

SECULAR CONDITIONS OF PLURALITY IN ENVIRONMENTAL CONFLICTS:
AN ANALYSIS OF THE DAKOTA ACCESS PIPELINE PROTEST MOVEMENT

BY

Marijn van der Zaag

S2407132

Master Thesis Religion, Conflict and Globalization

20 ECTS

Supervisor: Dr. Schewel

Second Assessor: Dr. Tarusarira

21 January 2019

19.670 words

I declare that this thesis is my own work except where indicated otherwise with proper use of quotes and references.

Abstract

Philosopher Charles Taylor argues that modern secularism is characterized by the emergence of conditions of plurality. This means that people can choose between many possibilities with regards to what they believe, including religious beliefs. Contrary to many academic discussions, which present secularism as religion's "other," Taylor's definition shows how religion and secularism are not separate entities. The aim of this thesis is to analyze how the public discourse surrounding the Dakota Access Pipeline (DAPL) protest movement manifests the secular conditions of plurality that Taylor describes. For this purpose, I introduce two ideal types within Taylorian secularism: the enchanted and the disenchanted mindset. My argument in this thesis is that within the public discourse of the DAPL protest movement, one can find both an enchanted and a disenchanted mindset that operate within secular conditions of plurality. This differs from the modern debate on secularism because within the movement the secular-religious distinction does not exist. There are two plausible reasons for this. First, the tribe's spirituality is not highly institutionalized. Second, the tribe's ideals align with secular ideals. My findings matter because these secular conditions of plurality enable co-operation within (environmental) protest movements. It enables groups with different beliefs to recognize and acknowledge each other and to join forces to protest.

Contents

Abstract 1

Acknowledgement 3

Introduction 4

Problem Statement and Research Questions 4

Context..... 5

 1. The Standing Rock Sioux Tribe..... 5

 2. The Dakota Access Pipeline Protest Movement 6

Significance 7

Structure of the Thesis 8

I Conceptual Framework..... 9

Theoretical Framework 9

Literature Review 11

II Methodology 17

Research Design..... 17

Sample 18

Sources 19

Ethics Statement 20

III The Standing Rock Sioux Tribe’s Public Discourse 22

Motivations 22

Conclusion..... 34

III The Supporters’ Public Discourse 36

Motivations 36

Conclusion..... 49

IIII The Academic Debate..... 50

The Academic Debate..... 50

Conditions of Plurality 54

Plausible Reasons..... 55

Conclusion..... 57

Conclusion..... 58

Bibliography 62

Acknowledgement

I wish to thank Dr. Schewel for being my advisor. He helped me to strengthen this research through his expertise, guidance and feedback on my thesis.

I owe a special word of thanks to my fellow students Irma Rodenhuis and Marjolein Woltjer for allowing me to share my ideas, for giving me tips and for answering all my questions.

And finally, I would like to thank my family. They have encouraged me throughout the last year in this process.

Introduction

Problem Statement and Research Questions

Philosopher Charles Taylor argues that modern secularism is characterized by the emergence of conditions of plurality. This means that people can choose between many possibilities with regards to what they believe, including religious beliefs. Contrary to many academic discussions, which present secularism as religion's "other," Taylor's definition shows that religion and secularism are not separate entities. Instead, religion operates within secularism.

The aim of this thesis is to analyze how the public discourse surrounding the Dakota Access Pipeline (DAPL) protest movement that began in early 2016 in the United States manifests the secular conditions of plurality that Taylor describes. I chose this protest movement because the movement consisted of a variety of groups. Some groups displayed spiritual beliefs whereas other groups displayed non-spiritual beliefs. It is therefore interesting to examine how the public discourse in this movement manifests Taylorian secularism.

In my thesis, I will adhere to Taylor's definition by defining secularism as the conditions of plurality. I will use secularism and the secular interchangeably. Within this definition of secularism and the secular, I will introduce two ideal types: the enchanted mindset and the disenchanted mindset. The enchanted mindset locates spiritual forces in reality. The disenchanted mindset recognizes spirituality as a reality for others. Tentative research also suggests a third mindset, which I define as the re-enchanted mindset. This mindset originally recognizes spirituality as solely a reality for others, but gradually re-captures an enchanted mindset. Nevertheless, since the evidence of my research with regards to this third mindset is not conclusive enough, I will focus my attention on the other two mindsets. In my theoretical framework, I will further define and explain secularism as conditions of plurality and the secular mindsets.

My argument in this thesis will be that within the public discourse of the DAPL protest movement, one can find both an enchanted and a disenchanted mindset that operate within secular conditions of plurality. This differs from the modern debate on secularism because within the movement the secular-religious distinction does not exist. I come to this argument by analyzing both the tribe and the supporters' public discourse, in specific the publicly articulated motivations, to grasp the extent to which these publicly articulated motivations manifest secular conditions of plurality. Then I will analyze the current academic debate on secularism and, lastly, I will examine how the public discourse of the DAPL protest movement differs from this current debate and why. This leads me to my main question: How

does the public discourse surrounding the Dakota Access Pipeline protest movement manifest secular conditions of plurality? To answer this question, I formulated three subquestions:

- To what extent do the publicly articulated motivations of the Standing Rock Sioux tribe within the Dakota Access Pipeline protests manifest secular conditions of plurality?
- To what extent do the publicly articulated motivations of the non-indigenous supporters within the Dakota Access Pipeline protests manifest secular conditions of plurality?
- How does the public discourse surrounding the DAPL protest movement differ from the current academic debate on secularism and why?

Context

1. The Standing Rock Sioux Tribe

The Standing Rock Sioux indigenous peoples, consistent of Lakota and Dakota people, are Plain Indians that have now settled in central North and South Dakota. Originally, they were nomadic people. Williams K. Powers, James Garrett and Kathleen J. Martin explain in “Lakota Religious Traditions” that the tribe “organize[d] their lives and ceremonies around the movement of the sun and stars.”¹ Nevertheless, the tribe did stay within certain areas. The Standing Rock tribe itself, for example, explains that “since time immemorial, [the Lakota and Dakota] have lived and governed a vast territory throughout North and South Dakota, and parts of Montana, Wyoming, Minnesota, Iowa and Nebraska.”² This is not the case anymore. The U.S. government has steadily limited the tribe’s freedom to move within this vast territory. In the eighteenth century, the U.S. government, for example, broke several treaties and, as a result, took the tribe’s land. In the late eighteenth century, moreover, the government even forced the tribe on a small plot of land called a reservation.³ As a result, currently, the tribe lives on the Standing Rock Sioux Indian Reservation.⁴ American Studies scholar Karyn Mo Wells explains that “this reservation is the sixth-largest (although greatly diminished in size) within the borders of the United States. It currently covers 3,572 square miles (-9,251 km²) with a population of over 8,000 people.”⁵ The Standing Rock Sioux tribe has thus been

¹ William K. Powers, James Garrett and Kathleen J. Martin, “Lakota Religious Traditions,” in *Encyclopedia of Religion*, ed. Lindsay Jones, 2nd ed. (Detroit, MI: Macmillan Reference USA, 2005), 8:5295.

² “History: Background,” *Stand With Standing Rock*, <https://standwithstandingrock.net/history/> (accessed December 14, 2018).

³ Powers, “Lakota Religious Traditions,” 5295.

Alina Yohannen, “The Standing Rock Sioux Indians: An Inconvenience for Black Gold,” *University of Baltimore Journal of Land and Development* 6, no. 1 (2016): 20-21.

⁴ Karyn Mo Wells, “In Defense of Our Relatives,” *Studies in Arts and Humanities Journal* 3, no. 2 (2017): 147.

⁵ *Ibid.*

forced to endure many unfair conditions, such as land grabs. Nevertheless, the tribe has maintained many traditions.

One of these traditions is their spirituality. This has several different aspects. One aspect relates to the tribe's concept of spirituality. This is very different from the Western ideology of religion. Wells, for example, explains that "for the Lakota, religion is not compartmentalized into a separate category. More appropriately, Lakota traditions can be characterized as a system of spirituality that is fully integrated into a rhythm of life that includes all aspects and patterns of the universe."⁶ In practice, this means that the tribe does not separate the sacred from the secular. They, first of all, see everything as sacred. They believe that all animals, plants, streams, etcetera, have a spirit and are, thus, part of their spirituality.⁷ They, second of all, do not separate their spirituality from their everyday lives. This means that they practice their spirituality in a quotidian manner. Another aspect of their spirituality relates to burials. The tribe attaches sacred connections to their deceased relatives. Wells, for example, explains that "at death, through the process of decomposition, all organic substances are broken down into the simple elemental matter of earth ... [it marks] the biological transformation of relatives and ancestors into place ecosystems and landscapes. Death is understood as the process through which the spirit (energy) is not lost to creation, it simply changes form."⁸ The tribe accordingly believes that their deceased ancestors become part of the earth again. They become the wind, the water, and the soil.⁹ As a result, the tribe does not exclude themselves, as humans, from nature. Both beliefs are innate to the tribe's perception of the environment.

2. The Dakota Access Pipeline Protest Movement

In June 2014, the Texas-based company Energy Transfer Partners (ETP) announced to the public that they wanted to build a pipeline. This pipeline would travel 1,172 miles (1,886 km) on land and cross the Missouri River.¹⁰ It would also be laid near the Standing Rock Sioux reservation. A year later, in 2015, Energy Transfer Partners approached the Standing Rock tribe to "discuss" the pipeline. In this meeting, the tribe expressed its concern and critique. The company on the other hand emphasized the importance of the pipeline. They explained that the pipeline was an important aspect of the oil infrastructure in the U.S. Specifically, the

⁶ Powers, "Lakota Religious Traditions," 5295.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Wells, "In Defense of Our Relatives," 147.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Ibid., 144.

pipeline would connect several oil wells in the state's Bakken Shale.¹¹ In addition, the company argued that the transport of oil per pipeline would be safer and less expensive than transport by rail or road.¹² The Standing Rock Sioux tribe rejected these arguments. They instead stated that both the construction and a possible spill would have negative consequences for their culture, the environment, etcetera. Nevertheless, Energy Transfer Partners continued the project.¹³

The tribe protested and took legal measures to prevent the pipeline.¹⁴ They, for example, built camps nearby the construction site to spiritually resist the pipeline.¹⁵ This helped temporarily in 2016 because then President Obama blocked the construction. Nevertheless, on 24 January 2017, the new President, Donald Trump, signed an executive action to advance the construction of the pipeline. Shortly after, in February 2017, the police cleared the resistance camps.¹⁶ The DAPL protest movement soon then fell apart. Since then, the tribe, however, has continued their other forms of protests.

The Standing Rock tribe gained a tremendous amount of support from people, indigenous peoples as well as non-indigenous people.¹⁷ Some only voiced their concern on social media. Others came to the camps to show their support. As a result, the camp grew. In October 2016, journalist Justin Worland for example explained: "There are now thousands of people at the construction site or in a nearby encampment. Protestors have set up teepee and tent camps on land owned by Energy Transfer Partners to slow the progress of construction and have threatened to block the highway."¹⁸ Within this movement, I want to examine how the public discourse manifests secular conditions of plurality.

Significance

The Standing Rock Sioux tribe received immense support from non-indigenous and indigenous peoples throughout the world. People with different background, races, and beliefs, thus, co-operated together to stop this pipeline. One significant example of these differences in the DAPL protest movement was the difference between non-spiritual and

¹¹ Justin Worland, "What to Know About the Dakota Access Pipeline Protests," *TIME*, October 28, 2016, <http://time.com/4548566/dakota-access-pipeline-standing-rock-sioux/> (accessed December 13).

¹² Wells, "In Defense of Our Relatives," 144.

¹³ "Sept 30th DAPL Meeting with SRST," *Earth Justice*, <https://earthjustice.org/sites/default/files/files/Ex6-J-Hasselmann-Decl.pdf> (accessed December 14, 2018).

¹⁴ Worland, "What to Know."

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 149.

¹⁶ Wells, "In Defense of Our Relatives," 153.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ Worland, "What to Know."

spiritual beliefs. By analyzing how the public discourse surrounding the DAPL protest movement manifests secular conditions of plurality, I will increase the understanding of the collaboration of people with different beliefs within such environmental protest movements. I will show that secular conditions of plurality create an environment in which people with different beliefs recognize and acknowledge each other. These conditions, as a result, enable groups with different beliefs to co-operate.

Structure of the Thesis

In chapter one, I will discuss my conceptual framework. I will start with my theoretical framework. I will touch upon Charles Taylor's definition of secularism as well as introduce the ideal types: the disenchanted mindset and the enchanted mindset. Then I will continue with my literature review, in which I explain on which academic discussion my research builds and how I will contribute to it. In chapter two, I will discuss my methodology as well as my research ethics. In chapter three, I will discuss the Standing Rock Sioux tribe's motivations with regards to the DAPL protest movement as well as discuss to what extent the publicly articulated motivations of the Standing Rock Sioux tribe manifest secular conditions of plurality. In chapter four, I will discuss the supporters' motivations with regards to the DAPL protest movement as well as discuss to what extent the publicly articulated motivations of these supporters manifest conditions of plurality. In my fifth chapter, I will examine how this differs from the current debate on secularism and give some ideas on why this differs. Lastly, in my conclusion, I will give a brief summary and I will give some suggestions for future research.

I Conceptual Framework

In this chapter, I outline the conceptual framework of my thesis. I begin with an explanation of my theoretical framework that revolves around secularism. I adhere to Charles Taylor's definition of secularism. However, I introduce two ideal types within his definition: the disenchanted mindset and the enchanted mindset. I also touch upon a third ideal type: the re-enchanted mindset. I continue with a literature review to show how my thesis builds on the current academic debate on religion and the environment, which presupposes the sacred/secular divide in environmental issues.

Theoretical Framework

My theoretical framework revolves around secularism. Since the Enlightenment, there have been certain assumptions about secularism. One of the basic assumptions about secularism is that religion, or the sacred, and the secular are clear separate entities. An assumption that builds on this is that secularism is a modern mindset that dismisses religion, which is irrational and outdated. Religion then either disappears altogether or is located to the private sphere.¹⁹ In *The Secular Age*, Taylor acknowledges that this assumption exists. He explains that many scholars use “variants on a narrative of coming of age, moving from a childlike to an adult consciousness.”²⁰ Taylor, thus, explains that these scholars see the world as progressing from religion to secularism. Taylor, however, refutes this.

He instead argues that modern secularism is characterized by the emergence of conditions of plurality, in which religious beliefs are still a possibility for people. Taylor explains that in the secular age, modern Westerners have created a new understanding of themselves, the world and their place in society without necessarily referencing spiritual realities.²¹ Taylor defines this as the immanent frame. He, however, explains that religion can still play a role in this. Taylor explains: “The immanent order can ... slough off the transcendent. But it doesn't necessarily do so. What I have been describing as the immanent frame is common to all of us in the modern West, or at least that is what I am trying to portray. Some of us want to live it as open to something beyond; some live it as closed.”²²

¹⁹ Erin K. Wilson, (2017a) (forthcoming) “Being ‘Critical’ of/about/on ‘Religion’ in International Relations,” in *Routledge Handbook of Critical International Relations*, ed. Jenny Edkins (London: Routledge, 2018), 4-5; José Casanova, “The Secular and Secularisms,” *Social Research* 76, no. 4 (2009): 1049.

²⁰ Charles Taylor, *A Secular Age* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2007), 589.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 573.

²² *Ibid.*, 543-544.

Thus, a secular mindset does not necessarily have to be atheistic. Instead, Taylor explains that there is an immanent frame that can be closed or open. Taylor, as a result, argues that people can take many different positions with regards to belief in the secular age. He calls this the conditions of plurality. He explains:

The end of the eighteenth century saw the emergence of a viable alternative to Christianity in exclusive humanism; it also saw a number of reactions against this, and the understanding of human life which produced it. This was the beginning of what I'm calling the nova effect, the steadily widening gamut of new positions – some believing, some unbelieving, some hard to classify – which have become available options for us.²³

This shows that there are many positions from which people can choose, including different religious values.

Taylor also argues that the different positions that operate within the conditions of plurality need to be defended and justified. Taylor explains that in the secular age, people have an awareness of this multitude of new positions. Taylor, for example, explains that “people in each of these contexts are aware that the others exist, and that the option they can't really credit is the default option elsewhere in the same society, whether they regard this with hostility or just perplexity.”²⁴ This means that there is the acknowledgement that people reasonably believe different things. Although this is accepted, this does not mean that there is no pressure to become disenchanted. Taylor acknowledges that “to live in this frame is to be nudged in one direction rather than another.”²⁵ Therefore, people in the secular age learn how to justify their beliefs and to strategically maintain and frame them in the context of this new force of disenchantment. Thus, all worldviews need to “establish” and “dictate” their values.²⁶

For the sake of my argument, I adhere to Taylor's definition of secularism. I, thus, define secularism as new conditions of plurality, in which one has an awareness of the necessity to give reasons for one's beliefs and also to constantly strengthen one's beliefs and frame them in relation to others discourses, such as science.

In my thesis, I find it useful to introduce a number of ideal types within Taylor's definition of secularism to understand the nuances between the Standing Rock tribe and the supporters. I will distinguish between two different ideal types: a disenchanted mindset and an enchanted mindset. These function within my definition of secularism. They are subsets. I

²³ Ibid., 423.

²⁴ Ibid., 556.

²⁵ Ibid., 555.

²⁶ Ibid., 580.

define the disenchanted mindset as a mindset that does not hold religion as a reality. It is, however, aware of the pluralities of belief. It, thus, recognizes and acknowledges that other people may hold religion as a reality. This means that religion matters within this mindset, but only because it is a value that other people hold. I define the enchanted mindset as the mindset that maintains religion or the sacred as part of reality. Thus, it will also use that reference of reality in discourse. However, it does so in a way that is aware of the conditions of plurality that exist in society. It therefore acknowledges the need to justify its beliefs and the need to express them in ways so that other people who may not believe the same things can understand these beliefs. I will use these two definitions of secularism throughout my thesis.

Tentative evidence moreover suggests a third subset, which I define as the re-enchanted mindset. This mindset originally does not hold religion as a reality, but gradually departs from this mindset. It is trying to re-capture aspects of the enchanted mindset. As mentioned before, my research is not conclusive enough to focus extensively on this subset. Nevertheless, since it does occur in the public discourse of the DAPL protest movement, I will touch upon it briefly in some of the following chapters.

Literature Review

My thesis contributes to the current academic debate because it tries to shift the debate away from the assumption that religion and secularism are clear separate entities. Many scholars working on religion and the environment perpetuate this assumption in their work.

Some scholars perpetuate this assumption because they argue that religion is an entity that should be excluded from environmental solutions. They argue this for different reasons. Some scholars reject religion's involvement because it is not based on rationality. Janet Biehl, for example, argues in *Rethinking Ecofeminist Politics* that religion is an inadequate basis for ecological activism because "the emphasis is on developing the nonrational."²⁷ As a result, she describes religion as a superstition and argues that people should focus instead on rational arguments. Other scholars question religion's involvement in environmental solutions because religion problematizes some environmental actions. Sociologist Randolph Haluza-Delay explains that many research articles demonstrate that belief-centered variables about biblical literalism and end-times (eschatology) theology have a consistent relationship with a lack of attention to environmental concerns.²⁸ A recent example of such a research is sociologists

²⁷ Janet Biehl, *Rethinking Ecofeminist Politics* (Boston: South End Press, 1991), 63, 94.

²⁸ Randolph Haluza-Delay, "Religion and Climate Change: Varieties in Viewpoints and Practices," *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change* 5, no. 2 (2014): 270.

