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#### The system’s terminally unsustainable, it’s the root cause of every impact, and attempting to save it only results in extinction and scapegoating violence.

**Robinson ’16** (William; 2016; professor of sociology, global studies and Latin American studies at the University of California at Santa Barbara; Truthout; “Sadistic Capitalism: Six Urgent Matters for Humanity in Global Crisis”; robinson 16<http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/35596-sadistic-capitalism-six-urgent-matters-for-humanity-in-global-crisis>)

In these mean streets of **globalized capitalism in crisis**, it has become profitable to **turn poverty** and inequality into a tourist attraction. The South African Emoya Luxury Hotel and Spa company has made a glamorized spectacle of it. The resort recently advertised an opportunity for tourists to stay "in our unique Shanty Town ... and experience traditional township living within a safe private game reserve environment." A cluster of simulated shanties outside of Bloemfontein that the company has constructed "is ideal for team building, braais, bachelors [parties], theme parties and an experience of a lifetime," read the ad. The luxury accommodations, made to appear from the outside as shacks, featured paraffin lamps, candles, a battery-operated radio, an outside toilet, a drum and fireplace for cooking, as well as under-floor heating, air conditioning and wireless internet access. A well-dressed, young white couple is pictured embracing in a field with the corrugated tin shanties in the background. The only thing missing in this fantasy world of sanitized space and glamorized poverty was the people themselves living in poverty. **Escalating inequalities** fuel capitalism's chronic problem of over-accumulation. The "luxury shanty town" in South Africa is a fitting metaphor for global capitalism as a whole. Faced with a **stagnant global economy**, elites have managed to turn **war**, **structural violence** and **inequality** into opportunities for capital, pleasure and entertainment. It is hard not to conclude that unchecked capitalism has become what I term "sadistic capitalism," in which the suffering and deprivation generated by capitalism become a **source of aesthetic pleasure**, leisure and entertainment for others. I recently had the opportunity to travel through several countries in Latin America, the Middle East, North Africa, East Asia and throughout North America. I was on sabbatical to research what the global crisis looks like on the ground around the world. Everywhere I went, social polarization and political tensions have reached **explosive dimensions**. Where is the crisis headed, what are the possible outcomes and what does it tell us about global capitalism and resistance? This crisis is not like earlier structural crises of world capitalism, such as in the 1930s or 1970s. This one is **fast becoming systemic**. The crisis of humanity shares aspects of earlier structural crises of world capitalism, but there are six novel, interrelated dimensions to the current moment that I highlight here, in broad strokes, as the "big picture" context in which countries and peoples around the world are experiencing a **descent into chaos** and uncertainty. 1) The level of **global** social polarization and **inequality is unprecedented** in the face of out-of-control, over-accumulated capital. In January 2016, the development agency Oxfam published a follow-up to its report on global inequality that had been released the previous year. According to the new report, now just **62 billionaires** -- down from 80 identified by the agency in its January 2015 report -- control as much wealth as one half of the world's population, and the **top 1% owns more wealth** than the other 99% combined. Beyond the transnational capitalist class and the upper echelons of the global power bloc, the richest 20 percent of humanity owns some **95 percent of the world's wealth**, while the bottom 80 percent has to make do with **just 5 percent**. This 20-80 divide of global society into haves and the have-nots is the **new global social** **apartheid**. It is evident not just between rich and poor countries, but within each country, North and South, with the rise of new affluent high-consumption sectors alongside the **downward mobility**, "precariatization," destabilization and **expulsion of majorities**. Escalating inequalities fuel capitalism's chronic problem of over-accumulation: The transnational capitalist class **cannot find productive outlets** to unload the enormous amounts of surplus it has accumulated, leading to **stagnation in the world economy**. The signs ofan **impending depression** are everywhere. The front page of the February 20 issue of The Economist read, "The World Economy: Out of Ammo?" Extreme levels of social polarization present a challenge to dominant groups. They strive to purchase the loyalty of that 20 percent, while at the same time dividing the 80 percent, **co-opting** some **into a hegemonic bloc** and **repressing the rest**. Alongside the spread of frightening **new systems of social control** and repression is heightened dissemination through the culture industries and corporate marketing strategies that **depoliticize through consumerist fantasies** and the manipulation of desire. As "Trumpism" in the United States so well illustrates, another strategy of co-optation is the **manipulation of fear** and insecurity among the downwardly mobile so that social anxiety is channeled toward **scapegoated communities**. This psychosocial mechanism of displacing mass anxieties is not new, but it appears to be increasing around the world in the face of the **structural destabilization** of capitalist globalization. Scapegoated communities are under siege, such as the Rohingya in Myanmar, the Muslim minority in India, the Kurds in Turkey, southern African immigrants in South Africa, and Syrian and Iraqi refugees and other immigrants in Europe. As with its 20th century predecessor, 21st century fascism **hinges on** such manipulation of **social anxiety** at a time of acute capitalist crisis. Extreme inequality **requires extreme violence** and repression that lend to projects of **21st century fascism**. 