1 Introduction: Facing Decolonization

When I moved from Lenapehoking New York City to Lower Tanana Dene Lands Fairbanks, Alaska, I moved from one educational-activist community into another. Initially, Fairbanks Climate Action Coalition meetings felt familiar compared with those of NYU Divest!, part of a growing Fossil Fuel Divestment Movement.[1] In both places there were many young people studying and co-creating theories of change, leading trainings in non-violent protest, and trying to make spaces safe for those on the frontlines of land protection and environmental justice. There were plenty of strategic planning sessions with white boards and markers and flow-charts, and plenty of story-sharing. In Fairbanks, however, I participated in my first decolonization and Indigenous advocacy workshops. These were offered by the Native-led organizations Native Movement and the Gwich'in Steering Committee, encouraging more stable alliances with non-Native groups.[2]

The Gwich'in Steering Committee was established in 1988 after Gwich'in elders convened a gathering during which the Nation resolved to speak as one voice against oil and gas drilling in Iizhik Gwats'an Gwandaii Goodlit The Sacred Place Where Life Begins. This is the birthing ground of the Porcupine Caribou Herd, inseparable from the Gwich'in. The Committee also would educate non-Gwich'in people on reasons to protect this Land tied with Gwich'in life because, as Neets'aii Gwich'in spokesperson Sarah James says, "oil is huge" and "we can't do it by ourself" (BLM, 2019a :8). The coastal plain (and beyond) is land never ceded by Gwich'in or Iñupiat to Russia or to the United States. Since 1960, the U.S. has claimed this geography as the 1002 area, taking its one and a half million acres as part of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. While 8 million acres of the 19.6 million acre Refuge were designated "wilderness," the coastal plain, in 1980, was excluded from this stronger protection as a political concession to the petroleum industry. This set up the ongoing fight over the plain's future. The history of Arctic Refuge advocacy and non-Natives' need for Gwich'in-led education are entangled with well-meaning settler-colonialist notions and on-the-ground expressions of wilderness as well as industry (Dunaway, 2021; Warren, 2024).[3]

Aldo Leopold (1887–1948) was a co-founder of The Wilderness Society in 1935. He had already published several writings developing the idea and values of wilderness and rationales for bounding areas protected from "the hammer of

[1] www.sunrisenyu.org/divest.
[2] https://ourarcticrefuge.org; www.nativemovement.org; https://fairbanksclimateaction.org.
[3] For a timeline see Dunaway, F. (2023). *Defending the Arctic Refuge: A Book and Public History Site,* https://defendingthearcticrefuge.com/timeline/.

development" (1935: 6) with influence still echoing in the 1964 U.S. Wilderness Act. Leopold was credited by the Society's first president, National Parks Association founder Robert Sterling Yard (1861–1945), as responsible for "starting the idea and title of the wilderness area."[4] Leopold had "first spread it broadcast," beginning with establishing the first wilderness area in the U.S. Forest Service (Flader 1991, 1994; Warren, 2008: 101). National Park Service Planner George Collins, one of the key strategists envisioning what would become the Arctic Refuge, in 1999, also credited Leopold's influence. "It was [Leopold's] ideas we brought to Alaska," he said. "If he hadn't lived I don't think the Arctic Refuge would be what it is today" (Kaye, 2006: 30).