Aimie L. B. Hope and Christopher R. Jones' research. They, for example, found that their religious participants "had low perceptions of urgency for environmental issues."²⁹ Hope and Jones explain that this is the case because the religious participants "trusted in God to assure their ultimate welfare."³⁰ Hope and Jones explain that secular participants instead expressed anxiety in relation to environmental issues. Hope and Jones state: "Lack of belief in an afterlife or divine intervention led secular participants to focus on human responsibility and the need for action."³¹ Hope and Jones conclude that due to the sense of urgency, the secular participants were more willing to accept a broader range of technological and behavioral solutions. These scholars, thus, emphasize that certain religious beliefs problematize certain environmental actions. Based on these issues, some scholars reject religion's involvement in environmental solutions.

Nevertheless, there are also many scholars that reject the exclusion of religion from the public sphere. They instead argue that religion, as this unique and separate entity, can and should contribute to environmental solutions.

Some scholars argue that religion should be included in environmental solutions because it has contributed to the environmental problems and should therefore also be part of the solutions. Historian Lynn White, Jr. is the most renowned author to argue this. In 1967, White, Jr. wrote his article "The Historical Roots of our Ecological Crisis," in which he argues that religion has contributed to the ecological crisis and can therefore only solve the problem as well. In his piece, he argues that "Christianity, in absolute contrast to ancient paganism and Asia's religions (except, perhaps Zoroastrianism), not only established a dualism of man and nature but also insisted that it is God's will that man exploit nature for this proper ends."³² He continues by explaining that modern technology is the realization of this Christian dogma and that this is out of control.³³ White, Jr., thus, blames Christianity for the ecological crisis. He, as a result, also believes that science is not the solution to this problem. Instead, White argues that societies need to create a new religion or rethink the old

Examples of such articles are Douglas Lee Eckberg and T. Jean Blocker, "Varieties of Religious Involvement and Environmental Concerns: Testing the Lynn White Thesis," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 28, no. 4 (1989): 509-517; Hal Lindsey and Carole C. Carlson, *The Late Great Planet Earth* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 1970); Robert D. Gifford, "The Dragons of Inaction: Psychological Barriers that Limit Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation," *American Psychologist* 66, no. 4 (2011): 290-302; Colette Mortreux and Jon Barnett, "Climate Change, Migration and Adaptation in Funafuti, Tuvalu," *Global Environmental Change* 19, no. 1 (2009): 105-12; David C. Barker and David H. Bearce, "End-Times Theology, the Shadow of the Future, and Public Resistance to Addressing Global Climate Change," *Political Research Quarterly* 66, no. 2 (2013): 267-79.

²⁹ Aimie L. B. Hope and Christopher R. Jones, "The Impact of Religious Faith on Attitudes to Environmental Issues and Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) Technologies: A Mixed Methods Study," *Technology in Society* 38 (2014): 48.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 57.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 48.

³² Lynn White, Jr., "The Historical Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis," *Science* 155, no. 3767 (1967): 1205.

³³ *Ibid.*, 1206.

one. He continues that this religion should emphasize the virtue of humility.³⁴ Thus, White argues that religion should be included in environmental solutions because it is part of the problem. Many academics have argued against White.

They instead argue that a right interpretation of religion stimulates people to become environmental stewards. Social scientist Mehmet Ali Kirman acknowledges that in several religions, including Christianity, humankind has a special position. He, for example, explains: “In religious view also humans have [a] more special position than all creatures and nature. For example, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, the three great faiths are noted for separating humans from the surrounding ecosystems.”³⁵ Kirman, however, argues that this special position does not necessarily have to result in exploitation. Kirman explains that this depends on the interpretation. He defines two types of interpretation. The first type is the belief that humans can use and exploit nature as they please. The second type is the belief that God has separated humans from other entities because they occupy the special position of stewardship of nature.³⁶ Kirman emphasizes that the second type of interpretation is the correct interpretation. Theologian Douglas J. Hall shares a similar argument with regards to Christianity. He argues that Christianity “cannot escape the charge of a certain culpability in relation to the use and abuse of nature.”³⁷ Hall, however, argues that this is caused by a misinterpretation of the concept of the *imago Dei*. He states that people interpret Christianity correctly when they image the God that takes care of all creatures. Hall emphasizes that people will then become God’s faithful stewards.³⁸ Thomas A. Reuter contributes to this argument in “The Green Revolution in the World’s Religions.” He argues that most religions have already taken this shift. He states that all major religions show a more eco-friendly religious cosmology, in which nature is no longer seen as vastly inferior and servile to human interest.³⁹ Many scholars have built on this with regards to religion’s involvement in environmental solutions.

They emphasize religious qualities that can contribute to environmental solutions, such as a respect for nature. Some focus on Christianity. Theologian Alister E. McGrath, for example, argues that Christianity emphasizes respect for nature. This means that exploitation

³⁴ Ibid., 1207.

³⁵ Ali Kirman, “Religious and Secularist Views of the Nature and the Environment,” *The Journal of International Social Research* 1, no. 3 (Spring 2008): 269.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Douglas J. Hall, *Imaging God: Dominion as Stewardship* (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 1986), 25.

³⁸ Douglas J. Hall, “Stewardship as a Human Vocation,” *Stewardship of Life Institute*, September 7, 2010, <http://www.stewardshipoflife.org/2010/09/stewardship-as-a-human-vocation/> (accessed December 12, 2018).

³⁹ Thomas A. Reuter, “The Green Revolution in the World’s Religions: Indonesian Examples in International Comparison,” *Religions* 6, no. 4 (2015): 1219.

is “antithetical to the central idea of Christianity.”⁴⁰ As a result of these ideals, McGrath argues that the Christian faith has strategic resources for the environmental struggle.⁴¹ Other scholars focus on the Islam. Frederick M. Denny for example explains in “Islam and Ecology” that the Islam does not promote the exploitation of nature. Instead, Denny explains that the Qur’an states that “there is a sacrality to the earth which is a fit place for human’s service of God, whether in formal ceremonies or in daily life.”⁴² Thus, according to Denny, the Islam obligates people to envision the earth as a sacred place, which they need to respect and take care of. As a result, Denny argues that the Islam can contribute to innovative environmental solutions. Other scholars do not focus on the Abrahamic religions. Many scholars, for example, focus on indigenous spirituality. Theologian and historian Vine Deloria is a well-known example of this. Deloria argues in *God is Red* that indigenous peoples believe that all entities have spirits. Deloria, for example, explains that indigenous peoples believe that “there are . . . many other entities with spiritual powers comparable to those generally attributed to one deity alone.”⁴³ This means that indigenous peoples do not believe in one God, but believe that everything is sacred. As a result, they respect everything. Deloria emphasizes that this attitude toward nature can help current societies deal with the environmental catastrophe.⁴⁴ Thus, all these scholars emphasize religious qualities that can contribute to environmental solutions.

Some scholars, moreover, argue that these qualities can add a moral imperative to environmentalism. Mary Tucker, a pioneer in the field of religion and ecology, for example argues in “Worldly Wonder” that materialistic interests characterize the current worldviews that exist in environmentalism. She explains: “Even the call for sustainability has frequently been manipulated by the drive for profit and growth rather than restraint.”⁴⁵ She suggests religion as an alternative to this. She explains that this does not necessarily mean that the environmental movement should use religious traditions because these have been written in a different historical time and are not always suitable anymore.⁴⁶ Instead, she emphasizes that

⁴⁰ Alister E. McGrath, *Reenchantment of Nature: The Denial of Religion and the Ecological Crisis* (Westminster, MD: Doubleday Publishing, 2003).

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² Frederick M. Denny, “Islam and Ecology: A Bestowed Trust Inviting Balanced Stewardship,” *Earth Ethics* 10, no. 1 (1998), <http://environment-ecology.com/religion-and-ecology/714-islam-and-ecology-a-bestowed-trust-inviting-balanced-stewardship.html> (accessed December 14, 2018).

⁴³ Vine Deloria, *God is Red: A Native View of Religion* (Golden, Colorado: Fulcrum Publishing, 2003), 151-52.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 304

⁴⁵ Mary Tucker, *Worldly Wonder: Religions Enter Their Ecological Phase* (Chicago and La Salle, Illinois: Open Court, 2003), 18.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 25.

religion equips people with certain orientations and values. Religion, thus, provides a moral imperative.⁴⁷ Tucker argues that these values are key to environmental solutions.

In addition, some scholars argue that religion should be included because religion's influence on people's behavior can be used in favor of the environmental movement. Environmental researcher Gary Gardner, for example, explains that religion has a significant effect on people's beliefs and behavior, including their environmental beliefs and behavior. Gardner, for example, explains that "a 2009 poll found that 72 percent of Americans say that religious beliefs play at least a 'somewhat important' role in their thinking about the stewardship of the environment and climate change."⁴⁸ Thus, religious worldviews to an extent shape environmental beliefs and behavior. As a result, Gardner argues that instead of dismissing religion to the private sphere, people should recognize this key position. They can then use religion to raise awareness about environmental problems. They can, for example, ask church communities to discuss environmental problems and solutions in services and Sunday schools.⁴⁹

Another reason for scholars to reject the dismissal of religion is that it problematizes the implementation of environmental solutions. Geographer Patrick D. Nunn is an example of such a scholar. He, for example, argues that in certain societies, people attach religious beliefs to climate disasters. These people, for example, believe that a cyclone is a punishment of God.⁵⁰ These people, therefore, look to their religion for solutions. This also means that they do not always understand non-religious environmental solutions. Nunn and his colleagues, for example, explain that certain societies are "more likely to respond positively when these [solutions] are conveyed through culturally-appropriate and/or religious channels rather than secular ones."⁵¹ Nunn, therefore, suggests that secular climate projects should involve, among other things, religious leaders to help communicate the project's ideas.⁵² Nunn, thus, argues that religion should play a role in environmental policies and projects.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 26.

⁴⁸ Gary Gardner, "Engaging Religions to Shape Worldviews," in *State of the World 2010: Transforming Cultures from Consumerism to Sustainability*, ed. The Worldwatch Institute (New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company, 2010), 24.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 27.

⁵⁰ Patrick D. Nunn, "Sidelineing God: Why Secular Climate Projects in the Pacific Islands are Failing," *The Conversation*, May 16, 2017, theconversation.com/sidelineing-god-why-secular-climate-projects-in-the-pacific-islands-are-failing-77623 (Accessed November 4, 2017).

⁵¹ Nunn, Patrick D, Kate Mulgrew, Bridie Scott-Parker, Donald W Hine, Anthony D. G Marks, Doug Mahar, and Jack Maebuta. "Spirituality and Attitudes Towards Nature in the Pacific Islands: Insights for Enabling Climate-Change Adaptation." *Climatic Change : An Interdisciplinary, International Journal Devoted to the Description, Causes and Implications of Climatic Change* 136, no. 3-4 Patrick D. Nunn and others, "Spirituality and Attitudes Towards Nature in the Pacific Islands: Insights for Enabling Climate-Change Adaptation," *Climatic Change Journal* 136, no. 3-4 (2016): 491.

⁵² Nunn, "Sidelineing God."

These scholars, thus, argue that religion in fact can be helpful in solving environmental problems. I right now have mentioned some scholars and some arguments, but there are many more.

The academic debate has thus intensively focused on either denying or verifying religion's contribution to environmental solutions. In both cases, scholars, however, treat religion and the secular as separate and opposite entities. The scholars that reject religion's contribution show this clearly because they argue that religion is irrational and should be excluded from the public sphere. The scholars that favor religion's contribution show this because they argue that religion, as a unique and separate entity, can contribute to the public sphere. By treating religion as a separate entity, the debate presupposes the religion/secular divide. In my thesis, I want to shift away from this presupposition. I instead want to show how secularism as conditions of plurality frames the ongoing engagement with environmental issues. I want to look into this in the context of the DAPL protest movement.

II Methodology

In this chapter, I will elaborate on my methodology. I proceed with this task in four steps. First, I explain my research design and choice for qualitative research. Second, I define and explain the method of discourse analysis that I employ. Third, I discuss my data sources. And fourth, I address the ethical aspects of my thesis.

Research Design

In my thesis, I have chosen to use a qualitative methodological approach. Monique Hennink, Inge Hutter and Ajay Bailey explain in *Qualitative Research Methods* that a qualitative methodological approach is an approach that “allows you to identify issues from the perspective of your study participants, and understand the meanings and interpretations that they give to [behavior], events or objects.”⁵³ This will be helpful for my thesis. In my thesis, I examine how the public discourse of the DAPL protest movement manifests secular conditions of plurality. In order to say anything about this, it is important for me to explore the protestors’ perspectives in the public discourse. I want to explore the interpretation that the tribe and the protestors give to DAPL and the meaning they give to the protest movement. Then I can examine the secular conditions of plurality. Although quantitative research would have been complementary to my thesis, given the limitation of space and the complexity of my qualitative research, I decided to focus solely on qualitative research.

Since I focus on the public discourse of the DAPL protest movement, I have chosen discourse analysis as my qualitative method. Simply said, discourse analysis analyzes written and spoken language use.⁵⁴ Sociologist Titus Hjelm explains that the concept of discourse, however, is in itself constitutive. Everyone creates his/her own picture of reality. This means that discourse “constructs social reality and relationships.”⁵⁵ Nelson Phillips and Cynthia Hardy explain in *Qualitative Research Methods* that as a result “[discourses analysis] examines how language constructs phenomena.”⁵⁶ Hjelm explains that in practice this means

⁵³ Monique Hennink, Inge Hutter and Ajay Bailey, *Qualitative Research Methods* (London: Sage, 2011), 9.

⁵⁴ Jennifer Mason, *Qualitative Researching*, 2nd ed. (London: Sage Publications, 2002), 57.

⁵⁵ Titus Hjelm, “Discourse Analysis,” in *The Routledge Handbook of Research Methods in the Study of Religion*, ed. Michael Stausberg and Steven Engler (London: Routledge, 2011), 135.

⁵⁶ Nelson Phillips and Cynthia Hardy, *Qualitative Research Methods: Discourse Analysis* (Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc., 2002), 6.

that “discourse analysis examines how actions are given meaning and how identities are produced in language use.”⁵⁷ This is useful for my thesis because I examine how the protestors give meaning to the DAPL protest movement through their public discourse. Thus, I ask questions, such as: How does the public discourse construct the movement? In specific, how do the publicly articulated motivations surrounding the DAPL movement manifest secular conditions of plurality?

There are, however, varieties within discourse analysis. Phillips and Hardy explain that there are certain ideal types of discourse analysis.⁵⁸ Although I do not believe my research falls neatly within one particular category, I do believe interpretive structuralism is most suitable for my research. Phillips and Hardy explain that “interpretive structuralism focuses on the analysis of the social context and the discourse that supports it.”⁵⁹ This form of discourse analysis will help me to explore how the public discourse of the DAPL protest movement manifests the secular conditions of plurality. Phillips and Hardy also state that “the description of the context often relies on interviews or archival materials to provide accounts of insiders’ interpretations of the context.”⁶⁰ In my research, I also rely on interviews to provide accounts of the protestors’ interpretation of the DAPL protest movement.

Sample

As mentioned before, I examine the public discourse of the DAPL protest movement. I distinguish between the supporters and the Standing Rock tribe. For my sample of supporters, I have chosen to look at public figures to analyze the support movement, such as famous actors and actresses. I have chosen public figures for several reasons. Although many people posted statements on social media and some even answered questions from journalists, these statements and answers are usually very short. Public figures, on the other hand, often get more space to elaborate their views. This, thus, results in more useable material. These public figures may be of a higher socio-economic class than most supporters, but in general their worldviews are similar to non-public figures that supported the Standing Rock Sioux tribe. Therefore, the public figures are as suitable for my sample as non-famous supporters.

I have chosen six public figures for my sample: actors and actresses Mark Ruffalo, Robert Redford, Shailene Woodley, Jane Fonda, Frances Fisher and Susan Sarandon. I

⁵⁷ Hjelm, “Discourse Analysis,” 134.

⁵⁸ Phillips and Cynthia Hardy, *Qualitative Research Methods*, 21.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 23.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 24.

selected these six public figures because they visited the protest site multiple times and were also very vocal about their support for the Standing Rock tribe. I found these six public figures through a form of the snowball recruitment. Hennink, Hutter and Bailey explain that “[snowball recruitment] involves asking a study participant or a key informant whether they know anyone else in the community who meets the study criteria ... then, after interviewing the referred person, asking them whether they also know others in the community with the specific criteria, and so on.”⁶¹ Since I did not directly speak to my study participants, I was not able to ask them this question. Several of these figures, however, mentioned fellow famous supporters in their interviews themselves. Thus, I started with actress Shailene Woodley because of my own knowledge of her involvement and then built on her interviews.

For my sample of the Standing Rock tribe, I have chosen to treat the tribe as a collective. The tribal members experience and practice certain aspects of their culture, such as their spirituality, for a large part individually. Nevertheless, within the media, the Standing Rock tribe presents itself less as individuals and more as a collective. Therefore, I follow this convention. This does not mean that I do not use interviews with specific tribal members, such as interviews with the chairman David Archambault II. Instead, it means that I recognize that these statements concern the tribe as a collective.

Sources

For my research on the supporters of the DAPL protest movement, I collected various sources. The majority of my sources are interviews. I use interviews of different television/multi-channel networks because I acknowledge and recognize that a television/multi-channel network, an interviewer, and a location can shape a person’s response. Originally, I intended to focus only on major networks, such as CNN and NBC. Nonetheless, this was not possible. Many news outlets did not cover the issue as much and therefore did not interview people about this subject either. In order to get enough data, I collected data from many different sources. I, as a result, use some interviews of CNN and NBC, but also use interviews from lesser known multi-channel networks and shows, such as the Young Turks and FUSION. The inclusion of these interviews has given me diverse data. In addition to interviews, I also use speeches and statements to increase my data. On the website of *TIME* magazine, for example, actor and actresses Robert Redford, Jane Fonda and Shailene Woodley wrote statements about their support for the Standing Rock tribe.

⁶¹ Hennink, *Qualitative Research Methods*, 100.

Moreover, actresses Susan Sarandon and Jane Fonda made speeches on stages about this topic.

For my research on the Standing Rock tribe, I also collected various sources. I use interviews, statements and letters of the Standing Rock tribe as well as articles about DAPL. I mostly collected material that was written by the tribe itself and published on their website because it means that outside parties have not contributed to this nor edited this. As a result, this gives me a clear, concise understanding of their publicly articulated motivations surrounding the DAPL protest movement. However, I also use interviews from other channels. These are important to include because the tribe may emphasize other concerns in these interviews. These sources therefore give me more diverse data. All these sources, moreover, are useful because they can provide me with the context and some background information about the protests and the tribe's religious beliefs.

I collected all these sources by searching on the Internet. With regards to the supporters, I first started by examining the titles of the sources. Then I listened to or read the interviews, speeches and statements. I included all the sources that touched upon DAPL and the protests regardless of what they exactly said about DAPL in order to avoid 'biased selectivity,' which sociologist Glenn A. Bowen explains is "an incomplete collection of documents."⁶² I did experience the problem that many sources have, as Bowen defines it, gaps. This means that they do not contain all information to answer my research questions.⁶³ By collecting more interviews, I was able to solve this problem and get a sufficient amount of data. With regards to the tribe, I mainly searched on their website because on this website, the tribe has an archive with statements, interviews and letters about DAPL. I use these sources for my data.

