

I

KEY CONCEPTS INFORMING EARLY CONSERVATION THOUGHT

The conservation movement arose against a backdrop of racism, sexism, class conflicts, and nativism that shaped the nation in profound ways. Though these factors are not usually incorporated into environmental history texts, they are incorporated into this narrative because they are critical to our understanding of how discourses about the environment were developed, policies formulated, and institutions organized. Hence, this chapter identifies seven key concepts that recur in the book: (1) race relations; (2) colonialism; (3) nativism; (4) gender relations; (5) the evolution of environmental ideologies; (6) power elites and environmental governance; and (7) the creation of an environmental identity.

Race Relations in the Environmental Context

Four aspects of race relations that had considerable impact on the transformation of the environment are defined here: the appropriation of Native American land and resources; the enslavement of blacks; the seizure of Latino territories; and the containment of Asians.

The role that race played in the formative experiences of early environmental activists and their subsequent formulation of environmental ideologies has been understudied, but race issues—relationships between Europeans and non-Europeans—were critical to the development of environmental discourse and activism in the United States. For instance, the American government and European settlers battled Indians for centuries to gain control over the land and other resources. These conflicts played significant roles in the crafting of policies that had lasting impacts on indigenous peoples and the environment.

During the battles to control land and resources, Native Americans were overpowered militarily and decimated by diseases. Tribal lands were seized as war bounties or through treaty making and breaking. Furthermore, Indians were repeatedly expelled (or removed) from their homelands, forced to live in reservations located on marginal lands, and allotted small parcels of land on which to subsist. Over time, federal Indian policies evolved to focus on the control of land, water, and mineral resources; the extermination and containment of Indians; forced assimilation, the transformation of Indians into farmers and urban low-wage laborers; and restrictions on religious and cultural expression (Nabokov 1991; Taylor 2009, 2014).

The first commercial trade between Indians and whites in North America probably occurred in the eleventh century, when Nova Scotia Indians traded gray fox and sable pelts for Viking knives and axes. During the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, as timber, fur-bearing animals, and other natural resources were depleted in Europe, Europeans explored the Americas for raw materials. Consequently, the French, English, and Dutch competed with each other to trade with Indians. In exchange for trinkets, metal objects, liquor, and guns, Indians traded raw materials such as salt, tobacco, wood, fish, fur, and hides. However, as trade increased Indians found themselves competing with each other to extract natural resources and trade them as rapidly as possible (Nabokov 1991: 32–35; R. Thornton 1987: 11–12).

Despite the long history of commercial relations, whites and Indians had vastly different views and attitudes toward the land. Whites viewed Indian worship of animal spirits, rocks, and rainbows as pagan rituals to be purged. Hence, by the 1630s numerous Spanish missions were established in the South and thousands of Indians were Christianized; those who refused baptism were beaten or executed. In the Southwest, in what is now New Mexico, the Spanish established a feudal system (the *encomienda*) sustained by the perpetual servitude of the native inhabitants. When British soldiers took over the territory

in the 1700s, they sold thousands of the Indian converts into slavery (Hannan 2001; Nabokov 1991: 50–52, 70; U.S. Commission on Human Rights 1992: 13–31).

- Native Americans and whites had differing views of the land, and this led to many conflicts and the disenfranchisement of indigenous peoples. Indians viewed themselves as custodians and stewards of the earth, not as masters with dominion over it. By contrast, white settlers saw the land as a commercial product best suited for private ownership and exploitation; consequently, they cleared forests for cultivation and the development of towns, and private property was essential to their entrepreneurial ventures. Whites were also disdainful of the Indian custom of sharing undeveloped, common land. These differences formed the philosophical basis of the Euro-American seizure of Indian lands.

The justification for seizing land was articulated early on when the first governor of Massachusetts, John Winthrop, expressed a view that was typical of the European perspective on Indian land-use practices. He questioned the communal living arrangements and seasonal migration patterns of Native American tribes. He also articulated and rationalized a colonialist ideology of conquest that paved the way for the appropriation of Indian land and resources. In so doing, Winthrop distinguished between two rights to the land—a natural right and a civil right. He argued that Native Americans had a natural right to the land, but Europeans in settling and developing the land had a civil right to it. The civil rights, in his view, superseded the natural rights. In 1629, Winthrop argued that the earth was the “Lord’s garden” and that the earth was given to the “sons of Adam to be tilled and improved by them” (Winthrop [1629] 1846: 272–276).¹ Winthrop justified the taking of Indian lands by arguing:

That which is common to all is proper to none. This savage people ruleth over many lands without title or property; for they enclose no ground, neither have they cattle to maintain it, but remove their dwellings as they have occasion . . . And why may not Christians have liberty to go and dwell among them in their waste lands and woods, (leaving them such places as they have manured for their corn,) . . . there is more than enough for them and us. (Winthrop [1629] 1846: 275–276)

John Locke also promoted individual ownership of land and resources in his writings about natural and property rights. In 1689, Locke argued that humans had a right to self-preservation, therefore they had a right to food and drink to subsist on as provided by nature. He stated, “The earth and all that is therein is given to men for the support and comfort of their being.” However, Locke

made an important argument about the appropriation of resources for individual use. He contended that though the bounties of the earth are given to humans in common, there must be a way to “appropriate them some way or other before they can be of any use, or at all beneficial, to any particular men” (Locke [1690] 1824: 144–145).² Raising the question of native peoples’ common use of resources, Locke argued that they had a natural right to resources, but postulated that once an individual added his or her labor to bring about the improvement or development of a particular resource, then that person gained individual rights to it and can claim it as individual property. Locke argued,

The fruit or venison which nourishes the wild Indian, who knows no enclosure, and is still a tenant in common, must be his . . . Every man has a “property” in his own “person.” This nobody has any right to but himself. The “labour” of his body and the “work” of his hands, we may say, are properly his. Whatsoever, then, he removes out of the state that Nature hath provided and left it in, he hath mixed his labour with it, and joined to it something that is his own, and thereby makes it his property. (Locke [1690] 1824: 145–146)³

Locke assumed that resources were bountiful; consequently, he argued that one can remove resources from the communal pool as long as one leaves adequate resources of good quality for others. That is, privatization should not result in the taking of something from someone else. In addition, one should not take excessive amounts, only what one can use without causing spoilage. However, since mineral resources did not rot, one could accumulate as much as one wanted. To avoid spoilage of resources that tended to degrade, one could sell them before they rotted (Locke [1690] 1824: 147–150). These arguments provided a rationale for privatization and trade in or aggregation of resources to generate wealth that had a strong influence on American thought.