Leopold had begun his career in the USFS in 1909 and otherwise influenced its scientific land-management policies from its earliest days.[5] He also authored *Game Management* (1933), the first major textbook developing this field. In 1947, Leopold served as president of the Ecological Society of America, who particularly wished him to help harmonize concerns shared with wilderness lovers. Leopold's ideas are at the foundation of the U.S. scientific conservation legacy. They also have influenced the contemporary environmental movement and agrarianism in the U.S. Leopold's most well-known work is his posthumously published *A Sand County Almanac* (1949), featuring his "land ethic" pointing to his ecologically informed vision of "land health." The *Almanac* became, in Wallace Stegner's words, "a famous, almost holy book in conservation circles" (Savoy, 2016: 32), gaining popularity around the first "Earth Day" in 1970. About the same time, prominent contemporary agrarians were rooting in Leopoldian ideas and grand narratives, including Wes Jackson, founder of The Land Institute. Leopold, says Jackson, "recognized the *problem of agriculture*," which his Institute is intent upon solving (Jackson, 2011: 30; see also Hausdoerffer, et al., 2021: 145–153). In 2020, in celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of Earth Day, Oxford University Press issued a new edition of Leopold's *Almanac* with an introduction by acclaimed author and conservationist Barbara Kingsolver. Within a year, tens of thousands of readers purchased the volume. Translated from English into fourteen other languages, Leopold's *A Sand County Almanac* had already sold millions of copies worldwide.

In mostly academic circles, I had felt defensive of Leopold. As I continued learning from Alaska Native colleagues, standing with them in defense of their lands and justice, however, I became increasingly uncomfortable about my authorship of a book developing and disseminating Leopold's ecological-ethical ideas of proper human relationships within land communities. Not

[4] For more on the National Parks construction of uninhabited, virgin wilderness for Indigenous dispossession see Gilio-Whitaker, 2019: 92–94, Spence, 1999.
[5] For biographies see Flader, 1994, Meine, 2010, Lorbiecki, 2016, Warren, 2016.

only could I *not* imagine my Fairbanks colleagues reading it, I cringed at the thought. At first I had wanted to hide, and certainly no longer to defend my past work. Thanks to the educational labor of my Indigenous colleagues, I was beginning to understand how not only offensive but dangerous conservation, including Leopoldian conservation, was, and is. So, too, then, were my own writings, focused on "land health." These had not pointed out that Leopoldian narratives – while critiquing the dominating U.S. culture of bad land-use, including forms of conservation that would be "too little too late" (Flader and Callicott, 1991: 295) – nonetheless did not break from the power structures of the society expressing it. And "the thread from which the American social fabric is woven," says Colville Confederated Tribes citizen and scholar Dina Gilio-Whitaker, is "white supremacy" (2019: 99).

By "white supremacy" Gilio-Whitaker does not mean an ideology restricted to "rogue alt-right neo-Nazis or white nationalist fringe groups." Nor does she use the term to describe only "hostile behavior from which individuals can excuse themselves" because they are friendly to or even live with a person of color. As Gilio-Whitaker says, "white supremacy" is "a foundational worldview constructed by centuries of white European settlement of the United States" (99). This worldview structures privileges for Europeans self-racialized as white – and, "beyond phenotype," to those legitimated by this legacy of power (Tuck and Yang, 2012: 5; Tallbear, 2013: 136–141) – while it dehumanizes, oppresses, and eliminates people racialized and looked down on as not-white, including "American Indians, African Americans, and ethnic minority 'others'" (Gilio-Whitaker, 2019: 99). Racialized oppressions intersect with related versions of authority and control, such as heteropatriarchy and ableism. In this sense, writing as a structurally privileged member of a white supremacist Nation reinforcing and not undermining systemic injustices to Indigenous, Black and Brown people/s, as well as in exhibiting "hostile behavior" or overt racism in some instances, Aldo Leopold's narratives are white supremacist. As a woman, I am personally beset by patriarchy. At the same time, I, too, continually perpetuate white supremacy in terms of built-in privileges and still unlearned oppressive assumptions, while more recently struggling to be part of undermining it and supporting environmental, which is also social, justice with entwined liberation called for in the short and long terms (Memmi, 1965).[6]

The legacy of white supremacy is enmeshed with that of U.S. settler-colonialism. This is the context of Leopold's conservation narratives and

