From Affinity to Conflict? Introducing ‘Green-Black’ Relations Today

In 2014, David Ritter, former native title lawyer and current Chief Executive Officer of Greenpeace Australia Pacific, provided his assessment of the state of ‘green-black’ relations in contemporary Australia. Ritter began by establishing the fact that news media stories increasingly report the relationship as fractious and proceeded to argue against the assumption that there exists ‘an essential and irreconcilable conflict between the values underpinning Indigenous land rights and aspirations on the one hand and environmental imperatives on the other’.1 The emphasis is ours – we are struck by ‘conflict’ assuming centre stage as the popular assumption characterising this time period, to the point that Ritter was compelled to counter it.

In previous decades, critical assessments of ‘green-black’ (or environmentalist-Indigenous) relationships cautioned against the assumption that there existed an essential affinity between Indigenous interests in and relations to land and water, on the one hand, and environmental objectives, on the other.2 Over recent decades, in Australia, an inversion of the underlying assumption about the status of relations between Indigenous people and environmentalist groups seems to have taken place. In the past five years especially, such relations have been subjected to
renewed public attention, driven, in part, by strident criticisms of environmentalist groups advanced by both Indigenous and non-Indigenous public figures. Prime ministers, politicians, journalists, academics, community leaders and others have variously accused ‘greenies’ of being an obstructive or stifling influence on resource extraction and, thereby, the improvement of Indigenous lives.3

The message has been consistent. As Warren Mundine, chair of the Abbott-Turnbull government’s Indigenous Advisory Council, wrote in 2014: ‘The only way for Indigenous people to rise out of poverty is through commercial and economic development’.4 When environmentalist groups’ objections to commercial industrial activity on Indigenous people’s country are sustained, this prospect is imperilled. And yet, productive and new alliances continued to be forged in this same time period. In this volume, for example, Stephen Muecke characterises the relationship between those Goolarabooloo people who sought to protect Walmadany (James Price Point) in Western Australia from a major liquid-gas processing plant and port, and their green supporters, as the most ‘successful, Indigenous-green alliance in Australia’s history’.5 This campaign culminated in proponents Woodside Petroleum abandoning the project in 2013. Elsewhere, Heidi Norman highlights that Gomeroi people in north-western New South Wales are in the process of forging new relationships with both green groups and local farmers in the midst of a massive expansion of coal mining and coal seam gas exploration in Gomeroi country.6 How do we make sense of these simultaneous changes?

Ritter notes, and we agree, that the current moment does not in fact mark a rupture from a past history of mutually reconciled interests. In Ritter’s terms, ‘relations between environmentalists and Indigenous people have always been complicated and taken multiple forms’.7 In this volume, we prefer to suggest that they
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have long been ‘unstable’. Further, Indigenous-environmentalist relations are not only unstable but also they take ever more diverse forms under the influence of two conditions. First, the definitions and meanings of ‘environmentalism’ or ‘greenness’ have diffused. Second, and more importantly, Indigenous interests in land are increasingly shaped by coercive and complex legal mechanisms, such as the Native Title Act 1993 (Cth) (NTA), which serves to facilitate ongoing resource extraction from Indigenous lands through the agreement-making processes it mandates.

Focusing in
This volume takes the present, persistently unstable situation as a stimulant to further inquiry. We seek, first, to learn more about the current status of environmentalist-Indigenous relations through the use of specific, empirically grounded case studies. As is to be expected, the authors of these case studies arrive at different conclusions; the anthropologists, geographers, historians and writers collected in this work do not hold a uniform perspective on this topic. While some search for a way forward for this unstable alliance, others develop the implications of Professor Marcia Langton’s trenchant critique of environmentalists’ involvement in Indigenous communities, delivered in the nationally broadcast Boyer Lectures in 2012. All submit the interrelationships between the environment movement, environmental organisations, ‘greenies’, Indigenous people – as well as images of, ideas about and investments in indigeneity – to rigorous analysis.

Second, we note that as recent critiques of ‘greenies’ gained ground, the social worlds and workings of environmentalists have been only crudely characterised before being lampooned. In seeking to shed light on the relationship, we deemed it a priority to subject actual environmentalists to analytic scrutiny
and rich description. Robert Levitus takes up this task in honing in on Dave Lindner’s approach to conservation. Lindner has long worked on the wetlands of the South Alligator River in Kakadu National Park: he is not a ‘greenie’ or environmentalist as such, but an individual who has dedicated himself to landscape restoration. Levitus carefully details Lindner’s sometimes politically unpopular conceptualisations of wilderness, land ‘management’, modernity and Aboriginal practices that inform Lindner’s undertakings and thinking.

