# Settler Colonialism FW

Kinda…

#### The aff is another form of colonialism in which natives are seen as exploitable and disposable. This is an oppressive structure that must be challenged in the debate space or else their violence will be invisible and continue to occur. Thus, the framework is to combat indigenous oppression. [53 sec]
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Drawing from the fields of critical race and ethnic studies and postcolonial theory, we develop two interconnected argument for the study of race, racism, and privilege. First, we argue for the value and need of developing geographically sensitive theorizations of white supremacy as the animating logic of racism and privilege. Second, we contend that the concept of settler colonialism, as an ongoing mode of empire, has much to offer studies of race and racialized geographies, particularly in illustrating the material conditions of white supremacy. Both conceptual tools complicate common sense temporalities and spatialities: neither white supremacy nor settler colonialism can be relegated to historical contexts. Rather, both inform past, present, and future formations of race. In expanding this theoretical frame, we engage with recent debates in geography about the materialities of race (Mahtani, 2014; Slocum and Saldana, 2013; Pulido, 2015) and develop a historicized, rather than historical (Schein, 2011), account that locates white supremacy and colonization in the ‘right here, right now’ (Morgensen, 2011: 52) rather than the past. As a project of empire enabled by white supremacy, settler colonialism is theoretically, politically, and geographically distinct from colonialism. Rather than emphasizing imperial expansion driven primarily by militaristic or economic purposes, which involves the departure of the colonizer, settler colonialism focuses on the permanent occupation of a territory and removal of indigenous peoples with the express purpose of building an ethnically distinct national community (Veracini, 2010; Elkins and Pedersen, 2005; Hixson, 2013; Tuck and Yang, 2012; Seawright, 2014; Pasternak, 2013; Kobayashi and De Leeuw, 2010). Because of the permanence of settler societies, settler colonization is theorized not as an event or moment in history, but as an enduring structure requiring constant maintenance in an effort to disappear indigenous populations (Wolfe, 2006). Settler colonialism is therefore premised on ‘logics of extermination’ (Wolfe, 2006) as the building of new settlements necessitates the eradication of indigenous populations, [through] the seizure and privatization of their lands, and the exploitation of marginalized peoples in a system of capitalism established by and reinforced through racism. Key examples of settler societies include the United States, Canada, Israel, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Argentina, and Brazil. In connecting settler colonialism to studies of whiteness and racism in geography, we argue that white supremacy is a critically important yet undertheorized concept, as compared to the more widely recognized notion of white privilege. An emphasis on white supremacy rather than white privilege is more than just semantics. Rather, white supremacy more precisely describes and locates white racial domination by underscoring the material production and violence of racial structures and the hegemony of whiteness in settler societies. The concept of white supremacy forcefully calls attention to the brutality and dehumanization of racial exploitation and domination that emerges from settler colonial societies. While white privilege remains an important analytic frame to analyze the taken-for-granted benefits and protections afforded to whites based upon skin color, the concept of privilege emphasizes the social condition of whiteness, rather than the institutions, practices, and processes that produce this condition in the first place (Leonardo, 2004; Smith, 2012; Pulido, 2015). White supremacy accentuates the structures of white power and the domination and exploitation that give rise to social exclusion and premature death of people of color in settler colonial states (Gilmore, 2002, 2006; Cacho, 2014). Our analysis begins with a discussion of studies of whiteness and white privilege. We distinguish white supremacy from white privilege and advocate for a broadening of the discussion to take white supremacy more seriously (see also Pulido, 2015; Berg, 2011). Our work should not be read in opposition to understandings of white privilege.1 Such an approach would undermine the significant and ongoing contributions of this work. However, we do wish to trouble the prominence of white privilege as a theoretical pivot point in geography as well as our own stakes in this intellectual project. Moreover, we do not rehash debates that posit political economic structures and historical materialism against discourse. Instead, we encourage dialogue for critical engagement in theorizing the systematic, enduring production of white racial dominance in settler societies at a moment of heightened political struggle and in an era when