Over the years, the courts were asked to rule on the primacy of agricultural and industrial land uses over communal land use and subsistence activities such as hunting and gathering. At first the courts were reluctant to decide. For instance, in *Johnson v. McIntosh* (1823), the court balked at taking sides. Chief Justice John Marshall argued, “We will not enter into the controversy, whether agriculturalists, merchants, and manufacturers, have a right, on abstract principles, to expel hunters from territory they possess, or to contract their limits. Conquest gives a title which the Courts of the conquerer cannot deny.” However, five years later James Kent, an expert on American jurisprudence, argued decisively that the “cultivators of the soil” should be given priority over hunters vis-à-vis their property rights (J. Kent 1828: 312).

Although Indians were enslaved in the United States, enslavement wasn’t the primary means by which tribes were suppressed. European settlers overpowered native tribes through warfare, the appropriation of land, treaties, and the control of natural resources. By contrast, blacks were subjugated primarily through forced migration from Africa and enslavement on American soil.

Historical records indicate that Africans had been visiting the American shores since the early 1500s and that African slaves were brought to Spanish Florida in the 1560s. The colonists who established St. Augustine in 1565 brought black slaves with them to help in the building of the settlement (Reynolds 1886: 20–105). However, blacks were not systematically enslaved until the seventeenth century. In 1619, about twenty Africans from Angola arrived in Virginia on a British pirate ship. The census shows that in 1623 there were twenty-two blacks in Virginia. Shortly thereafter blacks were enslaved in response to chronic labor shortages in the region (L. Bennett 1993: 5–12, 66–75, 84–90; D. B. Davis 2006: 124; Franklin and Moss 1994: 57; Parish 1989: 12–26; U.S. Census Bureau 1864: xiv). Roughly 12.5 million slaves were put on ships sailing from Africa to the Americas from the sixteenth century to the nineteenth; about 10.7 million Africans arrived alive in the Americas—the remaining 1.8 million died at sea. Estimates are that 389,000 of the Africans who survived the Transatlantic crossing were brought to the United States (Eltis and Richardson 2010: 4, 17–18; Sublette and Sublette 2016: 10–11; U.S. Census Bureau 1975: 1168).⁴

The slave population in America increased rapidly. The 1790 census of southern states indicated that there were 650,000 slaves; the total population of the United States was 4 million at the time. By 1830 the number of slaves had increased to more than 2 million, even though the importation of slaves had been banned in 1808 (table 1.1). The slave population continued to rise. However, as opposition to slavery mounted, slaves were increasingly concentrated in fifteen slaveholding states. In the intercensal period between 1850 and 1860 the white population in slaveholding states increased by 27.3 percent, while the slave population in those states increased by 23.4 percent. In 1860, slaves accounted for almost 4 million of the 12.2 million people residing in the slaveholding states. There were also 251,000 free blacks living in those states (L. Bennett 1993: 101–102; Parish 1989: 12–26; U.S. Census Bureau 1864).⁵ Nationwide, slaves comprised roughly 31 percent of the labor force in 1800 and about 23 percent in 1860 (Lebergott 1966: 117–204; U.S. Census Bureau 1864, vii). Table 1.1 also shows that rate of growth of free blacks slowed dramatically

TABLE 1.1. Census of Slaves and Free Blacks: 1790–1860

Year of Census	Number of Free Blacks	% Increase	Number of Slaves	% Increase	Total Number of Blacks	% Increase
1790	59,466		697,897		757,363	
1800	108,395	82.3	893,041	28.0	1,001,436	32.2
1810	186,446	72.0	1,191,364	33.4	1,377,810	37.6
1820	233,524	25.2	1,538,038	28.8	1,771,562	28.6
1830	319,599	36.9	2,009,043	30.6	2,328,642	31.4
1840	386,303	20.9	2,487,455	23.8	2,873,758	23.4
1850	434,449	12.5	3,204,313	28.8	3,638,762	26.6
1860	487,970	12.3	3,953,760	23.4	4,441,730	22.0

Source: U.S. Census Bureau. 1864. *Population of the United States in 1860, Compiled from the Original Returns of the Eighth Census*. Department of the Interior. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

over time, and only about 9 percent of the blacks living in America in 1860 were free.

Some slaves were highly skilled in a variety of trades. Though there is a tendency to view the slave as an unskilled plantation worker or a worker taught a trade by his or her master, some slaves brought skills developed in Africa with them on the slave ships. When the Europeans explored the African shores, they encountered people already skilled in mining and metalwork. West African craftsmen manufactured farm implements and handicrafts (Genovese 1972: 388–392). Most of the slaves brought to North America came from agrarian societies in West Africa, so they were experienced farmers and cattle producers (Blassingame 1979: 5). Rice cultivation was one such job: Africans skilled in growing the crop were brought to the Carolinas as slaves to cultivate it. Plantation owners were willing to pay high prices for slaves from Sierra Leone, Gambia, Liberia, Senegal, Ghana, and other rice-growing regions of Africa. By the 1690s the Carolinas became the largest supplier of rice in the world. As was the case with the Carolinas, Africans being transported to New Orleans took rice seedlings with them (Alpern 2013: 35–66; P. A. Bruce 1895: 331; Carney 2001; Littlefield 1991; Sublette and Sublette 2016: 170–171; Wood 1975: 36). Africans also brought indigo to the United States; sesame seeds were also brought for agricultural and medicinal uses (Bedigian 2013: 67–120; Sublette and Sublette 2016: 171).

