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#### Genocidal settlement is a structure, not an event meaning ontological logic of elimination is an everyday manifestation that defines settler identity.

Rifkin 14, Mark. Settler common sense: Queerness and everyday colonialism in the American renaissance. U of Minnesota Press, 2014. (Associate Professor of English & WGS at UNC-Greensboro)//Elmer

If nineteenth-century American literary studies tends to focus on the ways Indians enter the narrative frame and the kinds of meanings and associa- tions they bear, recent **attempts to theorize settler colonialism** have sought to **shift attention from its effects** on Indigenous subjects **to** its **implications for nonnative political attachments**, forms of inhabitance, **and modes of being**, illuminating and tracking the pervasive operation of **settlement as a system**. In Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology, Patrick Wolfe argues, “Settler colonies were (are) premised on the elimination of native societies. The split tensing reflects a determinate feature of settler colonization. The colonizers come to stay—invasion is **a structure not an event**” (2).6 He suggests that a “**logic** **of elimination” drives settler** governance and **sociality**, describing “the settler-colonial will” as “a historical force that ultimately derives from the primal drive to expansion that is generally glossed as capitalism” (167), and in “Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native,” he observes that “elimination is an organizing principle of settler-colonial society rather than a one-off (and superceded) occurrence” (388). Rather than being superseded after an initial moment/ period of conquest, colonization persists since “the logic of elimination marks a return whereby the native repressed continues to structure settler- colonial society” (390). In Aileen Moreton-Robinson’s work, whiteness func- tions as the central way of understanding the domination and displacement of Indigenous peoples by nonnatives.7 In “Writing Off Indigenous Sover- eignty,” she argues, “As a regime of power, patriarchal white sovereignty operates ideologically, materially and discursively to reproduce and main- tain its investment in the nation as a white possession” (88), and in “Writ- ing Off Treaties,” she suggests, “**At an ontological level** the **structure of subjective possession** **occurs through** the **imposition of one’s will-to-be on the thing which is perceived to lack will,** thus it is open to being possessed,” such that “possession . . . forms part of **the ontological structure of white subjectivity**” (83–84). For Jodi Byrd, the deployment of Indianness as a mobile figure works as the principal mode of U.S. settler colonialism. She observes that “colonization and racialization . . . have often been conflated,” in ways that “tend to be sited along the axis of inclusion/exclusion” and that “misdirect and cloud attention from the underlying structures of settler colonialism” (xxiii, xvii). She argues that settlement works through the translation of indigeneity as Indianness, casting place-based political collec- tivities as (racialized) populations subject to U.S. jurisdiction and manage- ment: “the Indian is left nowhere and everywhere within the ontological premises through which U.S. empire orients, imagines, and critiques itself ”; “**ideas of** Indians and **Indianness** have **served as the ontological ground through which U.S. settler colonialism enacts itself** ” (xix).

#### That results in land exploitation and ecocide – specifically manifests in knowledge institutions making forefronting Settler Colonialism a prior question.

Paperson 17 la paperson or K. Wayne Yang, June 2017, “A Third University is Possible” (an associate professor of ethnic studies at the University of California, San Diego)//Elmer

Land is the prime concern of settler colonialism, contexts in which the colonizer comes to a “new” place not only to seize and exploit but to stay, making that “new” place his permanent home. Settler colonialism thus complicates the center–periphery model that was classically used to describe colonialism, wherein an imperial center, the “metropole,” dominates distant colonies, the “periphery.” Typically, one thinks of European colonization of Africa, India, the Caribbean, the Pacific Islands, in terms of external colonialism, also called exploitation colonialism, where land and human beings are recast as natural resources for primitive accumulation: coltan, petroleum, diamonds, water, salt, seeds, genetic material, chattel. Theories named as “settler colonial studies” had a resurgence beginning around 2006.[2] However, the analysis of settler colonialism is actually not new, only often ignored within Western critiques of empire.[3] The critical literatures of the colonized have long positioned the violence of settlement as a prime feature in colonial life as well as in global arrangements of power. We can see this in Franz Fanon’s foundational critiques of colonialism. Whereas Fanon’s work is often generalized for its diagnoses of anti/colonial violence and the racialized psychoses of colonization upon colonized and colonizer, Fanon is also talking about settlement as the particular feature of French colonization in Algeria. For Fanon, the violence of French colonization in Algeria arises from settlement as a spatial immediacy of empire: the geospatial collapse of metropole and colony into the same time and place. On the “selfsame land” are spatialized white immunity and racialized violation, non-Native desires for freedom, Black life, and Indigenous relations.[4] Settler colonialism is too often thought of as “what happened” to Indigenous people. This kind of thinking confines the experiences of Indigenous people, their critiques of settler colonialism, their decolonial imaginations, to an unwarranted historicizing parochialism, as if settler colonialism were a past event that “happened to” Native peoples and not generalizable to non-Natives. Actually, settler colonialism is something that “happened for” settlers. Indeed, it is happening for them/us right now. Wa Thiong’o’s question of how instead of why directs us to think of land tenancy laws, debt, and the privatization of land as settler colonial technologies that enable the “eventful” history of plunder and disappearance. Property law is a settler colonial technology. The weapons that enforce it, the knowledge institutions that legitimize it, the financial institutions that operationalize it, are also technologies. Like all technologies, they evolve and spread. Recasting land as property means severing Indigenous peoples from land. This separation, what Hortense Spillers describes as “the loss of Indigenous name/land” for Africans-turned-chattel, recasts Black Indigenous people as black bodies for biopolitical disposal: who will be moved where, who will be murdered how, who will be machinery for what, and who will be made property for whom.[5] In the alienation of land from life, alienable rights are produced: the right to own (property), the right to law (protection through legitimated violence), the right to govern (supremacist sovereignty), the right to have rights (humanity). In a word, what is produced is whiteness. Moreover, it is not just human beings who are refigured in the schism. Land and nonhumans become alienable properties, a move that first alienates land from its own sovereign life. Thus we can speak of the various technologies required to create and maintain these separations, these alienations: Black from Indigenous, human from nonhuman, land from life.[6] “How?” is a question you ask if you are concerned with the mechanisms, not just the motives, of colonization. Instead of settler colonialism as an ideology, or as a history, you might consider settler colonialism as a set of technologies —a frame that could help you to forecast colonial next operations and to plot decolonial directions. This chapter proceeds with the following insights. (1) The settler–native– slave triad does not describe identities. The triad—an analytic mainstay of settler colonial studies—digs a pitfall of identity that not only chills collaborations but also implies that the racial will be the solution. (2) Technologies are trafficked. Technologies generate patterns of social relations to land. Technologies mutate, and so do these relationships. Colonial technologies travel. In tracing technologies’ past and future trajectories, we can connect how settler colonial and antiblack technologies circulate in transnational arenas. (3) Land—not just people—is the biopolitical target.[7] The examples are many: fracking, biopiracy, damming of rivers and flooding of valleys, the carcasses of pigs that die from the feed additive ractopamine and are allowable for harvest by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration. The subjugation of land and nonhuman life to deathlike states in order to support “human” life is a “biopolitics” well beyond the Foucauldian conception of biopolitical as governmentality or the neoliberal disciplining of modern, bourgeois, “human” subject. (4) (Y)our task is to theorize in the break, that is, to refuse the master narrative that technology is loyal to the master, that (y)our theory has a Eurocentric origin. Black studies, Indigenous studies, and Othered studies have already made their breaks with Foucault (over biopolitics), with Deleuze and Guatarri (over assemblages and machines), and with Marx (over life and primitive accumulation). (5) Even when they are dangerous, understanding technologies provides us some pathways for decolonizing work. We can identify projects of collaboration on decolonial technologies. Colonizing mechanisms are evolving into new forms, and they might be subverted toward decolonizing operations. The Settler–Native–Slave Triad Does Not Describe Identities One of the main interventions of settler colonial studies has been to insist that the patterning of social relations is shaped by colonialism’s thirst for land and thus is shaped to fit modes of empire. Because colonialism is a perverted affair, our relationships are also warped into complicitous arrangements of violation, trespass, and collusion with its mechanisms. For Fanon, the psychosis of colonialism arises from the patterning of violence into the binary relationship between the immune humanity of the white settler and the impugned humanity of the native. For Fanon, the supremacist “right” to create settler space that is immune from violence, and the “right” to abuse the body of the Native to maintain white immunity, this is the spatial and fleshy immediacy of settler colonialism. Furthermore, the “humanity” of the settler is constructed upon his agency over the land and nature. As Maldonado- Torres explains, “I think, therefore I am” is actually an articulation of “I conquer, therefore I am,” a sense of identity posited upon the harnessing of nature and its “natural” people.[8] This creates a host of post+colonial problems that have come to define modernity. Because the humanity of the settler is predicated on his ability to “write the world,” to make history upon and over the natural world, the colonized is instructed to make her claim to humanity by similarly acting on the world or, more precisely, acting in his. Indeed, for Fanon, it is the perverse ontology of settler becomings—becoming landowner or becoming property, becoming killable or becoming a killer—and the mutual implication of tortured and torturer that mark the psychosis of colonialism. This problem of modernity and colonial psychosis is echoed in Jack Forbes’s writings: Columbus was a wétiko. He was mentally ill or insane, the carrier of a terribly contagious psychological disease, the wétiko psychosis. . . . The wétiko psychosis, and the problems it creates, have inspired many resistance movements and efforts at reform or revolution. Unfortunately, most of these efforts have failed because they have never diagnosed the wétiko.[9] Under Western modernity, becoming “free” means becoming a colonizer, and because of this, “the central contradiction of modernity is freedom.”[10] Critiques of settler colonialism, therefore, do not offer just another “type” of colonialism to add to the literature but a mode of analysis that has repercussions for any diagnosis of coloniality and for understanding the modern conditions of freedom. By modern conditions of freedom, I mean that Western freedom is a product of colonial modernity, and I mean that such freedom comes with conditions, with strings attached, most manifest as terms of unfreedom for nonhumans. As Cindi Mayweather says, “your freedom’s in a bind.”[11]

#### Reliance on the Media as a distributor of knowledge ignores the fact that the Media is a colonial institution that must inevitably reflect and circulate dominant colonial ideologies.