2) The system is **fast reaching** the **ecological limits** to its reproduction. We have reached several tipping points in what environmental scientists refer to as **nine** crucial "**planetary boundaries**." We have already exceeded these boundaries in three areas -- **climate change**, the **nitrogen cycle** and **diversity loss**. There have been five previous mass extinctions in earth's history. While all these were due to natural causes, for the first time ever, human conduct is intersecting with and **fundamentally altering the earth** system. We have entered what Paul Crutzen, the Dutch environmental scientist and Nobel Prize winner, termed the Anthropocene -- a new age in which humans have **transformed** up to half of **the world's surface**. We are altering the composition of the atmosphere and acidifying the oceans at a rate that **undermines the conditions for life**. The ecological dimensions of global crisis cannot be understated. "We are deciding, without quite meaning to, which evolutionary pathways will remain open and which will forever be closed," observes Elizabeth Kolbert in her best seller, The Sixth Extinction. "**No** other **creature has ever managed this** ... The Sixth Extinction will continue to **determine the course of life** long after everything people have written and painted and built has been ground into dust." Capitalism cannot be held solely responsible. The human-nature contradiction has deep roots in civilization itself. The ancient Sumerian empires, for example, collapsed after the population over-salinated their crop soil. The Mayan city-state network collapsed about AD 900 due to deforestation. And the former Soviet Union wrecked havoc on the environment. However, given capital's implacable impulse to accumulate profit and its accelerated **commodification of nature**, it is difficult to imagine that the environmental catastrophe can be resolved within the capitalist system. "**Green capitalism" appears** as **an oxymoron**, as sadistic capitalism's attempt to turn the ecological crisis into a profit-making opportunity, along with the conversion of poverty into a tourist attraction. 3) The sheer magnitude of the means of violence is unprecedented, as is the **concentrated control over** the means of global communications and **the production** and circulation **of knowledge**, symbols and images. We have seen the spread of frightening new systems of social control and repression that have brought us into the **panoptical surveillance society** and the **age of thought control**. This real-life Orwellian world is in a sense more perturbing than that described by George Orwell in his iconic novel 1984. In that fictional world, people were compelled to give their obedience to the state ("Big Brother") in exchange for a quiet existence with guarantees of employment, housing and other social necessities. Now, however, the corporate and political powers that be **force obedience** even as the means of survival are denied to the vast majority. Global apartheid involves the creation of "green zones" that are cordoned off in each locale around the world where **elites are insulated** through new systems of spatial reorganization, social control and policing. "Green zone" refers to the nearly impenetrable area in central Baghdad that US occupation forces established in the wake of the 2003 invasion of Iraq. The command center of the occupation and select Iraqi elite inside that green zone were protected from the violence and chaos that engulfed the country. Urban areas around the world are now green zoned through **gentrification**, **gated communities**, surveillance systems, and state and **private violence**. Inside the world's green zones, privileged strata avail themselves of **privatized social services**, consumption and entertainment. They can work and communicate through internet and satellite sealed off under the protection of armies of soldiers, police and private security forces. Green zoning takes on distinct forms in each locality. In Palestine, I witnessed such zoning in the form of Israeli military checkpoints, Jewish settler-only roads and the apartheid wall. In Mexico City, the most exclusive residential areas in the upscale Santa Fe District are **accessible only by helicopter** and private gated roads. In Johannesburg, a surreal drive through the exclusive Sandton City area reveals **rows of mansions** that appear as military compounds, **with** **private armed towers** and electrical and barbed-wire fences. In Cairo, I toured satellite cities ringing the impoverished center and inner suburbs where the country's elite could **live out their** aspirations and **fantasies**. They sport gated residential complexes with spotless green lawns, private leisure and shopping centers and English-language international schools under the protection of military checkpoints and private security police. In other cities, green zoning is subtler but no less effective. In Los Angeles, where I live, the freeway system now has an **express lane reserved for** those that can pay **an exorbitant toll**. On this lane, the privileged **speed by**, while the rest remain one lane over, stuck in the city's notorious bumper-to-bumper traffic -- or even worse, in notoriously underfunded and underdeveloped public transportation, where it may take half a day to get to and from work. There is no barrier separating this express lane from the others. However, a near-invisible closed surveillance system monitors every movement. If a vehicle without authorization shifts into the exclusive lane, it is **instantly recorded by** this **surveillance** system and a **heavy fine is imposed** on the driver, under threat of impoundment, while freeway police patrols are ubiquitous. Outside of the global green zones, **warfare** and **police containment** have become normalized and sanitized for those not directly at the receiving end of armed aggression. "Militainment" -- portraying and even **glamorizing war and violence** as entertaining spectacles through Hollywood films and television police shows, computer games and corporate "news" channels -- may be the epitome of sadistic capitalism. It desensitizes, bringing about complacency and indifference. In between the green zones and outright warfare are **prison industrial complexes**, **immigrant** and refugee **repression** and control systems, the criminalization of outcast communities and **capitalist schooling**. The omnipresent media and cultural apparatuses of the corporate economy, in particular, aim to **colonize the mind** -- to undermine the ability to think critically and outside the dominant worldview. A neofascist culture emerges through **militarism**, extreme **masculinization**, racism and **racist mobilizations** against scapegoats. 