APPROPRIATION OF LATINO

TERRITORIES AND DISREGARD OF TREATIES

Initially, Latinos were incorporated into the United States through military conquest as territory was appropriated from Mexico during the first half of the 1800s. The period of conquest began with the 1836 Battle of San Jacinto and ended with the 1853 Gadsden Purchase. In 1819, Mexico permitted foreigners to settle in the area now known as Texas. By 1830, a year after Mexico abolished slavery, about twenty thousand Anglos (mostly southerners) and about two thousand “freed” slaves (who had been forced to sign lifelong contracts with their former owners) lived in the territory. Soon a number of factors—feelings of racial superiority, anger over Mexico’s decision to abolish slavery, defiance of the order to pledge allegiance to the Mexican government and convert to Catholicism (both of which were required of residents in Mexican territory), a rise in the number of European settlers pushing for independence from Mexico, and the failure of diplomatic efforts—resulted in the Texas Revolt of 1835–36 (Aguirre and Turner 1998: 143; Anna 1978; Archer 2003; Estrada et al. 1981: 103–131; Hamnett 1986).

The creation of the Republic and the granting of statehood in 1845 provided the pretext for further U.S. expansion into Mexican territory, thereby setting the stage for the Mexican-American War, which was fought between 1846 and 1848. Under the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, which ended the war, Mexicans living in the Southwest were considered U.S. citizens. The treaty also guaranteed that Mexicans could retain their political liberty; whatever property they owned; and the Spanish language, as a recognized and legitimate language. However, by the end of the war Mexico lost about half of its territory, while the United States increased its territory by a third.⁶ The United States acquired more land in 1853 with the Gadsden Purchase, when Mexico sold over forty-five thousand square miles of territory in what is now Arizona and New Mexico to gain an infusion of cash to rebuild its war-ravaged economy. The United States purchased the land so it could build railroads to California (Archer 2003; Estrada et al. 1981: 103–131; Hamnett 1986).

Treaties notwithstanding, violations of the civil and property rights of Latinos were widespread. In Texas, the transfer of land (by fraud, intimidation, violence, and force) from Mexicans to Anglos began with the Revolt and accelerated after the war ended. Though Mexicans could defend their property rights in court, the financial costs were staggering, hence, it was not economically feasible for them to defend their land ownership rights through the legal system. Those who went to court ended up selling their land to pay their legal bills. As they took over land, Anglos adopted Mexican mining, ranching, and

agricultural techniques. Consequently, whites in Texas expanded the cattle and sheep ranches as well as the cotton plantations, while Mexicans were relegated to the low-wage labor pool. Essentially, this resulted in a transfer of power that resulted in the ascendancy of white power brokers and the downward mobility of Mexicans (Estrada et al. 1981: 103–131).

Mexicans were dispossessed of land more slowly in New Mexico than in Texas. Native Americans and Mexicans organized to defend the territory from the few whites who ventured in. New Mexico had communal villages with communal grazing and water rights in the more densely populated north, and privately owned haciendas in the south. It took a military occupation of the area to open up the territory to white cattlemen and farmers, and it was only in the late 1800s, when the railroads were built, that many whites moved into the territory. The land transfers accelerated then. Arizona (originally a part of New Mexico) was also very sparsely populated by Indians who successfully resisted Christianization. The army fought the tribes in the 1880s, and this helped Anglos gain control of the land. Meanwhile, Latinos became low-wage laborers and were forced to live in segregated mining and railroad towns (Estrada et al. 1981: 103–131).

From the eighteenth to the early nineteenth century, Spain sent colonizers of the Franciscan Order to California to build missions on large tracts of land, convert Native Americans to Catholicism, and teach the indigenous people agriculture. Mexican artisans were brought to the missions in the 1790s to facilitate the aims of the missions. Regardless, the missions were not self-sufficient, and by the 1830s the system collapsed and the Franciscans left California (J. E. Bennett 1897a: 9–24; 1897b: 150–161; Estrada et al. 1981: 103–131; Vallejo 1890).

Between 7,500 and 13,000 Mexicans lived in California in 1848, and some were power elites, but within fifty years they were a powerless minority. After the Texas Revolt, large numbers of whites started flooding into California. This migration accelerated during the gold rush. Thousands of Chinese and some Chileans also joined the influx of new settlers. Whites took control of the goldfields and declared that all nonwhites were foreigners who could not own land or become citizens. Taxes were imposed on foreign miners, and even though they were citizens Latino miners were taxed. Taxes were also levied against the vast landholdings of Latinos and they were forced to show titles to prove their land claims. Prior to this, Latinos were taxed on the basis of the amount they produced, not on the acreage of the land. Litigation costs were high and lawyers usually charged a contingency fee of one quarter of the land in question. By the time the lawsuits were settled, most Latinos were left landless.

More land was lost when white squatters organized associations that succeeded in keeping land taken from Latinos illegally (Estrada et al. 1981: 103–131; Jibou 1988a: 23–25).

ASIANS: RESTRICTING OWNERSHIP, USE, AND OCCUPANCY OF LAND

Cities began experimenting with zoning as a mechanism for constraining the land uses of racial and ethnic minorities in the 1880s. The Chinese were the target of early discriminatory land-use ordinances. They were also the target of the earliest racially restrictive zoning ordinances. In the late nineteenth century, California cities such as San Francisco and Modesto began to ban the construction of laundries in “Caucasian” neighborhoods or the operation of laundries in wooden buildings. In San Francisco, 310 of the 320 laundries were constructed of wood; 240 of the laundries were owned by Chinese. More than 150 of the Chinese-owned laundry owners were prosecuted under the ordinance, while non-Chinese owners were spared prosecution. Though the statute appeared to be race-neutral on the surface, the enforcement of it had a discriminatory effect on the Chinese (Weinberg 1999; *Yick Wo v. Hopkins* 1886).