Ethics Statement

In my thesis, I consider multiple ethical issues. Since I use existing sources, certain ethical issues are more relevant than others. I, for example, did not ask for informed consent or assure the public figures' anonymity. All of my sources consist of interviews and essays that reliable websites have published. I therefore reckon that these sources have already been published with consent. I, moreover, do not intent to twist my sample's words to fit my context. Thus, I believe I can therefore use these sources without asking for my participants' consent.

⁶² Glenn A. Bowen, "Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method," *Qualitative Research Journal* 9, no. 2 (2009): 32.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 33.

Moreover, the public figures' names have been clearly stated in the interviews, statements and speeches. Therefore, I use these sources without anonymizing the sample.

My research is, moreover, not solely for academic benefit, but can help society. My research can help to improve the understanding on how public discourse surrounding protest movements such as the DAPL protest movement manifests secular conditions of plurality and why. In the long term, this will be beneficial because it will enable scholars to give more concrete advice to protestors concerning collaborations. This will make the co-operation within (environmental) protest movements stronger in the future. As a result of this goal, I will not sensationalize my research. I will try to provide a balanced report to the best of my abilities that will include both positive and negative findings.

III The Standing Rock Sioux Tribe's Public Discourse

From 2014 on, the Standing Rock tribe has voiced its critique to the pipeline in many ways. They have given interviews, have created documentaries, have written letters to then President Obama and other politically involved people, have written evaluations, statements, etc. In these sources, the tribe has voiced their motivations for resistance. In this chapter, I will argue that the tribe's main motivations within their public discourse revolve around their spirituality, which they explain and defend. Nevertheless, they also relate their resistance to non-spiritual motivations, such as health, the dominance of capitalism, and laws. This reveals an enchanted secular mindset. I come to this argument by analyzing the public discourse from the Standing Rock Sioux tribe in the DAPL protest movement, in specific their publicly articulated motivations with regards to the resistance against the pipeline. I then want to examine how these motivations manifest secular conditions of plurality. In my chapter, I deal with every motivation separately. I, however, want to emphasize that many of these themes relate to each other.

Motivations

The Construction and A Potential Spill

The tribe worries about DAPL because they believe both the construction of the pipeline and a spill will damage the surrounding area. The tribe, first of all, worries about the construction of the pipeline. They state that the construction of the pipeline “will have an adverse effect on this ... landscape.”⁶⁴ Second of all, the tribe worries about a spill. They state that a spill is a given fact. In *Awake*, the tribe for example explains that “pipelines like the black snake have burst in the past ... In fact, there have been thousands of spills in the past six years. Thousands.”⁶⁵ This shows that the tribe believes that it is not the question if the pipeline will break, but when. The tribe's other motivations flood from the consideration of the consequences of DAPL's construction and a potential spill.

⁶⁴ The Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, “Impacts of an Oil Spill from the Dakota Access Pipeline on the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe,” *Standingrock.org*, February 21, 2018, https://www.standingrock.org/sites/default/files/uploads/srst_impacts_of_an_oil_spill_2.21.2018.pdf#pdfjs.action=download (accessed December 12, 2018), 163.

⁶⁵ *Awake, A Dream from Standing Rock*, dir. Myron Dewey and Josh Fox, Netflix, 89 min. (Nevada: Digital Smoke Signals, 2017).

Spirituality

As mentioned before, spirituality is an important factor in the Standing Rock tribe's life. In their public discourse, the Standing Rock tribe emphasizes this as well. In many sources, they focus on this. The tribe does discuss several different aspects of this spirituality to reject DAPL.

In their public discourse, the tribe argues that they reject DAPL because it does not respect the interrelatedness of the world. The Standing Rock tribe believes that all things on earth are related to each other. The tribe mentions this in their Impact Assessment Report. Tribal member Pete Catches, Sr., for example, explains in this report: "To the traditional Lakota, every day is sacred to him. He looks at the world on this creation and knows they are all interrelated. The trees and the grasses, the animal world, the flowing stream and the mountains. Everything he's related to and he respects it."⁶⁶ The Standing Rock tribe, thus, emphasizes its connection to the environment. As a result of this, they have a universal respect for all living entities, including Mother Earth. The tribe indicates that DAPL ruptures this interrelatedness. Chairman David Archambault II, for example, explains with regards to DAPL:

The Earth is our mother, and the way we treat her is very important because let's be realistic here. She [is going] to continue on. We will not outlive her. So if she has to go on without us, then that's what [is going] to take place. But if we come together in unity, and we start changing our behavior and the way we think, the way we treat her, we become coherent, we become one with her again.⁶⁷

Archambault II thus implicates that the behavior surrounding DAPL contributes to a state in which people are not one with Mother Earth. Thus, DAPL ruptures the interrelatedness of the world. Archambault II insists this needs to stop.

In addition to DAPL's rupture of the interrelatedness of the world, the Standing Rock tribe also rejects DAPL because it disrespects the tribe's multiplicity of spirits. The Standing Rock tribe does not believe in one God. Instead, they believe in a multiplicity of spirits. Anthropologist David C. Posthumus explains that this is based on the concept of Wak'ą. Posthumus explains that this is a "force [that] underlays all things in both the seen and unseen realm and [has] manifested itself in various ways in relation to humans as mysterious

⁶⁶ The Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, "Impacts of an Oil Spill," 14.

⁶⁷ *The Naked Truth: Mark Ruffalo Speaks on Standing Rock & #NODAPL*, produced by FUSION, YouTube, 9 min. (2016), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=P-nnzizoGQ4&t=1s> (accessed December 14, 2018).

potency.”⁶⁸ The tribe, thus, believes that Wak’ą flows through all entities. Therefore, the tribe believes that all entities have spirits. The tribe uses this belief as an argument against DAPL. In their Impact Assessment Report, the tribe, for example, emphasizes the sacredness of the environment as a motivation to resist DAPL. They explain: “The Lakota believe that all things in nature have their own spirit, and that all of Creation is sacred.”⁶⁹ Since DAPL will destroy the environment and, as a result, disrespect these spirits, the tribe resists the pipeline.⁷⁰ Within their public discourse, the tribe often focuses this argument on specific aspects, such as water.

The tribe, for example, emphasizes that DAPL threatens the sacredness of water. Since the tribe believes that all things have spirits, they also deem water as sacred. They have linked this, for example, to their creation story. *Inyan*, the tribe’s first supernatural creature that Wak’ą created, sacrificed himself to create water. The tribe explains: “To create Maka, Inyan took so much from himself that he opened his veins, and all his blood flowed from him so he shrank and became hard and powerless. As his blood flowed from him, it became blue waters that are the waters of the earth.”⁷¹ As a result of this creation story, the tribe believes water is sacred. The tribe presents this sacredness as a reason to reject DAPL. The tribe, for example, explains with regards to DAPL: “And our tribe, our people, believe water is sacred. Water is not a resource. It’s a relative. And it’s worth protecting.”⁷² Another member states: “The tribe views a spill as an affront to their way of life, polluting the very water that they hold sacred.”⁷³ The tribe, thus, rejects DAPL because it threatens the sacredness of the water.

In addition to the multiplicity of spirits, the tribe also argues that DAPL will problematize certain spiritual practices. Animals have a special role within the tribe’s ceremonies. The tribe, for example, explains that “bald eagles are considered to be messengers between the people and the Creator, and their feathers are used in ceremonies and worn to signify distinction.”⁷⁴ For the tribe, this does not mean that people for example can not hunt anymore. Nevertheless, the tribe does believe that people should treat all animals with respect.⁷⁵ Therefore, they reject DAPL. They argue that a possible oil spills will have significant negative effects on animals. They explain that “this includes impacts on bald

⁶⁸ David C. Posthumus, *All My Relatives: Exploring Lakota Ontology, Belief and Ritual* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2018), 36.

⁶⁹ The Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, “Impacts of an Oil Spill,” 14.

⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷¹ Ibid., 16.

⁷² *Frazier and Archaumbault II address police tactics*, produced by KFYZ-TV, Facebook, 19 min. (2016), https://www.facebook.com/KFYRTV/videos/10154016576274103/?hc_ref=SEARCH (accessed December 14, 2018).

⁷³ The Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, “Impacts of an Oil Spill,” 88.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 11.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 1.

eagles...”⁷⁶ This impact problematizes the practice of the tribe’s ceremonies. Besides animals, the tribe also requires pure water to practice their ceremonies. The tribe, for example, discusses the Sun Dance ceremony. They, for example, explain that “[water] is also important in the sweat lodge ceremony of the Sun Dance, where it is poured upon heated rocks for purification.”⁷⁷ The tribe, thus, indicates that they need to use pure water to perform these ceremonies. DAPL problematizes this. Thus, the tribe rejects the pipeline.

Another concern for the tribe is that DAPL violates certain sacred places. Like many other religious groups, the Standing Rock tribe has certain sacred places. These, however, are not built structures. Thus, they do not look like churches or mosques.⁷⁸ This is partly the case because some sacred places are connected to individuals’ belief instead of the collective belief. Garrouette, for example, explains that “sacred sites may be the location of collective ceremonies, as well as special places for individuals pursuing vision quests, pilgrimages, healing, and prayer.”⁷⁹ Instead of built structures, one can recognize these sacred places for example through stone features. These stone features are located within and near the pipeline’s route.⁸⁰ The tribe refutes DAPL because ETP does not recognize this. A tribal member, for example, explains in *Awake*: “Those are our synagogues ... You don’t see, when you look out on the land, you don’t see anything like that, like how it comes up out of the ground. Everything about us was with the earth, and including our sites.”⁸¹ Thus, this tribal member emphasizes that even though you might not see the tribe’s sacred places, they still exist and one should respect them like churches and mosques. The tribe also emphasizes that this pipeline will not just affect one or two sacred places, but dozens. In their report, the tribe for example explains that they “have historical camps and ceremonial sites throughout the pipeline route...”⁸² The pipeline would have an impact on all these sites. As a result, the tribe rejects DAPL.

A specific example of such a sacred place on which the tribe repeatedly focuses in their discourse is a whirlpool near Lake Oahe. Tribal member Jon Eagle Sr. for example discusses this whirlpool in an interview with *The Guardian*. He explains: “At the confluence

⁷⁶ Ibid., 7.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 16.

⁷⁸ Peter B. Campbell, “‘Those are our Eiffel Towers, our Pyramids’: Why Standing Rock is about much more than Oil,” *The Guardian*, May 15, 2017, <https://www.theguardian.com/science/2017/may/15/those-are-our-eiffel-towers-our-pyramids-why-standing-rock-is-about-much-more-than-oil> (accessed December 14, 2018).

⁷⁹ Eva Marie Garrouette and others, “Religio-Spiritual Participation in Two American Indian Populations,” *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 53, no. 1 (2015), <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4646059/>.

⁸⁰ Tim Mentz, “Declaration of Time Mentz, Sr. In Support of Motion for Preliminary Injunction,” *Earth Justice*, August 11, 2016, <https://earthjustice.org/sites/default/files/press/2016/Decl-of-T-Mentz-Sr.pdf> (accessed December 13, 2018), 6.

⁸¹ *Awake*.

⁸² The Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, “Impacts of an Oil Spill,” 86.

of where those two rivers met was a great whirlpool that created perfectly round stones that we considered to be sacred.”⁸³ He continues: “In [that area] our ancestors went to pray for good direction, strength and protection for the coming year. Those stones are still there, and our people still go there today.”⁸⁴ Eagle Sr., thus, emphasizes the importance of this sacred place for the tribe. He relates this to DAPL. He explains that DAPL will cross this high rock promontory and thus violate this sacred place.

The tribe also argues that DAPL hurts their spirituality because it destroys their sacred burials. The Standing Rock tribe distinguishes between two forms of sacred areas.

Environmental historian Rosalyn R. LaPier explains that there are “those set aside for the divine, such as a dwelling place, and those set aside for human remembrance, such as a burial or battle site.”⁸⁵ Tribal member Mentz elaborates on this. He explains that the Standing Rock tribe believes that the spirits of their ancestors become part of the earth again. As a result, the tribe always creates burials. This does not necessarily mean that they bury the bodies there, but tribal members always do bring the spirits of their ancestors to these burials.⁸⁶ Thus, the Standing Rock tribe believes that burials are sacred places that people need to respect. The tribe also uses this reason in their publicly articulated resistance against DAPL. Mentz, for example, motivates the resistance by explaining:

These hills are near where the DAPL plans on inserting the pipeline to go east under the Missouri River. Numerous burials of an old warrior society and chiefs are buried there up on top and near the bottom of the hills and it was custom to stop and feed their spirits with wasna (a pounded beef jerky mixed with tallow) and also give water to the spirits.⁸⁷

This shows that the tribe emphasizes that DAPL will cross several sacred burials. DAPL, as a result, will destroy these burials. Therefore, the tribe rejects DAPL.

In their public discourse, the Standing Rock tribe, thus, rejects DAPL because it threatens their spirituality. In the interviews, letters and statements, they extensively explain many different aspects of this spirituality to the public, to ETP, and to the U.S. federal agency the Army Corps of Engineers. They for example emphasize the interrelatedness of the

⁸³ Campbell, “Those are our Eiffel Towers, our Pyramids.”

⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁸⁵ Rosalyn R. LaPier, “What Makes a Mountain, Hill or Prairie a ‘Sacred’ Place for Native Americans?” *The Conversation*, February 16, 2017, <https://theconversation.com/what-makes-a-mountain-hill-or-prairie-a-sacred-place-for-native-americans-73169> (accessed December 13, 2018).

⁸⁶ Mentz, “Declaration,” 8.

⁸⁷ Alan Gilbert, “Grave Matters in Pipeline Controversy,” *Who What Why*, September 19, 2016, <https://whowhatwhy.org/2016/09/19/grave-matters-pipeline-controversy/> (accessed December 14, 2018). One can find a similar motivation in *Awake*

environment, the multiplicity of spirits, and the importance of animals and water to their spiritual ceremonies. They, moreover, emphasize that DAPL threatens these aspects. Nevertheless, the tribe also addresses non-spiritual themes like corporate interests, health, environmentalism, and laws.

Corporate Interests

One of the non-spiritual motivations that the Standing Rock tribe gives for their resistance against the pipeline is that ETP favors corporate interests. A focus on economic development and profit often characterizes modern societies. Corporations, in specific, often have this focus. However, corporations can sometimes go as far as to favor these interests over citizens' interests. The Standing Rock tribe argues that DAPL is an example of this. In an interview with PBS, chairman Archambault II for example describes the process leading up to the construction of DAPL: "They never heard us. It was just a process that keeps moving forward because of the interest of economic development, the interest of money, the interest of greed."⁸⁸ Archambault II, thus, describes DAPL as a form of selfish corporate interests. As a result, the tribe does not recognize DAPL as a just and important project.

In fact, in their discourse, the tribe even rejects this profit-focused mindset because it has negative consequences. They argue that it leads to both unsafe conditions and inequality. On their website, the tribe, for example, explains that ETP is a company "who facilitate[s] unsafe energy and infrastructure practices."⁸⁹ The tribe, thus, portrays ETP as a company that favors and constructs the pipeline regardless of the destruction and unsafety of their project. In addition to this, the tribe also states that the pipeline contributes to inequality. Chairman Archambault II for example explains that these projects are characterized by "brazen private interests trying to push this pipeline through to benefit a few wealthy American with financial ties to the Trump administration."⁹⁰ The tribe, thus, describes DAPL as only benefitting a few people.

Burials

⁸⁸ "Tribes Across North America Converge at Standing Rock, Hoping to be Heard," *PBS NewsHour*, September 16, 2016, <https://www.pbs.org/newshour/show/tribes-across-north-america-converge-standing-rock-hoping-heard> (accessed December 14, 2018).

⁸⁹ The Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, "Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Chairman responds to Oil in DAPL," *Stand with Standing Rock*, March 28, 2017, <https://standwithstandingrock.net/standing-rock-sioux-tribe-chairman-responds-oil-dapl/> (accessed December 14, 2018).

⁹⁰ The Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, "Standing Rock Denounces Army Easement Announcement, Vows Court Challenge," *Stand with Standing Rock*, February 7, 2017, <https://standwithstandingrock.net/standing-rock-denounces-army-easement-announcement-vows-court-challenge/> (accessed December 14, 2018).

In several of the sources, the tribe also discusses burials in implicit religious terms as a reason to reject the pipeline. As mentioned before, the tribe attaches spirituality to their burials. Therefore, they reject the pipeline. In certain interviews, tribal members however do not discuss religion explicitly with regards to their burials. Tribal member Ladonna Allard for example explains in a documentary: “My son is buried on top of the hills here.” She continues: “Who would build a pipeline next to my son’s grave? Who would do that?”⁹¹ She, thus, rejects the pipeline because it will cross her son’s burial. Other tribal members emphasize that the pipeline problematizes their access to burials.⁹² They reject this.

Culture

The tribe also argues that they reject DAPL because it destroys aspects of their culture. The tribe focuses, first of all, on cultural objects. On their *Facebook*, the tribe for example explains that “the horizontal direction drilling in the construction of the pipeline would destroy valuable cultural resources of the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe.”⁹³ The tribe, thus, explains that along the route of the pipeline, there are valuable cultural resources that the construction of the pipeline will destroy. The tribe, second of all, focuses on cultural norms. One specific aspect of their cultural norms that the tribe discusses is the role of hunting. In their report, the tribe explains that an oil spill will have negative consequences for animals. They, however, emphasize that this also has consequences for their cultural norms. They for example explain: “Today, young men on the Reservation are taught to maintain their culture by hunting, butchering and distributing deer and other meat to elders throughout one’s extended family, as well as to elders throughout one’s community who are no longer able to hunt.”⁹⁴ The tribe suggests that DAPL will problematize these cultural roles because an oil spill will harm animals and, thus, disenable the young to hunt.

Health

Another concern that the tribe addresses is health. The Standing Rock tribe explains that the pipeline could have negative effects on peoples’ health. In their resolution, they for example explain that “the Dakota Access Pipeline threatens public health and welfare on the Standing

⁹¹ *Mni Wiconi – Water is Life*, produced by the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, Facebook, 8 min. (2016), <https://standwithstandingrock.net/mni-wiconi/> (accessed December 14, 2018). One can find a similar motivation in *Awake*.

⁹² *Awake*.
⁹³ The Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, “Resolution NO. 406-15,” *Facebook*, February 9, 2016, <https://www.facebook.com/StandingRockST/photos/a.422881167740159/1193297920698476/?type=1&theater> (accessed December 14, 2018).

⁹⁴ The Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, “Impacts of an Oil Spill,” 15.

Rock Indian Reservation.”⁹⁵ In the Impact Assessment Report, they elaborate on this. In their report, they explain that “bakken crude oil ... is generally recognized as having physical and chemical characteristics that create elevated hazards of significant chronic and acute adverse health effects. These include cancer, endocrine disruption activity and developmental and reproductive toxicity.”⁹⁶ The tribe, thus, believes that a spill will poison their people. As a result, they argue that DAPL will have detrimental effects for people’s health.

Water

The tribe also rejects DAPL because they argue that the pipeline will pollute people’s drinking water. The tribe gets their drinking water from the Missouri River, which DAPL could potentially pollute. Therefore, the tribe is concerned. They, for example, explain: “And we utilize that water for consumption on this reservation. And that’s going to be a major concern for us is the contamination of the water.”⁹⁷ The tribe, thus, worries about their drinking water. Nevertheless, they also articulate this as a concern for the non-indigenous citizens. In *Awake*, a tribal member for example explains that the Missouri River is “a water source for 17 million Americans and the only source of water for my home, Standing Rock Nation. Pipelines like the black snake have burst in the past, permanently destroying watersheds like Kalamazoo River and many others.”⁹⁸ Thus, the tribe extends DAPL’s threat to the water of non-indigenous citizens. They protest against DAPL because they want to protect this water.