Beckermann 19, Kay Marie. Newspapers as a Form of Settler Colonialism: An Examination of the Dakota Access Pipeline Protest and American Indian Representation in Indigenous, State, and National News. Diss. North Dakota State University, 2019. (Graduate Faculty of the North Dakota State University of Agriculture and Applied Science)//Elmer

INTRODUCTION The Dakota Access Pipeline (DAPL) protest that took place near North Dakota’s Standing Rock Sioux Reservation the fall of 2016 opened my eyes to the media misrepresentations of American Indians. What I found most interesting was how American Indians were framed based on news organization proximity to the protest site. State news media, for example, often portrayed American Indian activists as nuisances that were breaking the law. National press, on the other hand, portrayed the indigenous population as frozen in an idealized past, often describing a pastoral countryside dotted with tepees. In both cases the media ignored the larger issue: that North Dakota’s settler colonial history underlies today’s oil extraction and transportation needs. The goal of my dissertation research is to identify how Indigenous, national, and state newspapers represented American Indian activists during the DAPL protest. I will also explain how the media processes support the structures of settler colonialism through their biased framing of American Indian people. The aim of settler colonialism is to elimination of the native through violence, assimilation, recognition, and a variety of other means. The media eliminates the protests, voices, reasoning, and the humanity of the American Indian by framing and continuous use of stereotypes, such as the noble savage, bloodthirsty savage, or generic stereotype (Baylor, 1996). These media actions are continuing the ideology of the dominant (i.e. Euro-American) class and repressing the true needs and identities of the American Indian. This dissertation reflects a communication perspective because it focuses on journalism and the power it has to alter realities of an event through media framing. Journalism as a cultural artifact perpetuates ideologies such as settler colonialism. This research is important because the American field of communication does little to address the media as a form of settler colonialism. While settler colonialism and neocolonialism are related concepts, this research argues that settler colonialism is a somewhat different concept that arises from a different conceptual base. Certainly the work by neocolonialists inform the concept of settler colonialism, but in this research I maintain that settler colonialism moves in a slightly different way, and so will build my research using a different conceptualization of the term that I have established based on my research. Consequently, I will draw from sociology to explain how the media distributes dominant ideologies. It is important, I believe, to understand how the media work in tandem with other apparatuses to continuously repress society. Since repression is often successful, the needs of American Indians—the people that Euro-Americans have attempted to eliminate for centuries—often go under- or mis- represented in the media. In order to fully understand the Dakota Access Pipeline protest and media representation, this chapter will give an overview of the protest, explore Indigenous fears of water contamination and destruction of sacred sites, review the importance of oil in the state of North Dakota, and explain how the media act as a public informant. The chapter will conclude with a summary of upcoming dissertation sections. The Dakota Access Pipeline Protest The Standing Rock Sioux first learned of the proposed construction of a pipeline that would cross near reservation boundaries in 2014. Concerned about the pipeline’s affect on water and sacred sites, the Standing Rock Sioux began a years-long opposition (Stand with Standing Rock, n.d.-a). The Tribe voiced their concerns to numerous entities, including pipeline owners Energy Transfer Partners, state officials, and the United States Congress. The Tribe also met with and gained the support of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of the Interior, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. Yet despite the backing of these federal agencies, Energy Transfer Partners was authorized to begin construction on the Dakota Access Pipeline in July 2016 (Stand with Standing Rock, n.d.-a.). A few months earlier, in April 2016, approximately 30 members of the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe began demonstrating against the pipeline. Their numbers grew throughout the summer, reaching over 1,000 activists staying at the Oceti Sakowin and other camps by September (McKenna, 2016a; Stand with Standing Rock, n.d.-b). Unfortunately a demographic count was not recorded, but it is likely the early activists were Native American (McKenna, 2016a). In fact, this event is arguably the largest gathering of Indigenous Nations in decades (Stand with Standing Rock, n.d.-b). An August demonstration of American Indians on horseback mock charging police lines brought the demonstration to the national consciousness via mainstream and social media (McKenna, 2016c). Several weeks later a video showing guard dogs attacking demonstrators went viral, securing the legacy of the Dakota Access Pipeline protest. With each passing month during the fall of 2016, the number of activists staying at the various camps increased, as did the number of demonstrations and violence. Case in point, hundreds of demonstrators were meeting near a police blockade in November. The response of the Morton County Sheriff’s department included use of “rubber bullets, tear gas, concussion grenades, and water cannon” (Hawkins, 2016; McKenna, 2016b, para. 3). The standoff lasted well into the night during below freezing temperatures and over 300 activists were treated for wounds or hypothermia (McKenna, 2016b). The reason for the gathering or response of the local authorities is not clear based on artifacts examined for this research; however, the violence seemed excessive given the actions of demonstrators. The protest reached its climax December 4 with approximately 10,000 activists living at the camps (McKenna, 2016a). North Dakota’s notorious winter weather quickly drove many activists away, with only 1,000 remaining by midDecember (McKenna, 2016a). Dakota Access and Water The 1,200-mile Dakota Access Pipeline does not directly cross tribal land; however, it does cross the Missouri River less than a mile upstream of the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation (Dakota Access Pipeline Facts, n.d.-b). The Missouri River is the main water source for the Standing Rock Sioux (McKenna, 2016a). The issue is not necessarily where the pipeline is located but the damage to the water supply if the pipeline were to leak. An inadequate water supply is already an issue for the Standing Rock Sioux, with many people relying on “poorly constructed or low capacity” (Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, n.d., para. 37) wells. The problems with wells are numerous, including contamination, low quantities of water, and they are expensive to maintain (Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, n.d.). Problems not only affect the availability of drinking water, but water used for agriculture and cattle, which are main industries of the tribe. Surface water is unpredictable, shallow groundwater is limited, and deep groundwater is highly mineralized. These issues reduce the amount of land available for grazing, which affects the number of livestock that can be raised on the land, which in turn affects the quantity of cattle available for slaughter (Standing Rock Sioux Tribe, n.d.). The Missouri River provides a high volume of clean water to the reservation and areas downstream; without it the people and industry will suffer. Dakota Access and Sacred Sites The Standing Rock Sioux also feared the destruction of sites that had cultural or religious value to the tribe (Stand With Standing Rock, n.d.-a). Pipeline construction was essentially a 150-foot-wide road cutting through over 300 miles of prairie and had the potential to destroy hundreds of sacred sites (Colwell, 2016; Stand with Standing Rock, n.d.-a). According to the National Historic Preservation Act (1966/1992), federal agencies like the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers are required to consult with tribes when construction may disrupt sacred places. However, the Standing Rock Sioux refused to meet with the Army Corps of Engineers as the Corps refused to review all land that will be disrupted; Corps interest was only in the water crossing (Colwell, 2016). The Standing Rock Sioux were concerned about the safety of their sacred sites over the entire path of the construction, not just the water passage. Archeologists did eventually walk the pipeline but the required tribal survey was not conducted. The issue with not having the tribal survey is archeologists view the land through a different perspective than American Indians (Colwell, 2016). Archeologists are scientific, searching for shards of pottery or buried villages, something tangible to explain the past. American Indians, on the other hand, view a space via multiple levels. These levels “layer time and place in a complex way, enlacing the real and tangible with the symbolic and representational” (Ferguson & Colwell-Chanthaphonh, 2006, p. 150). Therefore, a space can be replete with cultural meaning, such as a traditional area for gathering healing plants or a place where water is collected for ceremonies (Colwell, 2016). A space is more than the location of tangible artifacts. Hence, federal agencies approved the construction of the pipeline without recognizing how American Indians view their own heritage. The National Historic Preservation Act was amended in 1992 to recognize the value of traditional cultural spaces, acknowledging the importance of American Indian history (NHPA, 1966/1992). Energy Transfer Partners skirted around these requirements, going so far as to exclude the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation in their Environmental Assessment documents (Environmental Protection Agency, 2016). The 6 breakdown between federal agencies and the Standing Rock Sioux could have been avoided had the government and corporation been willing to acknowledge American Indian perspectives. Dakota Access and the Media The Dakota Access Pipeline protest was reported across the globe. Top hits from the Google search “Dakota Access Pipeline Protest 2016” includes reports from Inside Climate News, New York Times, USA Today, CNN, NBC News, and The Guardian. It is clear from the thousands of articles found regarding the protest the media served as a public informant, acting as a conduit between those in power (oil companies, government agencies) and the masses. The press has the responsibility to inform the public so informed decisions regarding government actions can be made (Weston, 1996). This assumes, however, the press is sharing accurate information. The Hutchins Commission (1947) stated the “freedom of expression does not include the right to lie as a deliberate instrument of policy” (p. 10). To make an honest error is forgiven, but the press may not deliberately misinform the public. To suppress the truth also suppresses public discussion, which is important to a healthy society. The Hutchins Commission (1947) further states that debate “elicits mental power and breadth; it is essential to the building of a mentally robust public” (p. 9). This is an early formation of the public sphere as defined by Habermas, Lennox, and Lennos (1974), in which newspapers and other forms of mass communication exist to provide information to all people. Habermas et al (1974) states that in order for public debate to occur in a large society, the media must exist as a way to distribute information and “influence those who receive it” (p. 48). Nerone (2015) argues the values expressed in the Hutchins Commission are important today; however, individuals realize that news organizations are “unelected, unrepresentative (both demographically and politically), generally profit-seeking and, even in crisis, more powerful than they ought to be” (p. 324). 