## 1

#### The labor movement is built on the exploitation of indigenous populations. The aff’s “right to strike” only seeks to benefit the settler labor movement. Settler labor movements fight for higher wages and living standards while simultaneously exploiting indigenous labor and excluding indigenous workers from the labor market. The collective dispossession of the indigenous population ties the settler community together through settler quietism. The aff’s foundational assumptions perpetuate the destruction of Native life and governance.
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Dispossession – deprive of land

In order to reflect on the particular nature of accumulation by dispossession within a settler colonial context, another issue should be raised: that of the internal social relations within settler colonial societies. Indeed, the most striking aspect of settler colonial societies is the development of a colonial polity in which settlers live, produce, and reproduce themselves socially. They do so on the back of the dispossession of indigenous populations through which they acquire land, resources, and, depending on the context, labour. This—perhaps obvious—characteristic leads to the development of internal class relations and conflicts, alongside confrontations between settlers and indigenous peoples. The history of settler colonialism underscores the conspicuous absence of involvement by settler working classes (as opposed to individuals or limited networks) in mass, sustained challenges against the process of settlement and indigenous dispossession.3 In fact, more often than not, settler labour movements fought for the intensification of settler expansion and racial segregation (see “An Alternative Reading: Settler Colonies and the Exploitation of the Native” above), through colour bars, boycott campaigns and demands for expulsion. In the process, bitter confrontations emerged between settler labour and capital, when the latter [and] attempted to increase its profit margins through the exploitation of indigenous labour—for example in the context of the white labour movements in Australia and South Africa.4 Yet these conflicts can be resolved, especially while the settler colony continues to expand, by intensifying the dispossession of indigenous populations in order to improve the material conditions of settler workers (see “Case Studies” below). Here, the question of accumulation by dispossession returns to the fore. If settler workers are exploited as workers within the settler colony, they remain settlers. As such they participate in the processes of accumulation by dispossession through the occupation of lands, the elimination or exploitation of indigenous peoples, and the extraction of expropriated resources. For example, at a very basic level, their houses, workplaces, and basic infrastructure such as roads, railways, etc., are all premised on the capture and control of indigenous land. Settler workers are both exploited by settler bosses and their co-conspirators in the dispossession of indigenous peoples. As such, class struggle within a settler society has a dual character: it is waged over the distribution of wealth extracted from their labour as well as over the colonial booty. In the case of Zionism in Palestine, the current associated with the publication Matzpen (“Compass”) developed a class analysis of Israeli society. They came to the conclusion that because the Israeli economy was heavily subsidised from the outside (first primarily by Britain, then by the US) and that this subsidy was not simply going into private hands but was used by the Labour Zionist bureaucracy to organise the development of the Israeli economy and infrastructure, class antagonisms were diverted within its society. Hangebi et al. ([2012](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/anti.12659#anti12659-bib-0014):83) wrote: The Jewish worker in Israel does not receive his share in cash, but he gets it in terms of new and relatively inexpensive housing, which could not have been constructed by raising capital locally; he gets it in industrial employment, which could not have been started or kept going without external subsidies; and he gets it in terms of a general standard of living, which does not correspond to the output of that society … In this way the struggle between the Israeli working class and its employers, both bureaucrats and capitalists, is fought not only over the surplus value produced by the worker but also over the share each group receives from this external source of subsidies. If this analysis was essentially correct, it underplayed, however, the consequences of an important aspect of Israeli wealth creation (which Matzpen otherwise recognised): the Israeli state, its infrastructure, and its economy were made possible by colonial expansion, land confiscation, the expulsion of Palestinians and the expropriation of their wealth and property. Affordable housing, for example, an issue discussed further below, was not only possible because of the subsidies the Israeli state received from abroad. It was possible because the land on which new houses were built, as well as existing Palestinian houses, had been confiscated by the Israeli army, Palestinians had been expelled in their hundreds of thousands, and the spoils were re-distributed amongst settlers. It was—and remains—the collective dispossession of the indigenous population by the Israeli population as a whole, which ties the settler community together, despite internal class, ethnic, and political divisions. The settler class struggle is fought over the distribution of wealth extracted from settler labour power as well as over the share each group receives from the process of accumulation by dispossession. This dual class and colonial relationship helps explain the relative absence of settler workers’ resistance against settler colonial expansion or alliances with Indigenous peoples.