Environment

The tribe also worries about DAPL because it can have negative consequences for the environment, which the tribe, as environmental stewards, wants to avoid. The tribe is concerned about a potential spill with regards to the environment. The tribe, for example, states that “shoreline plants and grasses ... are abundant, particularly in bays, inlets, and marshes, where oil naturally settles.”⁹⁹ The tribe worries that a spill will oil these plants and grasses.¹⁰⁰ They state that this will have negative consequences because the transported oil

⁹⁵ The Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, “Resolution NO. 406-15.”

⁹⁶ The Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, “Impacts of an Oil Spill,” 31.

⁹⁷ “Sept 30th DAPL Meeting,” 32.

⁹⁸ *Awake*

One can see a similar motivation in:

Winona LaDuke, “What Would Sitting Bull Do?” *LA Progressive*, August 25, 2016,

<https://www.laprogressive.com/protesting-dakota-access-pipeline/> (accessed December 15, 2018); The Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, “Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Chairman responds to Oil.”

⁹⁹ The Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, “Impacts of an Oil Spill,” 7.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 9.

contains “elevated concentrations of benzene [which] poses significant negative human health and environmental impacts.”¹⁰¹ Thus, the tribe argues that DAPL has a high chance to destroy unique and sensitive habitat, plants, grasses, etc. Therefore, they reject it. This is especially important for the tribe because they consider themselves environmental stewards.¹⁰²

Environmental stewardship refers to the sustainable use as well as protection of the environment. This, thus, means that the tribe, as environmental stewards, should try to protect the environment. DAPL goes against this and therefore the tribe cannot accept it.

The tribe even relates their resistance to the global environmental crisis and movement. The global environmental movement argues that the over-exploitation of certain resources has contributed to the current ecological crisis. They want to stop this over-exploitation in order to protect the world. The tribe shares similar concerns. Chairman Archambault II explains in *The Naked Truth* with regards to DAPL: “Mother Earth is here to provide for us and we are to use the things that she makes available, so that we may live, but we don’t want to exploit them and we don’t want to abuse her because if we do then we’re creating a time when she can no longer provide for us.”¹⁰³ Archambault II explains here that people should be careful to exploit Mother Earth, such as with DAPL, because she can not take everything. Similar to the arguments in the global environmental movement, Archambault II argues against over-exploitation.

Historical Injustice

The tribe also thinks of DAPL as another form of the historical injustice that they have experienced for years. Since explorer Christopher Columbus set foot on the American continent, the indigenous tribes have experienced horrible conditions on the hand of non-indigenous people. One can think of murder, abuse, land piracy, cultural deprivation, and political reorganization. The Standing Rock tribe relates DAPL to this historical injustice. Sioux rapper the Prolific for example sings in his song: “This side of the planet’s been in decline since 1492 / 500 years and counting / Surviving the genocide they call ‘colonizing my Turtle Island.’”¹⁰⁴ Prolific relates DAPL to colonization by mentioning the year that Columbus “discovered” America. He also sings “500 years and counting.” He, thus, argues that non-indigenous people have continued to colonize indigenous peoples and that DAPL is

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 2.

¹⁰² “Sept 30th DAPL Meeting,” 17.

¹⁰³ *The Naked Truth*.

¹⁰⁴ *Prolific The Rapper x A Tribe Called Red - Black Snakes [Updated]*, by Prolific the Rapper, YouTube, 5 min. (2017), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QdeHUrL1FEM> (accessed December 15, 2018).

just another example of this. The tribe resists this. A tribal member for example declares with regards to DAPL: “We have continued collectively to be abused and I think people are tired of being treated like they’re less citizens.”¹⁰⁵ The tribe, thus, rejects the historical injustice. They see DAPL as an example of this. Therefore, they reject DAPL.

Environmental Justice

The tribe also rejects DAPL because it does not adhere to environmental justice. The United States Environmental Protection Agency defines environmental justice as “the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income, with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies.”¹⁰⁶ This means that no group should bear the disproportional burden of environmental harms. In their public discourse, the Standing Rock tribe states that ETP ignores environmental justice. In their Impact Assessment Report, the tribe, for example, states: “What is known, however, is that a vulnerable population is bearing the burden of the pipeline – its construction, its operations, and its potential failure ... As such, the construction and operation of DAPL is problematic from an environmental justice standpoint.”¹⁰⁷ They elaborate on this in their report as well. The tribe explains that although the pipeline will not cross their land, they will experience negative consequences. They, for example, explain that the pipeline will run just upstream from Lake Oahe. As a result, the pipeline can affect their water sources. The tribe explains that ETP does not acknowledge this.¹⁰⁸ Nevertheless, the tribe emphasizes that for this exact reason, ETP did stop the pipeline’s original route. The pipeline’s first route, the northern route, was supposed to go near Bismarck, but the Army Corps of Engineers rejected this because it would have negative consequences for the citizens of Bismarck, such as for their water.¹⁰⁹ As a result, EPT thought of an alternative route. The tribe, as a result, emphasizes that ETP does not adhere to environmental justice.

Laws

The Standing Rock tribe also argues that DAPL violates state laws. The tribe explains that “the state of North Dakota has laws where corporations cannot own farm and ranch land

¹⁰⁵ *Mni Wiconi*.

¹⁰⁶ EPA, “Environmental Justice,” *EPA.gov*, <https://www.epa.gov/environmentaljustice> (accessed December 15, 2018).

¹⁰⁷ The Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, “Impacts of an Oil Spill,” 88.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 77, 84.

David Archambault II, “A Letter to Assistant Secretary Darcy,” *Earth Justice*, October 28, 2016, <https://earthjustice.org/sites/default/files/files/Ltr-to-Asst-Sec-Darcy-10-28-16.pdf> (accessed December 15, 2018).

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*

The Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, “Impacts of an Oil Spill,” 72.

without a business, a pre-approved business. That didn't happen. Energy Transfer Partners purchased that property. And then they asked for the state of North Dakota to step in and remove us for trespassing on our land."¹¹⁰ This means that ETP has purchased land for the construction of the pipeline that state law did not allow them to purchase. The tribe, as a result, emphasizes that the construction of the pipeline violates this state law. Thus, they emphasize that this pipeline is unlawful.

In addition to state laws, the tribe also emphasizes the violation of several federal laws. The tribe, for example, argues that DAPL violates the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Alina Yohannen explains in her article "The Standing Rock Sioux Indians" that "NEPA was enacted to ensure that federal agencies consider environmental impacts before any 'undertaking,' and relevant environmental assessments (EAs) must be made available to the public at large and to the parties involved in the process. If the adverse effects are significant, the agency has to provide an environmental impact statement (EIS)."¹¹¹ The tribe explains that ETP violates this act. They explain that ETP has not conducted the necessary analysis as required by NEPA. As a result, the tribe states that DAPL's "current estimates of a worst case oil release into the Missouri River are based upon unrealistic assumptions."¹¹² DAPL, thus, violates this NEPA. The tribe also argues that DAPL violates the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), which is a policy that aims to protect national heritage against development.¹¹³ The tribe, for example, explains: "[DAPL] would cross the Missouri directly underneath a village site. There is an island that gets exposed when the Oahe Reservoir levels drop ... There are human remains, artifacts, pottery shards, tools throughout this entire channel."¹¹⁴ The tribe, thus, explains that DAPL violates this act because it has not properly consulted the tribe whereas it will destroy some of their heritage. Therefore, they reject DAPL.¹¹⁵ Lastly, the tribe indicates that DAPL violates the American Indian Religious Freedom Act (AIRFI). In their Impact Assessment Report, the tribe explains that "[in this act], Congress prescribed that it is national policy to protect the freedom of Native American people to exercise their traditional religions, including providing access to site."¹¹⁶ The tribe

¹¹⁰ *Frazier and Archaumbault II address police tactics.*

¹¹¹ Yohannen, "The Standing Rock Sioux Indians," 26.

¹¹² The Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, "Impacts of an Oil Spill," 2.

¹¹³ National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers, "National Historic Preservation Act of 1966," *NCSHPO.org*, <http://ncshpo.org/resources/national-historic-preservation-act-of-1966/> (accessed December 15, 2018).

¹¹⁴ "Sept 30th DAPL Meeting," 16.

One can see something similar in *The Naked Truth*.

¹¹⁵ Mentz, "Declaration."

Elizabeth Bower, "Standing Together: How the Federal Government Can Protect the Tribal Cultural Resources for the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe," *Vermont Law Review* 42 (2016): 606-607.

¹¹⁶ The Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, "Impacts of an Oil Spill," 151-152.

emphasizes that DAPL threatens their religion as well as their religious sites and, as a result, DAPL violates this act.¹¹⁷ As a result of all these violations, the tribe rejects DAPL.

Treaties

The tribe also rejects DAPL because it violates several treaties. The tribe, first of all, touches upon treaty land boundaries. In 1851, the Sioux signed a treaty with the U.S. government that recognized the Sioux's ownership of vast areas of the northern plains in exchange for the United States' right to establish the Oregon Trail across Sioux land.¹¹⁸ Violations of this treaty led to the Powder River War. The parties settled this war through the 1868 Fort Laramie Treaty, in which the Great Sioux Reservation was established. The tribe explains that this reservation comprised "all of present-day South Dakota west of the Missouri River."¹¹⁹ In their public discourse, the tribe argues that they still recognize these treaty boundaries. They also argue that DAPL challenges this. The tribe, for example, explains in their resolution: "... the Dakota Access Pipeline violates Article 2 of the 1868 Fort Laramie Treaty which guarantees that the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe shall enjoy the 'undisturbed use and occupation' of our permanent homeland, the Standing Rock Indian Reservation."¹²⁰ This shows that the tribe emphasizes that DAPL challenges the undisturbed use of the land. In addition to the undisturbed use, the treaty also promised the tribe certain hunting and fishing rights within the Standing Rock Reservation and the Great Sioux Reservation. The tribe emphasizes that DAPL also violates this aspect. They explain with regards to the treaty: "It is our interpretation that this includes the Treaty right to wildlife habitat undisturbed by toxic oil pollution."¹²¹ The tribe suggests in this text that DAPL will damage the surrounding environment, including the wildlife habitat, and, as a result, problematize the tribe's hunting. Since this was part of the treaty rights, DAPL violates the treaty. Therefore, the tribe rejects DAPL.

Rights

Another concern for the tribe is that DAPL violates several rights, such as human rights and indigenous rights. The tribe explains that many corporations, such as ETP, do not consult with indigenous peoples about projects. Moreover, tribes do not have any political representation

¹¹⁷ Ibid.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 18.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., 19.

¹²⁰ The Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, "Resolution NO. 406-15."

¹²¹ The Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, "Impacts of an Oil Spill," 22.

to resist this on a higher level. This problematizes human rights. Tribal member Allard, for example, explains with regards to DAPL: “Lack of ... legitimate representation and contributions on issues that affect us are resulting in violations of our equal and inalienable rights as members of the human family.”¹²² In addition to human rights, the tribe also argues that DAPL violates the United Nations Declaration on the rights of Indigenous Peoples, ILO 69. The tribe states: “Significantly, the ‘right of informed consent’ for such development projects was adopted by the United Nations, in Article 32, paragraph 2 of the Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. In the absence of consent by the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, DAPL violates international law.”¹²³ The tribe emphasizes that ETP has not received the tribe’s consent on DAPL and therefore violates indigenous rights.

Conclusion

The Standing Rock tribe gives many different motivations for resisting DAPL. The tribe’s main motivations to resist DAPL, however, revolve around their spirituality. In their public discourse, the tribe extensively explains their spiritual beliefs and explains the reasons that DAPL problematizes this spirituality. They, for example, discuss the interrelatedness of the world, the multiplicity of spirits and the key role of animals and water in their ceremonies. Nevertheless, the tribe also relates their resistance to non-spiritual motivations, such as corporate interests, health, and laws. This reveals an enchanted secular mindset.

The Standing Rock tribe believes on the one hand in the reality of their religion, but on the other hand they also show awareness of the conditions of plurality. Standing Rock tribal member Mentz explains in an interview: “In providing data and information, we sometimes are asked to step out of our spiritual protocol to create understanding.”¹²⁴ The tribe, thus, understands that they need to explain their spiritual beliefs to others because not everyone shares these beliefs. One can also see this awareness in the publicly articulated motivations of the Standing Rock Sioux tribe surrounding the DAPL protest movement. On the one hand, the tribe clearly reveals that they believe that their spirituality is a reality. Nevertheless, they also acknowledge that not all people share this belief. The tribe realizes that they therefore have to justify and defend their beliefs. This means that they have to explain the different aspects of their religion, such as the interrelatedness of the world and the multiplicity of spirits, for

¹²² LaDonna Brave Bull Allard, “LaDonna Brave Bull Allard Urges UN to Halt Dakota Access Pipeline,” *Sacred Stone Camp*, October 4, 2016, <http://sacredstonecamp.org/blog/2016/10/3/ladonna-bravebull-allard-urges-un-to-halt-dakota-access-pipeline> (accessed October 12, 2018).

¹²³ The Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, “Impacts of an Oil Spill,” 22.

¹²⁴ Mentz, “Declaration,” 5.

people to accept the pipeline's threat. In addition to this, the tribe also shows awareness that by relating DAPL to non-religious themes in their public discourse; they can increase non-indigenous people's understanding and support against DAPL. The tribe, for example, uses legal discourse to reject the pipeline by talking about DAPL's violation of treaties, rights and other laws. This has the potential to increase non-indigenous people's understanding. The tribe, moreover, also touches upon general concerns. One can see this, for example, with the themes of drinking water, burials and the global environmental crisis. This is important for indigenous as well as non-indigenous citizens. Thus, this can stimulate non-indigenous people's sympathy and concern. These are characteristics of an enchanted secular mindset.

III The Supporters' Public Discourse

Since its beginning, public figures, among other people, supported and joined the movement. They also gave interviews about it, gave speeches about it and wrote statements about it. In these sources, the supporters explain their motivations for resistance. In this chapter, I will argue that the supporters' publicly articulated motivations revolve mostly around non-spiritual themes. Nevertheless, the supporters do acknowledge and recognize the indigenous spirituality. This reveals a disenchanting mindset. Some supporters even show similar beliefs as the tribe within their publicly articulated motivations. This suggests a third mindset: the re-enchanting mindset. I come to this argument by analyzing the public discourse of the non-indigenous supporters in the DAPL protest movement, in specific their publicly articulated motivations with regards to the resistance against the pipeline. I then examine to what extent the public discourse manifests secular conditions of plurality. Similar to the last chapter, I deal with every theme separately, but I acknowledge that all of them relate to each other.

Motivations

The Construction and A Potential Spill

Similar to the tribe, the supporters worry about DAPL's construction and a spill in their public discourse. They argue that DAPL's construction will have negative consequences. Sarandon, for example, explains that the construction "will disturb the [surrounding area.]"¹²⁵ The supporters also argue that DAPL will eventually lead to an oil spill. Redford, for example, states: "An oil spill is all but guaranteed."¹²⁶ The supporters' other motivations flood from the consideration of the consequences of DAPL's construction and a potential spill.

Corporate Interests

¹²⁵ Susan Sarandon, "This Is How We Can Defeat Dakota Access Pipeline," *Care2*, November 3, 2016, <https://www.care2.com/causes/susan-sarandon-this-is-how-we-can-defeat-dakota-access-pipeline.html> (accessed December 15, 2018).

¹²⁶ *Robert Redford Urges Solidarity with Standing Rock Sioux*, produced by The Redford Center, Facebook, 1 min. (2016), <https://www.facebook.com/theredfordcenter/videos/watch-and-share-robert-redford-urges-solidarity-with-standing-rock-sioux-to-stop/1168544006524482/> (accessed December 15, 2018).

Several supporters explain that they reject DAPL because of corporate interests. These supporters relate corporate interests to greed. They explain that many corporations solely focus on progress and money. These supporters describe DAPL as an example of this. Fonda, for example, explains: "...that's what we're seeing here. The love of possession is a disease with them, which means greed, and that's what the pipeline represents, greed."¹²⁷ She, thus, describes DAPL as a form of greed. Other supporters build on this by arguing that ETP has put their own greed above citizens' interests. Ruffalo for example explains in a speech to the tribe: "They don't care about you. They don't know who you are. They don't know what you want. They don't know what you need."¹²⁸ He, thus, emphasizes that ETP focuses so much on profit that they do not care about nor listen to the tribe. The supporters resist this. They explain that, as a result, they join the protest movement. Ruffalo, for example, explains: "And what this is ultimately about is the will of the people over corporate greed and the corporate will."¹²⁹ He, thus, sees the DAPL protest movement as a fight against corporate interests. Other supporters argue that ETP has put their own greed above the welfare of the environment. They argue that this greed will contribute to its destruction. Sarandon, for example, argues with regards to DAPL that "we have this idea that we can own the land and make profit off it and therefore anything is justifiable ... [but] you can't put it at risk."¹³⁰ She, thus, explains that greed threatens the environment, which she rejects. Since DAPL is an example of this, she also rejects DAPL.

Health

The supporters also worry about DAPL's effect on public health. The supporters argue that the pipeline will have negative health effects. Fisher, for example, explains: "A pipeline is going to go under the Missouri river and ultimately, potentially poison many, many

¹²⁷ #NoDAPL – Press Conference with Jane Fonda and Francis Fisher, produced by NeuroPsyche, YouTube, 40 min. (2016), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PyZr-bUBSy4> (accessed December 15, 2018).

One can find similar arguments in: Robert Redford, "I Stand with the Standing Rock Sioux," *TIME*, September 26, 2016, <http://time.com/4501580/dakota-access-pipeline-protest/> (accessed December 15, 2018); *Robert Redford Urges Solidarity*; Sarandon, "This Is How We Can Defeat Dakota Access Pipeline"; *Susan Sarandon Gives Impassioned Speech at Climate Revolution*, produced by Rebel HQ, YouTube, 7 min. (2016), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xMKFHV8bvfl> (accessed December 15, 2018).

¹²⁸ *Mark Ruffalo Speaks at Standing Rock*, produced by The Laura Flanders Show, YouTube, 7 min. (2016), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0MSFEsNQmNq> (accessed December 15, 2018).

¹²⁹ Riyadh Mammadyarov, "Mark Ruffalo Talks Standing Rock, Corporate America and The Economic Power of the Environmental Industry," *The Knockturnal*, December 7, 2016, <https://theknockturnal.com/mark-ruffalo-talks-standing-rock-corporate-america/> (accessed December 15, 2018).

One can see similar sentiments in: Redford, "I Stand with the Standing Rock Sioux."; Robert Redford, "Stay Inspired and Stay Peaceful on Standing Rock," *TIME*, January 5, 2017, <http://time.com/4624262/robert-redford-stay-inspired-and-stay-peaceful-on-standing-rock/> (accessed December 15, 2018); *Susan Sarandon Gives Impassioned Speech*; *Susan Sarandon Interview with Cenk Uygur on The Young Turks*, produced by The Young Turks, YouTube, 21 min. (2016), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ngXuEVXjkWA> (accessed December 15, 2018).

¹³⁰ *Susan Sarandon Interview with Cenk Uygur*.

people.”¹³¹ Fonda, moreover, argues that the pipeline “threatens air and water quality in many states...”¹³² They, thus, describe the pipeline as toxic for people’s health. As a result, they fight the pipeline. Fonda, for example, states: “I will do everything I can to help not only stop the pipeline, but to help create a healthy community going forward.”¹³³ These supporters, thus, resist DAPL because they want to create a healthier future.