Further restrictions were afoot. In 1890, Chinese residents of San Francisco were arrested for violating Order No. 2190, the so-called Bingham Ordinance, which specified where the city’s more than twenty thousand Chinese residents could reside and conduct business. The ordinance, which went into effect on February 17 of that year, stated, “It is hereby declared to be unlawful for any Chinese to locate, reside, or carry on a business within the limits of the city and county of San Francisco, except in that district of said city and county hereinafter prescribed for their location.” The ordinance also stipulated the length of time (sixty days) that Chinese residents had to comply with the new ordinance. Any Chinese who did not comply was found guilty of a misdemeanor and jailed for up to six months (*Federal Reporter* 1890; *In re Lee Sing* 1890).

The ordinance passed even though the 1868 Burlingame Treaty between the United States and China stipulates that “Chinese subjects, visiting or residing in the United States, shall enjoy the same privileges, immunities and exemptions in respect to travel or residence, as there may be enjoyed by the citizens or subjects of the most favored nation” (Burlingame Treaty 1868). In deciding the Lee Sing case, circuit court judge J. Sawyer argued that “the gross inequality of the operation of this ordinance upon Chinese, as compared with others, in violation of the constitutional, treaty, and statutory provisions cited, are so manifest upon its face, that I am unable to comprehend how this

discrimination . . . can fail to be apparent to the mind of every intelligent person" (*Federal Reporter* 1890; *In re Lee Sing* 1890).

The earliest racially restrictive covenants (limitations in the deed of a property specifying what an owner can or cannot do with it) were also directed against Chinese residents living in California. As with racially restrictive zoning, the conflicts that arose from the use of racially restrictive covenants were often decided in the courts. One early case, *Gandolfo v. Hartman*, was decided in 1892. It involved the violation of a covenant that was signed in 1886 regarding a lot on East Main Street in San Buena Ventura, California. The covenant specified that the parties and their heirs and assigns could not rent any buildings or grounds "to a Chinaman or Chinamen" without the parties' consent to the agreement. The defendant in this case, Hartman, purchased the property from one of the original signers of the covenant and then leased the property to two Chinese men, Fong Yet and Sam Choy. A lawsuit was brought against Hartman for violating the terms of the covenant. Judge Ross decided that the covenant violated the Fourteenth Amendment as well as the 1880 treaty with China that offered Chinese residents in America the protections afforded those from a "most favored nation" (*Gandolfo v. Hartman* 1892; Groves 1950–51; Ming 1949). Later courts ignored this ruling.

Punjabi immigrants were also targeted by racially restrictive covenants in the early part of the twentieth century. An influx of Punjabi farmers into California's Imperial Valley resulted in the passage of an ordinance barring the sale of land to "Hindoos." The Punjabi farmers—who were mostly male—circumvented the restrictions by marrying Mexican women living in the area, as these women were not prohibited by law from taking possession of land. More than five hundred such marriages are recorded (Leonard 1994; Majumdar 2006–7).

Private racially restrictive covenants were also widely used in Seattle. Many still appear in the deeds to homes. The first of these covenants was penned in 1924 by the Goodwin Company; it covered three tracts of land in the Victory Heights neighborhood in North Seattle (Silva 2009). From the 1920s through the 1940s neighborhoods in North Seattle, West Seattle, South Seattle, and the suburbs across Lake Washington had deed restrictions on the homes that barred Ethiopians, Africans, and other blacks; Mongolians, Chinese, Japanese, Malays, and other Asians; and Jews from acquiring or residing in homes in these areas. The restrictive covenants also targeted Native Americans, Pacific Islanders, and those of Mexican ancestry. In addition to the Goodwin Company, neighborhoods covered by racially restrictive covenants were developed by the

South Seattle Land Company, Seattle Trust Company, Puget Mill Company, Crawford & Canover Real Estate Partnership, and the Boeing Aircraft Company (Chin 1992; Majumdar 2006–7; Pettus 1948; Silva 2009).

Colonialism

Colonialism is an important force that influences the relationship between settlers, indigenous, and other marginalized peoples. Robert Blauner (1969) defines colonialism as the process by which one country controls the political activities and economic resources of another less developed and less powerful country. He writes that the colonization complex has four main components: (1) forced entry of one country into the territory of another country, (2) alteration and destruction of the indigenous cultures and patterns of social organization of the invaded country, (3) domination of indigenous peoples by members of the invading country, and (4) development of elaborate justifications for the invasion and subsequent behavior of the invaders. Veracini (2010, 2011) argues that this form of exogenous domination is characterized by two elements—displacement of people and unequal relations between the colonizer and those predating them. The unequal relations arise because the colonizers are able to dominate the occupied territories.

European settlement of America occurred through colonial expansion. For example, even before Winthrop migrated to the United States, he envisioned economic and political ascendancy and articulated a logic for taking Indian lands and transferring them to European colonizers (Winthrop [1629] 1846: 272–276). Other settlers plotted their strategies and achieved these goals through warfare, genocide, and other forms of conquest (Fenelon and Trafzer 2014).

INTERNAL COLONIALISM

The term *internal colonialism* is used to describe the conditions and experiences of people of color in the United States. The term is also used to refer to territorial relations within a political entity. Scholars argue that the same dynamics that operate in the external colonial context operate with internal colonialism. In addition to overseas colonial expansion, countries seek to bring their hinterlands or peripheral regions under the control of the central government. Such moves toward internal colonization result in tensions or conflict between the country's core or center and its periphery. The core develops exploitive relations with the periphery, using the hinterland's natural resources and cheap labor to enhance or sustain the development or expansion of the core. If the periphery

has indigenous or culturally distinct peoples, the core often discriminates against them. The core monopolizes trade and commerce, thus forcing the peripheral region to develop as a complementary economy of the core. The economy of the internal colony typically relies on one or a few exports. The movement of laborers in the periphery is determined by forces outside of the region. Economic dependence of the internal colony is reinforced by legal, political, and military measures. The periphery is often characterized by lower levels of service and lower standards of living than the core (Blauner 1969, 1972, 1982; Hechter 1994; Horvath 1972; Taylor 2014).