[5](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/anti.12659#anti12659-note-1005_77) This tendency can be understood as “settler quietism”: even if working-class settlers are exploited by their ruling classes, overthrowing the settler state would mean overthrowing a system in which they share, however unequally, in the distribution of the colonial loot. Participating in the process of dispossession and fighting for a greater share of the pie leads to more important and immediate material gains. It also follows, as many anti-colonial thinkers and activists, not least among them Fanon ([2001](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/anti.12659#anti12659-bib-0011)) in the Wretched of the Earth, have argued that indigenous people face the settler population as a whole in their struggle for de-colonisation. This is not to say that individual settlers or specific settler organisations cannot or have not supported struggles for decolonisation. It is however to point out that this is not the case for the majority of the settler working class, while it continues to depend on the continued dispossession of the natives for the quality of its living standards. Whether the settler colony is organised on the basis of an eliminatory or an exploitative model, what remains constant is that the entirety of the settler polity will participate in the process of accumulation by dispossession, and that the different settler classes will struggle both against the natives to impose and maintain this dispossession, as well as amongst themselves in order to determine the nature of its internal distribution. More than that, the specific structural forms of settler rule over the indigenous population is best understood as the outcome of struggle, both between settler classes and between settlers and indigenous populations. This paper now turns to two brief case studies demonstrating this process in the context of Zionism in Palestine. The specificity of Zionism in the history of settler colonialism, its lack of a colonial metropolis, had real consequences for the Zionists in Palestine. Firstly, it could not impose—at first—its control over the land through military force. Secondly it could not organise the transfer of populations to the colony in the same way a state could. In the words of Shafir ([1996](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/anti.12659#anti12659-bib-0041):155): “Zionism, then, was a colonisation movement which simultaneously had to secure land for its settlers and settlers for its land”. The dual need for land and labour was at the heart of many political developments in the Yishuv. If the question of land was resolved first through acquisition from largely absentee land owners and then (and most extensively) through military violence, the question of immigration came close several times to bringing the whole colonial project to its knees, as the European Jewish population tended to reject Zionism as a political response to the poverty and discrimination they faced. Two distinct political responses emerged within the early settler population. On the one hand, the Jewish farmers and their sponsors hoped to develop a cash crop producing agricultural sector focused on export to Europe and the exploitation of cheap Palestinian workers. This vision was based, as demonstrated by Shafir ([1996](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/anti.12659#anti12659-bib-0041)), on the model of other European projects—especially the French settler colonies of North Africa. On the other hand, the nascent Labour Zionist movement demanded better wages and working conditions for Jewish workers in Palestine, which they argued would be the only way to attract and retain new settlers. This, they claimed, necessitated full separation between the Jewish and Palestinian sectors, removing thereby the “unfair competition” of the cheaper indigenous labour force. This led to the development of a series of new Labour Zionist institutions to organise this “Conquest of Hebrew Labour”, by organising strikes, pickets, and boycotts of Jewish owned businesses that employed Palestinian workers or sold products made by them. The Kibbutzim, the Histadrut,[6](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/anti.12659#anti12659-note-1006_81) and the early Zionist militias were all born out of the process of organising this campaign (Lockman [1996](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/anti.12659#anti12659-bib-0024)). For example, the Histadrut’s constitution, passed at its founding congress, made clear that it was a Zionist body committed to the project of settlement through the development of an exclusively Jewish society. It stated that the Histadrut’s goal was to: … unite all the workers and labourers in the country who live by their own labour without exploiting the labour of others, in order to arrange for all settlement, economic and also cultural affairs of all the workers in the country, so as to build a society of Jewish labour in Eretz Yisra’el. (quoted in Lockman 1996:68) The similarity between the logic of this statement and that of the white South African strikers mentioned above is remarkable. This struggle—waged against Palestinian workers and Jewish farmers—led to a partial victory for the Labour Zionist movement (Lockman [2012](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/anti.12659#anti12659-bib-0025)). Key industries, such as construction and agriculture, were taken over by Labour Zionist institutions such as Solal Boneh and the Kibbutzim. At the same time, Jewish representation in colonial institutions was increased through collaboration with the British Mandate authorities especially in the context of crushing the Arab Revolt of 1936-1939. The Labour Zionists took over the Yishuv’s political leadership and created a dominant Jewish sector, without however being able to establish a fully segregated one. It did set in motion the logic of separation as well as laying the infrastructure for a Jewish state, which would be made a reality by its militias’ military violence and mass expulsion of Palestinians during the Nakba. This case study shows that the Labour Zionist movement developed on the basis of opposing Jewish farmers as well as Palestinian workers, a political focus that also shaped its key institutions. The campaign for Hebrew Labour also demonstrates that the “elimination of the native” in the settler colonial context is not a given, as in the Wolfe-an framework, but the outcome of a specific set of struggles that pit both the indigenous population against the settlers, as well as different settler classes against one another.

