

Indigenous View On Nature: Emotionally Complement And Ethnically Complicate

Science and statistics have shown that the current climate change has very strong correlation with constant modernization activities of human beings. Yet these activities, such as operating a coal factory, sharply contrast against the more outmoded, natural lifestyle of indigenous people. Even though we do not tend to mention indigenous people's role in the causing of climate change, I argue that considering indigenous people's views on nature complements but also complicates the general sort of rational and scientific discussion on climate change.

When we think about indigenous people, several attributes of them naturally emerge in our imagination. It is, first and foremost, their extremely long lasting bond with their land of habitat that defines who they are. Besides, most people are aware of the unique cultures that indigenous people have created, and such cultures engender their probably distinct forms of world view compared to that from a modernized, western, society, including the view on nature. From Deloria's depiction of Indian people's religion, we can see that the enduring relationship with the land let Indian people cultivate strong love, care and even worship of their environment. They focus on the lively surroundings, such as animals and plants, rivers and mountains, and believe that everything has its role on earth.

Here is why considering this kind of view on nature is complementary to our discussion of climate change. Marshall advanced a quite compelling argument about why people do not take actions against climate change: people's brains are divided into rational part and emotional part, and we would subconsciously let our emotion determine our perception of risk. Merely talking about numbers, chemical reactions, and scientific logic of climate change does not appeal to people's emotion at all. However, just as the indigenous Indian people, if every one of us can treat our environment with genuine love and compassion, then our emotion can be triggered by knowing the implications on the devastation of our environment from those dead statistical numbers. Furthermore, I tend to believe that, if we replace all people in modern segment of the world with Native Indian people, then the care for the environment will outweigh economy, politics, technology, and power because of religion, and they

would start taking care of the nature from the bottom of their heart. Humans are emotional beings that have rationality as tools at their disposal. Our discussion on climate change will increase its level of effectiveness if we target people's emotion. If there is a lack of true love towards the nature over individual interests, the discussion should try to come up with ways to improve it.

From the perspective of practicality, the existing indigenous people and their views on nature do complicate the rational and scientific discussion on climate change, especially when we discuss actions that need to be taken for those people impacted by climate change. This complication often relates to ethnicity. For example, in Davenport and Robertson's article on resettling indigenous Indian tribes on islands that unfortunately suffered due to climate change, there are deep-rooted people that refused to move. They not only possess an intense tie with their island, but also have distrust of government which hinders the rescue effort. There were only dozens of people on the island, but it was already extremely challenging. As the climate changes, the love of nature from the indigenous people does not change, and thus when the situation becomes more severe, it would be a tough and complex ethnical discussion on the top of the scientific one, whether to leave them alone or forcefully move them out. Besides Indian people, people in developing countries such as India, China are undoubtedly indigenous to where they grow. We are inclined to believe that these people definitely love their homeland, but the terrible pollution and greenhouse gas emission are indeed realities as well. Should we leave them alone when discussing climate change? Probably not. But how should developed countries act towards them, those indigenous people struggling for a better life on their own ground? The factor of distancing (between different countries) in this case, as well as ethnicity raises the complexity of the issue.

To sum up, considering indigenous people's view on nature, which is essentially a genuine, emotional love of the environment, both complements and complicates the discussion of climate change. Complementation comes from the inclusion of emotion towards nature, a key factor to impact people's risk perception. Complication comes from ethnicity when we discuss actions against climate change: leaving indigenous people alone or not is not a simple problem.

– Kaiyu Zheng