7 Contemporary reporters follow the Code of Ethics established by the Society of Professional Journalists, which states they should strive to “ensure the free exchange of information that is accurate, fair and thorough” (SPJ, 2014, para. 1). This is accomplished via four foundational principles: seek truth and report it, minimize harm, act independently, and be accountable and transparent (SPJ, 2014). Included in these principles are guidelines that encourage reporters to never “misrepresent or oversimplify” (para. 6) and to “avoid stereotyping” (para. 18). However, as literature regarding the media and American Indian representation points out, these guidelines are often blurred. When this occurs, according to Arviso (n.d.), the reporting is inaccurate and adds to the “longstanding ignorance of non-Native media as well as perpetuating stereotypes of Native Americans” (para. 5). Oil and North Dakota The history of oil production in North Dakota is relatively young as its discovery was in April 1951 (State Historical Society of North Dakota, n.d.). Oil production in the state has since increased significantly. Indeed, the average well in western North Dakota’s Bakken Formation can produce over 600,000 barrels of product over 45 years (State Historical Society of North Dakota, n.d.). The state relies heavily on oil production to fund “schools, roads and infrastructure, the North Dakota Legacy Fund, property tax relief, wildlife and natural resources, and more” (Energy of North Dakota, n.d.). According to Energy of North Dakota (n.d.), taxes paid for oil production and extraction was over $1.63 billion in 2017. It is easy to understand, therefore, why the state government supports oil production to the extent it will ignore the needs of its original inhabitants. Some state representatives are known to accept substantial donations from oil companies like Energy Transfer Partners. To illustrate, all three members of the North Dakota Industrial 8 Commission, the office in charge of the state’s Oil and Gas Division, accepted sizeable donations from oil companies in recent elections. Agriculture Commissioner Doug Goehring received campaign donations from at least ten oil companies or their executives (Scheyder, 2014); Attorney General Wayne Stenhjem accepted $50,000 during his last race; and Governor Doug Burgum accepted over $100,000 from oil company executives (Dalrymple, 2017). Acceptance of these donations is a conflict of interest between their duty to all people of the state and corporate interest. Governor Burgum shows his support of oil on the homepage of Dakota Pipeline Facts, stating the project has “faced months of politically driven delays and will allow for safe transport of North Dakota product to market” (Dakota Access Pipeline Facts, n.d.- a). He does not have a message supporting the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe. It could be argued that acceptance of money from oil companies is a way to indicate their support of the oil industry in the state. Summary The media played an important role during the Dakota Access Pipeline protest. Through media framing of American Indian activists, newspapers reviewed in this research effectively rewrote the Indigenous narrative of natural resources inherently sacred to this population. My analysis of artifacts highlights North Dakota’s dependence on oil revenue and its willingness to repress its American Indian population. Therefore the mainstream media acted as a form of settler colonialism, under-or mis-representing the issue to the benefit of oil companies rather than follow the rule of law. The inclusion of Indigenous media highlights the multivocality of Indigenous reporters as they recognize the numerous levels of history and place during the protest. 9 The first chapter of this disquisition argues that today’s news media are a form of settler colonialism. Accomplished via media owners and boards controlling the narrative of American Indians, these men and women have the power to frame events in ways that will benefit the dominant class. The framing reinforces the structure in which American Indians are considered less superior by the dominant class. This leads to chapter two in which media framing is examined and explores how frames may influence audience perceptions. Chapter two also reviews the history of media bias against American Indians—and how this bias has not changed over the centuries. Chapter three discusses the comparative qualitative content analysis and coding frame used to examine artifacts regarding the Dakota Access Pipeline protest and the framing of American Indian activists. Chapter four explores the research findings and providing analysis regarding the five dominant frames discovered in the artifacts. The analysis also leads to the answering of the research questions. Chapter five concludes this disquisition, tying the chapters together to fully explain how settler colonialism is present in today’s news media. Implications of settler colonialism in the media and the legacy of the Dakota Access Pipeline protest are also discussed. 10 CHAPTER ONE: COLONIALISM & SETTLER COLONIALISM The term settler colonialism invokes pastoral images of pioneers crossing the open prairie in covered wagons, searching for a new life in America. Pioneers, or settlers, are often conceived of as young men eager to homestead in an effort to create an inheritance for future generations (Bowman, 1927). It goes without saying these young men are conceived of as white with a European ancestry following the ideology of a patriarchal social system (Veracini, 2013). It is also assumed these settlers will peacefully encourage the Indigenous population to resettle elsewhere (Ono, 2009). The reality of settler colonialism, in American and elsewhere, is significantly different from the popular conceptions noted above. It is a brutal act of elimination so embedded in society that it continues to repress today (Ono, 2009). Several theorists will be discussed in this chapter, ranging from Karl Marx to Noam Chomsky. The selection of theorists is not random, despite their varying ideologies. Rather, each theorist contributes to the understanding of colonialism. To illustrate, Fanon’s focus is post-colonialism. However, he understands post-colonialism via a historical lens, which contributes to Marx’s historical view of oppression. Both scholars discuss capitalist expansion and the widening gap between colonizers and colonized. Compartmentalization of social classes helps to understand settler colonialism and the efforts to eliminate the Indigenous. Marx and Fanon also discuss the tension in the relationship between the colonizers and colonized, as each are dependent upon one another. The bourgeoisie and colonizers cannot increase financial wealth without the labor of the working class and colonized. Settlers, however, were both colonizers and colonized. They attempted to eliminate the Indigenous, as this population was not needed for financial gain. However, settlers were dependent on the upper classes and lawmakers to eliminate the Indigenous without facing legal repercussions. 11 This chapter will provide a brief overview of traditional colonialism before discussing settler colonialism and the part it plays in today’s social structure before ending with a discussion of neocolonialism. The chapter will finish with a discussion of how the news media participate in settler colonialism via industry structure and how these actions maintain dominant ideologies. Colonialism: Then and Now Colonialism This section focuses on colonialism, which is the concept from which settler colonialism emerged. Colonialism is capitalistic expansion from one territory to another in which the ideology of race works to form distinct social categories. The Marxist perspective is applied due to his belief that, like colonialism, the working class suffers under the ideologies of the dominant class. It is a viewpoint of historical oppression, in which colonizers benefit from the labor of the colonized. As this research will discuss, the dominant class in the United States has long oppressed American Indians. European colonialism began in the Middle Ages with the goal of creating temporary or permanent settlements across the globe (Ashcroft, Griffiths, & Tiffin, 1998). It is defined as “the implanting of settlements on distant territory” (Said, 1993, p. 41). The origins of colonialism emerged from imperialism, a concept in which the dominant ideology stems from a metropolitan area ruling from a distance (Ashcroft et al., 1998). Expansion from metropolises to distant territories occurs when consumer demand of the bourgeoisie for a product increases while local resources needed for manufacture of the product decreases (Marx & Engels, 1848/1964). Owners and manufacturers of the resources, or the bourgeoisie, compose a society’s dominant class and it is in their interest to meet the consumer demands and find new locations for resource extraction. If expansion does not occur, wealth will be lost. Hence, colonialism is capitalistic at 12 its foundation, as the European bourgeoisie could no longer increase their wealth locally (Marx & Engels, 1848/1964). The bourgeoisie were forced to expand their resource extraction in distant territories in order to meet production demands. Philosopher and writer Frantz Fanon (1963), in his examination of colonialism, states “capitalism…regarded the colonies as a source of raw materials which once processed could be unloaded on the European market” (p. 26). Capitalism also defines the relationship between the production of goods and social class (Marx & Engels, 1848/1964). History, it has been argued, is a continuous repetition of class struggle in which the bourgeoisie regularly exploit the proletariat (Marx & Engels, 1848/1964). The repetition is ceaseless as humans are social beings that are shaped by the culture in which they are raised. A variety of social classes existed and evolved for centuries, yet the mid-17th century European bourgeoisie, desiring to meet the demands of global markets, reduced the class system into two factions (Marx & Engels, 1848/1964). The two camps—bourgeoisie and proletariat1 —exist in oppositional tension as they rely on one another for existence. Yet when social classes are divided so clearly, a compartmentalized world is created (Fanon, 1963). For example, the bourgeoisie recognized the necessity of global expansion to meet market needs; therefore, they began to settle in distant territories to create trade relationships, extract resources, and modernize production (Marx & Engels, 1848/1964). They also needed laborers, often individuals from the Indigenous population, for without them production would not occur and bourgeoisie wealth would not increase. Modernization, however, could lead to overproduction of goods that, in turn, may have a destructive effect on manufacturing. This results in decreased wealth of the working class due to overproduction (Marx & Engels, 1848/1964). Ideology of Race The ideology of race, in which the white race is considered dominant, is a defining factor in the development of colonization (Césaire, 1955; Fanon, 1963; Memmi, 1965). Like the class structure studied by Marx and Engels (1848/1964), Fanon (1963) states colonized societies consist of two categories: oppressors/colonizers and the oppressed/colonized. The oppressors (white European/dominant class) form the repressive state apparatus, the institutions necessary to create and enforce laws (Althusser, 1971; Fanon, 1963). The goal of the repressive state apparatus is to maintain the status quo established by the oppressors. The oppressed are the Indigenous that suffer under colonialist rule (Fanon, 1963). These categories of colonized societies are based on the ideology of race with the