#### The affirmative’s approach of understanding alienation through the analytic of the working going on strike reproduces colonialism. This over-determines the site of resistance at the wage-relation rather than the production of the commodity itself. This only reproduces white Marxism which necessarily excludes indigenous voices as their fight isn’t within the condition of the employment, rather of settlement. In simplest terms, the affirmative only carves out the potential for workers to strike for marginal improvements in employment negotiations and leaves indigenous people without any protection.
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I call this proletarian-centered approach settler Marxism for the disappearing of revolutionary actors that don’t fit its imperial teleology: the narrative in which Euro-U.S. industry, stealing or exploiting the resources of colonies and quasi-colonies, in turn stole the time and labor of factory workers. These workers then became the privileged actors in the overthrow of capitalism and thus the historical agents of revolution. And this mission continues to be taken up by a motley collection of contemporary workers, across sectors, even as global capitalism continually changes the forms of labor available. As analysts of both racial capitalism and settler colonialism—the two intertwined foundations of modernity and its institutions—have demonstrated, this paradigm leaves out the people most affected by capitalism. This includes Indigenous and racialized women, who are charged with the quadruple burden of wage labor, reproductive labor, racism, and sexism, as well as Indigenous and racialized trans and non-binary people, who resist the gender norms central to propagating heteropatriarchal global society. Indeed, feminicide, derived from the Spanish feminicidio, describes more than just the murder of women, one of the reasons it’s preferred over the more common English-language term femicide. As Rosa-Linda Fregoso, a leading scholar-activist on the issue, has written, the additional syllable of “in” “functions metaphorically as a register for the relationship between violence in the private and public sphere, between individuals and institutions, between the deadly sexism of persons who murder women and governments who condone this violence.” Further, “The extra ‘IN’ inextricably links INdividual and INstitutional forms of violence, symbolically representing how we conceptualize violence structurally and beyond a singular cause-and-effect model” (her capitalization). Fregoso’s formulation of violence here is an example of intersectional theory, that much benighted school of thought strategically vulgarized, by both the alt-right and the alt-left, as “identity politics.” But as Fregoso explains—and as Kimberlé Crenshaw, who gave the concept a name, readily asserts—intersectionality is not about identity claims per se but, rather, the relationality of “individuals and institutions.” It specifically theorizes the ways a person’s material vulnerability to various forms of violence is mediated by administrative bodies (including the media, which arbitrates truth claims, always with a bias for the dominant). I emphasize the word “material” above because—far from its caricature as postmodern superstructural nonsense—intersectionality theory factors in the profit motive of capitalists (see, for instance, the redoubtable Combahee River Collective Statement, forty-one years young.) It also shows how institutions, from national governments on down, manage the many violences of capitalism on behalf of its beneficiaries. And, like any good agent, these institutions get a cut of the blood money. The original colonial scene of the Americas is instructive. As Hortense J. Spillers showed in her landmark essay “Mama’s Baby, Papa’s Maybe: An American Grammar Book,” the commodity is always already both raced and gendered: the value of enslaved people came directly from “the loss of the[ir] indigenous name/land.” This dispossession of identity and home was nowhere clearer than in the “accounts and ledgers” of the industry, in which “the names of ships and the private traders” were dutifully recorded but the “goods” were simply described as “No. Negroes” and “Sum sold per head.” And while this process made all enslaved African peoples commodities, the master’s need to control the enslaved woman’s body and upend mother-child relations “mark[ed] the flesh as a prime commodity of exchange.” Before labor, there is the commodity: people reduced to things by the violence of enslavement. That this commodification of Indigenous peoples (of the African continent) took place on Indigenous ground (of the Americas), cleared of Indigenous peoples, underscores the indivisibility of indigeneity and capital—and the imperative to address both together. Furthermore, following Spillers (and numerous other thinkers, I should add), we must always attend to this relationship in its racial, gendered, and grounded terms. Such an approach necessarily resets the cause-and-effect model (to borrow Fregoso’s phrase) of Marxist theories of revolution that historically originated in the imperial metropole of Europe and that are still the baseline of so much labor and other organizing in the world today. That model, which I call settler Marxism, ignores the full material scope of the commodity in favor of a generic