4) We are reaching limits to the extensive expansion of capitalism. Capitalism is like riding a bicycle: When you stop pedaling the bicycle, you fall over. If the capitalist system stops expanding outward, it enters crisis and **faces collapse**. In each earlier structural crisis, the system went through a new round of extensive expansion -- from waves of colonial conquest in earlier centuries, to the integration in the late 20th and early 21st centuries of the former socialist countries, China, India and other areas that had been marginally outside the system. There are **no longer** any **new territories** to integrate into world capitalism. Meanwhile, the privatization of education, health care, utilities, basic services and public land are turning those spaces in global society that were outside of capital's control into "spaces of capital." Even poverty has been turned into a commodity. **What is there left to commodify?** Where can the system now expand? With the limits to expansion comes a **turn toward militarized accumulation** -- **making wars** of endless destruction and reconstruction and expanding the militarization of social and political institutions so as to continue to **generate new opportunities** for accumulation in the face of stagnation. 5) There is the rise of a vast surplus population inhabiting a "**planet of slums**," alienated from the productive economy, thrown into the margins and subject to these sophisticated systems of social control and destruction. Global capitalism has **no** direct **use for surplus humanity**. But indirectly, it holds wages down everywhere and makes new systems of **21st century slavery** possible. These systems include prison labor, the forced recruitment of miners at gunpoint by warlords contracted by global corporations to dig up valuable minerals in the Congo, sweatshops and exploited immigrant communities (including the rising tide of immigrant female caregivers for affluent populations). Furthermore, the global working class is experiencing accelerated "**precariatization**." The "new precariat" refers to the proletariat that faces capital under today's unstable and precarious labor relations -- informalization, casualization, part-time, temp, immigrant and contract labor. As communities are uprooted everywhere, there is a **rising** reserve **army of immigrant labor**. The global working class is becoming divided into citizen and immigrant workers. The latter are particularly attractive to transnational capital, as the lack of citizenship rights makes them particularly vulnerable, and therefore, exploitable. The challenge for dominant groups is **how to** **contain the real** and potential **rebellion** of surplus humanity, the immigrant workforce and the precariat. How can they contain the explosive contradictions of this system? The 21st century megacities become the **battlegrounds between mass resistance** movements **and** the new systems of **mass repression**. Some populations in these cities (and also in abandoned countryside) are at risk of **genocide**, such as those in Gaza, zones in Somalia and Congo, and swaths of Iraq and Syria. 6) There is a disjuncture between a globalizing economy and a nation-state-based system of political authority. Transnational state apparatuses are incipient and do **not wield enough power** and authority **to** organize and **stabilize the system**, much less to impose regulations on runaway transnational capital. In the wake of the 2008 financial collapse, for instance, the governments of the G-8 and G-20 were **unable to impose transnational regulation** on the global financial system, despite a series of emergency summits to discuss such regulation. Elites historically have attempted to resolve the problems of over-accumulation by state policies that can regulate the anarchy of the market. However, in recent decades, transnational capital has **broken free from** the **constraints** imposed by the nation-state. The more "enlightened" elite representatives of the transnational capitalist class are now clamoring for transnational mechanisms of regulation that would allow the global ruling class to reign in the **anarchy of the system** in the interests of saving global capitalism from itself and from **radical challenges from below**. At the same time, the division of the world into some 200 competing nation-states is not the most propitious of circumstances for the global working class. Victories in popular struggles from below in any one country or region can (and often do) become diverted and even undone by the structural power of transnational capital and the direct political and military domination that this structural power affords the dominant groups. In Greece, for instance, the leftist Syriza party came to power in 2015 on the heels of militant worker struggles and a mass uprising. But the party abandoned its radical program as a result of the enormous pressure exerted on it from the European Central Bank and private international creditors. The Systemic Critique of Global Capitalism A growing number of transnational elites themselves now recognize that any resolution to the global crisis must involve redistribution downward of income. However, in the viewpoint of those from below, a neo-Keynesian redistribution within the prevailing corporate power structure is **not enough**. What is required is a redistribution of power downward and **transformation toward a system** in which social need trumps private profit. A **global rebellion** against the transnational capitalist class has spread since the financial collapse of 2008. Wherever one looks, there is **popular**, **grassroots** and leftist **struggle**, and the rise of **new cultures of resistance**: the Arab Spring; the resurgence of leftist politics in Greece, Spain and elsewhere in Europe; the tenacious resistance of Mexican social movements following the Ayotzinapa massacre of 2014; the favela uprising in Brazil against the government's World Cup and Olympic expulsion policies; the student strikes in Chile; the remarkable surge in the Chinese workers' movement; the shack dwellers and other poor people's campaigns in South Africa; Occupy Wall Street, the immigrant rights movement, Black Lives Matter, fast food workers' struggle and the mobilization around the Bernie Sanders presidential campaign in the United States. This global revolt is spread unevenly and faces many challenges. A number of these struggles, moreover, have suffered setbacks, such as the Greek working-class movement and, tragically, the Arab Spring. What type of a transformation is viable, and how do we achieve it? How we interpret the global crisis is itself a matter of vital importance as politics polarize worldwide between a neofascist and a popular response. The systemic critique of global capitalism must **strive to influence**, from this vantage point, **the discourse and practice of movements** for a more just distribution of wealth and power. **Our survival** may depend on it