understanding that white is best (according to Christianity and white men of the dominant class). The capitalistic view of colonialism, with the understanding that class division combined with forced labor, creates an economic structure based on race (Fanon, 1963). Colonial racism is the ongoing separation of the colonizer and the colonized (Fanon, 1963; Memmi, 1965). The ideology of this separation means the colonizer is continuously degrading and reajusting the position of the colonized, making sure the gap between the two classes is always clearly defined. Colonial racism exploits this gap to the benefit of the colonizer (Memmi, 1965). This is accomplished through the subjection of the colonized to labor for increased profit. Additionally, the differences between the colonizer and the colonized is 14 considered by all parties to be absolute fact (Memmi, 1965). The construct of race and superiority of the white race is “a sine qua non of colonial life, but it also lays the foundation for the immutability of this life” (Memmi, 1965, p. 74). Fanon (1963) highlights the irony that while colonial racism considers the white race to be superior, it is also the race that is always the foreigner in the colonized world. The colonizers are from elsewhere while the colonized are considered “the other” (Fanon, 1963, p. 5). Othering Colonial attempts at “othering” include making the colonized appear uncivilized in the eyes of the dominant class (Césaire, 1955). This tactic is employed when violence, which is always present in colonial situations, pulls the colonizer “deeper into the abyss of barbarism” (Césaire, 1955, p. 9). However, rather than blame themselves, the oppressors endeavor to turn the colonized into the barbarian. This can be accomplished by public displays of the colonizer’s virtue and attempts to appear heroic (Memmi, 1965). To illustrate, the colonizer may focus on their deep spirituality to indicate their faithfulness to a higher power; a spirituality they consider not possessed by the colonized. The colonizer also attempts to degrade the colonized, “using the darkest colors to depict them” (Memmi, 1965, p. 54). In other words, colonizers actively strive to ensure the colonized is seen as their direct opposite. However, the more the colonizer attempts to depict himself as heroic, the more he is aware of the unjust relationship between colonizer and colonized (Hanson & Hanson, 2006; Memmi, 1965; Weaver-Hightower, 2018). Rather than acknowledge the relationship, the colonizer continues to perpetuate the myth of their importance and the evil ways of the colonized. Othering is also accomplished by viewing and treating the colonized as animals (Césaire, 1955; Fanon, 1963; Memmi, 1965). When the colonized are viewed as animals, the colonizer 15 dominates, turning “the indigenous man into an instrument of production” (Césaire, 1955, p. 42; Marx & Engels, 1848/1964). This is not unlike the use of oxen to plow a field or horses to pull heavy loads. Similarly, the colonizer views the oppressed as without values, “impervious to ethics, representing not only the absence of values by also the negation of values” (Fanon, 1963, p. 6; Marx & Engels, 1848/1964). The colonizer, therefore, views the colonized as an animal absent of all values, worthy only of production and labor that will allow the colonizer to profit. Power and Domination Colonized people do not willingly allow themselves to be oppressed (Fanon, 1963). They are turned into a workforce through violence, slavery, and other means of domination in order to increase the wealth of the colonizers. French philosopher Aimé Césaire (1955) explains this using Hitler as an example of domination and capitalism. Hitler considered the colonized country to be one that must be “a country of serfs, of agricultural laborers, or industrial workers. It is not a question of eliminating the inequalities among men but of widening them and making them into a law” (Césaire, 1955, p. 37). This is similar to Foucault’s (1977) belief the human body serves as an instrument. When the body is used against one’s will, i.e. a prisoner or colonized person forced to work, it is only to deprive the person of freedom. The body, then, is simply “caught up in a system of constraints and privations, obligations and prohibitions” (Foucault, 1977, p. 11). Forced labor affects the body in some way, such as starvation, injury, or confinement. Despite affects on the oppressed body, the forced labor increases wealth for the oppressor, as the body is political (Foucault, 1977). Those in power have the ability to use colonized bodies as the dominant class desires to “invest it, mark it, train it, torture it, force it to carry out tasks, to perform ceremonies” (Foucault, 1977, p. 25). 16 Power over bodies occurs in colonized territories, similar to Foucault’s philosophy on prisoner bodies. The colonized body is in a relationship between power and economics of the colonizer. The body as labor power is only possible when subjected, meaning “the body becomes a useful force only if it is both a productive body and a subjected body” (Foucault, 1977, p. 26; Marx & Engels, 1848/1964). Subjection of the body occurs through violence or strategy by the colonizer (Fanon, 1963; Memmi, 1965; Wolfe, 2006). Violence may be obvious to imagine, but the colonizer can strategically make life of the colonized unbearable through laws and other tactics to the point they have no choice but to submit to the oppression. If, as Foucault (1978) argues, truth is a function of power, then truth is built through knowledge/power systems. Not all people experience the systems in the same way, but they come to accept—by choice or by force—what is the truth. The truth eventually becomes a cycle of violence (Fanon, 1963). Like the colonized do not bow to subjection voluntarily, neither do colonizers stop oppressing voluntarily. In fact, colonization ends when the oppressed join forces for violent opposition (Fanon, 1963). Societies that participate in decolonialism, or the “revealing and dismantling of colonist power in all its forms” (Ashcroft, Griffiths, & Tiffin, 1998, p. 63), engage in a long process punctuated by frequent violence to achieve independence (Fanon, 1963). All characteristics of colonial power must be dismantled for liberation to occur. This is a difficult process as many aspects of colonialism are buried within the structure of society, laws, ideologies, and institutions. Settler Colonialism While settler colonialism emerged from colonialism, significant differences between the systems exist, in particular intentions regarding land, permanence, and Indigenous elimination - 17 all of which lead to settler colonialism being a structural aspect of society. Like traditional colonialism, the goal of settler colonialism is to increase financial wealth through land ownership. Settlers desire total control over the land, politically and otherwise (Macoun & Strakosch, 2013). The reason is because land provides sustenance and livelihood: therefore, to own land is to be provided for (Fanon, 1963; Wolfe, 1999, 2006). Agriculture is a common use of land for settlers; however, it is also valuable for grazing, fishing, mining and forestry (Wolfe, 2006). Land often replenishes itself: fish repopulate, fields are replanted, grass regenerates for grazing (Wolfe, 2006). Regardless of use, land ownership gives the settler access to resources that will increase financial wealth. Settlers have the opportunity for permanence due to the continuous revival of the land and its resources. Settler permanence and relationship with the Indigenous in the colonized territory is another difference between the concepts. Permanence is tied to land ownership as settlers arrive with the intent to stay (Veracini, 2010; Wolfe, 1999). However, in order to stay on the land, settlers had to first remove the Indigenous occupants (Veracini, 2010; Wolfe, 1999, 2006). Operating under the principle of terra nullius, settlers could claim land if it was not already occupied, if occupants granted permission, or if taken by force (Weaver-Hightower, 2018). Settlers did not seek land-use permission from the Indigene. Rather, they worked to “‘remove’ [Indigenous] to establish a better polity, either by setting up an ideal social body or by constituting an exemplary model of social organization” (Veracini, 2010). In other words, settlers bring their ideologies and customs with them to the new territory. The United States, for example, excluded the American Indian from the “national racial identity” (Hoxie, 2008, p. 1164), or the dominant ideology that excludes all but the white race. Euro-American settlers 18 determined the national identity should consist of white individuals, whom they consider to be racially and culturally superior to American Indians (Glenn, 2015; Hoxie, 2008). Elimination of the American Indian Since American Indians did not fit the racial identity of the nation, they were considered an obstacle that needed to be removed in order to take the land to create a “new colonial society” (Wolfe, 1999, 2006, p. 388). One way to remove them was through the agricultural narrative. Some American Indians were highly agricultural prior to settler colonization (Dunbar-Ortiz, 2014; Hurt, 2002; Iverson, 1994; Wolfe, 2006). In an effort to justify land theft, settler discourse framed the Indigenous as nomadic, never staying in one place and therefore removable (Iverson, 1994; Wolfe, 2006). Settlers then framed themselves as farmers and this narrative formed their identity and economic base, which remains intact today (Hurt, 2002; Wolfe, 2006). The irony of this reframing is the settlers were often landless (and assumed non-agricultural) prior to their move to a colonized area (Wolfe, 2006). Not only did settlers steal occupied land, but they stole the Indigenous identity as agricultural experts as well. This nomadic discourse and theft of identity facilitated, in part, the dehumanization of the Indigenous in the eyes of settlers, justifying elimination. Direct and indirect violence as an elimination tactic became a way of life for both the colonizer and the colonized. Case in point, settlers and the U.S. Army used forms of lowintensity warfare. They would intimidate, slaughter, and destroy Indigenous people and villages (Dunbar-Ortiz, 2014; Glenn, 2015; Wolfe, 2006). All Indigenous people would suffer regardless of age or gender. Despite the fact settler colonialism was founded on violence, it was disavowed once settlers occupied the land and the Indigene were, for the most part, eliminated (Veracini, 19 2010). Settler justification lies in their belief that violent acts were in self-defense as they attempted to cultivate vacant land (Veracini, 2010). Another strategy aimed at the Indigenous economy includes the mass slaughter of millions of buffalo, which destroyed the “economic base of the Plains Nations” (Dunbar-Ortiz, 2014, p. 142), and the separation of families via abusive boarding schools that attempted to erase the American Indian culture from the youth (Dunbar-Ortiz, 2014; Feir, 2016; Glenn, 2015; Jacobs, 2005). The goal for these actions was to eliminate a culture. Elimination strategies pushed American Indians west until they reached the Pacific Coast. At this point settlers turned to the micro-level of assimilation as an elimination option, focusing on the Indigenous individual as a person (Wolfe, 2006). Through total assimilation into white society, complete with forced relocation and boarding schools, the Indigenous would become extinct and therefore no longer a settler issue. This is a process of breaking down every part of Indigenous life, including “religion, speech, political freedoms, economic liberty, and cultural diversity” (Wunder, 1994, p. 17). Assimilation, argues Wolfe (2006), can be more effective than genocide. Settler colonialism aims to remove the Indigenous population; to write them out of history through assimilation and other forms of elimination and to carry on as if this population never existed (Veracini, 2010, 2011). Elimination indicates the