proletarian subject who recognizes the theft of his time and labor and then uses that recognition to strike and defeat the capitalist class, ushering in a socialist-cum-communist society. Settler Marxism has three crucial faults. First, in failing to account for all the people who don’t fit this proletarian form, settler Marxism doesn’t address the largest possible bloc of revolutionary actors. Where in this model, for example, are the people who aren’t employed and the people who are structurally unemployed? Where are incarcerated people? Land-based communities? The shelter-less? All those whose cosmologies don’t recognize the wage relation or the settler state? Where are the women, non-men, and queer people? The so-called “bread-and-butter” dispensation of most unions, in which wages and working conditions are the sole priorities, assumes that the aforementioned humans and their needs don’t count. Two, the site of struggle—labor—is misplaced, since the violence of commodification exceeds the violence of wage labor. Wage slavery is not chattel slavery, as Marx averred, but why do we organize around the wage relation rather than the chattel relation: that is, the hierarchy of human value? As Denise Ferreira da Silva has precisely and rigorously theorized, the “whole field of modern representation” inaugurated by Enlightenment thought to rationalize European imperialism is predicated on a universal Subject (akin to Sylvia Wynter’s “Breadwinner/Investor subject of the nation-state”) who seeks self-determination through the elimination of objects: the unhuman others of racial capitalism and settler colonialism. In 2666, Bolaño effectively investigates this relationship between canonical modern thought and the mortality of its others by connecting, in circuitous fashion, European philosophy and its contemporary scholars to the murdered and missing women in former New Spain. What would happen if we organized around this violence of life and death—of self-determination and extermination—rather than the abstract violence of the wage (which, after all, is a copy of the former)? What if we put murdered and missing Indigenous women (and their descendants) at the center of our collective efforts for transformation? Wouldn’t ending violence in all its forms mean the end of the wage relation too? The third problem with settler Marxism is that if we maintain the wage relation as the horizon of change, all the other violences of settler colonialism and racial capitalism will remain. That is to say, after the settler-Marxist revolution, we may have common ownership of the means of production (and thus an end to capitalism), but settlement, white supremacy, and heteropatriarchy will still be present and accounted for, as will institutionality and, arguably, nationalism and imperialism. So, too, will be the psychic economy that Silva adduces, and the hierarchy of human value overall. None of these issues simply “disappear” in the settler Marxist future, as anyone who’s been in a room with self-identified leftists can attest. Or look at the rise of the alt-left (exemplified by Chapo Trap House and works like Angela Nagle’s Kill All Normies and Mark Lilla’s The Once and Future Liberal: After Identity Politics) and its inability to account for (its) whiteness, let alone hierarchy altogether. Returning to Bolaño’s invocation of the strike vis-à-vis the murder of women in Juárez, how might we address the latter through the former? My speculation: by mounting a general strike against the settler state. In this I follow Cedric Robinson’s analysis in Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition and Glen Sean Coulthard’s thoughts about “red Marxism,” both of which assert the importance of land-based communities over the proletariat in revolutionary action. From the U.S. Civil War, Robinson writes, when “one hundred thousand poor whites had deserted the Confederate armies and perhaps a half million Black workers had abandoned the plantations,” to the “Indian Mutiny, the Boxer Rebellion, the nationalist struggles,” to “the Sudan, Algeria, Morocco, Somalia, Abyssinia, West and southern Africa, and…the ‘people’s wars’” of Mexico and China, “in every instance peasants and agrarian workers had been the primary social bases of rebellion. Nowhere, not even in Russia, where a rebellious urban proletariat was a fraction of the mobilized working classes, had a bourgeois social order formed a precondition for revolutionary struggle.” Picking up this theme through Fanon, Coulthard observes that “the theory and practice of Indigenous anti-colonialism, including Indigenous anti-capitalism, is best understood as a struggle primarily inspired by and oriented around the question of land—a struggle not only for land in the material sense, but also deeply informed by what the land as system of reciprocal relations and obligations can teach us about living our lives in relation to one another and the natural world in non-dominating and non-exploitative terms—and less around our emergent status as ‘rightless proletarians.’” If we are to truly end domination and exploitation, the wage relation and the chattel relation, then perhaps a general strike, for and with the people who are otherwise disappeared—the murdered and missing, the ignored and the unthought—might finally succeed in overthrowing the state: the settler state, shot through with violence.