neoliberal multiculturalism and post-racial ideologies frame racism in terms of individualized prejudices rather than in terms of enduring structures of white power (Melamed, 2011; Goldberg, 2009; Berg, 2011). Though still theoretically oriented around whiteness, we argue that the concept of white supremacy destabilizes the ‘innocence of whiteness’ (Leonardo, 2004) and emphasizes the ways whites – including those who identify as anti-racist – materially, socially and academically benefit in settler societies. Following this discussion, we present the example of a recent land dispute in the US western state of Nevada that illustrates the important, yet geographically undertheorized, implications of white supremacy and settler colonialism. Settler colonialism as a concept has been developed primarily in Australian and Canadian contexts, and we draw from this example to show how particular ‘colonial moments’ (Kempf, 2010) sustain and strengthen settler logics and white racial domination in the United States. Though our case is focused on the US, it has broad implications for understanding white supremacy and enduring modes of empire. Finally, we conclude with general remarks about the potential geography has to contribute to understandings of white supremacy and settler societies. Beyond white privilege Whiteness Studies has emerged as an interdisciplinary intellectual project aiming to unmask the power and structural advantages associated with whiteness as a social identity and location (Frankenburg, 1993; McIntosh, 2004 [1988]; Roediger, 1992; Lipitz, 1995; Rothenberg, 2008). Building from expanding research trajectories in critical race theory (e.g. Crenshaw et al., 1995; Delgado and Stefancic, 2001) and theories of racial formation (Omi and Winant, 1994), Whiteness Studies reveals the takenfor-granted and normative nature of whiteness and the ways white skin privilege affords racial obliviousness (Rothenberg, 2008; Dyer, 2008). This emphasis calls attention to the simultaneous invisibility and ubiquity of whiteness as a racial position, such that the notion of ‘race’ is applied almost exclusively to non-white people. It reveals how whiteness acts as the unseen, normative category against which differently racialized groups are ordered and valued. As Dyer (2008: 11) explains, ‘whites are not of a certain race, they are just the human race’. Other themes within the Whiteness Studies literatures include the shifting historical definitions of whiteness and the processes through which various ethnic and immigrant groups ‘became white’ (Jacobson, 2005; Brodkin, 2000; Roediger, 1992); the paradox of privilege (Johnson, 2005); and the naturalized social, cultural, and economic power associated with whiteness (McIntosh, 2004 [1988]). Roediger’s (1992) influential The Wages of Whiteness develops a historical materialist analysis of the social reproduction of whiteness and the making of the white working class. Roediger (1992) traces the ways in which whiteness became a ‘currency’ through which to access relative class privilege for Southern and Eastern European immigrants experiencing class subjugation and economic insecurity in the US. Indeed, a significant portion of the literature in Whiteness Studies has foregrounded the connections between class and whiteness and the ways the construction of whiteness is embedded within the cultural economy of western modernity (Nayak, 2007; Bonnett, 1997, 2000). Geographic studies of whiteness contribute to this body of literature in important ways by demonstrating spatial contingency of the social construction of whiteness and privilege (e.g. Bonnett, 1997, 2000; Jackson, 1998; Kobayashi and Peake, 2000; McGuinness, 2000; Pulido, 2000, 2002; Peake and Ray, 2001; Winders, 2003; Abbott, 2006; Alkon and McCullen, 2011; Housel, 2009). Scholarship examining geographies of whiteness reveals the sociospatial production of race, situating race within the grounded contexts and spatial hierarchies through which bodies are placed and ordered (Pulido, 2000). Through these interventions, geographers illustrate that landscapes do not merely reflect racial patterns, but are a fundamental component of processes of racialization. This body of work explores a wide range of themes, including the production of racialized landscapes (Alderman and Modlin, 2014; Schien, 2006; Kobayashi and Peake, 2000); normative practices and the production of geographies of whiteness (Bonnett, 2000; Pulido, 2000); NIMBYism (and YIMBYism) and the mobilization of white identities in support of exclusionary white spaces (Darden, 1995; Pulido, 2000; Hubbard, 2005; Barraclough, 2009; Bonds, 2013); the way whiteness and landscapes naturalize exclusions and privilege (Peake and Ray, 2001; Moreton-Robinson, 2004; Inwood and Martin, 2008; Hankins et al., 2012); and the intersections of whiteness and rural class identities (Jarosz and Lawson, 2002; Winders, 2003; Bonds, 2009). This work illustrates the systemic and structural production of white privilege through a range of racist practices. More recently, Baldwin (2012) has explored whiteness in relation to the biopolitics of race in