#### The assumption that Indigenous resistance is excluded from or irrelevant to class analysis and movements reifies that myth that “Indians missed out on modernity,” justifying their erasure from history. Recognizing the role anti-capitalism has to play in Indigenous liberation is necessary and is proven by contemporary resistance at Standing Rock.

Balthaser 16—Associate Professor of multiethnic US literature at Indiana University [Benjamin, “Colonies and Capital,” *Jacobin*, 11 Nov, https://www.jacobinmag.com/2016/11/native-americans-marxism-colonialism-nodapl-archie-phinney-means-nez-perce/]

Phinney’s life and work open up a set of questions about identity and praxis that still have purchase on the national imaginary about Native Americans.

As Dunbar-Ortiz recently articulated, the most persistent myth about indigenous Americans is that they have vanished, part of a premodern past that has inevitably, if tragically, come and gone. The notion that “Indians have missed out on modernity” has justified their erasure from history and the logic for their conquest. The little attention paid to Phinney only reinforces this.

Historians have tended to present him as either an Indian activist, uninterested in socialism, or as a “white man’s Indian” who adopted European ideas unsuited for Native life. But he was much more like other intellectuals of color of his day — concerned with colonialism, racial identity, and self-determination for his people in a global context.

His belief that Native issues should matter to the Left and that Marxism has a role to play in indigenous liberation does not make Phinney a lone iconoclast — rather, it places his work in a global context that understands indigeneity, land, imperialism, and modernity as part of a coherent historical conjuncture.

Phinney’s work suggests that modernity and Native American life need to be theorized together, and his ideas about what modern life may represent for all subaltern groups bears greater scrutiny. The questions he posed to the Nimi’ipuu apply to many groups that find themselves alienated, dispossessed, and exploited by capitalism: how to move forward as “alert, modern communities” that are “able to govern their affairs”? Equally, how do we transform the categories capitalism imposes upon us into modes of collective self-consciousness?

Phinney understood that capitalism has a global, totalizing logic. But he also realized that this does not mean all subjects’ oppression — or liberation — is configured in the same way.

He anticipated the largest, hemispheric pan-tribal gathering in many decades at the NoDAPL camp, and also saw that the fight to save the Standing Rock Sioux’s land, water, and treaty claims participate in a larger struggle over intensified resource extraction, primary accumulation, toxic racism, and the police state. Framing themselves as “water defenders,” the Standing Rock Sioux tribe both dramatizes the violation of their sovereign rights as a nation over their own resources, and connects them to a global struggle to wrest the foundational requirements of life, water, soil, and air from the grips of capital.

In much the same way Phinney writes about race, such a construction highlights what is specific to indigenous struggle, while at the same time connecting that struggle to a transnational call for ecological justice. Fighting for indigenous sovereignty does not distract from transforming capitalist modernity — it is central to it.

#### Modern financial instruments produce creditor/debtor relations that make up a neoliberal grammar of debt management is a constitutive element of land dispossession. These world systems serve as the backdrop to ongoing post-colonial futures and resistance that are made coherent as insurgent praxis against capital.

Chakravartty and da silva 12 (Title: Accumulation, Dispossession, and Debt: The Racial Logic of Global Capitalism—An Introduction/ American Quarterly Volume 64, Number 3/ September 2012/ Johns Hopkins University Press/ Authors: Paula Chakravartty -associate professor in the Department of Communication at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst. She has published many essays on technology, the postcolonial state, and inequality, migrant labor, race and caste, and the culture of neoliberal development/ Denise Ferreira da Silva (Professor and chair in ethics at Queen Mary, University of London. Her writings advance a racial/postcolonial critique of modern thought, which engages critical legal theory, political theory, historical materialism, feminist theory, critical racial and ethnic studies, and postcolonial/ global studies. Pg 363 MBA)

Given the public outrage against the unjust "socialization of loss" extracted by investment banks, it is difficult to see the bailout of Wall Street as anything other than a massive debt forgiveness scheme for those at the "top of the guilt [profit] hierarchy" for the current crisis.6 Why then should the holders of the "subprime mortgage" pay the exorbitant interest rates attached to their loans? Why should the economically dispossessed be expected to take on the risk assumed by those who, enabled by the privatization of public housing and the deregulation of financial markets, bet against them? Why should they pay for those who bet on the "truth" of prevailing constructions of Blacks' and Latino/as' racial (moral and intellectual) traits, on the certainty that they lack in "creditworthiness" and are "untrustworthy" debtors? Questioning and challenging the moral grammar of neoliberal debt management can be traced back to civil disobedience and calls for a "debt jubilee" for structurally adjusted Africa a decade before the current crisis, and were foreshadowed in Argentina's unprecedented sovereign default in 2001 paving the way for the "unthinkable" possible exit of Greece from the eurozone in 2012.7 **"Millennial capitalism," where wealth is generated "purely through exchange . . . as if entirely independent of human manufacture,"** has unleashed debtors' revolts in many forms.8 In the global South, the last three decades have seen an upsurge of what the anthropologist Janet Roitman has called **"fiscal disobedience," from food and price riots, tax revolts, boycotts, farmer suicides and protests, organized and spontaneous opposition to high-interest microfinance loans—which set powerful precedents for the kinds of anti-austerity uprisings and movements that we see in Europe and North America today**.9 This special issue reads the subprime crisis as a "relative" of crises that transformed the political economic [End Page 363] horizons of Africa, Asia, and Latin America in the 1980s and 1990s. We hope to highlight these resonances approximating national and global responses to the logic of neoliberalism to profit from calculated "mistakes" (like lending money to persons and nations precisely because they would not be able to pay it back) and read the subprime crisis through a dual lens of race and empire. American studies as a field has housed scholars interested in the relationship between the architectures of U.S. Empire and the apparatuses of social (racial-ethnic, class, and gender-sexual) subjugation.10 The global financial crisis cannot but compel us to further this exploration. In putting together this special issue, we posed the following question: How could the predatory targeting of economically dispossessed communities and the subsequent bailout of the nation's largest investment banks, instantly and volubly, be recast as a problem caused by the racial other ("illegal immigrants" and "state-dependent minorities")?11 **Beyond the immediate politics of blame, our interest is in situating the racial moment of the financial crisis in the last three decades of neoliberal backlash waged across the postcolonial (global) South.** **As a starting point for our discussion we assume that these recent histories are themselves embedded in the colonial and racial matrix of capitalist accumulation of land (conquest and settlement), exploitation of labor (slavery, indentured labor, forced migration), appropriation of resources, and ultimately the very meaning of debt in** what Walter Mignolo calls the "**modern/colonial world system**."12