settler intends to stay on Indigenous land, prefering to remove those already inhabiting the space (Veracini, 2010; Wolfe, 1999). As Bird Rose (1991) famously notes, “people [Indigene] got in the way by just staying at home” (p. 46). The combined beliefs of permanent ownership of land and elimination of the Indigenous highlight the argument that settler colonialism is a structure, deeply embedded and unceasing, in society rather than a single event (Wolfe, 1999, 2006). This structure is formed via 20 the ideologies delivered by the settlers, ideologies they brought with them from their place of birth and now impose on others (Veracini, 2010; Wolfe, 1999). Structure in Society Structuration theory, developed by sociologist Anthony Giddens (1984), draws upon the tension between society’s structure and agency by recognizing that they cannot exist separately. Social systems are created and reproduced by the relationship between structures and agents. This creates a duality of structure, indicating that society is formed by individuals and individuals create their society. Structure can be considered the institutional rules of society. Rules can both enable and constrain the agency, or capability of action, of individuals within society. For example, language is a form of communication between actors and “forms a ‘structure’ which is in some sense constituted by the speech of the ‘language community’ or collectivity” (Cassell, 1993, p. 102). Therefore, two people speaking the same language follow particular rules regarding sentence structure, meaning of words, and so on. When members of society follow the guidelines set in place by structures, they are essentially reproducing the social systems set in place by structure and agency. Individuals within a society are raised with an awareness of rules and choose, consciously or not, to reproduce these rules in their daily practice. Rules are expressions of dominance and power, as the dominant class creates and maintains rules (Giddens, 1993). Through Western laws, for example, the dominant class in America recognizes, dehumanizes, assimilates, and eliminates the Indigenous (Morgensen, 2011). By recognizing American Indians via treaties and acknowledgement of sovereignty, a structure was formed. This structure is recognized today but only when it benefits the dominant class. However, the recognition mainly occurs when money 21 is to be made. As soon as financial wealth is to be gained, the dominant class disregards the legal recognitions they, themselves, created (Morgensen, 2011). Also, those in power often reproduce the rules without question (Cassell, 1993). This reproduction is known as a dialect of control, indicating that those in power, who wish to remain in power, willingly accept social structures. It does not benefit them to change social structures if it means they would lose the benefits offered to those in the dominant class. Biopower, or the activity that “inherits and transforms the deeply historical conditions of Western law” (Morgensen, 2011, p. 54), indicates the dominant class inherited settler colonialism. Structure also determines a society’s level of success based on its economy and relationship between social classes. Metaphorically speaking, structure is described as a building with an economic base (infrastructure) and two upper floors of superstructure (Althusser, 1971). The infrastructure is a unifying force in society because money is one thing all individuals and organizations need. One dollar bill has little value; however, a large quantity of dollar bills helps to determine that individual’s social class. Additionally, the amount of money exchanged determine’s the economic success of that society. A strong economic base with money being saved and exchanged determines the level of success of the superstructure. A poor economy, for instance, would be reflected through increased homelessless, unemployment, government assistance, and so on. That economy means the working class is not able to increase their own financial gain in addition to the wealth of their employer. The superstructure consists of two levels: political/legal and ideological (Althusser, 1971). The political/legal superstructure is also known as the repressive state apparatus, or RSA (Althusser, 1971). Consisting of the military, prisons, police, and court system, the repressive state apparatus rules through mental or physical coercian and violence. It is important to note the 22 repressive state apparatus follows the leadership of the ruling class. Therefore, the repressive state apparatus wields “a monopoly of the means of force in capitalist societies and applied that monopoly to support capitalist class structures” (Wolff, 2005, p. 225). Threats to the capitalist class are repressed as quickly as possible. The ideological state apparatus (ISA), the other level of the superstructure, guides society via ideology first followed by repression. Ideological state apparatuses instruct “children and adults with specific ways of imagining—thinking about and thus understanding—their places within and relationships to the societies within which they lived” (Wolff, 2005, p. 225). The variety of ideological state apparatuses—education, religion, family, communication—work together in order to be successful. Each ISA works in tandem with each other to encourage individuals to consider their relationship within each ISA and act according to ideological guidelines. This means individuals act accordingly or face discipline, either through the ideological institution itself or the repressive state apparatus. What is most interesting is Althusser’s argument that individuals follow ISAs based on their own self-choosing rather than realizing the ideologies have been inculcated since childhood. This allows ISAs to serve capitalism because they can “interpellate subjects within meaning systems…that make them at least accept and at best celebrate capialist exploitation” (Althusser, 1971, p. 226). The work force is willingly accepting their own subjugation. The combination of ideologies and social class distinctions create settler colonial structures that are deeply embedded into the weave of American culture and nearly impossible to change (Macoun and Strakosch, 2013). Settler colonialism is permanent and therefore part of America’s repressive and ideological structures (Kauanui, 2016; Wolfe, 1999, 2006). Writing as a contemporary Indigenous scholar, Kaunaui (2016) “colonialism cannot be relegated to the 23 past” (p. 10). When historicized, it means the past is being rewritten to the benefit of the dominant class. It “persists as a pervasive part of the contemporary normalization of settler colonialism” (Kauanui, 2016, p. 11). This is related to the education ideological apparatus as the dominant class whitewashes history to showcase their heroisim rather than their brutal takeover of land. For example, the settlers considered land as open and free for the taking once the Indigenous population was removed. The goal, then, was to eliminate the American Indians and proceed as if they never existed (Wolfe, 1999). The elimination of native societies means settler colonialism is not a one-time event, it is a permanent part of a society’s structure. Ideological Structure of News Media The media—television, radio, newspapers—form Althusser’s communication apparatus (Sevgi & Ozgokceler, 2016). The institutions within the apparatus contribute to settler colonialism as they recognize Indigenous populations; however, the industry controls the narrative of this community through media frames. Beyond these frames, which will be discussed in the next chapter, the narrative is controlled through the ideology and hegemony of media organizations. Based on the ideology of objectivity, news media (theoretically) attempt to distribute accurate and unbiased information to the masses. However, the institutional structure of the media ensures the dominant ideology is being supported (Althusser, 1971; Mullen & Klaehn, 2010). Media owners and managers control the appearance of objectivity and “their forms of social control must be indirect, subtle, and not at all necessarily conscious” (Gitlin, 2003, p. 259). This is achieved through the hiring of personnel who are typically white and uppermiddle-class, decisions as to who is promoted or otherwise rewarded, and organizantional 24 policies. The result is upper-level decision makers that were raised in the dominant ideology and share the “core [emphasis original] hegemonic assumptions of their class” (Gitlin, 2003, p. 260). The media in America are ubiquitous, which makes it an ideal format for those in power to disseminate their ideology to the masses. The media are arguably the most “dynamic part of this ideological structure” (Gramsci, 2009, p. 36) as the dominant class works vehemently to maintain and defend their ideologies and use the press to circulate them to the masses (Gramsci, 2009). News stories that support dominant class ideologies are “reinforcing dominant social norms and values that legitimize the social system” (Gurevitch, Bennett, Curran, & Wollacott, 1982, p. 9) The Propaganda Model investigates how norms and values become standardised in a society. It explores the “relationships between ideology, communicative power and social class interests” (Mullen & Klaehn, 2010, p. 217). Developed by Herman and Chomsky (1988) the model argues that news flows through multple filters, each designed to maintain dominant class power. The Propaganda Model, particularly when viewed through the traditional Marxist lens and Althusser’s ISAs, emphasizes the fact that media are influencers in the control of the dominant ideology (Sevgi & Ozgokceler, 2016). This is accomplished through the five filters of the Propaganda Model: size, ownership, and profit of mass media; advertiser influence; use of sources; flak; and anti-communision as a control mechanism (Herman & Chomsky, 1988). This research focuses on two filters in particular, the size/ownership/profitability of mass media and reliance of government or corporate sources. The size/ownership/profitability (SOP) filter supports the institutional structural argument. The investment needed to start a media organization with significant outreach has grown to extreme proportions (Herman & Chomsky, 1988). Media historian Ben Bagdikian 25 (2004) points out that historically, many different individuals ran the dominant media corporations in America. However, by 2003 only five firms controlled most of the 37,000 media outlets (Bagdikian, 2004). The Big Five,2 as Bagdikian (2004) calls them, have access to the over $2 billion spent per year in advertising; money that helps them purchase and maintain the numerous media entities in their name. This trend continues, as 15 billionaires currently own 90% of American media (Vinton, 2016). This includes individuals such as Jeff Bezos, owner of amazon.com, who purchased the Washington Post for $250 million (Vinton, 2016). Prohibitive costs leads to reduced opportunities for small and/or alternative media to reach the masses as they typically do not possess the necessary capital (Goodwin, 1994). Most media owners and boards of directors are extremely wealthy, full-fledged members of the dominant class (Herman & Chomsky, 1988). For example, current board members of the New York Times include 11 corporate executives of global companies, two Times executives, and one lawyer (New York Times Company, n.d.-a). Additionally, the average net worth of board members is approximately $2 million.3 This is considerably more than the average net worth of the American worker, which is under $200,000 (Campbell, 2018). Board members are also closely aligned with brokerage firms and banks that, in turn, own stock in media organizations (Herman & Chomsky, 1988). If the news disseminated does not favor increased shareholder wealth, they may be inclined to sell stock or withhold advice (Bagdikian, 2004; Herman & Chomsky, 1988). This quid pro quo relationship indicates strong connections between dominant market forces.