geography, arguing for a focus on ‘futurity’ and the way the ‘future is rendered knowable through specific practices’ that intervene on the present (p. 173). However, we argue that within geography there is a blind spot to the ongoing significance of white supremacy and the white racial identities produced through a taken-for-granted logic of settler colonialism. For example, early work in geography on whiteness is largely associated with Alastair Bonnett (1997). Bonnett’s work is critical because he opened up the field of critical Whiteness Studies to a range of engagements by geographers who have explored the ‘plural constitution and multiple lived experiences of whiteness’ (Bonnett, 1997: 196). Additionally, by situating race within imperial projects he argues that geographers’ preoccupation with racialized ‘Others’ reinforced colonial tropes, invisibilized white racial identities, and reinforced assumptions about non-white races and ethnicities as the legitimate, and indeed exclusive, objects of study within scholarship on geography of race. Bonnett’s analysis underscores the linkages between imperial ideologies and practices in shaping the racial imaginaries of the West. Significantly, Bonnett’s (1997) analysis does not distinguish colonialism from settler colonialism, which has implications for the study of whiteness because the two are theoretically and spatially distinct. As Kobayashi and De Leeuw (2010) argue, much of the research on indigeneity and neo/colonialism in geography builds from scholars like Spivak, Said, and Bhabha, who theorize the (post)colonial condition after the departure of colonial authorities (see also Byrd, 2011; Gilmartin and Berg, 2007). But what of the indigenous peoples in settler nations who continue to live with colonial occupation? While there is much resonance and overlap between the two approaches, questions of dispossession, territoriality and race are different in settler nations where occupation and colonization are ongoing projects. While we respond to Bonnett’s (1997) call for more geographically sensitive theorizations of whiteness, we expand this argument by maintaining that it is also necessary to distinguish the production of white supremacy and racial identities in settler states as geographically and theoretically distinct from colonization in non-settler states. Building on Bonnett’s work, Dwyer and Jones (2000) analyze the contingency and socio-spatial production of whiteness, arguing that whiteness is an epistemology, ‘a particular way of valuing and ordering social life’ (p. 210). We further contend that one cannot make sense of the epistemic norms of whiteness in settler nations without also taking into account the nature of settler colonialism. Theories of whiteness that do not engage with indigenous geographies and the ongoing processes of colonization not only risk reinforcing the disappearance of Native peoples, they minimize the multiple processes of racialization producing raceclass identities in these places. For example, Dwyer and Jones (2000) theorize the production of a white socio-spatial epistemology through a focus on residential segregation in Lexington, Kentucky. Their analysis is profoundly revealing, demonstrating how whiteness shapes and is shaped by the production of racially ordered spaces and mobilities. How, we ask, might we further theorize a sociospatial of epistemology of whiteness (and, we would argue, white supremacy) through the incorporation of a settler colonial framework? Perhaps we might emphasize that the original inhabitants of what is now called Kentucky were peoples from over 20 different indigenous nations, including the Shawnee, the Cherokee, the Chickasaw, and the Yuchi peoples. We might then discuss how these peoples were forcibly ‘relocated’ to Oklahoma reservations during the Indian Removal Acts of the 1800s, enabling land speculation and the expansion of slave-supported agricultural ventures that violently remade the state and consolidated white political, economic, and social power. This consolidation continues well into our present day. Starting at this point is about more than building a complete picture of the historical and geographical production of whiteness. Rather, a settler colonial framework enhances understandings of whiteness by revealing how white supremacy is produced through ongoing structures of genocide and indigenous displacement that are concomitantly connected to the continued subordination of black and other non-white racialized bodies. Thus the analytics of white supremacy and settler colonialism is useful in materially locating privilege in settler states because of their emphasis on the enduring structures of genocide and forced labor upon which white power rests. White supremacy, as a concept, has long been a key component of feminist and black radical thought (Mills, 2003; hooks, 1989). However, the concept is often associated with the de jure racism of the past (i.e. slavery, Jim Crow) rather than with contemporary, de facto racial projects. For instance, in his critical intervention on whiteness, Bonnett mentions white supremacy only once to