Environment

Some supporters explain that they resist DAPL because they want to protect the environment. These supporters explain that DAPL will carry toxic fracked oil. They, as a result, worry about the environment because if a spill will occur, this oil can damage the environment. It can poison and pollute the land.¹³⁴ Fonda argues that that this has already occurred before. Fonda, for example, explains: “According to the National Lawyers Guild, Energy Transfer Partners is being sued by 5 states for contaminating groundwater.”¹³⁵ She, thus, emphasizes that there is a high chance that DAPL will pollute and poison the environment, such as contaminate the groundwater. She rejects this. She explains that she instead wants to “[respect] the land and water on which human life depends.”¹³⁶ Therefore, she resists DAPL.

The supporters, moreover, extend this environmental concern by discussing DAPL’s contribution to the destruction of the earth. Several supporters worry about DAPL’s effect on not just the environment, but also on the entire earth. Sarandon, for example, states with regards to DAPL: “We’ve got the Mother Earth just being raped constantly.”¹³⁷ She, thus, suggests that ETP abuses the earth by constructing DAPL. The supporters envision the DAPL protest movement as a movement fighting this. Fonda voices this clearly in her essay on the

¹³¹ *Frances Fisher – Where to Learn More about Standing Rock*, produced by Teton Productions, YouTube, 2 min. (2016), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TgLJAL4MWMo> (accessed December 15, 2018).

One can see similar sentiments in: *Mark Ruffalo Uncut At Standing Rock*, produced by APTN News, YouTube, 6 min. (2016), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rFiz8JPtdl0> (accessed December 15, 2018); *Mark Ruffalo Speaks at Standing Rock*; Redford, “I Stand with the Standing Rock Sioux.”

¹³² Jane Fonda, “My 79th Birthday,” *Jane Fonda Official Website & Community*, December 23, 2016, <https://www.janefonda.com/my-79th-birthday/> (accessed December 15, 2016).

¹³³ *Press Conference with Jane Fonda and Francis Fisher*.

One can see a similar sentiment in Mark Ruffalo, “We Must Listen to the Dakota Access Pipeline Protesters, Not Punish Them,” *The Guardian*, November 3, 2016, <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/nov/03/dakota-access-pipeline-standing-rock-protesters-mark-ruffalo> (accessed December 15, 2018).

¹³⁴ *Fisher – Where to Learn More*.

One can see something similar in Ruffalo, “We Must Listen.”

¹³⁵ Jane Fonda, “I’m Back,” *Jane Fonda Official Website & Community*, December 16, 2016, <https://www.janefonda.com/im-back/> (accessed December 15, 2018).

¹³⁶ Jane Fonda, “Standing Rock is Greed vs. Humanity’s Future,” *TIME*, December 1, 2016, <http://time.com/4587314/jane-fonda-standing-rock/> (accessed December 15, 2018).

One can see something similar in Ruffalo, “We Must Listen.”

¹³⁷ *Susan Sarandon Gives Impassioned Speech*.

One can see something similar in *Frances Fisher Slams Obama On Broken Promises To Natives*, produced by TYT, YouTube, 12 min. (2016), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=m31FM8pru-c> (accessed December 15, 2016).

website of *TIME*. She explains that “these are people fighting not simply against their oppressors but also for the earth and all its creatures including us.”¹³⁸ These supporters, thus, envision the DAPL protest movement as trying to protect the earth. They sympathize with this. Therefore, they support the movement to resist DAPL.

The supporters relate this argument to human’s survival as well. They argue that ETP does not consider future generations. They elaborate that DAPL will cause so much destruction that this will problematize human’s survival. Fisher, for example, states: “[All of this] is so disrespectful because they’re not thinking about even their children, certainly not seven generations from now.”¹³⁹ The supporters envision the DAPL protest movement as a movement that will help to ensure human’s survival. Fonda, for example, states with regards to DAPL: “So keep teaching us because it’s the only way we’re going to survive...”¹⁴⁰ This is also a reason for the protestors to support the movement.

Climate Movement

Most of the supporters explain that they join the DAPL protest movement because they see this movement as part of the climate movement. The climate movement is a subset of the environmental movement. It is a movement that is engaged in activism related to the issues of climate change. One main aspect of this movement focuses on the abandonment of fossil fuels. Several supporters relate DAPL to this aspect of the climate movement. Redford, for example, explains: “Once burned, the carbon that the proposed DAPL pipeline carried will continue warming our world for years ... [The fossil fuel industry is] a clear and present danger to the health, prosperity and national security of all of our nation’s people.”¹⁴¹ He, thus, describes DAPL as an example of the fossil fuel industry. As a result of this image of DAPL, many protestors position the DAPL protest movement within the climate movement. Ruffalo, for example, explains with regards to the DAPL protest movement: “But really, I think this is a very important moment in time and I see it – these struggles are happening all over America and all over the world, where folks are finally saying no to a fossil fuel paradigm, a fossil fuel system that isn’t working for us anymore...”¹⁴² Redford, moreover,

¹³⁸ Fonda, “Standing Rock is Greed vs. Humanity’s Future.”

¹³⁹ *Frances Fisher Slams Obama*.

One can see similar motivations in *Press Conference with Jane Fonda and Francis Fisher* and *Sarandon Interview with Cenk Uygur*.

¹⁴⁰ *Press Conference with Jane Fonda and Francis Fisher*.

Shailene Woodley, “The Truth About My Arrest,” *TIME*, October 20, 2016, <http://time.com/4538557/shailene-woodley-arrest-pipeline/> (accessed December 15, 2018).

¹⁴¹ Redford, “I Stand with the Standing Rock Sioux.”

One can see a similar sentiment in *Mark Ruffalo Speaks at Standing Rock*.

¹⁴² *Mark Ruffalo Uncut At Standing Rock*.

states: “This was no ordinary protest. Not only did it bring together over 500 tribes, but it also became the rallying cry to millions across the world who believe we need to make the shift from fossil fuels to renewable energy.”¹⁴³ These supporters, thus, explain that they join the DAPL protest movement because they believe it is part of the global environmental movement.

Environmental Stewards

Some supporters, moreover, support the DAPL protest movement in their public discourse because they respect the indigenous’ treatment of the earth. In their public discourse, the supporters emphasize that the indigenous peoples treat the earth with utter respect. Fisher, for example, explains: “And the natives were the first environmentalists. They understand about living on earth. They understand about honoring the earth, honoring the water, honoring the sky.”¹⁴⁴ She, thus, emphasizes that the Standing Rock tribe treats the earth, the water and the sky with respect. The supporters admire this treatment. They envision this treatment for the future. Ruffalo, for example, states: “We’re leaving the extractive model, which takes and takes and takes and doesn’t replenish and the people who are going to lead us are the native people who have known this all the time.”¹⁴⁵ The supporters, thus, believe that the tribe’s treatment will lead the world to a better greener future. Therefore, they support the tribe.

Historical Injustice

The celebrities, moreover, reject DAPL because they argue that it continues the historical injustice that the tribe has experienced for years. Many of the supporters recognize that non-indigenous people have treated indigenous peoples horribly for decades. Fonda, for example, explains in an essay for *TIME* that the U.S. government has uprooted these people from their ancestral land, has forced them on a reservation, and has forced them to abandon their

¹⁴³ Redford, “Stay Inspired.”

Many celebrities share this perspective. One can find this for example in: *Shailene Woodley on Dakota Pipeline & Bernie or Bust — Complete Interview*, produced by Rebel HQ, YouTube, 8 min. (2016),

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jphp8u_qDIs (accessed December 15, 2018); *Press Conference with Jane Fonda and Francis Fisher*; Redford, “I Stand with the Standing Rock Sioux”; Ruffalo, “We Must Listen”; Michael Sainato and Chelsea Skojec, “Interview with Susan Sarandon: Obama and Clinton ‘Silent’ on Dakota Pipeline,” *Observer*, September 8, 2016, <https://observer.com/2016/09/interview-with-susan-sarandon-obama-and-clinton-silent-on-dakota-pipeline/> (accessed December 15, 2018).

¹⁴⁴ Frances Fisher, interview by Debbie Levin, *Environmental Media Network*, MP3, 46 min. (2016), <https://player.fm/series/environmental-media-network-by-ema/organic-lunch-wdebby-levin-frances-fisher> (accessed December 15, 2018).

One can see something similar in *Fisher Slams Obama* and *Press Conference with Jane Fonda and Francis Fisher*.

¹⁴⁵ *Mark Ruffalo on Why He is Fighting DAPL*, produced by MintPressNews, YouTube, 1 min. (2016), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qA5rqA6yMHs> (accessed December 15, 2018).

cultures. Many of the supporters state that DAPL is just another form of this historical injustice. Woodley, for example, states:

Yeah, I mean to use the word genocide is the appropriate word. [Colonization] was not only a cultural genocide, it was a people's genocide and that genocide is still sort of continuing because every single time a pipeline gets built on a reservation or a dump gets built on a reservation where we dump our trash on their sacred mountains, that's contributing to this slow genocide.¹⁴⁶

Woodley, thus, describes pipelines such as DAPL as a continuance of the genocide that started during colonization. The supporters explain that the DAPL protest movement fights this historical injustice. Redford, for example, states: "We can be a sea of people, rising up together to prevent ... our history of mistreatment of Native Americas from repeating."¹⁴⁷ The supporters, thus, support the movement because they want to end the historical injustice.

Environmental Justice

The supporters also reject DAPL because it does not adhere to environmental justice. Several of the supporters argue that ETP routed DAPL near the Standing Rock reservation because the Standing Rock tribe is a minority. This has two aspects. Some celebrities argue that corporations believe minorities are more disposable than other groups. Sarandon, for example, states: "So they moved it near people they value less ... They decide one group of people is more disposable than another, and that is what allows these things to happen in these communities."¹⁴⁸ Other supporters argue that minorities do not have a public voice and are, therefore, easy targets for companies. They explain that the government and other institutions and companies often do not listen to minorities. Corporations therefore prefer to place projects near these communities. Woodley, for example, explains: "And most of the time, indigenous peoples and marginalized communities are the first people affected by climate change and by the fossil fuel industry, because there's a certain veil of silence that's thrown

¹⁴⁶ *Shailene Woodley on Dakota Pipeline & Bernie or Bust.*

One can find similar motivations in Fonda, "Standing Rock is Greed vs. Humanity's Future"; *The Naked Truth*; *Frances Fisher Slams Obama* and Penny Starr, "Susan Sarandon on Halting Pipeline in Indian Country: After '500 Years' of Mistreatment 'It's Time We Listen To Them,'" *CNS News*, August 25, 2016, <https://www.cnsnews.com/news/article/penny-starr/susan-sarandon-halting-pipeline-indian-country-after-500-years-mistreatment> (accessed December 15, 2018).

¹⁴⁷ Redford, "I Stand with the Standing Rock Sioux."

One can see similar statement in *Actor Shailene Woodley On Her Arrest, Strip Search and Dakota Access Pipeline Resistance*, produced by Democracy Now, YouTube, 10 min. (2016), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GYk3XQOYCOg> (accessed December 15, 2018).

¹⁴⁸ Sainato and Skojec, "Interview with Susan Sarandon."

One can see something similar in *Actor Shailene Woodley On Her Arrest.*

over these communities when these pipelines go through.”¹⁴⁹ These supporters, thus, describe DAPL as a form of environmental racism. As a result, they reject DAPL.

Awareness

The supporters also explain that they join the DAPL protest movement because they want to try to create awareness of DAPL and the protests. Several supporters state in their public discourse that the mainstream media does not cover the Standing Rock protest movement. As a result, many people do not know about DAPL and the movement. Sarandon, for example, states: “Americans don’t know and they don’t know for a reason and that’s because the press is not there.”¹⁵⁰ As a result, the supporters publicly link themselves to the movement to help the tribe spread awareness. Ruffalo, for example, states: “The one thing I can do is be of service and put a spotlight to the people whose voice you must be hearing and you’re not hearing, okay?”¹⁵¹ Woodley similarly states: “As we all know there has been a media blackout about what’s going on and it’s up to people ... like us on the ground with our Facebook live streams and these brave warriors out there who are being arrested to bring attention to this cause, because no one’s talking about it and it’s time for that to stop.”¹⁵² The supporters, thus, explain that they join the movement to help spread awareness.

Unnecessary

Some supporters also argue that DAPL is unnecessary. Fonda, for example, explains: “Oil prices have dropped and production from the Bakken Fields has declined a stunning 25% from its peak in 2014. This means that, on top of everything else, DAPL is redundant –there is no economic rationale to increase the regional pipeline capacity.”¹⁵³ Fonda, thus, argues that oil production has decreased. She explains that this means that there is no need for ETP to create a new pipeline. The current amount of pipelines in the region can manage the oil production. Therefore, DAPL is unnecessary.

¹⁴⁹ *Shailene Woodley On Her Arrest*.

One can see something similar in *Sarandon Interview with Cenk Uygur* and Redford, “I Stand with the Standing Rock Sioux.”

¹⁵⁰ *Sarandon Gives Impassioned Speech*.

One can see something similar in *Mark Ruffalo on Epic Struggle at Standing Rock*, produced by Rebel HQ, YouTube, 4 min. (2016), https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=P_p0vOEoCSA (accessed December 15, 2018) and *Actor Shailene Woodley On Her Arrest*.

¹⁵¹ *Ruffalo on Epic Struggle*.

¹⁵² *Woodley On Her Arrest*.

One can see similar motivations in *Susan Sarandon and Shailene Woodley rally against Dakota Access Pipeline*, produced by RT America, YouTube, 5 min. (2016), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MULfkyDGhrG> (accessed December 15, 2018); and *Sarandon Interview with Cenk Uygur*.

¹⁵³ Fonda, “My 79th Birthday.”

One can see something similar in Fonda, “I’m Back.”

Lack of Benefits

Other supporters reject DAPL because it is not beneficial for Americans. The supporters argue, first of all, that DAPL does not bring much profit. Fonda, for example, emphasizes that pipelines in general do not bring much profit because oil prices have dropped.¹⁵⁴ Ruffalo focuses in specific on DAPL's profit. He states: "It's already starting to lose money."¹⁵⁵ These supporters, thus, emphasize that DAPL does not deliver much profit. The supporters argue, second of all, that DAPL does not create energy independency. Woodley, for example, states: "We know that lots of that oil is being exported. So, when their argument is that we're creating jobs and we're also creating energetic independency, that's not true."¹⁵⁶ The supporters, as a result, argue that DAPL is not very beneficial. The supporters instead argue that the transition to green energy will be much more beneficial. They emphasize that this will create much more work opportunities. Woodley, for example, explains about DAPL: "Perhaps it will create, let's say, a couple thousand jobs or a million jobs in America. They're temporary jobs. If we're talking about real job creation in this country, we have to start looking at renewable energy."¹⁵⁷ The supporters, thus, favor green energy over DAPL.

Original Inhabitants

Other supporters reject DAPL because it disrespects the original inhabitants. The indigenous peoples have lived on the American continent for centuries. They already lived there when the European colonizers arrived. Many people, thus, call them the original inhabitants. Some supporters suggest that DAPL does not acknowledge or respect this. Fisher, for example, states with regards to DAPL: "These people who have been here and who are the original natives of this country who were colonized by European white people, they need to be respected."¹⁵⁸ She, thus, implicates that DAPL does not do so right now. She, therefore, rejects DAPL.

Communication

¹⁵⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵⁵ Mammadyarov, "Mark Ruffalo Talks Standing Rock"

¹⁵⁶ *Boycott the Banks: Actor Shailene Woodley Calls for Action Against Funders of Dakota Access Pipeline*, produced by Democracy Now, YouTube, 17 min. (2017), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cQbskYdoars> (accessed December 15, 2018).

One can also see this in Alexandra King, "Susan Sarandon: Both Clinton, Trump are 'Untrustable,'" *CNN*, November 3, 2016, <https://edition.cnn.com/2016/11/03/politics/susan-sarandon-candidates-jill-stein/> (accessed December 15, 2018).

¹⁵⁷ *Boycott the Banks*.

One can see a similar argument in Ruffalo, "We Must Listen."

¹⁵⁸ Fisher, interview by Debbie Levin.

Some supporters explain that they support the DAPL protest movement because it stimulates communication among different groups. Many of the supporters emphasize that DAPL brought together a variety of people. Ruffalo, for example, explains: “The vets came, the priests came, the reverends came, the sisters came, the brothers came, everyone came, the natives came, the environmentalists came, the socio-justice people came, the children came, the grandmothers came, [and] the grandfathers came.”¹⁵⁹ In the movement, thus, many people work together. Some supporters explain this as their reason for joining the movement. Woodley, for example, explains: “Because you know the pipeline brought us together, but I never saw this as something that was about the pipeline, it was about Nations uniting and people communicating and we didn’t just see it then but we’re seeing it now still today.”¹⁶⁰ She, thus, not solely supports the movement to resist DAPL. She also supports the movement to change the narrative of us against them and to stimulate communication.

Social Justice

Some supporters explain that they join the movement because it fights for social justice. Several supporters describe DAPL as a social justice issue. Fisher, for example, states that DAPL is a “social justice [issue] all the way.”¹⁶¹ Woodley elaborates on this in her essay for *TIME*. She explains that people in current societies often use indigenous culture for their own gains. One can think, for example, of native art. She, however, emphasizes that people do not know native reality. She explains: “There is a silencing amongst Native Americans nations where our government fossil fuel industries is an oppression where for some reason nobody wants to know about them, nobody wants to know about their culture, nobody wants to hear their stories yet we use symbols that are their symbols constantly.”¹⁶² Thus, she explains that people acknowledge indigenous peoples, but only to the extent that they can use them. She

¹⁵⁹ Mammadyarov, “Mark Ruffalo Talks Standing Rock.”

¹⁶⁰ *Shailene Woodley Talks Standing Rock*, by APTN News, YouTube, 3 min. (2016), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xcv-LPHCPVQ> (accessed December 15, 2018).

One can see something similar in *Shailene Woodley’s Speech at the 2016 Environmental Media Awards*, produced by Environmental Media Association, YouTube, 11 min. (2016), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1U1C8oH-kWM> (accessed December 15, 2018).

¹⁶¹ Frances Fisher, interview by Heather Matarazzo, *Shut Up and Listen With Matarazzo*, MP3, 112 min. (2017), <https://player.fm/series/shut-up-and-listen-with-heather-matarazzo-1421511/ep-27-mad-about-crista-flanagen> (accessed December 15, 2018).

One can see similar argument in *Sarandon Gives Impassioned Speech*.

¹⁶² *Woodley on Dakota Pipeline & Bernie or Bust*.

One can see something similar in *I Don’t Vote with my Vagina’: Susan Sarandon on Not Backing Hillary Clinton*, produced by BBC Newsnight, YouTube, 5 min. (2016), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4LoGej6BqMc> (accessed December 15, 2018).

sees DAPL as an example of this.¹⁶³ She, however, wants to change this. She explains that she is therefore part of the movement.