The frame of internal colonialism is also applicable to Native American reservations because these entities arose out of military conquest and subsequent military domination. The reservations are entities that are geographically defined, and their location was chosen by the federal government. Indigenous populations were placed in these designated territories. The reservation system was one of the tools of military conquest that settlers used to get the upper hand over native tribes. The designation of fixed territories for indigenous peoples by invading groups is a common feature of the colonial model. There is a long history of military operations occurring adjacent to reservations. In fact, the U.S. War Department was created in 1789, in part to handle Indian affairs. Even after the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) was created in 1824, Indian matters remained under the aegis of the War Department. The BIA was transferred to the newly created Department of the Interior in 1849 (Bureau of Indian Affairs 2012).

SOVEREIGNTY

The question of sovereignty is also tied to colonial relations. Native American tribes are sovereign nations: they are autonomous and have a legal right to govern and to determine how their lands are used. However, the notion of sovereignty is nebulous when it comes to the appropriation of Indian land for conversion to parks and forests, the extraction of valuable resources, and operation of hazardous facilities. As later discussions show, tribal wishes are usually ignored when decisions are made about designating federal and state parks, forests, wildlife refuges, and so on. While sovereignty allows the tribes greater decision-making power, it also leaves room for manipulation by government appointees and corporate interests.

SETTLER COLONIALISM

Some scholars distinguish between colonialism as described above and settler colonialism. In the American context colonialism was characterized by warfare, appropriation of territory, slavery, the removal and relocation of subjugated

peoples, the reservation system, coercive assimilation, and the denial of education. Scholars argue that settler colonialism differs from this form of colonialism in that settler colonialism persists long after obvious forms of colonialism and their structures are dismantled (Veracini 2010, 2011; P. Wolfe 1999). For instance, slavery has been abolished in America for more than a century, yet elements of the logic on which it was built (the belief that whites were superior to blacks, for example, and the fact that whites receive privileges based on race) still persist in society today. Similarly, Native Americans are no longer forced to live on reservations, but the reservation system and all the inequities that go with it are still intact.

Scholars contend that inherent in American settler colonialism is the desire to replicate Anglo-American societies in the wilderness, conquer and corral indigenous peoples, stimulate swift economic growth through mineral extraction and processing, and create political apparatuses based on racial exclusion (Ngai 2015: 1085). The study of such settler colonialism investigates the entrenched and impervious structures and systems that perpetuate inequities arising from the colonizer-colonized relationship. It also examines how rhetoric is used to erase and diffuse claims of inequities between settlers and subjugated peoples. For example, the use of concepts and terminology such as *frontier* and *pioneer* not only erases the presence of indigenous peoples but also establishes the settler as the “first” people to see, do, or experience whatever is being described on “empty” land. It grants settlers ownership and control of land and other resources and gives primacy to their claims. The settler discourse also transforms places like Indian reservations from sites of forced relocations to sovereign homelands. This complicates the claims of the colonized and gives the colonizer opportunities to suggest that equity has been achieved and past harms redressed (Fenelon and Trafzer 2014; L. Russell 2001; Veracini 2010, 2011, 2013; P. Wolfe 1999). Hence, Veracini (2011) argues that while colonialism has an end point, settler colonialism is characterized by its permanence.

Nativism

The rise of nativism, a belief system that influences race and ethnic relations, in the nineteenth century coincided with and influenced the emergence of pro-environmental thought and actions. The term *nativism* refers to organized efforts by some members of a society to improve their quality of life or hold on to remnants of the past by attempting to exclude or eliminate particular groups of people or ideas, beliefs, customs, and objects from a society. It also describes

attempts by elites to limit immigration to select racial groups, as nativists revile racial mixing. Nativist movements flourished in the United States during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, particularly during economic depressions. Nativism was strongly associated with promoting Anglo-Saxon heritage and securing greater privileges for whites. Nativism can arise from economic, cultural, or status conflicts sparked by increased immigration or the competition for jobs, commercial opportunities, housing, outdoor space, and so on. It can also be triggered by one social group's discomfort with the lifestyles of others. In addition, nativism can arise if one group perceives that it has lost status or power vis-à-vis another group. For instance, nativism was rampant in cities like New York in the 1840s. Consequently, as the competition for customers intensified during the 1842 depression, native-born merchants were angered by immigrant peddlers selling wares on the sidewalks of Lower Manhattan and in the streets in front of their stores. Immigrants were seen as invading what was once the exclusive space of the native-born merchants. Those merchants expressed their frustrations by stereotyping the Irish, organizing efforts to exclude immigrant peddlers from upscale commercial districts, and working to restrict immigration (Bradley 2005: 388–389; Spann 1981: 40–41). Likewise, the declaration that Mexicans and other nonwhites were foreigners subject to taxation and devoid of any rights to own land was part of the nativist ideology that grew commonplace in the United States.

Gender Relations

During the time when attitudes were shifting and environmental consciousness was inchoate, social norms prescribed different and rigid roles to men and women. These gender roles influenced the way each interacted with the environment. Many of these influences are explored in the book through the lens of true manhood and true womanhood. These concepts are defined in this chapter and elucidated further below, particularly in chapters 4 and 7.