#### Aff is a prerequisite to the alt. Anti-capitalism must be at the core of indigenous resistance—this requires broad networks of solidarity.

Jeffery R. WEBBER 16, Lecturer in the School of Politics and IR at Queen Mary, University of London [“Idle No More: An Introduction to the Symposium on Glen Coulthard’s Red Skin, White Masks,” *Historical Materialism*, Vol. 24, No. 3, 2016, p. 3-29, Accessed Online through Emory Libraries]

Ensuring that anti-capitalism is at the core of Indigenous resurgence is the basis of Coulthard’s second thesis. ‘For Indigenous nations to live,’ he concludes, ‘capitalism must die.’ 15 Coulthard sees in recent Indigenous tactics like traffic- and train blockading an anti-capitalist impulse, rooted in the disruption of the sphere of circulation. Such actions ‘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’. 16 Such actions are consciously built to intensify their ‘negative impact on the economic infrastructure that is core to the colonial accumulation of capital in settler-political economies like Canada’s’. 17 Although Coulthard does not highlight the connection, this strategic orientation resonates in many ways with what might be labelled the turn to circulation in much of contemporary Marxist and anarchist strategic theory, particularly in the domain of historical-materialist geography. 18

Another urgent concern of Coulthard’s anti-capitalist thesis is again one of socio-geography: ‘how might we begin to scale up these often localized, resurgent land-based direct actions to produce a more general transformation in the colonial economy?’ 19 He recognises that short of a ‘massive transformation in the political economy of contemporary settler-colonialism, any efforts to rebuild [Indigenous] nations will remain parasitic on capitalism, and thus on the perpetual exploitation of our lands and labour’. 20 A project of transformation at this level inevitably requires networks of solidarity beyond the Indigenous movement:

This reality demands that we continue to remain open to, if not actively seek out and establish, relations of solidarity and networks of trade and mutual aid with national and transnational communities and organizations that are also struggling against the imposed effects of globalized capital, including other Indigenous nations and national confederacies; urban Indigenous people and organizations; the labour, women’s, gbltq2s (gay, bisexual, lesbian, trans, queer, and two-spirit), and environmental movements; and, of course, those racial and ethnic communities that find themselves subject to their own distinct forms of economic, social, and cultural marginalization. 21

An anti-capitalist strategy of Indigenous liberation, then, requires broad networks of solidarity and purposeful linkages between local battles and wider scales of conflict.

#### Thus the alternative is to affirm the model of the Communist Party – only democratic centralist dual power organizing can provide effective accountability mechanisms to correct unproductive tendencies, educate and mobilize marginalized communities, and connect local struggles to a movement for international liberation.

**Escalante 18**  
(Alyson Escalante, you should totally read her work for non-debate reasons, Marxist-Leninist, Materialist Feminist and Anti-Imperialist activist. “PARTY ORGANIZING IN THE 21ST CENTURY” September 21st, 2018 <https://theforgenews.org/2018/09/21/party-organizing-in-the-21st-century/> rvs)