Non-Indigenous citizen scientists are a major focus of Stephen Muecke’s account of the dispute over Walmadany. Muecke’s interviewees explain the ways their survey work was directed by Goolarabooloo people who had long ‘paid attention’ to the movements and preferences of turtles, whales and bilbies. In Eve Vincent’s essay ‘environmental culturalists’ are the primary subject of an inquiry into the exchanges that unfold between them and a small group of Aboriginal greenies. While elsewhere Vincent has stressed the possibilities offered by this engagement, here the sticky problems of fostering relationships across racialised difference in a settler colonial setting are foregrounded. As Vincent writes, ‘non-Indigenous desires for contact with Aboriginal people, reification of cultural otherness, and postcolonial guilt combine to shape, constrain and sometimes wreck these relations’.

Third, the authors here are not content to simply represent Indigenous and environmental groups as separate and pre-formed entities, although hard distinctions are unavoidable at times. What emerges across the volume is that all the scenarios the authors describe are not just understood as shared worlds, structured by historic and ongoing inequities, and characterised by complex entanglements and the co-constitution of Indigenous and non-Indigenous identities. A major objective of this volume is
to begin to account, analytically, for Indigenous ‘greenies’, be they protestors, rangers, residents or others. And we are just as interested in the ways in which greenies might seek to become indigenised, often through involvement in an environmental issue or scene. Perhaps the language of ‘alliances’ and ‘allies’ limits our understanding of the ways in which social groups such as ‘greenies’ or ‘Aboriginal spokespeople’ – and even entities such as ‘a mine’ – come into being and are rendered coherent in relation to each other?¹⁰ Such language may be altogether too tidy and deceptively realist for the messiness of the world. Further, as our contributors bring to light, encounters between environmentalists and Indigenous people might prove profoundly transformative for all involved. The instability we reference in the book’s title then is not just a quality of the relationships between Indigenous people, environmentalists, and environmentalism, but also internal to each of these realms.

Finally, we add to these case studies a series of interviews with Indigenous and non-Indigenous ‘practitioners’, whom we have asked to reflect on their experience of working at the interface between environmentalist and Indigenous groups. Here we establish a dialogue between some of the ideas presented in the scholarly work and the insights of those whose analysis is derived primarily through involvement.

In the remainder of this brief essay, we first backtrack to summarise the history of environmentalist-Indigenous relations and recent legislative developments affecting them,¹¹ before highlighting three themes common to the contributions – proximity, governmentality and indigeneity.
A History of Unstable Meetings

In the 1970s, a new protest-based social movement gained prominence in Australia, as it did globally. Its broad focus was ‘protecting the environment or improving its condition’. The prominence of this movement grew to the point that, today, multinational corporations and political parties alike lay claim (however cynically) to the language of environmental awareness, ‘greenness’ and sustainability. A cursory survey of the history of environmentalist-Indigenous engagements over this same period helps illustrate the various sources of both affinity and conflict within specific meetings of these groups’ concerns. For example, revisiting the Franklin Dam controversy (1978–83) recalls the environment movement’s early history of circulating and reproducing problematic images of people-less landscapes: here the colonial overtures of ‘wilderness’ discourse are starkly in evidence. The dispute over the road in the Daintree Rainforest (1983–84) reveals the tendency of environmentalists to interpret pro-development Indigenous positions as a symptom of ‘cultural loss’. On the other hand at Noonkanbah in 1979, as at Coronation Hill (1984–91) and other places, Indigenous peoples’ notions of sacredness were articulated to make arguments for conservation against the large-scale designs of extractive industries. These notions came to be incorporated in various ways into the environmental movement’s understanding of the value of Australia’s undeveloped landscapes and its frequent support for campaigns and legislation protecting Indigenous heritage and sacred sites. While these cases point to the variability of the meeting of Indigenous people and environmentalism over time, these relations, as already stated, have become ever more unstable in recent years.