#### Their assumption of an “objective” reality and processes creates a dialectic relationship between Colonial truths and indigenous forms of knowledge that is a form of assimilation and elimination.

Mayorga et Al 19, Edwin, Lekey Leidecker, and Daniel Orr de Gutierrez. "Burn it down: The incommensurability of the university and decolonization." Journal of Critical Thought and Praxis 8.1 (2019). (Associate Professor at Swarthmore)//Elmer

The Epistemic Violence of the University Birthed through and for the colonial state, modern philosophy does not coincidentally bear colonialist ideology, although we would not attempt a full accounting of that here. Rather, because knowledge production and regulation are the defining functions of the university, we analyze the epistemology of modern philosophy. In doing so, we find that modern epistemology not only justifies and authorizes colonial violence, but, in itself, demands epistemic violence. Operating upon these principles, the essential function of the modern university has become a colonization of knowledge: knowledge is processed to conform to colonial ideology and agendas, and, in turn, disseminated in order to assimilate the populace. To conceal the inherent violence of that mission today, the university employs a strategic negligence that reaffirms its own indispensability. Two epistemological assumptions narrate modern philosophy: (1) there are certain aspects of reality which are ubiquitously and invariably true, (2) observation and logical reasoning are the only means of accessing that absolute truth. From these two basic assumptions however, issue a number of derivative beliefs linking knowledge production to power. The first of these corollaries is the privileging of objectivity, assessing knowledge against the perceived contamination of subjective experience, by which modern scholars limit the scope of legitimate knowledges to those consistent with their own principles and tradition. In so doing, Western thinkers not only affirm the superiority of their knowledge systems but also claim for themselves the exclusive authority to define knowledge (Smith, 2012). Moreover, the assumption that absolute truth is ascertainable practically and ethically implies a responsibility to do so, creating an obligation for humanity to thoroughly investigate their reality. Given the exclusive authority of modern Western scholars to lead that investigation, instrumental reasoning insinuates, and hubris abets, that all reality need come under Western dominion. On the one hand, this epistemology leaves no room for enchantment, sacrificing the private and sacred for the pursuit of knowledge3 (Grande, 2015). On the other hand, it justifies imperialist ideation and, in fact, makes scientific investigation dependent upon the subjugation of non-Western peoples and lands. In order to understand reality, modern philosophy thus engenders material and symbolic violences against reality. But, more immediately, modern scientific investigation and knowledge production, in themselves, constitute epistemic violence. Modern philosophy is confronted by the same conflict as is any intellectual paradigm: incorporating and rectifying new knowledges with the old. In its pursuit of absolute truth, however, modern philosophy cannot engage in dialogic relations, but is confined to the dialectic, and, operating upon the presumed objective superiority of its own knowledge traditions, must contort new knowledge so that it takes on a form comprehensible within its own ideological framework. That framework, of course, extends far beyond modern philosophy itself, to a larger knowledge system metaphorically described as the Western cultural archive (Smith, 2012): cosmologies, ontologies, ethical systems, histories, symbols and their associations, which predate Christian civilization (Deloria, 2003), and from which the Western sociological imagination derives. In the wake of global colonization, this archive has also been overwhelmingly saturated by the imagery and ideology of colonial cultures (Nandy, 1983), including what Grande (2015) names the “deep structures of the colonialist consciousness” (p. 99): the conflation of progress with change, the separateness of faith and reason, the impersonal nature of reality, individualism, and anthropocentrism. Knowledge that has been extracted by the university must be sieved through this heterogeneous composition before it becomes legitimate within the modern paradigm. Of course, the only knowledge able to emerge from this processing is that which upholds the values, doctrines, and political necessities of the West (Smith, 2012). In particular, that which defines the violence of colonization as natural and/or necessary, and affirms the colonial state as the only entity able to exercise legitimate forms of violence (Rifkin, 2009). By mutilating and eradicating contradictory knowledges in this manner, the essential functions of the university, extracting, processing, producing, and regulating knowledge, become an epistemic colonization, enriching, evolving, and safeguarding the settler state. As with any colonialism however, those knowledge functions also entail a civilizational mission (Nandy, 1983), exporting assimilatory knowledge products in order to reproduce the colonialist consciousness. Assimilation was the explicit mission of colonial universities, Indian agents, and church missionaries (Grande, 2015), but, because the university is integrated within the state, its knowledges are also implicitly reified throughout state infrastructure. For example, such knowledge enters public education alongside official instructional content as a hidden curriculum (Anyon, 1980), latent norms, values, and beliefs which socialize students into colonialist worldviews and ways of knowing (Grande, 2015). This circulation and naturalization of assimilatory knowledges works to both colonize the mind of the indigenous (Fanon, 2005) and decivilize that of the colonizer (Césaire, 1955), inhibiting decolonial action and enabling further material, symbolic, and epistemic violences. While in earlier periods the university openly embraced this colonialist purpose, democratic social movements and anticolonial struggle of the twentieth century made doing so antithetical to its self-professed role of social institution. And yet, since the university first allied itself with the state, it has suppressed the social, in order to protect the state and thereby itself. The key, in this context, to concealing university violence while still maintaining a facade of social consciousness, is institutional negligence (Moten & Harney, 2004).

#### Focus on Objective Rationality reduces People to Bodies that are exchangeable reproducing Colonial Oppression. The process of the Aff’s research is part-and-parcel w/ the will to predict and control colonized populations.

Nelson 15, Diane M. Who Counts?: The Mathematics of Death and Life After Genocide. Duke University Press, 2015. (Professor of Cultural Anthropology at Duke University)//Elmer