refer to racial projects of the 19th and early 20th centuries (1997: 193). This emphasis on an historical understanding of white supremacy rather than an historicized one has the potential to curtail analysis of the way ‘institutions or the state’ normalize and maintain the ‘racialized and gendered economic and political system benefiting the few at the expense of the many’ (Smith, 2012: 238). During an era of liberal multiculturalism and (ostensible) decolonization, in which formally colorblind institutions and policies have supplanted de jure racism and explicitly racist structures, a focus on individualized identities and experiences elides the systematic marginalization of people of color (Melamed, 2011; Goldberg, 2009; Berg, 2012). That is, in locating privilege at the scale of the individual, efforts to overcome privilege have the potential to leave the underlying structures of racism’s ‘death dealing displacement[s]’ (Gilmore, 2002: 16) largely hidden from view. Furthermore, as both Pulido (2015) and Leonardo (2004) have argued, white privilege allows whites to recognize how they benefit from the color of their skin – the social condition of whiteness – without actually examining the processes and relationships that make such benefits possible. By engaging with whiteness through the logic of settler colonialism and the materiality of state sanctioned and extra-legal production of death, we provide a framework that focuses on white supremacy as an ongoing colonial project. Defining white supremacy Our engagement with white supremacy begins with Gilmore’s (2006) definition of racism as ‘the state-sanctioned or extralegal production and exploitation of group-differentiated vulnerability to premature death’ (p. 28; emphasis added). Most simply defined, white supremacy is the presumed superiority of white racial identities, however problematically defined, in support of the cultural, political, and economic domination of non-white groups (Mills, 2003; see also Pulido, 2015). It is white supremacy that makes the differentiated outcomes and exposure (or lack of exposure) to premature death possible in the first place (Leonardo, 2004; Rodriguez, 2011; Pulido, 2015). The naturalization and invisibility of white racial identities and white skin privilege is made possible through the structures and logics of white supremacy. If privilege and racism are the symptoms, white supremacy is the disease. Theorized this way, white supremacy is the defining logic of both racism and privilege as they are culturally and materially produced. Moreover, the analytic of white supremacy underscores the historic, material production of white racial domination. As clarified by Leonardo (2004), ‘a critical pedagogy of white supremacy revolves less around unearned advantages, or the state of being dominant, and more around the direct processes that secure domination and the privileges associated with it’ (p. 137, emphasis in original). The analytic frame of white supremacy connects the discursive construction of race to the structural, material, and corporeal production of white racial hegemony. This locates whiteness more broadly than a collection of unearned privileges and reveals the way white privilege is part of a broader white supremacist, settler socio-spatial dialectic. This material conceptualization situates whiteness as produced by, and producing, socio-spatially contingent modes of production, thus moving away from the twinned dynamics of white privilege/racism as ‘problems to be solved’ to instead see them as politically productive forces. White supremacy is a central organizing logic of western modernity, legitimating both European colonization and settler projects. It is therefore foundational to the historic development of settler colonial states, but also to contemporary postcolonial societies (Mills, 2003; Hixson, 2013). Rather than being a relic of the past or an ideology of extremists, white supremacy continues to produce social and spatial relations that frame broad understandings of difference. A focus on white supremacy thus highlights both the social condition of whiteness, including the unearned assets afforded to white people, as well the processes, structures, and historical foundations upon which these privileges rest. European and, later, North American colonists created and developed a logic of race that placed white, European men at the pinnacle of the social hierarchy and all others in various positions of subordination (Bonnett, 1997; Goldberg, 2002). These imaginations valorized whiteness and sanctioned the violence of white domination, enslavement, and genocide while bolstering Eurocentric understandings of land use, private property, and wealth accumulation (Mills, 2003; Hixson, 2013; Seawright, 2014). This ‘white racial frame’ (Feagin, 2012: 7) was instrumental in creating the international slave trade, the colonization of large swaths of the globe, and in establishing contemporary heteronormative and patriarchal social relations. White supremacy is not only a rationalization for race; it is the foundational logic of the modern capitalist system and must be