One established account proposes that environmentalists and mining companies have traded places. Marcia Langton and
others suggest that mining and other forms of resource extraction present a unique opportunity for sustaining remote and regional Indigenous communities. As environmentalists or the ‘green left’ cannot offer forms of development that compare to those allegedly offered by multimillion dollar mining operations, those who object to the mineral sectors’ proposals – including against new fossil fuel projects that accelerate global climate change – are taken to constitute a threat to Indigenous peoples’ present and future prosperity. Where environmentalist campaigns ostensibly align with the positions of local Indigenous people, the former are criticised as opportunistic agents sowing discord or exploiting ‘misfits’ to the latter’s ultimate detriment. There are several problems with this account.

One is the assumption of Indigenous passivity, whereby Indigenous people are represented as being freely manipulated by outsiders’ ideological agendas. Anyone can be manipulated, but it is untenable to assume members of a given ethnic group are necessarily being manipulated, especially when they say that they are not. Second, this argument assumes that the economic benefits associated with land use agreements are transformative of social conditions, which we do not deny are often dire. Third, this celebratory account redirects our attention away from broader systemic developments within the nation, in which neoliberal economic restructuring has produced a situation in which mining companies are depended upon to provide what are essentially state services. ‘Resource frontiers’, to use anthropologist Anna Tsing’s term, are spaces that engender ‘revitalization and renewal, as well as inequality, exploitation, and displacement’, whether located in regional and remote Australia or elsewhere.

The realignment between Indigenous and extractive interests has been produced in part by the NTA, the legislative response to
the High Court’s famous 1992 *Mabo* decision, and the resulting ‘native title market’. Like state-based land rights legislation, the federal NTA recognises the reality of Indigenous land title and places a statutory obligation on resource companies (and others) to enter into negotiations with Indigenous claimants or owners prior to development. The new era of agreement-making, Langton and others argue, promises to deliver real economic benefits to communities proximate to mine sites. We argue that policy analyst Ciaran O’Faircheallaigh’s point is crucial: it ‘is necessary to examine and assess the actual outcomes of agreements before reaching any conclusions about their role and significance’, particularly as close examination of high-profile agreements reveals a mixed picture.

Employment opportunities at mines are often unavailable to Indigenous people for reasons of health or education levels, while some find themselves precluded because they have a criminal record or substance abuse problem. Deeper problems are common to many agreements, which see minimal amelioration of Indigenous poverty through the payment of compensatory and/or consent monies, and often engender conflict and differentiation between Indigenous groups drawn into involvement in complex organisational landscapes. Furthermore, with Australia’s recent and richest mining boom now over, those Indigenous communities that have become integrated with mining economies are left exposed to their market volatility; wages, like agreement benefits, stop and start in relation to production. As such, the end of the boom is especially concerning in remote and regional areas where state service provision is minimal and where mining companies have come, often reluctantly, to assume a ‘state-like’ role. As in comparable settler colonial countries, such as Canada, politicians routinely describe remote Indigenous communities without major
projects as ‘unviable’ or ‘unsustainable’. In late 2014, for example, the Western Australian Barnett administration suggested it would defund or forcefully close up to 150 out of the state’s 274 remote communities precisely on these grounds. Asked to respond to this plan, then prime minister Tony Abbott insisted: ‘What [governments] can’t do is endlessly subsidise lifestyle choices’.20

Proximity
One of the abiding criticisms of environmentalists, in Australia as elsewhere, has been their apparent disconnection from the places they seek to ‘defend’. That is, they are seen to campaign in the name of sites that they do not reside in and whose inhabitants they do not personally know. This is both paternalistic and hypocritical, critics add: paternalistic in its presumption to speak for others’ places; and, hypocritical in that environmentalists are often urbanites seeking to preclude further industrialisation. Having singularly benefited from economies of resource exploitation, while externalising their costs, urban greenies now want to prevent its expansion. Underlying this criticism is the more general idea that we are most sympathetic with and understanding of those people we live with, or are proximate to. However, as the above suggests, the mining and environmentalist sectors have in fact each been in proximity to Indigenous lands and people for several decades.