THE CULT OF TRUE MANHOOD

Gender roles were very structured in nineteenth-century America. Scholars who study the cult of true manhood identify several characteristics of that cult that is evident among the activists discussed in this book. According to this thesis, male honor is rooted in the performance of dangerous tasks, risk taking, daring, and the harsh socialization of men. Men also tended to pursue their

own self-interest. While the cult of true womanhood or the cult of domesticity associated middle- and upper-class women with the home and domestic sphere, the cult of manhood associated men of similar social classes with the public sphere of economic competition, military conquest, and politics (Gilmore 1991; Merchant 2010: 4; Mosher 1994: 601–605; Winter 2003: 120–122). This is manifested in the stories (recounted below) of male outdoor enthusiasts who routinely left their fiancés, pregnant wives (at a time when there was a high risk of women dying during childbirth), young children, and ailing parents for lengthy periods of time while they went on expeditions. Manhood was also rooted in land ownership. This had gender and racial implications: white males controlled land. They dispossessed indigenous peoples of land and developed policies that made it illegal for slaves and ethnic minority immigrants to own land. In some cases males made major financial decisions—such as purchasing property—without consulting their wives. Men also felt they had to be physically fit; prove their toughness, courage, virility, and dominance over women; and attempt to recover their primitive masculinity.

THE CULT OF TRUE WOMANHOOD

During the first half of the nineteenth century, the epitome of the American woman was defined through the social construct of “true woman.” The definition of “true womanhood” arose from the interrelationship between religiosity and civic responsibilities, which had four main tenets: piety, purity, submissiveness, and domesticity. Because women were thought to be endowed with the virtues of piety and purity, they were perceived as the guardians of morality. In addition, true women were expected to be versed in domestic affairs, as they were charged with caring for and creating a warm and nurturing environment for the family. The true woman was also expected to submit to the will of her husband, family, and the demands of society (Crouse 2005: 259–279; Merchant 1984: 57–85, 2010: 5–6; Rabinovitch 2001: 354–355; Welter 1966: 151). However, true women managed their households rather than doing the actual tasks that made it function. They did not work outside the home, and inside they had slaves or servants to do the housework for them. They were also heavily involved in charitable work.

This definition of womanhood arose at a time of increasing social inequality, breakdown of social order, and fragmentation of the family. In their attempts to restore social order, elites created rules and norms that set upper- and middle-class men and women apart from the masses. True womanhood was one such idea. Barbara Welter believes true womanhood was such a potent

construct that "anyone, male or female [who] dared to tamper with the complex virtue which made up true womanhood was damned immediately as an enemy of God, of civilization, and of the Republic" (Welter 1966: 152).

The Evolution of Environmental Ideology

Environmental consciousness arose during the time of slavery, Native American wars, and the conquest of Mexico. The ideas and actions of early environmental activists were shaped by these events and other social conditions. Later discussions in the book will illustrate their relation to environmental thought and advocacy, which had six influential tenets: Transcendentalism, romanticism, frontierism, conservation, preservation, and business environmentalism.

TRANSCENDENTALISM

One of the earliest manifestations of collective environmental consciousness is found in the rise of Transcendental thought in New England in the 1830s. Transcendentalists believed there was a spiritual relationship between humans, nature, and God. The earliest American Transcendentalists were generally the children of Puritans and liberal Unitarian ministers. Transcendentalists believed in the existence of a reality or truths beyond the physical. In other words, they believed there was a body of knowledge innate within humans that transcended what the senses could convey. They believed that divinity was inherent in the human soul, that a person's perceptions and intuition provided knowledge of the Divine, and that this knowledge was the basis of truth and moral judgment. Transcendentalists argued that there is a parallel between the higher realm of spiritual truths and the lower one of material objects; for them, natural objects are important because they reflect universal spiritual truths. People's place in the universe was divided between object and essence. Their physical existence rooted them in the material portion of their being, while their soul gave them the ability to transcend their physical conditions. Hence they were aware of a God that was both immanent and transcendent. For Transcendentalists, the wilderness was the place where spiritual truths were most pronounced (Bode [1947] 1982: 16–18; Walter Harding 1992: 62–63; Le Beau 2005: 806–808; Nash 1982: 84–86). Transcendentalists placed a premium on individual autonomy and freedom. They also believed the best route to social reform was through individual or personal reform (Richardson [1986] 1996: 74–75, 100–101).

The idea of transcendence comes from the work of the German philosopher Immanuel Kant. While John Locke believed that all knowledge and

understanding is gained through sensory experiences, Kant argued that certain concepts, such as time and space, are "transcendental"—that is, they are innate categories of the mind and are known intuitively. Transcendentalists were also influenced by the writings of English thinkers Samuel Taylor Coleridge and Thomas Carlyle, Swedish mystic Emanuel Swedenborg, and French philosopher Victor Cousin. Transcendentalists were influenced by Hindu writing too. Some of the most prominent members of the movement were Ralph Waldo Emerson, Frederic Henry Hedge, Bronson Alcott, George Ripley, Henry David Thoreau, and Margaret Fuller. This group formed the Transcendental Club in 1836; most of its members lived in and around Boston. They met periodically at Emerson's house during the 1840s. Other important Transcendentalists include the three Peabody sisters—Elizabeth, Sophia (who married Nathaniel Hawthorne,) and Mary (who married Horace Mann). The Transcendentalists published *The Dial* from 1840 to 1844. Margaret Fuller, a women's rights advocate, was *The Dial's* editor, Elizabeth Peabody its publisher (Emerson 1883: 161–188; Walter Harding 1992: 62–63; Le Beau 2005: 806–808; M. Marshall 2005; Nash 1982: 84–86; Paul 1952; Thoreau 1893).

ROMANTICISM

Romanticism connotes an enthusiasm for the strange, remote, solitary, and mysterious. Romantics, particularly those in the second half of the nineteenth century, showed a preference for wild, untamed places like the American wilderness, where they could express their freedom. They disdained tamed and manicured landscapes and wrote about the wildlands in positive terms. This made many want to see these landscapes and protect them. It should be noted that to the earliest generation of American romantics, such as Ralph Waldo Emerson, who wrote about this in the 1830s, "wild" meant the pastoral and picturesque settings of large urban parks or rural towns. Early American romantics were influenced by Jean-Jacques Rousseau, who believed that the lives of the urban poor would be improved if they could experience pastoral beauty and rural charms. They were also influenced by William Wordsworth. However, by the 1860s romanticism was associated with wilder, more remote areas (Lovejoy 1955; Nash 1982: 47).