#### The impact is twofold 1) Psychological violence due to the denial of cultural practices 2) The settler colonial mindset is the root cause of indigenous and black oppression
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Settler colonialism, capitalism, and white supremacy are foundational to one another. Their exploitations cross-reference one another; the construction of each warrants the sustained presence of the other because they all emerged in tandem. They are structured to support one another, but they affect their subjects whose exploitation they subsist off of differently particularly in terms of race and Indigeneity. Hence, Black and Indigenous people in the United States and Canada experience largely distinct, yet interconnected struggles that originate from the same triad of structural oppression. Settler Colonialism, Capitalism, and Indigeneity. Beyond its blatant functions of land theft and occupation, settler colonialism operates covertly to produce a myriad of detrimental effects on Indigenous people. For instance, the traumatic generational longevity of colonialism characterizes Indigenous people’s present-day interactions with the settler state: “All Indigenous people’s personal interfaces with the state are channeled through and shaped by the collective relationship that their nation has, historically, and currently, with the colonial regime” (Alfred 50:2009). The settler state forcibly mediates Indigenous people’s interactions in order to reinscribe patterns of “marginalization” and “forced acculturation” (Alfred 50:2009). By positioning interactions with the state as inescapable, settler colonialism produces detrimental psychological effects on Indigenous people: This is a major effect of colonization: denial of access to land-based cultural practices leading to a loss of freedom on both the individual and collective levels equating to the psychological effect of anomie, or the state of profound alienation that results from experiencing serious cultural dissolution, which is then the direct cause of serious substance abuse problems, suicide, and interpersonal violence (Alfred 49:2009). The settler colonial foundation of land theft and subsequent occupation, in addition to psychological manipulation, shifts Indigenous relationships with land by propagating itself and the economic system that enables it--capitalism--as the singular framework by which to conceive of relationship to land (Alfred 48:2009). Capitalism and settler colonialism position themselves as the primary modalities through which survival is possible but are inherently structured to eradicate Indigeneity. Moreover, the eradication of Indigeneity is a function of white supremacy, because the eventual assimilation of Indigenous people into whiteness fortifies the settler colonial existence. Settler Colonialism, Capitalism, and (Anti)-Blackness. Historically, white supremacy has sought to eliminate Indigeneity to justify the presence of settlers but has racialized Black people in an opposite way. In early United States and Canada settler societies, the logic of anti Blackness strived to multiply the number of people considered Black in order to grow the pool of available slave labor. The structure and sentiment of anti-Blackness that resulted from Black people’s subjugation has endured. However, although Black people’s presence in North America--particularly those descended from slaves--is often solely attributed to white supremacy, it is also a tangential consequence of settler colonialism. Most notably, settler colonialism used the logic of white supremacy as means to forcibly migrate and racialize Black people as Black to justify exploiting their bodies for labor and to occupy Indigenous land: “The reality then is that Black peoples have not been quintessential “settlers” in the White supremacist usage of the word; nevertheless, they have, as free people, been involved in some form of settlement process” (Amadahy and Lawrence 107:2009). Therefore, the logic of settler colonialism forcefully produced mass Black displacement and subjugation, and non-consensually implicates Black people in the occupation of Indigenous land.