Garawa elder Jacky Green’s paintings – such as *Lots of Money Moving around over Aboriginal Heads* (2012) and *One Eye on the Money* (2016) – visually illustrate this, connecting past and present proximities as part of a criticism of, in Green’s words, ‘the absurdity of what’s being offered to us’ by mining companies today (see Figure 1.1 and Figure 1.2). Green’s artworks speak to his concern about Glencore’s thirty-year-old McArthur River zinc mine, the
poor environmental record of which has attracted considerable attention of late. Green explains that the presence of mining and government interests in their midst does not guarantee that the financial benefits stay. In *Lots of Money*, ‘The road-train with the dollar signs represents the wealth being taken away from us, from our country’, The criticism of dislocation, then, does not help us to either account for or understand the nature of the manifold proximities that clearly exist. Over 60 per cent of Australia’s mines neighbour an Indigenous community, producing everyday interactions and structural entanglements that seem incompatible with the familiar image of mining as a definitively ‘whitefella’ project. Environmentalists, similarly, can no longer be thought of as a simple externality to Indigenous worlds. Where ‘greenies’ become conscious of their lived separation from Indigenous people, they might actively travel or work to bridge this difference.

*Figure 1.1: Lots of Money Moving around over Aboriginal Heads (Jacky Green, 2012).*
This is not to suggest proximities are intentional or beneficial. It is rather that their existence would be hard to believe, let alone conceptualise, given the ways in which environmentalists are typically discussed. While it is clear that environmentalist organisations of various kinds draw significant authority and resources from non-Indigenous populations, in cities and elsewhere, it is also clear that environmentalists of various kinds have been, and remain, intimately engaged with Indigenous people in urban,
remote and rural areas. To draw upon an example from this book, the campaign against the gas hub at Walmadany (James Price Point) in northern Western Australia over the past decade was based in long-term collaborations between Goolarabooloo people and white environmentalists. This joining together in common cause was shaped by years, if not decades, of association and allegiance, based around the Lurujarri Heritage Trail, just as it was shaped by a lack of relation between the environmentalists and Jabirr Jabirr people who, ostensibly, hoped for the hub to go ahead. Alternately, as Timothy Neale reminds us in his chapter, engagement can turn to enmity, as in the case of the recent *Wild Rivers Act* controversy in Cape York Peninsula, Queensland. During the controversy, environmentalist organisations and peak Indigenous bodies raged against one another in the nation’s news media, though these same groups had worked explicitly as a ‘green-black alliance’ to acquire land for conservation in the mid-1990s and continued to engage in negotiated outcomes together. Proximate relations do not equate to stable relations over time. In other situations, as Richard Martin and David Trigger’s chapter suggests, proximity can be highly ambivalent. Taking the example of the Australian Wildlife Conservancy’s Pungalina–Seven Emu sanctuary in Queensland’s Gulf Country, they detail the emergent relations between Garawa people and whitefellas in the context of a conservationist land and water use project. The groups’ proximity to one another, country, and their respective ‘intimacies with country’ both unite and differentiate them as they negotiate the governance and care of this remote space. Further, Martin and Trigger show that groups who have long lived in the same geographic place can sustain certain kinds of disengagement. Pastoralists who have been intimately acquainted with Garawa people for many generations profess ignorance of Garawa attachments to and knowledge of country.
As these examples suggest, proximities spawn complex interactions, exchanges or disengagements, whether between organisations or individuals. One way of accounting for these dimensions is to attend to the types of institutions involved and their structural positioning. For Indigenous groups, any interest in working with environmentalist organisations and drawing upon their resources likely depends upon their own limitations and affordances. The potential gains are undoubtedly different for Indigenous land councils, particular traditional owner groups, or community-based groups, for example, as each is able to draw upon different procedural rights in their encounters with developers and state and federal government agencies.

Another analysis of the various meetings of Indigenous and environmentalist groups would attend to the principles that explicitly underwrite their respective positions, pointing out overlaps and divergences in their commitments to conservation, environmental sustainability, sovereignty, and so on. But the necessary companion to any legal and philosophical account of interactions is, we suggest, ethnographic attention. Too frequently, the people caught up in the events and sites addressed in this book have been discussed as agents of institutional forces, cleansed of their personal and interpersonal details. Instead, authors in this book ask after the social textures of campaigns and negotiations. How are these events founded in, and foundational of, exchanges between people? Are indigeneity and environmentalism the primary coordinates within such spaces? How are these concepts ‘at large’ in these collaborative spaces? Such inquiries are all the more pressing as anthropogenic climate change, like global warming before it, continues to cut across established political lines as an issue of urgent public concern. Organisations such as Seed (http://www.seedmob.org.au) and anti-fracking and anti-coal groups...
(e.g. Protect Arnhem Land, Frack-Free NT Alliance) are a few examples of recent Indigenous mobilisations to end or prevent fossil fuel projects in collaboration with environmentalist groups.