[6] Thanks to Kyle Whyte for introducing me to Memmi's work. Memmi discusses how "In the eyes of the colonized, all Europeans in the colonies are *de facto* colonizers, and whether they want to be or not, they are colonizers in some ways" (1965: 130).

thus of this Element, although others might be able to elaborate and connect the praxis encouraged here to assessments beyond this American location. "White" Euro-Americans' imperial legacy is one of self-righteous theft of non-European lands via a doctrine of Christian discovery. Christian discovery was first sanctioned by fifteenth-century Papal Bulls and, as recently as March 2023, was repudiated by the Vatican. This policy meant that European explorers of often vying Empires – including the French, British and Spanish – who landed in geographies inhabited by non-Christians – including many Indigenous Nations – could claim these lands in the name of their sovereigns by presumed right of divinely sanctioned superiority (Gilio-Whitaker, 2019: 25, 55–56; also Dunbar-Ortiz, 2014; Estes, 2019; Hernandez, 2022). In 1823, the U.S. Supreme Court, via the *Johnson v M'Intosh* decision, first wove the discovery doctrine into property law giving the U.S. superior right of land title. This became part of a series of other federal decisions to justify, within its new and growing empire, ongoing violence and land theft from culturally and politically self-determining Indigenous Peoples. Many Indigenous Peoples long pre-existed U.S. occupation and had track records of innovative technologies and re/generational land relations (Kimmerer, 2013; Whyte, 2015, 2024; Kolopenuk, 2020).[7] As Europeans usurped North American lands, they not only colonized but also settled them, building infrastructure, spreading westward under manifest destiny.

That is, "settler colonialism," as defined by scholars Eve Tuck (Unangax̂) and K. Wayne Yang (U.S.), is when "settlers come with the intention of making a new home on the land, a homemaking that insists on settler sovereignty over all things in their new domain" (2012: 5). And, as these authors underscore, citing Australian scholar Patrick Wolfe (1999), "settler colonialism is a structure and not an event." Incorporated into this structure is the labor stolen from chattel slaves required for successful European dominion over stolen geographies and extraction of economic "resources" from them. White settler-colonialism (1) relegates Indigenous Peoples and others racialized as non-white from customary geographies, disrupting their co-constituted relationships, including by killing; (2) appropriates lands and labor from their people; and (3) assimilates everyone into empire's all-inclusive appetites. As a structure of relationships, functioning as a system expressing a normative worldview, the genocidal violence of settler-colonialism is not merely located in the past; it is very much still present, visible in the consequences of intensifying climate warming. To date, as U.S.-based scholar Farhana Sultana says,

[7] Gilio-Whitaker, D. (2022). "Environmental Justice Is Only the Beginning," www.hcn.org/issues/54.7/indigenous-affairs-perspective-environmental-justice-is-only-the-beginning.

"common climate narratives are often about white futures that 'de-future' racialized Others which reinforces white supremacy" (2022: 8).[8]

Sultana's observation applies to common, contemporary Leopoldian conservation narratives. With few exceptions (e.g., Cryer, 2015; Powell 2015, 2016; Cook and Sheehey, 2020) white settler philosophers, scientists, and Leopold scholars, including myself, have "revisited" Leopold's work in order to defend, uplift, expand, reinterpret, and/or lightly critique it and/or others' interpretations of it (Millstein, 2015; Rolston, 2015; Meine, 2022).[9] For instance, in a 2011 U.S. National Endowment for the Humanities Summer Institute titled, "Rethinking the Land Ethic: The Humanities and Sustainability," my own lecture series looked "through the lens" of Leopold's land health concept to explore a Western legacy of utopias and consider what were desired and possible futures. In the process, I critiqued my own heritage of ideas, including some of Leopold's earlier ones, yet without ever questioning the structures of power within nor the ongoing authority of either. So far, questioning by Euro-settler scholars of racism and colonialism in Leopoldian narratives and of his canonical importance to any desired future has been limited.