I would argue that within the base building movement, there is a move towards party organizing, but this trend has not always been explicitly theorized or forwarded within the movement. My goal in this essay is to argue that base building and dual power strategy can be best forwarded through party organizing, and that party organizing can allow this emerging movement to solidify into a powerful revolutionary socialist tendency in the United States. One of the crucial insights of the base building movement is that the current state of the left in the United States is one in which revolution is not currently possible. There exists very little popular support for socialist politics. A century of anticommunist propaganda has been extremely effective in convincing even the most oppressed and marginalized that communism has nothing to offer them. The base building emphasis on dual power responds directly to this insight. By building institutions which can meet people’s needs, we are able to concretely demonstrate that communists can offer the oppressed relief from the horrific conditions of capitalism. Base building strategy recognizes that actually doing the work to serve the people does infinitely more to create a socialist base of popular support than electing democratic socialist candidates or holding endless political education classes can ever hope to do. Dual power is about proving that we have something to offer the oppressed. The question, of course, remains: once we have built a base of popular support, what do we do next? If it turns out that establishing socialist institutions to meet people’s needs does in fact create sympathy towards the cause of communism, how can we mobilize that base? Put simply: **in order to mobilize the base which base builders hope to create, we need to have already done the work of building a communist party.** It is not enough to simply meet peoples needs. Rather, we must build the institutions of dual power in the name of communism. We must refuse covert front organizing and instead have a public face as a communist party. When we build tenants unions, serve the people programs, and other dual power projects, we must make it clear that we are organizing as communists, unified around a party, and are not content simply with establishing endless dual power organizations. We must be clear that our strategy is revolutionary and in order to make this clear we must adopt party organizing. By “party organizing” I mean an organizational strategy which adopts the party model. Such organizing focuses on building a party whose membership is formally unified around a party line determined by democratic centralist decision making. The party model creates internal methods for **holding party members accountable**, unifying party member action around democratically determined goals, and for educating party members in communist theory and praxis. A communist organization utilizing the party model works to build dual power institutions while simultaneously educating the communities they hope to serve. Organizations which adopt the party model focus on propagandizing around the need for revolutionary socialism. They function as the forefront of political organizing, empowering local communities to theorize their liberation through communist theory while organizing communities to literally fight for their liberation. A party is not simply a group of individuals doing work together, but is a formal organization unified in its fight against capitalism. Party organizing has much to offer the base building movement. By working in a unified party, base builders can ensure that local struggles are tied to and informed by a unified national and international strategy. While the most horrific manifestations of capitalism take on particular and unique form at the local level, we need to remember that our struggle is against a material base which functions not only at the national but at the international level. The formal structures provided by a democratic centralist party model allow individual locals to have a voice in open debate, but also allow for a unified strategy to emerge from democratic consensus. Furthermore, **party organizing allows for local organizations and individual organizers to be held accountable for their actions.** It allows criticism to function not as one independent group criticizing another independent group, but rather as comrades with a formal organizational unity working together to sharpen each others strategies and to help correct chauvinist ideas and actions. In the context of the socialist movement within the United States, such accountability is crucial. As a movement which operates within a settler colonial society, imperialist and colonial ideal frequently infect leftist organizing. Creating formal unity and party procedure for dealing with and correcting these ideas allows us to address these consistent problems within American socialist organizing. Having a formal party which unifies the various dual power projects being undertaken at the local level also allows for base builders to not simply meet peoples needs, but to pull them into the membership of the party as organizers themselves. The party model creates a means for sustained growth to occur by unifying organizers in a manner that allows for skills, strategies, and ideas to be shared with newer organizers. It also allows community members who have been served by dual power projects to take an active role in organizing by becoming party members and participating in the continued growth of base building strategy. It ensures that there are formal processes for educating communities in communist theory and praxis, and also enables them to act and organize in accordance with their own local conditions. We also must recognize that the current state of the base building movement precludes the possibility of such a national unified party in the present moment. Since base building strategy is being undertaken in a number of already established organizations, it is not likely that base builders would abandon these organizations in favor of founding a unified party. Additionally, it would not be strategic to immediately undertake such complete unification because it would mean abandoning the organizational contexts in which concrete gains are already being made and in which growth is currently occurring. What is important for base builders to focus on in the current moment is building dual power on a local level alongside building a national movement. This means aspiring towards the possibility of a unified party, while pursuing continued local growth. The movement within the Marxist Center network towards some form of unification is positive step in the right direction. The independent party emphasis within the Refoundation caucus should also be recognized as a positive approach. It is important for base builders to continue to explore the possibility of unification, and to maintain unification through a party model as a long term goal. In the meantime, individual base building organizations ought to adopt party models for their local organizing. Local organizations ought to be building dual power alongside recruitment into their organizations, education of community members in communist theory and praxis, and the establishment of armed and militant party cadres capable of defending dual power institutions from state terror.

## 2

#### We endorse the resolution through the pedagogical model of the aff except for use of the term “settler”

#### The term ‘settler’, and settler colonial studies, totalize Indigenous experience. Only utilizing Indigenous words for ‘settlers’ can provide deeper insights into the violence of colonization. This is a requirement for ‘settlers’ to change their relationships and re-center the discussion.

Corey SNELGROVE ET AL. 14, University of British Columbia; Rita Kaur Dhamoon, University of Victoria; and Jeff Corntassel, University of Victoria [“Unsettling settler colonialism: The discourse and politics of settlers, and solidarity with Indigenous nations,” *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, Vol. 3, No. 2, 2014, p. 1-32, http://decolonization.org/index.php/des/article/view/21166/17970]