**Governmentality**

In this book, we seek to pair the context of such environmental campaigns with another set of interactions and proximities. Over the past decade, Indigenous people have become increasingly engaged in conservation and payment for ecosystem services (PES) projects. This engagement is extensive and occurs across a variety of contexts, including through direct employment, advisory roles, and entrepreneurial enterprises. Having been previously excluded from environmental management, such changes have been viewed positively by many as offering opportunities for both culturally appropriate employment and community development. As advocates note, not only have Indigenous people long expressed a desire to look after their country, conservation and PES projects can be empowering and are closely associated with positive health outcomes. However, while Indigenous engagements with such projects are often glossed as a ‘propitious niche’ – founded on ‘a congenial or favourable match’ between people and their cultural and economic needs – this book offers a more circumspect appraisal. As Lee Godden summarises, ‘When agreements are implemented in contractually-oriented policy settings, there is the potential for them to act as powerful agents of settler colonial administration’. For all their avowed fit with Indigenous culture, such projects are necessarily influenced and, in some cases, directed by other agents, discourses and processes. In her contribution to this volume Michaela Spencer, for example, wrestles with her role in mediating between state directives and Indigenous priorities in Arnhem Land, a political dilemma that resonates with earlier
fieldwork experiences. Spencer was already familiar with the ways in which environmentalist groups might come to participate in marketised environmental projects, assisting the Tasmanian forestry industry offset their environmental impact.

The larger point is this: whatever their effects, conservation projects are necessarily transformative; they bring with them ideas and practices of environmental care, accountability and accountability that, to varying degrees, require the reordering of local ideas and practices. Environmental management is, as political scientist Arjun Agrawal suggests, a form of governmentality comparable to others, in that it mandates certain ways of going about things. Other arrangements and other practices persist, but in the context of new norms and sanctions. A recent essay by Ute Eickelkamp confirms this point. Writing about Anangu – Pitjantjatjara-speakers in northern South Australia – Eickelkamp argues that imposed conceptual shifts have recently turned kuka wiru (good meat) into ‘endangered species’. While this new framework might be endorsed, scepticism is another possible response, as is re-indigenisation either within or against a colonising conservation framework.

A concrete example from the Northern Territory helps ground these Foucauldian points. As anthropologist Sean Kerins writes, the widely praised initiative ‘Caring for Country’ began in 1995 as a ‘social movement’ managed by the Northern Land Council, working towards environmental and employment objectives while maintaining relations to country. However, this program eventually morphed into a federally funded program in 2007 called ‘Working on Country,’ which centralised power, reduced budgets and focused on technical outputs. Political empowerment had been turned, as Kerins suggests, into a narrowly defined employment program aimed at ‘normalising’ how people work...
and behave. Yet, as Jon Altman shows, these governmental aims are not neatly transposed. Altman’s essay in this collection draws on his long association with Kuninjku people to consider the place of buffalo in the Kuninjku imaginary. A younger generation has, as Jon Altman writes, been ‘bestowed with a great deal of power through the Working on Country program’. Rangers enjoy wages, the opportunity to acquire new skills and access to resources including high-quality work vehicles and high-powered rifles. But their involvement in this scheme also ‘lumbers them with more and more relational responsibility to deliver meat to their families in Maningrida and at outstations’. In the process of becoming individuated wage-earners, kin-based demands make their presence keenly felt. Just as we should question the professed benevolence of mining projects, we should remain critical of the manifold effects of conservation projects, whether directed by Indigenous people or not.

Indigeneity
For all our efforts to redirect scholarly attention towards environmentalists and environmentalism, indigeneity remains a major theme of the contributions. This is, in part, because Australian environmentalists make themselves and their environmentalism through their relationships with and understandings of indigeneity.

