



Whisper Radio

Turning whispers into change.
JoAnn Smotherman, Durango Colorado

Standing Rock: Collective Resistance and the Limits of Moral Victory

The resistance at Standing Rock against the Dakota Access Pipeline represents one of the most complex and instructive examples of modern civil disobedience in the United States. It brought together Indigenous leadership, environmental activists, faith groups, veterans, and first-time protesters in a rare coalition unified around the protection of land, water, and treaty rights.

For the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe and other Indigenous nations, the pipeline was not an abstract environmental concern. It threatened the Missouri River, the primary water source for the reservation, and crossed land protected under treaties that had already been repeatedly violated by the federal government. The proposed route had originally been planned near Bismarck, North Dakota, but was rerouted south after concerns were raised about risks to that city's water supply. This rerouting intensified perceptions that Indigenous communities were being asked to bear risks others would not accept.

The movement that formed around Standing Rock drew participants with widely different philosophies of resistance. Tribal elders emphasized prayer, ceremony, and nonviolent presence. Environmental activists focused on climate justice and ecological harm. Others engaged in direct action, including physically obstructing construction equipment and disrupting infrastructure. These approaches were not always in agreement, but the movement maintained cohesion by allowing role differentiation rather than enforcing ideological purity.

A key feature of Standing Rock was the distinction many participants drew between violence toward people and aggression toward objects. While the movement broadly rejected harm to individuals, it tolerated and sometimes supported the disruption or damage of equipment and infrastructure associated with pipeline construction. This distinction allowed the movement to apply pressure without fully abandoning nonviolent principles, though it also complicated public interpretation and legal classification.

Law enforcement response escalated rapidly. Local, state, and private security forces deployed militarized tactics, including mass arrests, rubber bullets, tear gas, water cannons used in freezing temperatures, surveillance aircraft, and coordination across multiple agencies. These actions were widely documented and circulated, reinforcing claims about state violence and unequal enforcement of law.

Despite broad sympathy and international attention, Standing Rock ultimately did not stop the Dakota Access Pipeline. Construction continued, legal challenges failed to halt completion, and the pipeline went into operation. This outcome matters. Any serious discussion of civil disobedience

must acknowledge that moral clarity, legitimacy, and even widespread support do not guarantee success.

The failure at Standing Rock was not the result of confusion, apathy, or internal collapse. The harm was real, the claims were coherent, and the movement sustained participation across months of pressure. What it lacked was sufficient leverage to outweigh entrenched economic interests, regulatory momentum, and state enforcement capacity.

Standing Rock is instructive precisely because it reveals the limits of solidarity when harm is unevenly distributed. For many supporters, the stakes were moral and political rather than personal. The movement asked people to act in defense of treaty rights, environmental risk, and Indigenous sovereignty, rather than immediate self-interest. That distinction shaped the ceiling of national mobilization.

The state's response further illustrates a structural reality. Rather than negotiating, authorities relied on attrition. Encampments were dismantled through exhaustion, winter conditions, legal pressure, and targeted arrests. The movement was not defeated by argument, but by endurance.

Standing Rock should not be remembered as a victory, nor dismissed as a failure of principle. It was a serious, disciplined attempt that exposed how much force is required to interrupt systems designed to continue despite opposition.

For contemporary movements, Standing Rock offers realism rather than reassurance. It demonstrates that civil disobedience can be morally justified, broadly supported, and strategically coherent, and still fail to produce immediate change. Recognizing that reality is not cynicism. It is a necessary condition for informed action.

Selected Sources

Sources listed reflect the scholarly and historical traditions informing this essay rather than direct quotation.

- Estes, Nick. *Our History Is the Future: Standing Rock Versus the Dakota Access Pipeline, and the Long Tradition of Indigenous Resistance*. Verso, 2019.
- Dhillon, Jaskiran, and Nick Estes, eds. *Standing with Standing Rock*. University of Minnesota Press, 2019.
- Whyte, Kyle Powys. "The Dakota Access Pipeline, Environmental Injustice, and U.S. Colonialism." *Red Ink*, vol. 19, no. 1, 2017.
- Amnesty International. *Out of Control: Police Violence Against Indigenous Protectors at Standing Rock*, 2017.
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. *Dakota Access Pipeline Environmental Assessment documents*.
- Gilio-Whitaker, Dina. *As Long as Grass Grows: The Indigenous Fight for Environmental Justice*. Beacon Press, 2019.