The Sublime. Romantic landscapes were also considered sublime. The sublime, a ubiquitous cultural construct, is one of the most significant expressions of romanticism. The sublime refers to the belief that in wild places the supernatural was near at hand. One was most likely to realize one's spirituality and commune with the Divine in the wilds, especially in those vast, powerful landscapes that

evoke a person's insignificance and mortality. Sublime landscapes triggered strong emotions—fear, excitement, awe, and a sense of wonder. Sublime landscapes were described as sacred; one worshipped them but did not linger in their presence. In the works of the romantics wild places were transformed from satanic abodes to sacred temples (Cronon 1995: 72–75; Lovejoy 1955; Muir [1911a] 1972; Nash 1982: 45–51; Thoreau 1982; Wordsworth 1936: 536).

Primitivism. Primitivism, related to both romanticism and frontierism, advocated that the best cure for the ills of the modern, industrial world was a return to simple, basic living. In nineteenth-century America, Thoreau and Muir were ardent proponents of this view (Rousseau [1761] 1880, [1762] 1974; Thoreau 1893).

FRONTIERISM

Frontierism is both rooted in American thought and influenced by European thinking. Instead of endowing the frontier with sacred qualities, Turner maintained that European immigrants, in moving to the wilds, shed the trappings of civilization; rediscovered their independence, vigor, and primitive drives; reinvented democratic institutions; and displayed a creativity that was the source of democracy and national character. Roosevelt argued, in a similar vein, that the immigrants endowed the frontier with liberating and invigorating qualities. He claimed that if he hadn't been a frontier rancher in the West, he wouldn't have ascended to the presidency (Ambrose 1996: xxvii; Roosevelt [1885] 1996, [1888] 2000, [1893] 1996; Turner [1893] 1953: 22–27).

The 1890 U.S. census signaled the end of the frontier era. The census showed a population distribution that spread from coast to coast. It enumerated 325,464 Native Americans, 7,470,040 blacks, 107,475 people of Chinese descent, 2,039 Japanese, and 54,983,890 whites (Department of the Interior 1895: 396–400; Gibson and Lennon 1999: 4). The census, framed in the discourses of settler colonialism, Manifest Destiny, and westward expansion, triumphantly declared that the United States had witnessed a “century of progress and achievement unequalled in the world's history.” Where there was only a group of “feeble settlements” in 1790, a “great and powerful nation” stood a century later. Here Native American communities are seen as fleeting and vanishing, while strength and permanence is bestowed on Euro-American settlements. According to the census, as settlements spread across the continent and the population increased, land was “redeemed from the wilderness and brought into the service of man” (Department of the Interior 1895: xxvii).

CONSERVATION AND PRESERVATION

It should be noted that though the terms *conservation* and *preservation* are used interchangeably today, at the beginning of the twentieth century the words had different meanings. Conservation implied a utilitarian view of natural resources: that is, they should be developed and used for the current generation. Preservation implied saving resources for their own sake or their intrinsic value. The needs of future generations played a major role in the decision to preserve resources (Nash 1982: 129–139, 222–224).

The term *conservation* was first used to describe reservoirs built to retain floodwaters that were used in dry seasons. In this context, conservation implied planning and efficiency. The term was later expanded to mean the planning and management of rangeland and water supplies in forested areas. In 1907, Gifford Pinchot and Overton Price popularized the term, which they used to mean the wise use of resources. Pinchot thought *protection* and *preservation*, by contrast, meant that resources would be withdrawn from use in perpetuity (Fox 1981: 128–130; Hays [1959] 1999: 5–6, 135; Trefethen 1975: 126–127). According to Pinchot, “the first principle of conservation is development . . . the use of natural resources now existing on this continent for the benefit of the people who live here now” (cf. Turner 1985: 303).

BUSINESS ENVIRONMENTALISM

This book describes a form of environmentalism that I label *business environmentalism*. I argue that business environmentalism is an amalgam of utilitarianism, preservationism, conservationism, and capitalist interests. This form of environmental activism arose during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. It manifested itself through the tight coupling of business and environmental interests: that is, business executives and corporations played significant roles in environmental affairs.⁷ Business environmentalism was seen as a win-win situation for conservationists, preservationists, and corporations. Environmentalists were able to protect the environment, while corporations could generate profits from pro-environmental activities. Astute corporate executives realized that the sale of arms, ammunition, gear, and other equipment to the burgeoning ranks of outdoor recreationers was profitable. They also recognized that environmental protections were necessary to ensure that the public continued to participate in outdoor activities. Outdoor recreationers were also in need of transportation to their destinations, and railroad magnates were only too happy to support efforts to preserve scenic wonders so that they could build the rail lines to facilitate access to the

wonderlands, along with lodging and food services. Likewise, hoteliers and restaurateurs had a stake in environmental affairs, as they, too, competed to house and feed travelers.

Power Elites

Understanding, using, and protecting the environment was envisioned as a delicate balancing act that was vital to nation-building efforts and long-term sustainability. Power and privilege are critical elements of such efforts. Hence, power brokers orchestrated the emergence of the conservation movement and guided it to prominence. These advocates are referred to as the *power elite*. I explore this concept throughout the book as I examine the significant roles that wealth, power, and privilege played in the early conservation movement.

This discussion is also informed by power-elite theory. It contends that environmental discourses and policies were conceptualized and orchestrated by elites in accordance to upper- and middle-class values and interests. In the context of this discussion, elites can be viewed as the people who run things—that is, the key actors or inner circle of participants who play structured, functionally understandable roles in the formation and execution of environmental policies. Elites are those who obtain most of what there is to get in the institutionalized sector of the society; by exercising institutional power, they enhance and consolidate their own power. Hence, at every stage of any decision-making process, elites will inevitably accumulate disproportionate amounts of valued attributes such as money, esteem, power, or resources that people desire and try to attain. Power-elite theory helps us to identify six types of power elites who helped to shape the events discussed in this book: ideological, innovative, planning, implementing, economic, and political. The theory also helps us to understand the role environmental advocates assume as guardians of the nation's natural resources (Czudnowski 1983; Giddens 1994: 170–174; Mills 1994: 161–169; Prewitt and Stone 1973: 84–85; Schneider-Hector 2014: 645; Taylor 2009: 581).