Many of the essays take us to places seen in Indigenous terms, whereby ancestral beings created landscapes, waterways and other features in a creative epoch and continue to manifest their lively presence in country. In Muecke’s essay, Goolarabooloo protestors, non-Indigenous supporters and non-human species are bound to reproduce the powerful institution of the Bugarrigarra or Dreaming. Martin and Trigger travel with their companions into Emu Dreaming country; Vincent visits powerful Seven Sisters
Dreaming sites tended by Kokatha people today. Monica Morgan argues that when Yorta Yorta people explain that the Murray cod is sacred, they face incomprehension. But, she notes, ‘If you say to [whitefellas] that it has a financial means, because we catch cod to have a feed, it sustains our family: they understand that’. Jessica Weir shows that Indigenous conceptions of country condition the basis and content of claims to the Murray-Darling Basin, disrupting techno-rationalist views of water as a resource. Altman illustrates that Indigenous understandings of country might encompass species that conservationists categorise as introduced and an environmental threat, such as buffalo or *nganabbarru*. This builds on earlier work, such as that of Lesley Head, which argues that the persistent use of 1788 as marker between ‘native’ and ‘exotic’ species is scientifically arbitrary, and that Indigenous responses to introduced species are characterised by their intellectual flexibility.

In the essays in this volume, environmentalists of various ilk explicitly and implicitly express that there is much to ‘learn’ from Indigenous ways of relating to an interconnected whole. Non-Indigenous people are invited to take tutelage from contact, often assiduously sought, with Indigenous land-based cosmologies, in the process of these precepts being lived out, retrieved and revived, or redirected into new ends such as conservation projects or protests. Autochthony can of course also be laid claim to by pastoralists and settlers, as several key works from Australia and elsewhere have recently made clear.

However, the closing contribution by Tony Birch urges us to proceed with caution. Where does this association of Indigenous people with nature leave the majority of Indigenous Australians, who live in urban settings? ‘Where we are has a negative impact on how outsiders perceive who we are’, writes Birch. Indeed, we are
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conscious of reproducing the focus on the north in this volume, at the expense of analysis of south-eastern settings. As Birch is keenly aware, Indigenous knowledge has never been posited as more ‘valuable’ than these during times of global environmental crisis, first in the 1970s and 1980s and, more recently, in the context of discussions of the Anthropocene and catastrophic climate change. For Birch this offers the prospect of engaged and respectful dialogue amid the persistence of colonial denial and cultural ignorance in Australia. But, Birch says, these conversations cannot take place without also maintaining a commitment to its consequences: the valuing of ecological wisdom also ‘impacts directly on the legitimacy of the intellectual and cultural knowledge held in urban Indigenous communities’. An anti-essentialist position would, we conclude, see ecological knowledge as socialised, or even learned (potentially by non-Indigenous people), rather than intrinsic and a requisite aspect of an Indigenous identity. Are the perspectives Birch holds in a productive tension to be reconciled? Further research is needed to determine future directions.

Conclusion
We do not seek to stabilise the terms of engagement, these categories or these sets of relations. This volume aims to identify and give terms to the nature of the problems present in these spaces. Further, our contributors do not hold uniform political commitments to environmental agendas, and variously engage with our themes in order to critique, challenge or advance agendas that might be described as environmentalist. Certainly, colonialism – historical and contemporary – remains a fundamental analytical touchstone throughout this volume. Colonial categories, frontier violence and racialised dynamics are everywhere apparent in our authors’ analyses of contemporary meeting points. The
encounters, scenes and spaces analysed here must be understood as both unequal and unstable.

Nonetheless, this volume is also an effort to trouble the binaries we have listed and sideline the bipartisan politics through which discussions of the ‘green’ and ‘black’ are usually framed and analysed; to continue talking simply of the ‘left’ or ‘right’, for example, is both poor a descriptive technique and a circular method. Our hope is that this volume provides grounds for different kinds of conversations about indigeneity and environmentalism, and with Indigenous people and environmentalists (and Indigenous environmentalists), that take account of the proximities and governmentalities that condition the lives of many in contemporary Australia. We argue that it is untenable for analysts to proceed as though non-Indigenous political agendas and intentions are the determining aspect of Indigenous-environmentalists engagements. Conversely, it is untenable for environmentalists to proceed as if Indigenous actors are either naturally conservationist in their orientation, or if they are not, that their cultural difference has been somehow corrupted or diluted. Both approaches deny the presence and agency of Indigenous people in shaping these relations with environmentalists.

We hope this volume proves a useful critical intervention into important public debates, and stimulates further empirical research into the meeting of environmentalist and Indigenous worlds, as well as anthropological analysis of the cultures of Australian environmentalism.
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