This trend has been changing. Recently, in one of the few exceptions, philosophers Anna Cook (second generation Canadian) and Bonnie Sheehey (U.S.-based) have critiqued Leopold's historical-evolutionary narrative of ethical extension from humans to land. Although Leopold's narrative focuses on human-land interdependencies, they note, ironically, it "laminates" delocalized Greco-European perspectives over localized Indigenous relationships, thus projecting a "normativity" that is "groundless," assimilative, eliminatory, expansionary, and harmful (Coulthard & Simpson, 2016; Cook & Sheehey, 2020). These authors also reflect on the observation of Citizen Potawatomi philosopher Kyle Powys Whyte that Leopold's historical-ethical narrative of progress "unfolds in the opposite direction" of the narratives many Indigenous

[8] For a brief discussion, see Trahant, M. (2019). "How Colonization of the Americas Killed 90 Percent of Their Indigenous People – And Changed the Climate, www.yesmagazine.org/opinion/2019/02/13/how-colonization-of-the-americas-killed-90-percent-of-their-indigenous-people-and-changed-the-climate. There is a vast literature/s by Indigenous and other frontlines authors related to un/desired futures (including the already present one/s) e.g., Whyte, 2017 a and b, 2018b; Davis and Todd, 2017; Ybarra, 2022. Also Espelie, E., et al. (2020–21). *Deep Horizons: Making Visible an Unseen Spectrum of Ecological Casualties and Prospects*, www.colorado.edu/project/environmental-futures/. And, in my community, Alaska Just Transition, *Remembering Forward: Just Transition*, www.justtransitionak.org.

[9] Also Forbes, W. (2017). "Revisiting the 'River of the Mother of God,'" https://humansandnature.org/revisiting-the-river-of-the-mother-of-god/; Colwell, et al. (2014). "Revisiting Leopold: Resource Stewardship in the National Parks," http://parksjournal.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/PARKS-20.2-Colwell-et-al-10.2305IUCN.CH_.2014.PARKS-20-2.DRC_.en_.pdf, (Revisits the 1963 *Leopold Report*, chaired by Aldo's son Starker).

people would provide (Whyte, 2015: 2, 2024).[10] They expound on how this narrative "does not account for the role of power in conditioning settler history and ethical relations (348–349)." The quotation of Whyte's is from his paper "How Similar Are Indigenous and North American Environmental Ethics," which he wrote subsequent to the NEH Summer Institute, where we first met. Whyte's original essay was supposed to appear in a collection that was never published. On SSRN, it has been downloaded over 1500 times, in any case. A somewhat revised version (in 2024) is now slated for another volume.

Whyte's piece was prompted by the sometimes agitated, defensive, or even hostile insistence, "in academic or in conservation and climate action circles," of the necessity to compare Indigenous and Leopoldian ethics. Some non-Indigenous colleagues even have asked Whyte to line up his own ethical work with others' interpretations of Leopold's (2024). Meanwhile, as Leopold scholars were "fussing over Leopold's reputation," Whyte writes, "massive environmental injustices against Indigenous peoples were occurring" (2024). Moreover, Leopold's writings do not speak to matters important to many Indigenous people or to the roles of their own ethics, Whyte explains (2015, 2024). Meaning to engage with those at least trying to listen, Whyte looked in the literature for serious attempts to compare North American Indigenous and Leopoldian ethics. From that study, he proposed three crucial issues that – left unaddressed in any further comparisons – would overlook crucial differences and perpetuate coalition-destabilizing Indigenous suppression in (1) history-telling, (2) consequential ethical abstractions, and (3) assumed epistemologies (2015, 2024). As a Leopold scholar, in this Element my method is to more comprehensively interpret Leopoldian texts and to organize a rejoinder, which is listening to understand particular Alaska Native perspectives, according to all three of Whyte's crucial issues. This Element, in Cook and Sheehey's terms, "accounts for the role of power" harmfully normalized throughout Leopoldian narratives (2020: 336). My desire is to support development of a praxis of "deep narrative and ontological revision" of a settler worldview, in the words of the Sisseton-Wahpeton Oyate scholar Kim Tallbear, by my re-delving into Leopold's influential thinking and story-telling (2019: 36).

