Bear Rainforest Regional Plan." *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, vol. 12,

    no. 5, Nov. 2009, pp. 745–62, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-009-9222-3.

McLean, Sheelah. "The Whiteness of Green: Racialization and Environmental Education." *The*

    Canadian Geographer / Le Géographe Canadien, vol. 57, no. 3, Aug. 2013, pp. 354–362,

    https://doi.org/10.1111/cag.12025.

Nadasdy, Paul. "Transcending the Debate over the Ecologically Noble Indian: Indigenous

    Peoples and Environmentalism." *Ethnohistory*, vol. 52, no. 2, Apr. 2005, pp. 291–331,

    https://doi.org/10.1215/00141801-52-2-291.

Pickering Sherman, Kathleen, et al. "Practical Environmentalism on the Pine Ridge Reservation:

    Confronting Structural Constraints to Indigenous Stewardship." *Human Ecology*, vol. 38,

    no. 4, July 2010, pp. 507–20, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10745-010-9336-0.

Rutherford, Jack. "Standing Rock and Its Ancestors." *Third Text*, vol. 37, no. 4, Routledge, July

    2023, pp. 449–66, https://doi.org/10.1080/09528822.2023.2292447.

Stevens, Jeremy. "Of Whaling, Judicial Fiats, Treaties and Indians: The Makah Saga Continues."

    American Indian Law Journal, vol. 1, no. 1, Jan. 2017, pp. 99–126.

Tran, Tanya C., et al. "'Borders Don't Protect Areas, People Do': Insights from the Development

    of an Indigenous Protected and Conserved Area in Kitasoo/Xai'xais Nation Territory."

    FACETS, edited by Andrea Olive, vol. 5, no. 1, Jan. 2020, pp. 922–41,

    https://doi.org/10.1139/facets-2020-0041.

van Holstein, Ellen, and Lesley Head. "Shifting Settler-Colonial Discourses of

    Environmentalism: Representations of Indigeneity and Migration in Australian

    Conservation." *Geoforum*, vol. 94, Aug. 2018, pp. 41–52,

    https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2018.06.005.

Whyte, Kyle. "Settler Colonialism, Ecology, and Environmental Injustice." *Environment and*

    Society, vol. 9, no. 1, Sept. 2018, pp. 127–146.