Water

The supporters also acknowledge that the tribe is fighting DAPL to protect the water of not just the Standing Rock tribe, but also the water of non-indigenous people. The supporters explain that the Standing Rock tribe resists DAPL because they want to protect their water. Fisher, for example, explains: “I started following it and realizing what all the issues were surrounding Standing Rock. The foremost of course was the protection of the water...”¹⁶⁴ The supporters, moreover, emphasize that the tribe does not just protect this for their own people, but they protect the water for millions of other people as well. Redford, for example, explains: “Now they are not just fighting for their right, they’re also fighting for 17 million Americans who depend on the Missouri river for their clean water.”¹⁶⁵ The supporters also relate this to future generations. Woodley states: “They’re resisting this pipeline not for you and I, not for those of us who are alive right now or my future children; they’re resisting this pipeline for seven generations to come, so that in seven generations we will know, we can guarantee, that they will have water to drink.”¹⁶⁶ Thus, the supporters recognize that the DAPL protest movement is a fight to protect water.

The supporters, moreover, explain that they join the movement themselves because they also want to help protect this water. In their public discourse, the supporters emphasize the importance of water. Ruffalo, for example, explains: “The other thing that strikes true to people is water. We understand inherently how important clean water is. We all understand the importance of that. We can live without oil; we can’t live without water.”¹⁶⁷ He, thus, emphasizes water as a basic resource. As a result of this importance, the supporters want to help ensure its protection. Woodley, for example, states: “We have to ensure, as a population, that if we want clean drinking water, because it shouldn’t be a privilege—it’s not a privilege;

¹⁶³ Woodley on Dakota Pipeline & Bernie or Bust.

¹⁶⁴ Fisher, interview by Heather Matarazzo.

Many supporters share this perspective. One can, for example, find it in Fonda, “Standing Rock is Greed vs. Humanity’s Future”; Redford, “I Stand with the Standing Rock Sioux”; *Ruffalo Speaks at Standing Rock*; Sarandon, “This Is How We Can Defeat”; and *Shailene Woodley Fights for Native Americans Against North Dakota Pipeline*, produced by Late Night with Seth Meyers, YouTube, 4 min. (2016), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3PDUGcCmt4A> (accessed December 15, 2018).

¹⁶⁵ *Redford Urges Solidarity*.

One can see something similar in Fonda, “Standing Rock is Greed vs. Humanity’s Future”; Ruffalo, “We Must Listen”; *Sarandon Interview with Cenk Uygur*; and Woodley, “The Truth About My Arrest.”

¹⁶⁶ *Boycott the Banks*.

One can a similar sentiment in *I Don't Vote with my Vagina*

¹⁶⁷ *The Naked Truth*

Many share this perspective. One can find this perspective in for example *Fisher – Where to Learn More*; Fonda, “My 79th Birthday”; “Ruffalo, “We Must Listen”; and *Sarandon & Woodley rally against Dakota Access Pipeline*.

it's something that should be available for all human beings.”¹⁶⁸ The supporters, thus, resist DAPL to ensure drinking water.

Traditions

The supporters also understand the DAPL protest movement as a movement that protects indigenous traditions. In her essay on the *TIME* website, Fonda writes about the loss of indigenous traditions throughout the centuries. She explains that the seventies, however, was a pivotal moment of change. She explains that during that time the inspired youth tried to reclaim the indigenous traditional ways. She explains that the Occupation of Alcatraz was an example of this. She then relates this to the movement at Standing Rock. She explains: “At Standing Rock we are witnessing the flowering of the seeds that were planted [during the seventies] and, again, it is the youth who seem to be leading the way.”¹⁶⁹ For her, the DAPL protest movement is the extension of this movement that protects indigenous traditions. Ruffalo shares this perspective. He states that the tribe is “defending their water and their way of life.”¹⁷⁰ The supporters, thus, see the DAPL movement as a movement that tries to defend indigenous traditions. They support this.

Burials

Another concern for the supporters is that DAPL will destroy the tribe's burials. As mentioned before, the Standing Rock tribe often describes their burials as sacred. Sarandon is the only supporter that explicitly acknowledges this sacredness in her public discourse. She explains: “[The tribe] note[s] [that] the pipeline will disturb sacred burial sites.”¹⁷¹ The other supporters do not explicitly discuss the sacredness, but they express their concerns about DAPL's threat to the burials. Fisher, for example, explains: “The ancestors are buried here. I have good friends whose ancestors are buried up there and it's heartbreaking. They're being disrespected.”¹⁷² Fonda, moreover, states that “DAPL personnel deliberately desecrated documented burial grounds...”¹⁷³ The supporters reject this destruction and therefore reject DAPL.

¹⁶⁸ *Boycott the Banks*.

¹⁶⁹ Fonda, “Standing Rock is Greed vs. Humanity's Future.”

¹⁷⁰ Ruffalo, “We Must Listen.”

One can see a similar statement in *Susan Sarandon, Anti-DAPL Rally, Los Angeles, 11/15/16*, produced by Truth Justice, YouTube, 7 min. (2016), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RQJZLhcRieg> (accessed December 15, 2018).

¹⁷¹ Sarandon, “This Is How We Can Defeat.”

¹⁷² *Fisher Slams Obama*.

¹⁷³ Fonda, “My 79th Birthday.”

One can see something similar in *Mark Ruffalo Optimistic for #NODAPL Despite Trump*, produced by Rebel HQ, YouTube, 8 min. (2016), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jVDB4lcFyes> (accessed December 15, 2018).

Law

The supporters also reject DAPL because it does not adhere to federal environmental agreements. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) has set some environmental rules for corporations. This includes the rule that a corporation needs to conduct an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) if the adverse effects of a project are significant. The supporters state that ETP has not done this nor has the government required them to do so. Fonda, for example, explains: “Yet, shockingly, despite its horrific record of contaminations, DAPL has not been required to do a full Environmental Impact Statement.”¹⁷⁴ Sarandon similarly states: “So there’s a lot of lawsuits that are going on now too because just to say ‘okay forget about an environmental study’ is not legal.”¹⁷⁵ The supporters, thus, first want an EIS. Therefore, they reject DAPL’s construction.

The supporters also argue that DAPL denies several rights. Several supporters argue that DAPL violates people’s rights. Sarandon, for example, states: “[DAPL] is a clear example of raping the earth, trampling over people’s rights, trampling over sacred ground. This is wrong in every way.”¹⁷⁶ Other supporters focus on indigenous rights. Fonda, for example, explains that DAPL personnel “committed gross violations of Indigenous Peoples rights . . . and stands in violation of the international standards of Indigenous Peoples right to Free Prior Informed consent.” Fonda, thus, explains that ETP did not adequately involve the tribe prior to the start of the construction. Moreover, the tribe did not give their consent. Therefore, DAPL violates indigenous rights. As a result of these violations, the supporters reject DAPL.

Another concern for the supporters is that ETP does not recognize treaties. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the Standing Rock tribe made several treaties with the U.S. government in the eighteenth century. The supporters argue that DAPL violates these treaties. Ruffalo, for example, explains with regards to DAPL: “What we've seen repeatedly happen to these people is they have made one treaty in 1851 and ever since then, that treaty has been violated. That land that they're talking about, that easement, is actually treaty land ... it's Native American land that belongs to this - to the Standing Rock Sioux reservation, and

¹⁷⁴ Fonda, “My 79th Birthday.”

¹⁷⁵ *Susan Sarandon: Oil And Gas Is Not Tenable For Future Sustainability*, produced by MSNBC, YouTube, 13 min. (2017), https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oj-CyVT5P_o (accessed December 15, 2018).

¹⁷⁶ *Sarandon Gives Impassioned Speech*.

nation.”¹⁷⁷ Ruffalo, thus, argues that DAPL violates the 1851 treaty because it crosses treaty land. Woodley does not necessarily agree with this. She acknowledges that DAPL does not actually cross treaty land. However, she argues: “It does cross treaty water, so it’s still broken treaty.”¹⁷⁸ These supporters, thus, reject DAPL because it violates treaty agreements.

Spirituality

Most of the supporters’ publicly articulated motivations, thus, are non-spiritual motivations. The supporters touch upon many different aspects of this, such as water, health, and laws. They moreover relate the DAPL protest movement to other movements, such as the climate movement. Nevertheless, the supporters do recognize that spirituality plays an important role in the movement.

The supporters reject DAPL because they acknowledge that it threatens the tribe’s spirituality. Many of the supporters are aware and understand the tribe’s spirituality. Fisher for example explains: “This culture is about honoring the earth and honoring the creator.” Fonda, moreover, states: “[They believe] the land and water belong[s] to everyone, [consider] the earth their mother and that they are connected to the stars, part of a seamless web of life.”¹⁷⁹ The supporters, thus, grasp that the tribe believes that everything is interrelated and should therefore be respected. The supporters also acknowledge that DAPL threatens these spiritual beliefs. Fonda, for example, states that DAPL is “an inherently dangerous and unjust oil pipeline that ... violates sacred lands of the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe.”¹⁸⁰ Sarandon similarly states: “They are putting the pipeline through land that is sacred land, that ... would be the same as you know digging up graves in a cemetery or going tearing down a cathedral for them.”¹⁸¹ The supporters, thus, recognize DAPL’s threat to the tribe’s spirituality and reject this.

Some supporters even voice beliefs that are similar to the tribe’s spiritual beliefs as a reason to reject DAPL. As mentioned in the previous paragraph, the Standing Rock tribe does not separate themselves from the rest of the universe. They believe everything is interrelated. Therefore, people should respect the earth. Some of the supporters adopt similar beliefs in their publicly articulated motivations. Fisher, for example, states: “We have to open our

¹⁷⁷ *Mark Ruffalo on the Status of the Dakota Access Pipeline Protest*, produced by CNN, uploaded by Daily Kos, YouTube, 3 min. (2016), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9nSaFrBSQ3I> (accessed December 15, 2018).

¹⁷⁸ *Shailene Woodley on Dakota Pipeline & Bernie or Bust*.

¹⁷⁹ Fonda, “Standing Rock is Greed vs. Humanity’s Future.”

¹⁸⁰ Fonda, “My 79th Birthday.”

One can see a similar argument in *Press Conference with Jane Fonda and Francis Fisher*; Ruffalo, “We Must Listen”; King, “Susan Sarandon”; and *Woodley on Dakota Pipeline & Bernie or Bust*.

¹⁸¹ *Sarandon Interview with Cenk Uygur*.

minds to realize first of all that we are all one on this planet. And the natives were the first environmentalists. They understand about living on earth. They understand about honoring the earth, honoring the water, honoring the sky.”¹⁸² Fisher, thus, emphasizes that everything on earth is interconnected because she says: “we are all one.” For her, this also means we should honor the earth, water and sky. Fonda, similarly, emphasizes the earth’s interconnectedness. She states: “We are all made up of molecules from the stars and quantum physics show that we are all one. We are just waves of energy.”¹⁸³ In addition to Fisher and Fonda, Woodley also believes that everything is interrelated and that humankind therefore needs to respect everything. Woodley states: “We are all connected and when one part of our system falters, one person suffers or one community suffers, then we all suffer.”¹⁸⁴ These women, thus, not only acknowledge indigenous spirituality, but they also adopt similar beliefs. Thus, they reject DAPL because the pipeline problematizes this belief system.

Conclusion

The supporters, thus, voice many different motivations for supporting the DAPL protest movement. Most of these motivations revolve around non-religious themes. They focus on the environment, on health, and on laws. Nevertheless, all supporters do grasp that the tribe’s spirituality plays a role in the DAPL protest movement. They acknowledge that DAPL threatens this and they reject this.

This reveals a disenchanted mindset. The supporters recognize that the tribe sees reality as enchanted. They also acknowledge that DAPL challenges this reality. Thus, they mention this in their motivations. Nevertheless, this role of religion only matters because it is important for the tribe. The supporters themselves do not share these beliefs. They instead present many other non-religious motivations for supporting the movement, such as health, unlawfulness, and environmentalism.

Tentative evidence suggests a second mindset within the public discourse of the supporters: the re-enchanted mindset. Fisher, Sarandon and Woodley focus in most of their public discourse on non-spiritual motivations. Nevertheless, in several of their interviews, statements and speeches, they not only recognize that the tribe sees reality as enchanted, but they also express beliefs that correspond to the tribe’s spirituality. They state that the world is

¹⁸² Fisher, interview by Debbie Levin.

¹⁸³ *Press Conference with Jane Fonda and Francis Fisher.*

¹⁸⁴ *Shailene Woodley on Taking Responsibility for White Supremacy*, produced by Rebel HQ, YouTube, 4 min. (2016), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TpbMIQkCFXs> (accessed December 15, 2018).

interconnected and that people, as a result, need to have respect for the environment. Thus, although their basis is non-spiritual, they seem to re-capture aspects of spirituality. More research, however, is needed to say anything conclusive about this mindset.

IIII The Academic Debate

Both the supporters and the Standing Rock Sioux tribe reveal mindsets that operate within secular conditions of plurality. In this chapter, I examine how this differs from the current academic debate on secularism. Moreover, I examine why this differs. As a result, I will argue that the public discourse surrounding the DAPL protest movement differs from the current binary debate on secularism because within the movement the secular-religious distinction does not exist. Instead, one can find an enchanted and a disenchanted mindset that operate within secular conditions of plurality. The binary patterns do not appear in the DAPL protest movement because the tribe's spirituality is not highly institutionalized and because the tribe's ideals align with secular ideals. In this chapter, I first discuss the current academic debate. Then I compare this to the secular mindsets that I found in my two previous chapters. Lastly, I discuss two plausible reasons on why the binary patterns of the secular-religious distinction do not appear in the DAPL protest movement.

The Academic Debate

The current academic debate revolves around the binary of the sacred and the secular. Within this debate, there have been a lot of different opinions and varieties. Since the 2000s, in specific, there has been a break with the past. In order to, however, understand the current debate, I will shortly touch upon the academic opinions before this time.

Up until the 1990s, many academics argued that there was a distinction between the sacred and the secular. In the nineteenth century, several scholars coined the secularization theory, which argues that modern mindsets contribute to the decline of religion's influence. An example of such a scholar is sociologist Peter Berger.¹⁸⁵ In *The Heretical Imperative*, he argues that "the impact of modernity on religion is commonly seen in terms of the process of secularization, which can be described simply as one in which religion loses its hold on the

¹⁸⁵ Other examples are Karel Dobbelaere, Thomas Luckmann, and Bryan Wilson.

level both on institutions and of human consciousness.”¹⁸⁶ Berger argues that this is the case because religion lacks rational thinking. He states that “it is a matter of a gap between the cognitive presuppositions of the religious consciousness and the cognitive presupposition of the surrounding social milieu.”¹⁸⁷ Social science scholars, thus, believed that religion’s influence would decline in societies. Therefore, these scholars barely discussed religion anymore. If they did still discuss religion, they discussed religion as a dangerous and irrational influence on society.¹⁸⁸

Although most scholars agreed that religion would decline in influence, they did not agree on the exact meaning of this decline. As a result, there were different narratives about this. Sociologist José Casanova identifies three main narratives in *Public Religions in the Modern World*: secularization as differentiation, secularization as religious decline and secularization as privatization. The differentiation thesis posited that the process of secularization would separate the secular spheres, such as the state, the economy and science, from the religious spheres. The decline-of-religion thesis posited that with increasing secularization religion would decline and eventually even disappear. Lastly, the privatization thesis posited that the process of secularization would privatize and marginalize religion by excluding it from the public sphere.¹⁸⁹ In time, it became clear that religion did not disappear. Societies, for example, experienced violent religious conflicts.¹⁹⁰ The other two narratives, nevertheless, did remain relevant within the academic discourse.

From the 2000s on, academics, however, began to challenge the normative assumptions inherent in secularism by defining the secular and the sacred as social constructs. From the 2000s on, scholars began to question secularism as the natural logic of reasoning.¹⁹¹ Casanova is an example of this. He, for example, states in “The Secular and Secularisms”: “Secularism may be unreflexively held and phenomenologically assumed as the taken-for-granted normal structure of modern reality.”¹⁹² He, thus, argues that people take secularism

¹⁸⁶ Peter L. Berger, *The Heretical Imperative: Contemporary Possibilities of Religious Affirmation* (Garden City, NY: Anchor Press, 1979; Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1980), 24.

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 91.

¹⁸⁸ Wilson, “Being ‘Critical’ of/about/on ‘Religion,’” 4.

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 5; José Casanova, *Public Religions in the Modern World* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), 19-20.

¹⁹⁰ Wilson 5.

¹⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 9.

One can also see this in José Casanova, “Religion, European Secular Identities, and European Integration,” in *Religion in an Expanding Europe*, ed. Timothy A. Byrnes and Peter J. Katzenstein (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006); Elizabeth Shakman Hurd, *The Politics of Secularism in International Relations* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008); Ahmet T. Kuru, *Secularism and State Policies toward Religion: The United States, France, and Turkey* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009); Talal Asad, *Formations of the Secular: Christianity, Islam, Modernity* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2003).

¹⁹² Casanova, “The Secular and Secularisms,” 1051.

for granted as the normal structure of the modern world. Scholars soon began to challenge these normative assumptions. They began to argue that the secular and its binary opposite religion are social constructs. Political scientist Elizabeth Hurd, for example, emphasizes that one can understand secularism “as a set of discursive traditions that seeks to construct both the secular and the religious in particular ways.”¹⁹³ Talal Asad argues something similar in *Formations of the Secular*. He states that “the ‘religious’ and the ‘secular’ are not essentially fixed categories.”¹⁹⁴ He argues instead that they are constructed. Asad illustrates this clearly with regards to the concept of religion. He explains that the late nineteenth-century, anthropological and theological thought “rendered a variety of overlapping social usages rooted in changing and heterogeneous forms of life into a single immutable essence, and claimed it to be the object of a universal human experience called ‘religious.’”¹⁹⁵ He, thus, argues that linguistic formulations contribute to the definition and regulation of religion.

In addition, scholars also began to argue that secularism is not homogeneous. From the 2000s on, scholars began to argue that secularism is a flexible and fluid concept that can differ per country.¹⁹⁶ An example is Wilson. She argues that “like ‘religion’, ‘secularism’ is not a singular entity. It is diverse, shifting, changing, unstable and contextually specific.”¹⁹⁷ This means that secularism can mean different things in different countries. In *The Politics of Secularism*, Hurd illustrates this by defining two forms of secularism: Laicism and Judeo-Christianism. Hurd explains that Laicism believes that religion is an “impediment to modern politics” and religion should therefore be expelled from politics or disappear altogether.¹⁹⁸ Hurd explains that Judeo-Christianism believes that Judeo-Christianity contributes to society, but other religions do not.¹⁹⁹ Hurd explains that this latter is existent in the U.S. In this country, presidents, for example, swear on the bible during the presidential oath.²⁰⁰ These scholars, thus, argue that secularism is a fluid concept.

Scholars, however, often continue to define secularism in terms of the sacred/secular binary. In “Critical Approaches,” Wilson questions that “if ‘religion’ and ‘secular’ are categories that are filled with different meanings in different contexts, are they useful as analytical and descriptive terms, or should we be attempting to develop alternatives, and what

¹⁹³ Hurd, *The Politics of Secularism*, 44.

¹⁹⁴ Asad, *Formations of the Secular*, 25.

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 31.

¹⁹⁶ One can also find this in Kuru, *Secularism and State Policies toward Religion*; Casanova, “Religion, European Secular Identities, and European Integration;” Stacey Gutkowski, *Secular Ways of War* (London: I.B. Taurus, 2014).

¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁹⁸ Hurd, *The Politics of Secularism*, 5, 23.

¹⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 5.

²⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 38.

would those alternatives be?”²⁰¹ Nevertheless, Wilson continues to use these terms and the adherent binary. She defends her choice by explaining that although there are different manifestations of secularism, there are some “family resemblances that characterize ideological forms of secularism.”²⁰² Wilson explains that some assumptions that exist in these resemblances are:

- a) ‘religion’ is something tangible and identifiable, that can be clearly distinguished, defined and separated from the ‘secular’, which can also be clearly defined...
- b) ‘religion’ should be clearly distinguished and separated from other areas of human activity, such as politics, economics, law, education and so forth, that are grouped under the ‘secular’, because
- c) ‘religion’ is highly subjective, particular, individual and irrational, as opposed to the ‘secular’ which is neutral and universal; and,
- d) ‘religion’ is what people will disagree about more frequently and violently than anything else, thus ‘religion’ is the fundamental cause of violence, intolerance and chaos; therefore
- e) ‘religion’ must be kept out of the ‘public’ sphere and relegated to the ‘private’ to preserve order and peace, meaning that the distinction between ‘religion’ and the ‘secular’ is managed through the existence of ‘public’ and ‘private’ spheres ...
- f) ‘religion’ is always subordinated to the ‘secular’, in that, even if ‘religion’ is viewed as something that can positively contribute to politics and public life, its interventions should still be regulated by so-called ‘secular’ authorities and institutions.²⁰³

Wilson does explain that not all of these assumptions are inherent in all manifestations or in the same extent. Nevertheless, she continues to treat and define the secular and the sacred as separate entities.

As mentioned before, one can see also see this binary in the academic debate on religion and the environment. The scholars within this debate disagree on the common assumptions about secularism, such as those described by Wilson in the previous paragraph. Some argue in favor of the exclusion of religion from the public sphere, such as from

²⁰¹ Wilson, “Being ‘Critical’ of/about/on ‘Religion,’” 3.

²⁰² Ibid., 8.

²⁰³ Ibid., 8-9.

environmental solutions. Other scholars argue that religion can contribute to the public sphere, such as environmental solutions. Nevertheless, both sides continue to treat and define religion as a separate entity. The debate, thus, continues to revolve around the binary of the secular and the sacred. In my previous two chapters, I found that the publicly articulated motivations of the two groups within the DAPL protest movement differ from this binary.

Conditions of Plurality

The DAPL protest movement consists of two groups: the Standing Rock tribe and the supporters. The Standing Rock tribe is a group that does not separate spirituality from other aspects of their lives. As a result, spirituality also plays a significant role within their publicly articulated motivations. The supporters live in a secular country. Although Christianity has maintained an important role in U.S. society and politics, the U.S. does not explicitly include religion in policies, such as environmental policies.²⁰⁴ This also means that non-spiritual themes play a significant role within the supporters' publicly articulated motivations. As a result, one could assume that there is a clear secular/sacred distinction between these groups. This, however, is not the case.

In my previous two chapters, I found that the publicly articulated motivations of the two groups that are involved in the DAPL protest movement differ from the binary of the secular and the sacred. Both groups' publicly articulated motivations manifest secular conditions of pluralities. There are, however, varieties within their public discourse. I have introduced two ideal types to define these varieties: the enchanted mindset and the disenchanting mindset.

The Standing Rock tribe's publicly articulated motivations differ from the secular/sacred binary because they reveal an enchanted mindset that operates within secular conditions of plurality. As mentioned in the third chapter, the tribe's public discourse mainly focuses on their spirituality. They emphasize the importance of their religion. Moreover, they emphasize that DAPL will threaten this religion because it will harm the environment, destroy sacred places and burials as well as problematize the practice of their religion. The tribe's public discourse, thus, focuses on spirituality. Nevertheless, it differs from the secular/sacred binary because these spiritual motivations operate within secular conditions of plurality. The tribe presents an understanding of the fact that not everyone shares their beliefs. They show an understanding that not all people see the tribe's spirituality as a reality. One can see this

²⁰⁴ Hurd, *The Politics of Secularism*, 115.

because they first of all extensively explain and defend their spirituality in their statements and interviews. This shows that they acknowledge that people may have different perspectives and thus do not understand the tribe's spirituality. Second of all, they discuss motivations that not only affect the tribe but also non-indigenous people. Moreover, they use non-spiritual language, such as legal language. This shows that they understand that they have to indicate other motivations to get people involved. This reveals an enchanted mindset.

The supporters' publicly articulated motivations differ from the secular/sacred binary because they reveal a disenchanting mindset that operates within secular conditions of plurality. As seen in chapter four, the supporters discuss many different non-spiritual motivations. They, for example, focus on environmental concerns. They describe DAPL as a threat to the environment and to water. In addition to this, they discuss DAPL's violation of several laws. The supporters, thus, focus on non-spiritual aspects in their public discourse. Nevertheless, the supporters' public discourse differs from the secular/sacred binary because they acknowledge the pluralities of belief in the secular age. All supporters recognize and acknowledge the tribe's spirituality. They, moreover, recognize that DAPL threatens this spirituality. Ruffalo, for example, repeatedly states that DAPL threatens the tribe's sacred places. The supporters, therefore, also state that they refute the pipeline. However, they do not express similar beliefs. The supporters, thus, touch upon religious aspects in their public discourse because it is important for the tribe. This reveals a disenchanting mindset.

Tentative evidence, moreover, suggests a third mindset. As mentioned before, none of the supporters focus extensively on religion. Nevertheless, in certain statements, some supporters voice motivations that indicate similar beliefs as the tribe's beliefs. Thus, these supporters on the one hand still attach value to non-religious motivations, but also draw from the tribe in trying to re-capture enchantment. More research is needed, however, to say anything conclusive about this.

This shows that in the public discourse of the DAPL protest movement, there is not a binary between the secular and the sacred. There is not an opposition. Instead, there are mindsets that operate within secular conditions of plurality: the enchanted mindset and the disenchanting mindset.

Plausible Reasons

Thus, the dualistic patterns of the secular/sacred binary do not appear in the DAPL protest movement. Why is this the case? There are two plausible reasons for this: first, the tribe's

spirituality is not highly institutionalized, and, second, the tribe's ideals align with secular ideals.

The first plausible reason is that the tribe's spirituality is not highly institutionalized. In her article *Beyond Dualism*, Wilson argues that religion has traditionally been excluded from public debates because "[it] is premised on a limited understanding of religion, engendered by dualistic thinking."²⁰⁵ One of these dichotomies is the institutional/ideational. Wilson explains that this dichotomy "relates to religion as an institution or religion as a set of ideas."²⁰⁶ Wilson argues that scholars exclude religion from the public debate because they focus on the institutional aspects of religion. She argues that this is the case because "the institutional element of religion is observable and tangible, and thus, easier to examine, in contrast to religion's ideational influences, which are more subtle, implicit, and intangible."²⁰⁷ Wilson explains that scholars couple this dichotomy to the public/private divide.²⁰⁸ Scholars, thus, connect religious institutions to the private sphere.

The Standing Rock tribe's spirituality is not highly institutionalized and therefore avoids the exclusion from the public sphere. The tribe has several collective ceremonies. One can, for example, think of the Sun Dance ceremony, which is a ceremony that the entire community enacts to pray for the renewal of individuals and of the earth. Nevertheless, the tribal members often practice their spirituality in a quotidian manner. Anthropologist Raymond J. DeMallie, for example, explains that "Lakota religion may be phrased in terms of beliefs and rituals that [permeate] everyday life."²⁰⁹ Lee Irwin elaborates on this in his book *Native American Spirituality*. He explains: "Ceremonial activity, prayer, or simply carrying out daily activities like driving a friend to work or struggling for political rights may engage individuals in aspects of 'religious' concern."²¹⁰ Spirituality is, thus, part of the tribe's daily life. This shows that the tribe's spirituality is not highly institutionalized. As such, it does not fully adhere to the dominant understanding of religion. Consequently, the tribe's spirituality is less likely to be excluded from the public sphere.

The second plausible reason is that the tribe's spirituality aligns with secular ideals. As mentioned before, Wilson explains that one of the common assumptions with regards to secularism is that "'religion' is what people will disagree about more frequently and violently

²⁰⁵ Erin Wilson, "Beyond Dualism: Expanded Understandings of Religion and Global Justice," *International Studies Quarterly* 54, no. 3 (2010): 749.

²⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 742.

²⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 742.

²⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 743

²⁰⁹ Raymond J. DeMallie, "Lakota Belief and Ritual in the Nineteenth Century," in *Sioux Indian Religion: Tradition and Innovation*, ed Raymond J. DeMallie and Douglas R. Parks (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1987), 27.

²¹⁰ Lee Irwin, *Native American Spirituality: A Critical Reader* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2000), 3.

than anything else.”²¹¹ As a result, there is the adherent assumption that religion is “the fundamental cause of violence, intolerance and chaos.”²¹² These assumptions also contribute to the idea that religion should be excluded from the public sphere. The tribe’s spirituality does not fit these assumptions about religion. Instead, the tribe’s spirituality aligns with secular ideals because respect characterizes the tribe’s spirituality. The Standing Rock tribe, as discussed in the third chapter, emphasizes interconnectedness in their spirituality. In their report, tribal member Catches, Sr. for example explains that the Lakota “looks at the world on this creation and knows they are all interrelated ... Everything he’s related to and he respects it.”²¹³ This quote shows that a Lakota believes that the whole earth is connected. This also applies to humankind. Thus, the Standing Rock Sioux tribe believes that all human beings are connected. The tribe moreover argues that, as a result of this interconnectedness, people should respect everything on earth. This also means that a tribal member should respect other human beings regardless of different beliefs and backgrounds. These ideals align with secular ideals because secular ideals also emphasize a form of respect. Secular ideals advocate for the recognition and acknowledgement of other peoples’ beliefs. Based on this alignment, the tribe’s spirituality is again less likely to be excluded from the public sphere.

Conclusion

The current academic debate revolves around the binary of the secular and the sacred. These binary patterns do not exist within the DAPL protest movement because within the movement one can find an enchanted mindset and a disenchanting mindset that operate within secular conditions of plurality. Tentative evidence even suggests a third mindset: the re-enchanted mindset. Although further research needs to be done on why the patterns of the secular/sacred binary do not appear in the protest movement, based on my research, I discussed two plausible reasons. First, the tribe’s spirituality is not highly institutionalized. Second, the tribe’s ideals align with secular ideals.

²¹¹ Wilson, “Being ‘Critical’ of/about/on ‘Religion,’” 8-9.

²¹² Ibid.

²¹³ The Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, “Impacts of an Oil Spill,” 14.

Conclusion

In his book *A Secular Age*, Taylor challenges the current debate on secularism, which revolves around dominant modes of secularism as dualistic. He instead argues that modern secularism is characterized by the emergence of conditions of plurality. This means that people can choose between many possibilities with regards to what they believe, including religious beliefs. The aim of this thesis was to analyze how the public discourse surrounding the DAPL protest manifests the secular conditions of plurality that Taylor describes. As a result, in my thesis I argued that within the public discourse of the DAPL protest movement, one can find both an enchanted and a disenchanted mindset that operate within secular conditions of plurality. This differs from the modern debate on secularism because within the movement the secular-religious distinction does not exist. I arrived at this argument through my main question: How does the public discourse surrounding the Dakota Access Pipeline protest movement manifest secular conditions of plurality?

In my first chapter, I clarified that I adhere to Charles Taylor's definition of secularism in my thesis. He argues that modern secularism is characterized by the emergence of conditions of plurality, in which people have an awareness of the necessity to give reasons for their beliefs and also to constantly strengthen their beliefs and frame them in relation to others discourses. In my thesis, I found it useful to introduce a number of ideal types within Taylor's definition of secularism: the disenchanted mindset and the enchanted mindset. In my thesis, I also explained that tentative evidence suggests a third ideal type: the re-enchanted mindset.

In my second chapter, I explained my methodology. I explained that I would use qualitative research, in specific discourse analysis. I explained that I would analyze interviews, speeches and statements of the Standing Rock tribe as well as interviews, speeches and statements from six supporters. I explained that I specifically chose six celebrities as the supporters because of the accessibility of their public discourse.

In my third chapter, I examined to what extent the publicly articulated motivations of the Standing Rock Sioux tribe within the Dakota Access Pipeline protests manifest secular conditions of plurality. I found that the majority of the publicly articulated motivations of the tribe revolve around their spirituality. Nonetheless, this spirituality operates within secular

conditions of plurality. The tribe's shows an awareness of other beliefs, which has led to the justification of their belief as well as to the fact that they also mention motivations that involve non-religious aspects. This reveals an enchanted mindset.

In my fourth chapter, I examined to what extent the publicly articulated motivations of the non-indigenous supporters within the Dakota Access Pipeline protests manifest secular conditions of plurality. I found that the supporters discuss many non-religious motivations. Nevertheless, they also grasp the tribe's spirituality. They, however, only recognize this spirituality because it is important for the tribe. This reveals a disenchanted mindset. Tentative evidence, moreover, suggested a third mindset: the re-enchanted mindset. Three supporters voice in a few of their interviews and statements certain beliefs that share resemblances to the tribe's beliefs. I stated that there is, however, more research needed to say anything conclusive about this third mindset.

In my final chapter, I examined how the secular conditions of plurality inherent in the DAPL protest movement differ from the current academic debate on secularism, and why this differs. I found that the current academic discussion revolves around the binary of the secular and the sacred. The public discourse of the DAPL protest movement differs from this because it does not recognize religion and secularism as separate, opposite entities. Instead, I found a disenchanted mindset and an enchanted mindset that operate within secular conditions of plurality. I then gave two plausible reasons why the dualistic patterns of the sacred/secular binary do not appear in the DAPL protest movement.

Thus, in the public discourse of the DAPL protest movement, the disenchanted mindset and the enchanted mindset both operate within secular conditions of plurality. What does this mean? In the context of the DAPL protest movement, one can see a collaboration between two different groups. Regardless of the differences between the beliefs of the supporters and the Standing Rock tribe, they co-operate to stop DAPL. They do not reject each other's beliefs, but instead justify and defend their own beliefs and recognize and acknowledge the other group's beliefs. This creates the conditions that allow them to fight DAPL as a unified protest movement.

This finding serves future (environmental) protest movements. The common assumptions about secularism inherent in the modern debate have trickled into Euro-American societies. Hurd, for example, explains that "[the] traditions of secularism are powerful and persuasive collective dispositions that shape modern sensibilities, habits, and

beliefs concerning the meaning of religion and its relationship to the political.”²¹⁴ Thus, many Euro-American citizens see religion and secularism as opposites, in which religion should be excluded from the public sphere.²¹⁵ Hurd explains that the U.S. is different in this because it displays a Judeo-Christian secularism. As mentioned before, Judeo-Christian secularism expels religion from the public sphere with the exception of Judeo-Christianity. This is the case because this secularism believes that “Judeo-Christian, religious tradition [culminate] in and [contribute] to the unique Western achievement of the separation of church and state.”²¹⁶ Nevertheless, with regards to other religions, the U.S. makes crucial distinctions between the public and the private and the secular and the sacred.²¹⁷ These assumptions within US society can problematize collaborations between people with different beliefs. Moreover, it can increase hostility between different groups. The DAPL protest movement, however, reveals that this does not necessarily have to be the case. Within this context, one finds secular conditions of plurality. This means that both spiritual and non-spiritual beliefs can function within secularism. The different groups recognize and acknowledge each other. This creates conditions for co-operation. As a result, different groups can join together for a common cause. This secular perspective, thus, has the potential to strengthen (environmental) protest movements.

I am aware that my argument is based on a specific case in a specific time in a specific context. In order to say something more definitive about this, it requires more research. Future research should look first of all at similar (environmental) protest movements to see whether secular conditions of plurality occur more often. Scholars should also consider the differences between secularisms across countries. For example, they should compare secular conditions of plurality in U.S. (environmental) protest movements and secular conditions of plurality in European (environmental) protest movements. Lastly, scholars should do more research on why the dualistic patterns of the sacred/secular binary do not appear in certain contexts. In my research, I have discussed two plausible reasons for this, but there are many more. Thus, there is a lot of work that still needs to be done. However, this work can help future movements.

Unfortunately, for the Standing Rock Sioux tribe this is already too late. In June 2017, the first oil started flowing through the pipeline. Public policy expert Brigham A. McCown explains that since then “DAPL has been quietly transferring crude oil from the Bakken fields

²¹⁴ Hurd, *The Politics of Secularism*, 148.

²¹⁵ Wilson, “Being ‘Critical’ of/about/on ‘Religion,’” 25.

²¹⁶ Hurd, *The Politics of Secularism*, 110.

²¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 115.

in North Dakota at a rate of over 500,000 barrels per day.”²¹⁸ For many people, this has been a blessing. McCown explains that DAPL has created many jobs and has not had any major spills yet.²¹⁹ The protestors, however, have not much to celebrate. They lost their battle. As a result, the Standing Rock tribe will have to worry about their spirituality, the environment, their health etc. Regardless of this loss, future research is still important because more “battles” will likely occur.

²¹⁸ Brigham A. McCown, “What Ever Happened To The Dakota Access Pipeline?” *Forbes*, June 4, 2018, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/brighammccown/2018/06/04/what-ever-happened-to-the-dakota-access-pipeline/#5bc6fe4b4055> (accessed December 15, 2018).

²¹⁹ *Ibid.*

Bibliography

- #NoDAPL – Press Conference with Jane Fonda and Francis Fisher. Produced by NeuroPsyche. YouTube. 40 min. 2016. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PyZr-bUBSy4> (accessed December 15, 2018).
- Actor Shailene Woodley on her Arrest, Strip Search and Dakota Access Pipeline Resistance. Produced by Democracy Now. YouTube. 10 min. 2016. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GYk3XQOYCOg> (accessed December 15, 2018).
- Allard, LaDonna Brave Bull. “LaDonna Bravebull Allard Urges UN to Halt Dakota Access Pipeline.” *Sacred Stone Camp*. October 4, 2016. <http://sacredstonecamp.org/blog/2016/10/3/ladonna-bravebull-allard-urges-un-to-halt-dakota-access-pipeline> (accessed October 12, 2018).
- Archambault II, David “A Letter to Assistant Secretary Darcy.” *Earth Justice*. October 28, 2016. <https://earthjustice.org/sites/default/files/files/Ltr-to-Asst-Sec-Darcy-10-28-16.pdf> (accessed December 15, 2018).
- Asad, Talal. *Formations of the Secular: Christianity, Islam, Modernity*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2003.
- Awake, A Dream from Standing Rock*. Directed by Myron Dewey and Josh Fox. Netflix. 89 min. Nevada: Digital Smoke Signals, 2017.
- Barker, David C., and David H. Bearce. “End-Times Theology, the Shadow of the Future, and Public Resistance to Addressing Global Climate Change.” *Political Research Quarterly* 66, no. 2 (2013): 267-279.
- Berger, Peter L. *The Heretical Imperative: Contemporary Possibilities of Religious Affirmation*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press, 1979. Reprint, Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1980.
- Biehl, Janet. *Rethinking Ecofeminist Politics*. Boston: South End Press, 1991.