Jeff: If you think about it, the most effective times I’ve used the term settler have been in spaces where folks are most resistant to it. And then it creates these tensions, but it also creates these great conversations about what is their role and responsibilities. I think folks become complacent with the term. There are several Indigenous words for settlers that provide deeper insights into the violence and destructiveness of historic and ongoing colonization. For example, yonega is a Tsalagi (Cherokee) term for white settlers, which connotes “foam of the water; moved by wind and without its own direction; clings to everything that’s solid.” Wasicu is a Dakota term for settlers, which means “taker of fat.” In the northwest, hwunitum is a Hul’qumi’num and SENĆOŦEN word for settler, that some have described as “the hungry people”. None of the above terms are positive reflections of settler society and represent the lived experiences of Indigenous nations amidst settler occupation. Often hearing that the word settler is offensive to some people or polarizing, I find that using Indigenous words to describe settler relationships can help to re-center the discussion and potential actions of solidarity back into community. Just as it is a challenge for Cherokees to be welcomed into another nation’s territory as strangers, there is an urgent need for settlers to change their current relationships with the local Indigenous nations on whose territory they reside. If this is not the relationship one wants to embody, whether as yonega or hwunitum or any number of Indigenous terms for settler, then the impetus is on the settler to change the nature of the relationship by taking direction from Indigenous nations themselves. The ultimate goal is to create the need for a new word or phrase to describe positive features of a settler-Indigenous relationship. Corey: We’ve had similar conversations about this Jeff. And I think there is great potential in using Indigenous terms. It literally makes that Indigenous nation known to the settler, challenging the lie of Indigenous disappearance. It also reminds me of that scene on the train in France in Black Skin, White Masks, where Fanon identifies the enemy and makes himself known. And although the deployment of ‘settler’ certainly identifies the enemy (to me that is its function), it fails to make the Indigenous nation known. So, what you’re talking about Jeff, this sort of counter-performative and thereby transformative demand, is often obscured by the definitions alone, especially when they are taken out of context, as well as by settler colonial studies, through their representation of settler colonialism as transhistorical and inevitable. I think this is at least partially attributed to the overshadowing of Indigenous peoples’ articulations – their own accounts of Indigenous-settler relations, their own governance, legal and diplomatic orders. This then also stresses the importance of centering Indigenous resurgence to avoid the further disavowal of colonization and colonial fatalism, as well as to inform decolonization efforts.

## Case

#### Presumption – what does this aff do – they say we have to disagree with the resolution but they don’t even defend it.

#### 2 – they have not made a ballot argument, no new ones in the 1ar – why is the ballot key to solve their impacts

#### Stop it – this is a procedural – you lose- non indigenous setcol is violent and makes debate exclusive which is a prereq to engagement

Brough ’17 Taylor Brough <https://resistanceanddebate.wordpress.com/2017/03/23/open-letter-to-non-black-native-people-in-debate/> (won CEDA in 2016, debated for Vermont)//Elmer