Environmental Governance

Environmental activists and their supporters were frequently faced with the challenge of responding to political leaders and governance structures that lacked efficacy and legitimacy (Habermas 1975; Ingram 1987: 155–160; Pusey

1993: 92–110). Hence, activists and government entities developed policies and laws to govern resources as environmental awareness spread. These policies generated questions about environmental governance that had significant implications for the integrity of the nation-state. Consequently, environmental conflicts erupted over the question of public versus private ownership of resources such as land, water, wildlife, fisheries, timber, and minerals. There were questions about what constituted a violation of policies, what the appropriate punishment would be, and who had the right to enforce the policies and administer the punishments. Questions also arose about the government's role in the ownership and administration of said resources. Some asked whether the government had a responsibility to provide public goods and services (such as parks, clean water, etc.) for its citizens. The issues of privatization and the protection of national treasures also generated debates: If resources are publicly owned, can and should they be privatized, by whom, and under what conditions? How should these resources be treated, and what exactly did protection mean?

The activities described in this book were as much about winning environmental campaigns as they were about establishing fundamental principles of governance. They were about establishing principles regarding the way people understood and related to the environment. They were also aimed at instilling the idea that the populace had a civic and moral duty to protect the environment. The environmental campaigns also established the concepts of stewardship and sustainability and the notion that future generations ought to be considered in environmental decision making. Probably the most important result was that this activism demonstrated that individual actions were tied to larger environmental actions and outcomes that people should be conscious of.

Though some of these issues still arise in contemporary environmental conflicts, the nature and the implications of the questions are different, because until the early twentieth century there was little or no precedent to draw on when the questions arose. Thus the decisions reached at that point laid the groundwork for what followed. So in the nineteenth century, activists drafted bills and lobbied government bodies to pass legislation to establish hunting seasons, protect migratory species, and conserve forests. However, as soon as laws were put in place, opponents challenged them in court by questioning whether the government owned the resources in the first place or had the right to regulate them. Today citizens generally accept the notion that government entities have the authority to set and regulate hunting and fishing seasons. So though there might be challenges to specific aspects of natural resource policies and regulations, the fundamental questions of whether governments have any right to administer

and regulate such resources are not being challenged. In fact, we now see government entities being sued for failing to protect the environment.

Likewise with questions regarding setting aside national forests, parks, and monuments, and so on: while there might still be conflicts over the size and the nature of what's being set aside, the national parks and forests are generally accepted as legitimate. Questions of whether such entities should exist are not being debated or challenged extensively. It is also generally accepted that these entities will be public.

Creating an Environmental Identity

This chapter concludes with a brief discussion of identity formation in the context of pro-environmental advocacy. Activists such as those in the conservation movement articulate their grievances and create identities that attract supporters and facilitate movement building. People are more likely to become active in issues they identify with and are passionate about. Such individuals are likely to join with others of like mind in collective endeavors (Stryker 1968: 558–564, 1981: 23–24). The upper- and middle-class mobilization around the environment occurred because people who spent time in the outdoors found such issues salient. Activists did not expend energy on mass appeals; instead they focused on recruiting individuals who had an attitudinal affinity for the issues addressed by the organizations and campaigns and who were motivated to act on their concerns (Brubaker 2009; Klandermans and Oegema 1987: 519–531; Yamamoto 2015). To sway potential converts, activists employed rhetorical idioms of loss of nature and calamity, and their rhetorical motifs conjured up images of mass slaughters of animals, the frivolous use of dead birds, or the logging of giant ancient trees (Best 1987: 101–121). These claims were effective in appealing to naturalists, wildlife advocates, outdoor recreationers, and country-life enthusiasts. Appeals for support and movement participation were also framed in terms of rectitude. That is, not only were salient identities engaged, but potential supporters were also told that they had a moral obligation to help and that it was their civic duty to do something about the perceived social problems. In addition, they were told how to fix the problem. For instance, in creating the identity of true sportsmen, activists evoked salient and prized roles—that of the naturalist and steward of the earth—and made them essential dimensions of being a sportsman. Sportsmen not willing to embrace these new identities had no credibility with their peers and were ostracized as game hogs, dandies, and depredators.

Thus collective identities are not fashioned from scratch. They are formed by appropriating and co-opting existing roles and expanding and crafting them to suit the needs of the new collective identity (Eder 2009; Friedman and McAdam 1992: 156–173; Thomas, McGarty, and Mavor 2009). As conservationism and preservationism spread, it became evident that it was no longer all right to wear hats festooned with birds or go hunting, birding, mountaineering, fishing, trapshooting, and so on without having a concomitant concern about the indiscriminate slaughter of wildlife, diminishing wildlife stocks, environmental degradation, and deforestation. Both the cultural nationalist and frontierist identities were also incorporated. Cultural nationalists and frontierists were expected to act to either create landscapes or protect existing ones to be cherished. In any case, concern was most appropriately expressed through participation in environmental activities. In essence, the identities associated with the aforementioned recreational pursuits, lifestyles, and sentiments were appropriated and expanded both to recruit a pool of people who were very interested in the issues and to motivate them to act on their interests. Moreover, a collective identity is a public declaration of status. Individuals adopting a collective identity value that identity. By embracing it, adherents are also committing themselves to the principles, values, behaviors, and attitudes the group promotes. Consequently, the individual identities of nature lovers, outdoor recreationists, cultural nationalists, and country-life enthusiasts were redefined to include an activist agenda built around a variety of environmental issues.