[10] Whyte's essay "How Similar Are Indigenous North American and Leopoldian and Environmental Ethics" was first drafted as an invited essay for an edited volume. This was subsequent to a Leopold-focused event in which Whyte had participated. Whyte posted his draft, in 2012, on the SSRN platform followed by a 2015 revision (https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2022038). Publication of the original edited volume was then delayed until 2017, and then never happened. Understanding it to be forthcoming in 2017, however, Whyte also posted the paper on ResearchGate. Altogether, it has had thousands of reads. More recently, Whyte's essay was invited into another edited volume, which, to date, is in progress. Whyte has a 2024 revised version (unpaginated) prepared for this new volume. As called for, I will cite either or both the 2015 and 2024 versions. (with his consent; thank you, again, Kyle).

The most prominent of settler scholars revisiting Leopoldian narratives is historian and Leopold biographer Curt Meine. Meine has continued lightly critiquing, defending, and keeping Leopold centered, most recently in his comprehensive 2022 article "Land, ethics, justice, and Aldo Leopold." As a long-term Aldo Leopold Foundation Senior Fellow, Meine's writing also has developed alongside the work of the Aldo Leopold Foundation, intending to "foster a land ethic through the legacy of Aldo Leopold" (https://www.aldoleopold.org/about/mission-and-vision). The Foundation's 2021 online speaker series "Land Ethics and Social Justice: Building an Ethic of Care," to which Meine contributed, for instance, featured white and non-white participants with a platform wide-reaching enough to have drawn 3,387 registered participants, representing every U.S. state and over 11 countries.[11] This juxtaposition, of keeping Leopold centered while talking about racial inclusion, diversity, engagement, and/or justice, sheds light on how these things are not necessarily the same as deep ontological and narrative revisioning. At the same time, it bears hope that any unearthed contradictions may lead to increasingly strategic, supportive direct action for environmental justice and caring. This juxtaposition also sheds light on the often complex and of course non-homogeneous positionalities of non-white thinkers, including some with engagements with Leopold's legacy that are positive, or potentially so.

One speaker in the 2021 event was the Black American ornithologist J. Drew Lanham. He is author of *The Home Place: Memoirs of a Colored Man's Love Affair with Nature* and many other writings, including an essay for *Audubon Magazine* grappling with the racist legacy of John James Audubon (2021).[12] In the form of a letter "to my dear Estella, Jr. [Leopold's youngest daughter]," Lanham raises many questions. His is a poetic reckoning with his childhood adoption of "your dad, Aldo, as my own" – as Leopold was "one who cannot live without wild things words . . . stuck like cockleburs" (2021: 13:00) – in the "raw" aftermath of Lanham's own father's death. Lanham acknowledges that connecting with a dead, white privileged author "is a risky business" (13:00). He wonders how "Aldo would have felt about me [a Black man], about . . . the societal sins of racism and bigotry and all the other biases." "Does his kindness to and through you," Estella, he asks, does kindness from throughout Leopold family who are warmly hosting him, "is all of that a good enough predictor of a rising tide of ideas that weren't of his time but in actuality beyond it? Can we

[11] "Why Words from the Land Matter," Last accessed, 2023–4, www.aldoleopold.org/about/land-ethics-and-social-justice/. Please contact The Aldo Leopold Foundation for information on the apparently since archived video.