#### Thus the alternative is generative refusal – a simultaneous affirmation of indigenous sovereignty and a political force to generate action
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In Dancing on our Turtle’s Back, Leanne Betasamosake Simpson (2011, p. 32) pushes back against understanding Indigenous resistance as ‘antagonism’ but instead the desire to move towards resurgent new forms. She says ‘I have spent enough time taking down the master’s house, and now I want most of my energy to go into visioning and building our new house’. From this moment of refusal, resistance then is both generative and imaginative, visioning and building rather than dismantling. In Stó:Lō, scholar Dylan Robinson’s analysis of Indigenous soundscapes, he argues that critical sovereign listening ‘understands that in entering Indigenous sound territories as guests, we will be unable to hear Indigenous sovereignty, at the same time that Indigenous peoples affirm sovereignty of their lands through the felt history of song’ (Robinson, 2020, p. 53). This is a vital decoupling of the practice of Indigenous sovereignty from the perceptions of those subject to Indigenous sovereignty as guests or settlers on sovereign territories. Robinson states that ‘sovereign speech does not necessarily provoke specific forms of sovereign listening … by decoupling the deterministic relationship between sovereign object and reception, we can gain a more nuanced understanding of Indigenous and settler forms of sensory experience’ (Robinson, 2020, p. 63). Decoupling acts from reception offers the space for understanding Indigenous sovereignty as deeply relational, but not requiring recognition. Audra Simpson argues, ‘just because the settler state cannot hear or comprehend the articulations of Indigenous sovereignty, does not mean that they are not happening’ (A Simpson, 2000, p. 114). Indigenous practices of sovereignty need not be recognized and affirmed by the settler state in its juridical or normative forms to nevertheless be a manifestation of Indigenous sovereignty. Robinson describes the colonial practice of ‘hungry listening’, or listening for settler consumption. In resistance, sovereign practices of listening refuse that ear, sometimes through spatializing sovereignty to create ‘irreconcilable spaces’ that ‘unwelcome non-Indigenous desire’ (Robinson, 2020, p. 236). Audra Simpson describes ‘refusal’ as ‘a political and ethical stance that stands in stark contrast to the desire to have one’s distinctiveness as a culture, as a people, recognized. Refusal comes with the requirement of having one’s political sovereignty acknowledged and upheld, and raises the question of legitimacy for those who are usually in the position of recognizing’ (Simpson, 2014, p. 11). Simpson identifies here the dual nature of a politics of refusal, simultaneously enacting a new reality while offering a critique of the assumed sovereignty of the settler colonial state. In turning away, the practice of refusal is the ‘imagination of the political under conditions of falsehood’ (Simpson, 2017, p. 2), and simultaneously enacts a critique of the state, and generative of Indigenous sovereignty as otherwise. Decoupling sovereign actions from the perception and reception of those actions as sovereign challenges the assumed settler authority to recognize what and whom can be sovereign, again opening the space to answer Starblanket and Stark’s call for governance as the business of all living things. Through the acts of doing, the relations these actions generate with the land and with others, this work becomes sovereign enactment in itself, refusing the authority of the state to authorize in favour of generating or creating something else. Embedding refusal within a relational analytic through his analysis of sensory sovereignty, by decoupling sovereign actions from sovereign perceptions, Robinson makes a vital interjection into understanding Indigenous sovereignty as both contemporary practice, but also within a larger historic context. Despite the ongoing settler colonial violence and dispossession, Indigenous sovereign acts continue, no matter the perception or recognition. These relational forms invite, but do not require, recognition. In these moments of refusal ‘this is political life that, in its insistence on certain things—such as nationhood and sovereignty—fundamentally interrupts and casts into question the story that settler states tell about themselves’ (A Simpson, 2014, p. 177). While secondary to the generative and creative relations that Indigenous sovereignty produce, this refusal, and the moments of distribution concomitantly enact a critique. Detangling the generative relations of sovereignty from a disruptive critique of the settler colonial state allows both acts to exist simultaneously, without capitulating to the authority of colonial recognition. Rather than demanding engagement from Indigenous forms and relations of sovereignty, refusal, or this generative no, takes critique into a realm that is responsive to, but not dependant on, the engagement of Indigenous nations. This critique offers an opportunity for settler colonial relations to take up the generative refusal as a call to action. Taking seriously the assertion of Starblanket and Stark that governance is the business of all living things, this calls for non-Indigenous subjects and subjectivities to constitute themselves as refusable. As a response to Audra Simpson’s call for refusal as consents revenge, to be refusable is not just imagining the possibilities of a world created through that generative ‘no’ but inviting it. It starts from acknowledging ‘the trickery of consent’ (A Simpson, 2016, p. 3), and affirming that these ongoing structures, events and experiences of settler colonial violence were not consented to, are not consented to. Moreover, it affirms that recognition, and the assumption of the consent to be recognized, is not the starting point of ethical relations. To be refusable is to invite action. To be refusable does not require being refused, but it does mark a moment of constituting oneself as acknowledging and understanding the diverse sovereignties of Indigenous nations and that to be refused is always a possibility and sometimes a necessity.