Perhaps they feared that abstraction is only adequate for nongrowing things, paralleling how Gary Urton and Primitivo Nina Llanos describe Quechua understandings. Because numbers “separate things,” it is prohibited to count what is considered inseparable, particularly reproductive groups like animals and harvested produce, and the colors of the rainbow (1997, 52–53, 102). “The potential for reproduction is, in all cases, considered to be based on unity and interdependence.” Assigning numbers, creating or emphasizing individualism, represents a force of alienation and threatens the reproductive capacity and unity of the group (1997, 103).21 In other examples of numbers’ ambivalence, Michael Closs says the Crow “do not count above a thousand, as they say honest people have no use for higher numbers” (1986a, 16).22 Guatemalan journalist David Dubón said that in 1968, after the first terrible wave of counterinsurgency violence, the government held a census but his activist friends joked it was not to determine “cuántos somos sino cuántos quedamos” (not how many there are but how many are left). Today censuses seem more fraught by struggles to be counted,23 but there is still a whiff of necromancy about this apparently prosaic act. In 1812 Robert Southey denounced Adam Smith for estimating man’s importance solely “by the gain which can be extracted from him, the quantum of lucration of which he can be made the instrument” (Poovey 294–95). And perhaps the fact that collecting data about mortality was an early application of statistics led to the suspicions W. H. Auden evokes, that numbers divide “the tender who value from the tough who measure” (2007, 426). Alan Bishop says for “imperialist powers . . . mathematics, with its clear rationalism, and cold logic, its precision, its so-called ‘objective’ facts (seemingly culture and value free), its lack of human frailty, its power to predict and control, its encouragement to challenge and to question, and its thrust towards yet more secure knowledge, was a most powerful weapon indeed” (1990, 59). (Yet note the ambivalence: cold power and encouragement to question.) David Graeber is a recent and eloquent practitioner of the misarithrope (i.e., number hater) form, connecting mathematics directly to war, slavery, debt, and empire, a primary engine of forcing people out of their context, cutting them off from human ties, and making them exchangeable. He says: “debt, unlike any other form of obligation, can be precisely quantified. This allows debts to become simple, cold, impersonal . . . [and] transferable. If one owes a favor to another human being—it is owed to that person specifically. But if one owes forty thousand dollars at 12% interest, it doesn’t really matter who the creditor is . . . or what the other party needs, wants, is capable of. . . . If you end up having to abandon your home . . . if your daughter ends up in a mining camp working as a prostitute, well, that’s unfortunate, but incidental to the creditor. Money is money and a deal is a deal. . . . The crucial factor is . . . money’s capacity to turn morality into a matter of impersonal arithmetic . . . to justify things that would otherwise seem outrageous or obscene. . . . The violence and the quantification are intimately linked. . . . violence . . . turns human relations into mathematics” (2011, 13–14). In one of her infrequent allusions to colonialism, Poovey says Englishman William Petty, a major figure in making the modern fact and in breaking Ireland, posited a world in which the Irish would be forbidden to keep the kind of numerical accounts on which Petty had staked his claim to impartiality and expertise: “‘It may be offensive to make Estimates of the Number of Men slain in Ireland for the last 516 years. . . . Of the Charge of the last Warr begun Anno 1641; the Value of the Wasting and Dispeopling of the Contrey’” (in Poovey 1998, 137). She sees no necessary connection between the method he developed to produce abstractions like the value of people, national wealth, and population and the kind of brutality expressed in his solution to the Irish problem but admits abstractions tend to emphasize the well-being of the aggregate over individuals and to define “well-being” solely in economic terms (137). We will see just such effects throughout this book. Yet, here’s the peculiarity. Mr. Petty seems well aware that number would also be a potent weapon for the Irish. Frantz Fanon puts it elegantly: “The settler-native relationship is a mass relationship. The settler pits brute force against the weight of numbers . . . during the phase of insurrection, each settler reasons on a basis of simple arithmetic . . . when in laying down precise methods the settler asks each member of the oppressing minority to shoot down 30 or 100 or 200 natives. . . . This chain of reasoning which presumes very arithmetically the disappearance of the colonized people does not leave the native overcome with moral indignation. He . . . has practically stated the problem of his liberation in identical terms: ‘we must form ourselves into groups of two hundred or five hundred, and each group must deal with a settler’ ” (1968, 53, 84–85). And, even as Thomas Malthus was denounced as the demonic spokesman for numbers as the amoral vehicle of indifferent facts, he was bringing into being a new collective subject, the poor, as precursor to the very idea— and mobilizing potential—of the 99%. The number 6 million took over a decade to make into a fact, but it has been transformative. Can the positive effects of “1 in 10” be overstated for a lonely gay boy in Nebraska or the legitimation of queer politics more globally? Or, more horribly, “1 in 5 women” for a survivor of rape, believing herself to be alone and possibly complicit in the crime against her? And in Guatemala the number 200,000—the war dead counted by the United Nations—is an incredibly important (if not completely precise) figure in ongoing struggles for justice. In part because of these powers, numeracy and matheracy have been actively withheld from oppressed peoples and in turn become a liberation demand. Vinicio Lopez, an antimining activist in Guatemala, put it this way: “Why aren’t there any schools in the villages? Schools that teach math and history? Because to harvest coffee you don’t need to study, you are just mano de obra (hands that work) and it’s better if mano de obra doesn’t know their rights, because then they might make demands.” Numbers make visible abstractions that without them couldn’t be seen: the market, poverty, the Maya, and fictitious personifications like Stock, Money, Profit, and Loss. Poovey also reminds those of us of more qualitative bent that our critical methods for “seeing through” numbers actually depend on them and on the logics of double entry. “The episte- mological conundrum of numerical precision” comes from number as “an object of sense, because we can count,” but numbers are also “used to generate mathematical formulas which, though rule bound or precise, might not accurately reflect observable reality at all” (Herschel [1830], in Poovey 1998, 320). The solution devised was to factor “the limits of epistemological certainty into the method of science itself ” (320). Engaging with the difficulties of adequation that will accompany us through the book, by the nineteenth century science (hard and soft) was based on “both constant scrutiny of the fit between the data one collected and the actual world, and a ruthlessly honest acknowledgment of the limits of the data themselves” (321). Yet I think there’s more to that “conundrum” of numbers as both object of sense and the product of elaboration, emerging new and transformed via calculation. One expression of it might be found in the enchantments of aggregation, so beautifully evoked in those “ornate and punning” words that mark pluralities or groups of beings—an unkindness of ravens, a pride of lions, an exultation of larks, a romp of otters, an ostentation of peacocks, a parliament of owls (Gronland 2011, 7). Singles melt into a plurality that in turn merges into an uncanny singularity—sums greater than their parts, outcomes to formulas that are not quite containable by calculating procedures.24 Like Guyer’s links between scales, Gronland suggests the metaphoric linking done by the “x of y” formulation is less description than “invocation” (2011, 7, 11).

#### Objective Epistemologies are a form of power production and control that reproduces exclusion, stratifies indigenous and migrant subjectivities, and wrecks agency.

Bass et Al 20, Madeline J., Daniel Córdoba, and Peter Teunissen. "(Re) Searching with Imperial Eyes: Collective Self-Inquiry as a Tool for Transformative Migration Studies." Social Inclusion 8.4 (2020): 147-156. (Faculty of Humanities and Philosophy, FU Berlin, Germany)//Elmer

Power and privilege are hallmarks of western academia, a historically elitist institution that looks through ‘imperial eyes,’ producing research through which “the underlying code of imperialism and colonialism is both regulated and realized” (Smith, 2012, p. 8). The imperial eyes of the academy set terms and limitations on interactions and make claims of sterile objectivity and neutrality in research which diminish the agency of migrants, produce stratified configurations, and, subsequently, exacerbate the dynamics of exclusion in these relationships. In the context of EUrope, research justifies and propels forward discrimination and Eurocentrism. As EUrope fuels chaos and conflict around the world (Akkerman, 2016, 2018), people move through the securitized, selective, and deadly EUropean migration regime(s) (Papadopoulos, Stephenson, & Tsianos, 2008). The “waiting, detention, relations, suffrage— and even deaths—have become a profitable business” (Franck, 2018, p. 201) and knowledge production is one branch of this industry (Cabot, 2019). In 2017 alone the European Commission announced that they had reserved EUR 200 million, to be used from 2018–2020, for research proposals that would predict and manage migration flows and “tackle migration challenges” (European Commission, 2017). It is from this fund that we as early-stage researchers ‘enjoy’ our paycheck. The imperial eyes of Europe are well-funded, rigid, and restrictive. As early-stage researchers with liberatory intent, we must seek to challenge the normativity of institutionalized, colonial narratives, and the ‘b/ordering’ of movement(s) of people across former empires (van Houtum & van Naerssen, 2002). Given these challenges, is our intended decolonial vision sufficient, or are we actually undertaking research with “imperial eyes?” (Smith, 2012). Our positions are problematized by our inability to reside solely in spaces of struggle, the frontlines that are the beginnings of decolonial space, requiring upkeep and radical inclusion in order to counteract the differential inclusion of migration regimes (Ahmed, 2000; Casas-Cortes et al., 2015; Mezzadra & Neilson, 2014; Papadopoulos & Tsianos, 2013). The work of this upkeep, a labor of love, is made more difficult by the violent power of the university institution, but it is not foreclosed altogether. We will begin this article by outlining some of the essential theoretical frameworks for our research and the methodological tools we used. This will be followed by selected passages from our researcher vignettes, created during focus group sessions. This research model was inspired by the work of Indigenous scholar Madeline Whetung (Nishnaabeg) and non-Indigenous academic Sara Wakefield and their collective reflection (Whetung & Wakefield, 2019). The academic institution is only one branch of empire, and our research is only a few lines on one grant-funded project embedded within the billions of euros dedicated to researching migrants and their movements. But rather than being an instrument for migration management within the colonial context of EUropean migration (Gutiérrez Rodríguez, 2018; Saucier & Woods, 2014), we are attempting to model a research design that takes tools from the research institution (e.g., funding, infrastructures, methodological frameworks), and uses them for liberatory purposes. This article is a discussion of how we aim to engage with research, as operationalized through our collaborative approach. We use collective self-inquiry in order to undermine the academy’s imperial eyes, which produce stratified configurations in the positionality of migrants and researchers, while exacerbating hierarchies within the university. This method helps us instead to move, together, towards a university space that refuses the divisive forces of academia. As we aim to demonstrate in this article, collective self-inquiry allows us to detect and undermine our position within the migration industry by moving together towards a more liberatory practice of doing research. We hope that our reflection, presented in this article, will be helpful for other collectives and researchers who want to work within and alongside academia.