[12] Lanham, J.D. (2021). "What Do We Do About John James Audubon?" www.audubon.org/magazine/spring-2021/what-do-we-do-about-john-james-audubon.

take the words we know now as uninformed or biased, he made in his imperfections, in context of his greater human whole?" In response, Lanham hears Estella arguing "for inclusion at every level of this [conservation] work, [echoing from her father's advice], 'just do the right thing'" (31:00). And Lanham hears Estella affirming that her "dad was who I had believed him to be, a kind patient man, a lover of his family and the land," imperfect, yes, "but with a vision that broadened out in this wide, rich fan of thinking" (15:00). Leopold, he continues, also had a mind "led by a heart that seemed to be bigger than those of his compatriots" (27:00). Lanham asks, "what's the legacy left behind?" (26:00). He finds in Leopold's daughter Estella "a bright light and enduring legacy that allows me to see the evolution of care in the flesh of someone I never knew" (34:00). At the same time, Lanham acknowledges that many questions arose, for him, that "go unresolved." And, too, he says, there is "ultimately the reckoning that each of us must have with our heroes and with history" (45:00). It is my own earnest reckoning, as a white settler and Leopold scholar, that I respectfully offer in this Element.

Lauret Savoy, geologist and woman of African-, Euro-, and Native American heritage, has been another guest of the Aldo Leopold Foundation. Savoy is author of *Trace: Memory, History, Race, and the American Landscape* (2015) and many other path-making writings, including a 2023 essay for *Emergence Magazine* exposing the construction of race in America. In *Trace*, Savoy's perspective on Leopold also involves the warmth of relations within the present-day Leopold community and an adult reckoning. She looks back on her fourteen-year-old self first reading *A Sand County Almanac.* She had been attracted by Leopold's "intimate images of land" and "the seeming openness of this man's struggle to frame personal truth" (33). At the same time, Savoy "so feared" that Leopold's albeit expansive "we" did not include her and others "with ancestral roots in Africa, Asia, or Native America" (33–34). Years later, gifted by the Foundation with time by the Wisconsin River, Savoy finds herself standing on "worn-out" farmland that Leopold and his family had begun restoring. She imagines the possibility not only of the "capacity for self-renewal" that is the "health of the land" but also, correspondingly, "the health of the human family" with an "intergenerational capacity for locating ourselves within many inheritances" (2015: 47). Along this path, she also wants *A Sand County Almanac* to meet a novel published the same year – *Alien Land,* which was written by her father Willard Savoy. She wants these two narratives which have yet "to meet and answer to each other" to do so in our lifetimes (47). *Alien Land* powerfully conveys fear, grief, and anger from singular and systemic, racialized violence against African Americans also loss of personal dignity – also deeply rooted in losses of land relationships. Her father's book portrays

a struggle, across a lifetime, to regain dignity in an unjustly divided world (Savoy, 1949; Savoy 2015: 48). "Yet who else," Savoy writes in *Trace*, "then or now, would put these books on the same shelf?" (39). Without this meeting of narratives, without hearing their clashes reverberate as well as resonances, to my understanding, will, paradoxically, risk capture in the "separate trap," in Savoy's words. It will risk repeating "inculcated divisions" of skin types and of human beings and land relations. Without recognizing "who and what *we* are," there is danger of sticking ineffectually between theory and practice and of losing responsibility and respect to disingenuous and even well-meaning gestures (43–44).

There is also the danger, when theory and practice do not keep up with one another, of even well-meaning demanding actions not accomplishing their intention, reinscribing harms. Consider the "we" who "identify as non-Indigenous, white, and privileged," in Whyte's words, having gained by historic and ongoing oppressions of the Indigenous and/or Black and/or more groups with whom we wish to ally.[13] Our ideas have brought us to the desire to enact justice and care. Our acts may include community seed collection gatherings to restore prairies; support for distribution of money from multi-million-dollar conservation organizations to sovereign Tribes and Black land projects and defunding police; and participating in decolonial (Land Back) campaigns against the fossil fuel industry.[14] Caring acts and the relationships built, in turn, might be goods in themselves and also challenge we settler participants' fantastical, ancestral assumptions and institutions of privilege, which, when threatened, might trigger our retreat or move us forward. Challenges to our privilege would need to include, I think, questioning Leopold's suggestion, which Savoy mentions with generosity (44), that "to strive" is "the important thing" because ideals like "justice or liberty for people" are assumed to be as unattainable as expectations of "harmony with land." Not merely striving but achieving, however, appear critical in view of Indigenous and Black peoples' experiences on the front lines of land dispossession, including by conservation interests, and on the front lines of colonialist-imposed mining and polluted waters.