- Bowen, Glenn A. "Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method." *Qualitative Research Journal* 9, no. 2 (2009): 27-40.
- Bower, Elizabeth. "Standing Together: How the Federal Government Can Protect the Tribal Cultural Resources for the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe." *Vermont Law Review* 42 (2016): 604-630.
- Boycott the Banks: Actor Shailene Woodley Calls for Action Against Funders of Dakota Access Pipeline*. Produced by Democracy Now. YouTube. 17 min. 2017.
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cQbskYdoars> (accessed December 15, 2018).
- Campbell, Peter B. "'Those are our Eiffel Towers, our Pyramids': Why Standing Rock is about much more than Oil." *The Guardian*, May 15, 2017.
<https://www.theguardian.com/science/2017/may/15/those-are-our-eiffel-towers-our-pyramids-why-standing-rock-is-about-much-more-than-oil> (accessed December 14, 2018).
- Casanova, José. *Public Religions in the Modern World*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.
- Casanova, José. "Religion, European Secular Identities, and European Integration." In *Religion in an Expanding Europe*, edited by Timothy A. Byrnes and Peter J. Katzenstein, 65-92. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Casanova, José. "The Secular and Secularisms." *Social Research* 76, no. 4 (2009): 1049-1066
- Deloria, Vine. *God is Red: A Native View of Religion*. Golden, Colorado: Fulcrum Publishing, 2003.
- DeMallie, Raymond J. "Lakota Belief and Ritual in the Nineteenth Century." In *Sioux Indian Religion: Tradition and Innovation*, edited by Raymond J. DeMallie and Douglas R. Parks, 25-44. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1987.
- Denny, Frederick M. "Islam and Ecology: A Bestowed Trust Inviting Balanced Stewardship." *Earth Ethics* 10, no. 1 (1998), <http://environment-ecology.com/religion-and-ecology/714-islam-and-ecology-a-bestowed-trust-inviting-balanced-stewardship.html> (accessed December 14, 2018).
- Eckberg, Douglas Lee, and T. Jean Blocker. "Varieties of Religious Involvement and Environmental Concerns: Testing the Lynn White Thesis." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 28, no. 4 (1989): 509-517.
- EPA. "Environmental Justice." *EPA.gov*. <https://www.epa.gov/environmentaljustice> (accessed December 15, 2018).

- Fisher, Frances. Interview by Debbie Levin. *Environmental Media Network*. MP3. 46 min. 2016. <https://player.fm/series/environmental-media-network-by-ema/organic-lunch-wdebbie-levin-frances-fisher> (accessed December 15, 2018).
- Fisher, Frances. Interview by Heather Matarazzo. *Shut Up and Listen With Matarazzo*. MP3. 112 min. 2017. <https://player.fm/series/shut-up-and-listen-with-heather-matarazzo-1421511/ep-27-mad-about-crista-flanagen> (accessed December 15, 2018).
- Fonda, Jane. "I'm Back." *Jane Fonda Official Website & Community*. December 16, 2016. <https://www.janefonda.com/im-back/> (accessed December 15, 2018).
- Fonda, Jane. "My 79th Birthday." *Jane Fonda Official Website & Community*. December 23, 2016. <https://www.janefonda.com/my-79th-birthday/> (accessed December 15, 2016).
- Fonda, Jane. "Standing Rock is Greed vs. Humanity's Future." *TIME*, December 1, 2016. <http://time.com/4587314/jane-fonda-standing-rock/> (accessed December 15, 2018).
- Frances Fisher Slams Obama on Broken Promises to Natives*. Produced by TYT. YouTube. 12 min. 2016. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=m31FM8pru-c> (accessed December 15, 2016).
- Frances Fisher – Where to Learn More About Standing Rock*. Produced by Teton Productions. YouTube. 2 min. 2016. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TgLJAL4MWMo> (accessed December 15, 2018).
- Frazier and Archaumbault II Address Police Tactics*. Produced by KFYP-TV. Facebook. 19 min. 2016. https://www.facebook.com/KFYRtv/videos/10154016576274103/?hc_ref=SEARCH (accessed December 14, 2018).
- Gardner, Gary. "Engaging Religions to Shape Worldviews." In *State of the World 2010: Transforming Cultures from Consumerism to Sustainability*, edited by The Worldwatch Institute, 23-29. New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company, 2010.
- Garrouette, Eva Marie, Heather Orton Anderson, Patricia Nez-Henderson, Calvin Croy, Janette Beals, Jeffrey A. Henderson, Jacon Thomas, Spero M. Manson and The AI-SUPERPFPP Team. "Religio-Spiritual Participation in Two American Indian Populations." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 53, no. 1 (2015), <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4646059/>.
- Gifford, Robert D. "The Dragons of Inaction: Psychological Barriers that Limit Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation." *American Psychologist* 66, no. 4 (2011): 290-302.

- Gilbert, Alan. "Grave Matters in Pipeline Controversy." *Who What Why*, September 19, 2016. <https://whowhatwhy.org/2016/09/19/grave-matters-pipeline-controversy/> (accessed December 14, 2018).
- Gutkowski, Stacey. *Secular Ways of War*. London: I.B. Taurus, 2014.
- Hall, Douglas J. *Imaging God: Dominion as Stewardship*. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 1986.
- Hall, Douglas J. "Stewardship as a Human Vocation." *Stewardship of Life Institute*. September 7, 2010. <http://www.stewardshipoflife.org/2010/09/stewardship-as-a-human-vocation/> (accessed December 12, 2018).
- Haluza-Delay, Randolph. "Religion and Climate Change: Varieties in Viewpoints and Practices." *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change* 5, no. 2 (2014): 261-279.
- Hennink, Monique, Inge Hutter and Ajay Bailey. *Qualitative Research Methods*. London: Sage, 2011.
- "History: Background." *Stand with Standing Rock*. <https://standwithstandingrock.net/history/> (accessed December 14, 2018).
- Hjelm, Titus. "Discourse Analysis." In *The Routledge Handbook of Research Methods in the Study of Religion*, edited by Michael Stausberg and Steven Engler, 134-150. London: Routledge, 2011.
- Hope, Aimie L. B., and Christopher R. Jones. "The Impact of Religious Faith on Attitudes to Environmental Issues and Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) Technologies: A Mixed Methods Study." *Technology in Society* 38 (2014): 48-59.
- Hulme, Mike. *Why We Disagree About Climate Change: Understanding Controversy, Inaction and Opportunity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Hurd, Elizabeth Shakman. *Beyond Religious Freedom: The New Global Politics of Religion*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015.
- Hurd, Elizabeth Shakman. *The Politics of Secularism in International Relations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008.
- 'I Don't Vote with my Vagina': Susan Sarandon on Not Backing Hillary Clinton*. Produced by BBC Newsnight. YouTube. 5 min. 2016. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4LoGej6BqMc> (accessed December 15, 2018).
- Irwin, Lee. *Native American Spirituality: A Critical Reader*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2000.

- King, Alexandra. "Susan Sarandon: Both Clinton, Trump Are 'Untrustable.'" *CNN*, November 3, 2016. <https://edition.cnn.com/2016/11/03/politics/susan-sarandon-candidates-jill-stein/> (accessed December 15, 2018).
- Kirman, Ali. "Religious and Secularist Views of the Nature and the Environment." *The Journal of International Social Research* 1, no. 3 (Spring 2008): 268-277.
- Kuru, Ahmet T. *Secularism and State Policies toward Religion: The United States, France, and Turkey*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- La Pier, Rosalyn R. "What Makes a Mountain, Hill or Prairie a 'Sacred' Place for Native Americans?" *The Conversation*, February 16, 2017. <https://theconversation.com/what-makes-a-mountain-hill-or-prairie-a-sacred-place-for-native-americans-73169> (accessed December 13, 2018).
- LaDuke, Winona. "What Would Sitting Bull Do?" *LA Progressive*, August 25, 2016. <https://www.laprogressive.com/protesting-dakota-access-pipeline/> (accessed December 15, 2018).
- Lindsey, Hal, and Carole C. Carlson. *The Late Great Planet Earth*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 1970.
- Mammadyarov, Riyad. "Mark Ruffalo Talks Standing Rock, Corporate America and the Economic Power of the Environmental Industry." *The Knockturnal*, December 7, 2016. <https://theknockturnal.com/mark-ruffalo-talks-standing-rock-corporate-america/> (accessed December 15, 2018).
- Mark Ruffalo on Epic Struggle at Standing Rock*. Produced by Rebel HQ. YouTube. 4 min. 2016. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=P_p0vOEoCSA (accessed December 15, 2018).
- Mark Ruffalo on the Status of the Dakota Access Pipeline Protest*. Produced by CNN. Uploaded by Daily Kos. YouTube. 3 min. 2016. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9nSaFrBSQ3I> (accessed December 15, 2018).
- Mark Ruffalo on Why He is Fighting DAPL*. Produced by MintPressNews. YouTube. 1 min. 2016. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qA5rqA6yMHs> (accessed December 15, 2018).
- Mark Ruffalo Optimistic for #NODAPL Despite Trump*. Produced by Rebel HQ. YouTube. 8 min. 2016. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jVDB4lcFyes> (accessed December 15, 2018).

- Mark Ruffalo Speaks at Standing Rock*. Produced by The Laura Flanders Show. YouTube. 7 min. 2016. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0MSFEsNQMnQ> (accessed December 15, 2018).
- Mark Ruffalo Uncut at Standing Rock*. Produced by APTN News. YouTube. 6 min. 2016. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rFiz8JPtdl0> (accessed December 15, 2018).
- Mason, Jennifer. *Qualitative Researching*. 2nd ed. London: Sage Publications, 2002.
- McCown, Brigham A. "What Ever Happened to the Dakota Access Pipeline?" *Forbes*, June 4, 2018. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/brighammccown/2018/06/04/what-ever-happened-to-the-dakota-access-pipeline/#5bc6fe4b4055> (accessed December 15, 2018).
- McGrath, Alister E. *Reenchantment of Nature: The Denial of Religion and the Ecological Crisis*. Westminster, MD: Doubleday Publishing, 2003.
- Mentz, Tim. "Declaration of Time Mentz, Sr. In Support of Motion for Preliminary Injunction." *Earth Justice*. August 11, 2016. <https://earthjustice.org/sites/default/files/press/2016/Decl-of-T-Mentz-Sr.pdf> (accessed December, 13, 2018), 6.
- Mni Wiconi – Water Is Life*. Produced by the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe. Facebook. 8 min. 2016. <https://standwithstandingrock.net/mni-wiconi/> (accessed December 14, 2018).
- Mortreux, Colette, and Jon Barnett. "Climate Change, Migration and Adaptation in Funafuti, Tuvalu." *Global Environmental Change* 19, no. 1 (2009): 105-112.
- National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers. "National Historic Preservation Act of 1966." *NCSHPO.org*. <http://ncshpo.org/resources/national-historic-preservation-act-of-1966/> (accessed December 15, 2018).
- Nunn, Patrick D, Kate Mulgrew, Bridie Scott-Parker, Donald W Hine, Anthony D. G Marks, Doug Mahar, and Jack Maebuta. "Spirituality and Attitudes Towards Nature in the Pacific Islands: Insights for Enabling Climate-Change Adaptation." *Climatic Change: An Interdisciplinary, International Journal Devoted to the Description, Causes and Implications of Climatic Change* 136, no. 3-4 (2016): 477-93.
- Nunn, Patrick D. "Sidelineing God: Why Secular Climate Projects in the Pacific Islands Are Failing." *The Conversation*, May 16, 2017. theconversation.com/sidelineing-god-why-secular-climate-projects-in-the-pacific-islands-are-failing-77623. Accessed Oct 26, 2017.
- Phillips, Nelson, and Cynthia Hardy. *Qualitative Research Methods: Discourse Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc., 2002.

- Posthumus, David C. *All My Relatives: Exploring Lakota Ontology, Belief and Ritual*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2018.
- Powers, William K., James Garrett and Kathleen J. Martin. "Lakota Religious Traditions." In *Encyclopedia of Religion*, edited by Lindsay Jones, 5295-5298. Vol. 8. 2nd ed. Detroit, MI: Macmillan Reference USA, 2005.
- Prolific The Rapper x A Tribe Called Red - Black Snakes [Updated]*. By Prolific the Rapper. YouTube. 5 min. 2017. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QdeHUrL1FEM> (accessed December 15, 2018).
- Redford, Robert. "I Stand with the Standing Rock Sioux." *TIME*, September 26, 2016. <http://time.com/4501580/dakota-access-pipeline-protest/> (accessed December 15, 2018);
- Redford, Robert. "Stay Inspired and Stay Peaceful on Standing Rock." *TIME*, January 5, 2017. <http://time.com/4624262/robert-redford-stay-inspired-and-stay-peaceful-on-standing-rock/> (accessed December 15, 2018).
- Reuter, Thomas A. "The Green Revolution in the World's Religions: Indonesian Examples in International Comparison." *Religions* 6, no. 4 (2015): 1217-1231.
- Robert Redford Urges Solidarity with Standing Rock Sioux*. Produced by The Redford Center. Facebook. 1 min. 2016. <https://www.facebook.com/theredfordcenter/videos/watch-and-share-robert-redford-urges-solidarity-with-standing-rock-sioux-to-stop/1168544006524482/> (accessed December 15, 2018).
- Ruffalo, Mark. "We Must Listen to the Dakota Access Pipeline Protesters, Not Punish Them." *The Guardian*, November 3, 2016. <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/nov/03/dakota-access-pipeline-standing-rock-protesters-mark-ruffalo> (accessed December 15, 2018).
- Sainato, Michael and Chelsea Skojec. "Interview with Susan Sarandon: Obama and Clinton 'Silent' on Dakota Pipeline." *Observer*, September 8, 2016. <https://observer.com/2016/09/interview-with-susan-sarandon-obama-and-clinton-silent-on-dakota-pipeline/> (accessed December 15, 2018).
- Sarandon, Susan. "This Is How We Can Defeat Dakota Access Pipeline." *Care2*, November 3, 2016. <https://www.care2.com/causes/susan-sarandon-this-is-how-we-can-defeat-dakota-access-pipeline.html> (accessed December 15, 2018);
- "Sept 30th DAPL Meeting with SRST." *Earth Justice*. <https://earthjustice.org/sites/default/files/files/Ex6-J-Hasselman-Decl.pdf> (accessed December 14, 2018).

Shailene Woodley Fights for Native Americans Against North Dakota Pipeline. Produced by Late Night with Seth Meyers. YouTube. 4 min. 2016.
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3PDUGcCmt4A> (accessed December 15, 2018).

Shailene Woodley on Dakota Pipeline & Bernie or Bust — Complete Interview. Produced by Rebel HQ. YouTube. 8 min. 2016. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jphp8u_qDIs (accessed December 15, 2018).

Shailene Woodley on Malia Obama's Presence at Sundance Standing Rock Solidarity Event Against DAPL. Produced by Democracy Now. YouTube. 2 min. 2017.
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=H50SCZLILYw> (accessed December 15, 2018).

Shailene Woodley on Taking Responsibility for White Supremacy. Produced by Rebel HQ. YouTube. 4 min. 2016. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TpbMIQkCFXs> (accessed December 15, 2018).

Shailene Woodley Refutes Claims of "Violence" at Standing Rock. Produced by Rebel HQ. YouTube. 3 min. 2016. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SveuzDwwcZ8> (accessed December 15, 2018).

Shailene Woodley Talks Standing Rock. Produced by APTN News. YouTube. 3 min. 2016.
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xcv-LPHCPVQ> (accessed December 15, 2018).

Shailene Woodley's Speech at the 2016 Environmental Media Awards. Produced by Environmental Media Association. YouTube. 11 min. 2016.
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1U1C8oH-kWM> (accessed December 15, 2018).

Starr, Penny. "Susan Sarandon on Halting Pipeline in Indian Country: After '500 Years' of Mistreatment 'It's Time We Listen To Them.'" *CNS News*, August 25, 2016.
<https://www.cnsnews.com/news/article/penny-starr/susan-sarandon-halting-pipeline-indian-country-after-500-years-mistreatment> (accessed December 15, 2018).

Susan Sarandon and Shailene Woodley Rally Against Dakota Access Pipeline. Produced by RT America. YouTube. 5 min. 2016.
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MULfkyDGhrG> (accessed December 15, 2018).

Susan Sarandon, Anti-DAPL Rally, Los Angeles, 11/15/16. Produced by Truth Justice. YouTube. 7 min. 2016. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RQJZLhcRieg> (accessed December 15, 2018).

Susan Sarandon Gives Impassioned Speech at Climate Revolution. Produced by Rebel HQ. YouTube. 7 min. 2016. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xMKFHV8bvfl> (accessed December 15, 2018).

- Susan Sarandon Interview with Cenk Uygur on The Young Turks*. Produced by The Young Turks. YouTube. 21 min. 2016. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ngXuEVXjkWA> (accessed December 15, 2018).
- Susan Sarandon: Oil And Gas Is Not Tenable For Future Sustainability*. Produced by MSNBC. YouTube. 13 min. 2017. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oj-CyVT5P_o (accessed December 15, 2018).
- Taylor, Charles. *A Secular Age*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2007.
- The Naked Truth: Mark Ruffalo Speaks on Standing Rock & #NODAPL*. Produced by FUSION. YouTube. 9 min. 2016. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=P-nnzizoGQ4&t=1s> (accessed December 14, 2018).
- The Standing Rock Sioux Tribe. "Impacts of an Oil Spill from the Dakota Access Pipeline on the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe." *Standingrock.org*. February 21, 2018. https://www.standingrock.org/sites/default/files/uploads/srst_impacts_of_an_oil_spill_2.21.2018.pdf#pdfjs.action=download (accessed December 12, 2018).
- The Standing Rock Sioux Tribe. "Resolution NO. 406-15." *Facebook*. February 9, 2016. <https://www.facebook.com/StandingRockST/photos/a.422881167740159/1193297920698476/?type=1&theater> (accessed December 14, 2018).
- The Standing Rock Sioux Tribe. "Standing Rock Denounces Army Easement Announcement, Vows Court Challenge." *Stand with Standing Rock*. February 7, 2017. <https://standwithstandingrock.net/standing-rock-denounces-army-easement-announcement-vows-court-challenge/> (accessed December 14, 2018).
- The Standing Rock Sioux Tribe. "Standing Rock Sioux Tribe Chairman Responds to Oil in DAPL." *Stand with Standing Rock*. March 28, 2017. <https://standwithstandingrock.net/standing-rock-sioux-tribe-chairman-responds-oil-dapl/> (accessed December 14, 2018).
- "Tribes Across North America Converge at Standing Rock, Hoping to be Heard." *PBS NewsHour*, September 16, 2016. <https://www.pbs.org/newshour/show/tribes-across-north-america-converge-standing-rock-hoping-heard> (accessed December 14, 2018).
- Tucker, Mary. *Worldly Wonder: Religions Enter Their Ecological Phase*. Chicago and La Salle, Illinois: Open Court, 2003.
- Wells, Karyn Mo. "In Defense of Our Relatives." *Studies in Arts and Humanities Journal* 3, no. 2 (2017): 142-160.
- White, Jr., Lynn, "The Historical Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis." *Science* 155, no. 3767 (1967): 1203-1207.

- Wilson, Erin K. (2017a) (forthcoming) "Being 'Critical' of/about/on 'Religion' in International Relations." In *Routledge Handbook of Critical International Relations*, edited by Jenny Edkins, 1-31. London: Routledge, 2018.
- Wilson, Erin. "Beyond Dualism: Expanded Understandings of Religion and Global Justice." *International Studies Quarterly* 54, no. 3 (2010): 733-754.
- Woodley, Shailene. "The Truth About My Arrest." *TIME*, October 20, 2016. <http://time.com/4538557/shailene-woodley-arrest-pipeline/> (accessed December 15, 2018).
- Worland, Justin. "What to Know About the Dakota Access Pipeline Protests." *TIME*, October 28, 2016. <http://time.com/4548566/dakota-access-pipeline-standing-rock-sioux/> (accessed December 13).
- Yohannen, Alina. "The Standing Rock Sioux Indians: An Inconvenience for Black Gold." *University of Baltimore Journal of Land and Development* 6, no. 1 (2016): 19-31.