#### Vote negative to endorse a cartography of refusal

Day 15 Iyko, Associate Professor of English. Chair, Critical Social Thought. “Being or Nothingness: Indigeneity, Antiblackness, and Settler Colonial Critique.” Source: Critical Ethnic Studies, Vol. 1, No. 2 (Fall 2015), pp. 102-121 //Elmer

And so the potential relations that Wilderson sets up through a critique of sovereignty are at best irrelevant or at worse false in Sexton’s absolute claim that slavery stands alone as the “threshold of the political world.”45 I suggest that this wavering relation/nonrelation of antiblackness and Indigeneity exhibited in Wilderson’s and Sexton’s work reveal the problem in any totalizing approach to the heterogeneous constitution of racial difference in settler colonies. Beyond this inconsistency, the liberal multiculturalist agenda that Wilderson and Sexton project into Indigenous sovereignty willfully evacuates any Indigenous refusal of a colonial politics of recognition. Among other broad strokes, Sexton states, “as a rule, Native Studies reproduces the dominant liberal political narrative of emancipation and enfranchisement.”46 This provides a basis for Wilderson’s assertion that Indigenous sovereignty engages in a liberal politics of state legitimation through recognition because “treaties are forms of articulation” that buttress “the interlocutory life of America as a coherent (albeit genocidal) idea.”47 But such a depoliticized liberal project is frankly incompatible with Indigenous activism and scholarship that emerges from Native studies in North America. The main argument in Glen Sean Coulthard’s book Red Skin, White Masks is to categorically reject “the liberal recognition-based approach to Indigenous selfdetermination.”48 **This is not** a politics of **legitimizing** Indigenous nations **through state recognition** **but** rather **one of refusal**, a refusal to be **recognized and** thus **interpellated by the settler colonial nation-state**. Drawing on Fanon, Coulthard describes the “necessity on the part of the oppressed to ‘turn away’ from their other-oriented master-dependency, and to instead struggle for freedom on their own terms and in accordance with their own values.”49 It is also difficult to reconcile the depoliticized narrative of “resurgence and recovery” that Wilderson and Sexton attribute to Indigenous sovereignty in the face of **Idle No More**, the anticapitalist Indigenous sovereignty movement in Canada whose national railway and **highway** **blockades** have seriously **destabilized** the **expropriation of natural resources** for the global market. These are examples that Coulthard describes as “**direct action**” rather tjhan negotiation—in other words, antagonism, not conflict resolution: The [blockades] are a crucial act of negation insofar as they seek to impede or block the flow of resources currently being transported to international markets from oil and gas fields, refineries, lumber mills, mining operations, and hydroelectric facilities located on the dispossessed lands of Indigenous nations. These modes of direct action . . . seek to have **a negative impact on** the economic **infrastructure** that is **core to** the **colonial accumulation of capital in settler-political economies** like Canada’s.50 **These tactics are** part of what Audra Simpson calls a “**cartography of refusal” that “negates the authority of the other’s gaze**.”51 It is **impossible to frame** the **blockade movement**, which has become the greatest threat to Canada’s resource agenda,52 **as a struggle for “enfranchisement**.” **Idle No More is** not in “conflict” with the Canadian nation-state; it is in **a struggle against the very premise of settler colonial capitalism** that requires the elimination of Indigenous peoples. As Coulthard states unambiguously, “For Indigenous nations to live, capitalism must die.”

#### This requires straying away from the Objective Praxis of the Aff in favor of Liberation Psychology.

Sánchez 18, Alejandro. "Leaving the Academia/Community Borderlands to Enter a Libratory Convivio: An Authethnographic Relfection on the Academic and Community Liberatory Dialectics." Educational Borderlands: A Bilingual Journal 2 (2018): 22-34. //Elmer

A Liberation Theoretical Framework Liberation theorists Martı́n-Baró (1994) in his call to action for Latin American Psychology to become emancipated, assists in outlining the “urgent tasks” to help the formation of a conscious liberated individuals (p. 30). Martı́n-Baró (p. 199) includes to de-ideologize the dominant narrative and social constructs, in which people reject this and instead (re)construct their own knowledge based on their own experiences and those shared collectively (p. 31). Horton, Bell, aventa, & Peters (1990) additionally advocate for education derived from everyday life and practice called “experiential education (p. 202).” A precursor to this step, also alluded by Freire’s concept of intervention, is the need to recover the historical memory of the marginalized masses (Horton, Bell, aventa, & Peters, 1990, p. 146; Martı́n-Baró , 1994, p. 30). Resurfacing the “lost” history to the people will allow them to reflect, thus stimulate their praxis and can potentially aid them in rejecting the oppressor’s theoretical underpinning. The last step mentioned by Martin-Baró (1994) is the use of people’s virtues to liberate, also part of community psychology’s philosophy (Nelson & Prilleltensky, 2010). In order for the urgent tasks to be carried out, a new form of unorthodox psychology is required, one that strays away from the notion of objectivity, and positivism. The notion of objectivity has been challenged by critical theory according to Cordetti (n.d.). Under critical theory, objectivity is seen as used by the dominant form of power to engage in “instrumental” rationality were the masses surrender to normative criteria devised in a despotic manner and enforced through social, political, and violent means (p. 12). This process echoes that of false generosity (Freire, 2015, p. 44-47). In false generosity the will of the oppressor is prescribed to the oppressed who then attribute the act to benevolence further solidifying the hierarchy of the oppressor. Positivism is heavily engrained into mainstream psychology. It recreates the notion of “objectivity” ignoring the human aspect, or the conditions under which it can find itself. It can be identified as a social laboratory whose attempts are ineffectual at humanizing its subjects, therefore not a method for liberation (Martı́n-Baró , 1994, p. 21). To counter these forces, Martin-Baró (1994) and Waltkins and Shulman (2010) have provided the framework required to generate the structural liberation. Watkins and Shulman used the analogy of assisted regeneration, a term from contemporary environmentalist were humans collaborate in devastated environments to strengthen and grow the biodiversity (p. 15). Under this process, various layers of development need to occur. First, a local area of desired biodiversity needs to be selected and fenced to keep animals and people out. In liberation psychology, this search for biodiversity is associated with Freire (2015)’s problem posing education (p. 83). By posing a question, the individuals seeking liberation can reflect on their way of life as dynamic and not static, and seek a plan of action. Next, the species of plants need to be identified in both forms: mature and seeds. In liberation psychology, this means for the liberation team to be knowledgeable of their community, resources, and socio-political structure. Lastly, the biodiversity is continuously strengthen to the point of new hybrid species emerging and keeping invading species or colonizing species at bay. In liberation psychology, this is the road to empowering communities. Martin-Baró (1994) lists the frame for a structural liberation within the context of the field of psychology in academia. For psychology in Latin America to be liberated, it will require the following: a new horizon, a new epistemology, and a new praxis (p. 26). This process is similar to the biological analogy of assisted regeneration. Establishing a new horizon requires for the liberation seeking individuals, alongside with the practitioner, to reject a drive for positivistic neocolonial tendencies and intellectualize and strategize on the problems affecting the community (p. 26). Establishing this new horizon, under the anology of assisted regeneration, is fencing the rich biodiversity to be cared for at the later stage. The second element proposed by Martin-Baró (1994) is a new epistemology. Seeking a new epistemology requires revolutionary perspectives and praxis. As mentioned before, to establish a counter perspective itself requires to de-ideologize the oppressive tactics found within the oppressed. This requires neocolonial institutions to be transformed through internal and external advances (Horton, Bell, aventa, & Peters, 1990, p. 206). This allows for an internal push on the neocolonial institutions that allows for external advances to critique the neocolonial institutions. By doing work through external and internal channels, liberation messages are prevented from being filtered due to being coopted on either channel. This course in itself is practice till the liberated individuals reflect on their reflection, constituting praxis (Freire, 2015, p. 65). The internal advances benefit from this movement as they can bring liberation dialogue into the system, and assess the neocolonial institution using their own tools (hooks, 1994; Sulé, 2011). This step is synonymous withassisted regeneration to identifying infant seeds and mature plants imperative to the biodiversity of the environment. The seeds and plants are synonymous to the liberation perspectives rooted inthe community that will aid in its salvation, and the search for the best planting techniques correlates to searching for prime liberation practices and liberation tools for reflection to ultimate in a liberation praxis. A liberation praxis, the third element proposed by Martin-Baró (1994), requires liberation psychologists to circumvent neoliberal institutions and transcend the notion of subject/object binomial (p. 29). This requires the rejection of the colonial definition of objectivism because it assumes the liberation researcher, practitioner, and individual unsuited to take a stance, but to contrary, liberation requires subjectivity to allow the liberation seeking group and individuals to bare their voice as part of the society that is aiming to designate them as stagnate objects who are acted upon (Jiménez-Domı́nguez, 2009, p. 41). As it was with the racialization of African Americans, when individuals and communities arrive at the intersecting road of “turn white or disappear,” those assisting them in their liberation lay out the decisions based on their level of consciousness (Fanon, 2008, p. 75). The two routes include action, or passivity. Action, other the contrary, leads to reject the dichotomy of “turn white or disappear” and engage in refortalecimiento (Vázquez Rivera, 2004). In critical psychology, under refortalecimiento, it is implied that systemic change cannot provide immediate relief for those seeking liberation, therefore, individuals and communities must resort to their “weaknesses” and convert them into strengths by creative and revolutionary means (Vázquez Rivera, 2004, p. 45). Passivity leads to the (re)creation of the oppressed being socially, culturally, and political dehumanized, leading to fatalism. Under fatalism, not only do individuals further plunge into neocolonial hierarchies, but experience symbolic loss. This means the loss of culture, rituals, and individual identity (Watkins & Shulman, 2008, p. 2). Thus, objectivity and passitivity cannot be incorporated into the praxis of liberation seeking individuals and community. Raising and cultivating consciousness in the community and academia is a daunting task that requires for the individuals to come to their own startling realization. Both the community and academia must realize they are in need of humanization and freedom from institutional systemic oppression (Freire, 2015, p. 67). Such an extensive process requires a revolutionary liberation leader to be trained beyond dialogue; the revolutionary leader needs to be able to plant liberation seeds, or moments of reflection, strategically within the system and outside. If the external world is outside of their spheres of influence because the leader has been co-opted, the revolutionary liberation leader must then find innovative new approaches for them to bring the external into the internal. Additionally, this means for the internal to spill flow into the external. Identifying the internal or external depends to the perspective.