Deepening settler-ontological change needed for increasingly stable coalitions will require more than what is merely imaginable to our settler selves

[13] Whyte, K. (2018). "White Allies, Let's Be Honest About Decolonization," www.yesmagazine.org/issue/decolonize/2018/04/03/white-allies-lets-be-honest-about-decolonization.

[14] Respectively, Meine, C. (2020). "Healing Sacred Earth," https://humansandnature.org/healing-sacred-earth/; Hausdoerffer, J. (2020). "What Does an Anti-Racist Wilderness Look Like," https://wilderness-society.org/what-does-an-anti-racist-wilderness-look-like/; Warren, personal experience.

(Tallbear, 2019). It will require a particularly self-aware, non-defensive openness to what we have been suppressing and whom we oppress – and to *not* knowing (Robinson, 2020: 64) – to shift baselines and power relations. It will take a willingness to let go of what are only seeming likenesses between "ethical" conservation (and other settler movements), including Leopoldian narratives, and Indigenous (and other suppressed) ones (Whyte, 2015, 2024). The possibility of stable coalitions of colonizers and colonized intending to overturn that dichotomy will require dispensing with comforting notions of common histories and experiences – a willingness not only to remake but to jettison cherished ideals like wilderness, philanthropy, and our own trustworthiness – and banishing a dream that "we" can get back to our "normal" lives after (or even before) the end of a project or fight. Stabilizing Indigenous-settler alliances-in-action calls for attuning our settler abstractions not only to commonality but to differences that make a difference.

In "Land, Ethics, Justice, and Aldo Leopold" (2022), Meine, undoubtedly well-meaning in his awareness of the urgency of reckoning with injustice in "conservation and the environmental movement" (168), yet maintains, a Leopold-defensive penchant for commonality without also attending to differences required to advance deep, structural revisioning of settler-colonial theory and practices. A "land ethic," Meine writes, "(however labeled)," for Leopold, "was not static and *could not be* exclusionary" (2022: 167, 179). He stresses Leopold's ethic's "core tenets of ecological interdependency," which "explicitly embraced people" with "no conditions" into land community membership. Meine thus takes Leopold's expansionary ethic to "inherently subvert racist, classist, sexist, and white supremacist attitudes" (2022: 167, 179). Such an ethic, Meine claims, "may now contribute to further progress in realizing an ethic of care" (179). "In the broad arc of Western conservation history," Meine says, "the land ethic represented a move away from a colonial and anthropocentric view . . . toward something more aligned with Indigenous views" (179). Assuming Leopold as an "essential transitional figure"[15] – even as "within a still broader, ongoing movement, informed by an ever-evolving ethic of care" (167, 180) – with a Leopoldian ethic as an unfolding, bridging, inclusive call for participation (169, 176) veers dangerously close to Whyte's "translational view," which would continue privileging Leopoldian ideas as the basis of

[15] With regard to Leopold as "an essential transitional figure," (Meine, 2022: 167, 180) other questions worth raising include: If so, for whom? The assumption that "mainstream American society" would be worse off without Leopold's "new foundations for the expansion of environmental awareness" (Meine 2022: 167) neglects, side by side, to wonder who is worse off because of it? And it neglects to question whether or how, as Leopold wrote, competition between Indigenous, e.g., Puebloan and Euro-American settler cultures for land "was inevitable?" (Flader and Callicott, 1991: 102).