at the center of efforts to understand the significance of whiteness (Gilmore, 2006; Inwood, 2013; Du Bois, 1935; Feagin, 2012). Reframing questions from privilege to supremacy challenges commonsense understandings that associate white supremacy with particular historical moments (i.e. the Reconstruction Era in the US or the colonization of Africa by Europeans) or with white power groups (e.g. Ku Klux Klan, neo-Nazis) (see hooks, 1989). Such framings treat white supremacy as a historic relic or dismiss the power of white supremacy by associating it with groups and individuals who are outside of the ‘mainstream’ of society. Indeed, Pulido (2015: 4) argues that the ‘caricaturing’ of white supremacy is one of the key means through which the ongoing significance of white supremacy is obscured. While few whites openly acknowledge an adherence to a white supremacist ideology, white racial domination necessitates racial exclusions that can only be made possible through the ‘taking or appropriation ... of land, wages, life, liberty, community, and social status’ (Pulido, 2015: 4). Our historicized understanding does not locate white supremacy in the past, or within the purview of extremist groups, but instead reveals its stubborn endurance and the ways its everyday logics are reproduced through spectacular and mundane violences that reaffirm empire and the economic, social, cultural and political power of white racial identities. Therefore our account situates white supremacy as foundational and as the ongoing result of the colonial logics that permeate settler societies. Settler colonialism and the foundation of the white supremacist dialectic Examining the material conditions of white supremacy requires acknowledgement that large areas of the earth are a product of settler colonialism and that ‘settlement’ in these places – premised on the extermination of indigenous peoples, the occupation of their territories, and the exploitation of others – is an ongoing structure that continues to define socio-spatial development (Harris, 2004; Kobayashi and De Leeuw, 2010; Morgensen, 2011; Hixson, 2013; Veracini, 2013; Smith, 2012; Arvin et al., 2013; Seawright, 2014; Tuck and Yang, 2012; De Leeuw et al., 2013; Pasternak, 2013; De Leeuw, 2014; Hunt and Holmes, 2015; Pasternak, 2015). Colonization, from the settler colonial perspective, is a kind of permanent occupation that is always in a state of becoming. This unfolding project involves the interplay between the removal of First Peoples from the land and the creation of labor systems and infrastructures that make the land productive. These two processes are interconnected and necessary: land must be cleared of indigenous populations, privatized, and then cultivated and made profitable through labor exploitation (Arvin et al., 2013). This ongoing project requires the continued displacement of indigenous and other marginalized peoples who are an impediment to capitalist development, as well as particular forms of labor exploitation that extract value from appropriated land (Arvin et al., 2013; Smith, 2012; Kobayashi and De Leeuw, 2010). This ‘white settler epistemology’ (Seawright, 2014) is grounded in racialized and gendered western knowledge systems and the norms of liberal individualism that legitimate privatization and private property rights (Dempsey et al., 2011; Pasternak, 2015) and ‘accumulating wealth and property by extracting it, via labor, from nature or inferior beings’ (Seawright, 2014: 563). Settler colonialism licenses the disappearance of indigenous peoples, the expropriation of indigenous spaces, and makes others infinitely exploitable and/or expendable (e.g. slaves, immigrant labor, prisoners). It is thus foundational in establishing processes that separate humanity into distinct groups and in placing those groups into a larger hierarchy. The political, economic, and social processes necessary to contain, exterminate, and permanently occupy territory are premised on a continuously reworked white supremacist dialectic that underwrites racial capitalism.

# Lay Version

## weighing overview [45sec]

#### The suffering of Native Americans comes before any other impact for a couple reasons

#### 1] they have been an oppressed group that have been dominated over since the beginning of American History, which means they have suffered the most historically

#### 2] Their suffering has become invisible in our impact calculus. They aren't seen as humans but are things to be disposed of after we've drained them of their resources. Debate's silence on this issue just allows this oppression to operate in the shadows. Don’t let them get up and say oh we impact to a bigger number. Because then we will never talk about these issues and unable to understand the inner workings of power and how they perpetuate these problems.

#### 3] Inwood 15 - the natives were the first racialized group to be oppressed in America. Meaning this set a historical precedent for things like slavery and discrimination against other minorities. This means by helping native Americans we tackle the origin point that normalizes violence on these minorities.