#### The Role of the Ballot is to vote for the debater who best challenges settler colonialism – fiat is illusory, no policy is being implemented out of round – the only material impact is affecting our subjectivity. Speech acts are a necessary step in the destabilization of the settler subject
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Goeman writes as an explicit challenge to other indigenous peoples, but this holds true to settler-allies as well, that decolonization must include an analysis of the dominant ‘self-disciplining colonial subject’.73 However, as this discussion of subjective precarity demonstrates, the degree of to which these disciplinary or phenomenological processes are complete should not be overstated. For settler-allies must also examine and cultivate the ways in which settler subjects fail to be totally disciplined. Evidence of this incompletion is apparent in the subject's arrested state of development. Discovering the instability at the core of the settler subject, indeed of all subjects, is the central conceit of psychoanalysis. This exception of at least partial failure to fully subjectivize the settler is also what sets my account apart from Rifkin's. His phenomenology falls into the trap that Jacqueline Rose observes within many sociological accounts of the subject: that of assuming a successful internalization of norms. From the psychoanalytical perspective, the ‘unconscious constantly reveals the “failure”’ of internalization.74 As we have seen, within settler subjects this can be expressed as an irrational anxiety that expresses itself whenever a settler is confronted with the facts regarding their colonizing status. Under conditions of total subjectification, such charges ought to be unintelligible to the settler. Thus, the process of subject formation is always in slippage and never totalized as others might suggest.75 Because of this precarity, the settler subject is prone to violence and lashing out; but the subject in slippage also provides an avenue by which the process of settler colonialism can be subverted – creating cracks in a phantasmatic wholeness which can be opened wider. Breakages of this sort offer an opportunity to pursue what Paulette Regan calls a ‘restorying’ of settler colonial history and culture, to decenter settler mythologies built upon and within the dispossession of indigenous peoples.76 The cultivation of these cracks is a necessary part of decolonizing work, as it continues to panic and thus to destabilize settler subjects. Resistance to settler colonialism does not occur only in highly visible moments like the famous conflict at Kanesatake and Kahnawake,77 it also occurs in reiterative and disruptive practices, presences, and speech acts. Goeman correctly observes that the ‘repetitive practices of everyday life’ are what give settler spaces their meaning, as they provide a degree of naturalness to the settler imago and its psychic investments.78 As such, to disrupt the ease of these repetitions is at once to striate radically the otherwise smooth spaces of settler colonialism and also to disrupt the easy (re)production of the settler subject. Goeman calls these subversive acts the ‘micro-politics of resistance', which historically took the form of ‘moving fences, not cooperating with census enumerators, sometimes disrupting survey parties’ amongst other process.79 These acts panic the subject that is disciplined as a product of settler colonial power, by forcing encounters with the sovereign indigenous peoples that were imagined to be gone. This reveals to the settler, if only fleetingly, the violence that founds and sustains the settler colonial relationship. While such practices may not overthrow the settler colonial system, they do subvert its logics by insistently drawing attention to the ongoing presence of indigenous peoples who refuse erasure.