I am here preoccupied with our enunciative capacities in debate—with what I perceive “Native debate,” and specifically non-Black Native debaters, to be doing in service of Settler/Master (mis)recognition, what the consequences of such doing might be, and what it might mean to push against the disciplining force of recognition in debate. The ontological fact of genocide/sovereignty as a dual positioning for Native people, coupled with academia’s push to identify ourselves at the site of (coherent and recognizable) trauma (what Wilderson terms “intra-human conflicts”), has led Native thought in debate, broadly, to do three related things: 1) prioritize the coherent discussion of sovereign loss over one of genocide and its incoherence, 2) articulate ourselves as always in conversation with (read: traumatized by) the Settler, 3) distance ourselves from a Black/Red conversation or from Black/Red theorizing. These three moves are all antiblack in addition to being an insidious manifestation of the genocide that structures half of our (non?)being. Depressingly, if we were to historicize “Native debate,” we would have to begin with a litany of non-Native debaters reading “Give Back the Land,” offering sovereignty as a solution to a tragic history of genocide that relegates Native people to phobic/phillic objects of the past whose futures are in the hands of those Settlers who bravely dare to talk about them. The terrain in which everyone can become Native—or at least become an advocate for Natives—is a cleared landscape produced by genocide but also, significantly, produced by antiblack slavery. This history of non-Native debaters’ representations of sovereignty, land repatriation, and treaty rights as the only solution to genocide also reaches into the present. What is most disturbing to me about this ongoing history is that we have yet to tie virtually any debate round to actual, material land repatriation, sovereign gains, or the upholding of treaty rights. These material gains involve labor from Native people organizing at the grassroots level, not an academic labor from Settlers. Debate arguments do not facilitate sovereign benefits for Native peoples. Further, the struggle for sovereignty itself does not overcome or solve genocide. The removal of the Hunkpapa Lakota Oyate and their relatives at the Oceti Sakowin camp at Standing Rock should be proof enough of this—sovereignty as a politic is often met with, rather than resolving, genocidal violence. Non-Black Native people in debate have performed a similar land-based politic. Native debate has become so associated with words like “land,” “sovereignty,” “space,” “place,” “treaty rights,” and others, that it is almost impossible to theorize Native debate absent sovereignty as a grammar that marks our existence. So both non-Native debaters (who claim to advocate for Native peoples’ sovereignty) and Native debaters (who claim to advocate for something that usually falls into the grammar of sovereignty) are talking in essentially the same register, with incredibly limited slippage towards genocide as a vector of violence. And, for Native people, like non-Natives, debate arguments do not and cannot facilitate the material elements of decolonization that these land-based arguments frequently rely upon. Sovereign gains don’t happen in debate rounds, but for some reason the (mis)recognition of Native enunciation as sovereignty persists, in that the word “land” harkens to Native debate in almost every instance, that almost every debate involving Native people reading perceptibly “Native” arguments includes a discussion of “treaties” or “sovereignty” or “land-based pedagogy” or “spatiality.” What other reason could this be than a structure of desire around recognition from the Settler/Master? If we really follow the history of how “Nativeness” has been misrepresented in debate by Settlers, it becomes clear that much of contemporary Native debate, strangely (or as I argue, not so strangely), mimics these misrepresentations. Of course, debate is an economy of (mis)recognition. That “Native” becomes coextensive with “land” in debate is no accident. It is an enunciation that has been evoked prior to the involvement of any Native debaters or coaches. And it is reiterated by non-Black Native debaters with increasing certainty about the truthiness of Native relationships to the land. Systematically absent from this conversation, of course, is a discussion of genocide. I have gestured above towards the ways that the desire for recognition from the Settler/Master motivates this conceptual move towards the register of sovereignty. As Wilderson writes, “The crowding out, or disavowal, of the genocide modality [by the sovereign modality] allows the Settler/’Savage’ struggle to appear as a conflict rather than as an antagonism. This has therapeutic value for both the ‘Savage’ and the Settler: the mind can grasp the fight, conceptually put it into words. To say, ‘You stole my land and pilfered and appropriated my culture’ and then produce books, articles, and films that travel back and forth along the vectors of those conceptually coherent accusations is less threatening to the integrity of the ego, than to say,- ‘You culled me down from 19 million to 250,000.’”[4] This gesture towards conceptual coherence and therapeutic value is why there is a celebrated and ongoing association between “land” and “Native” in both non-Native argumentation and in arguments made by Native people. It is why we cannot theorize about Native debate absent the contingent register of sovereignty. I am hesitant to claim that sovereignty should be completely abandoned as an analytic for obvious reasons—I think Wilderson also gives credit to indigenous conceptions of sovereignty, what it unseats, and how it operates, while still articulating a critique of sovereignty unrivaled by much of Native studies. I am not interested in suggesting that all Native people ignore our peoples’ land relationships or histories of broken treaties as politic throughout the United States or the world. I agree with Qwo-Li Driskill’s suggestion, alongside similar ones from other Native theorists, that sovereignty must be re-theorized significantly rather than echoing the propertied enterprise that confers legibility to state formations. Regardless of my reluctance to disavow the potential for sovereignty as a politic outside debate rounds, I think it is obvious that sovereignty in its terms in debate—as a recognized and fundamentally “Native” utterance—is genocidal and anti-Black. Broadly, my argument is that genocide is an undertheorized arm of an antagonism that halfway positions Native people, and that the basis of such undertheorization is the desire to be (mis)recognized as nearly-Human by the Settler. This claim invites an investigation of the context of (mis)recognition in debate and what is particular about debate itself with regard to Wilderson’s theory of position.

#### Thinking indigeneity through ontology is violent and ignores opportunities for resistance in modernity---prefer nuanced historical readings via the alt

David Bond 14, Associate Director of the Center for the Advancement of Public Action @ Bennington College, and Lucas Bessire, assistant professor, Department of Anthropology @ Oklahoma, 2-28-2014, “The Ontological Spin,” <https://culanth.org/fieldsights/494-the-ontological-spin>, modified for ableist language

At the risk of oversimplifying a diverse body of research, here we ask how the ontological turn works as a problematic form of speculative futurism. While the symmetrical future it conjures up is smart, the turbulent present it holds at bay is something we would still like to know more about. Our skepticism derives from our respective fieldwork on the co-creation of indigenous alterity and on how the lively materiality of hydrocarbons is recognized. In both of these sites, we have documented dynamics that elude and unsettle the ontological script. Much, we would argue, is missed. We are troubled at how ontological anthropology defers thorny questions of historical specificity, the social afterlives of anthropological knowledge, and the kinds of difference that are allowed to matter. We are also concerned by the ultimate habitability of the worlds it conjures. Or consider nature and culture. In many places today, nature and culture matter not as the crumbling bastions of a modern cosmology (e.g., Latour 2002; Blaser 2009) but as hardening matrices for sorting out what forms of life must be defended from present contingencies and what must be set adrift. That is, nature and culture matter not as flawed epistemologies but as dispersed political technologies. Ontological anthropology is fundamentally a story about the Amazonian primitive. It rests on the recent discovery of a non-modern “multinaturalist” ontology within indigenous myths (Viveiros de Castro 1998). Yet, as Terry Turner (2009) shows, the figure of this “Amerindian cosmology” is based on ethnographic misrepresentation. Kayapó myths, for instance, do not collapse nature/culture divides. Rather, the “whole point” is to describe how animals and humans became fully differentiated from one another, with one key twist: humanity is defined not as a collection of traits but as the capacity to objectify the process of objectification itself. In such ways, the attribution of this hyper-real cosmology paradoxically reifies the very terms of the nature/culture binary it is invoked to disprove. At the very least, this means that ontological anthropology cannot account for those actually existing forms of indigenous worlding that mimetically engage modern binaries as meaningful coordinates for self-fashioning (Taussig 1987; Abercrombie 1998). This is certainly true in the case of recently-contacted Ayoreo-speaking peoples in the Gran Chaco. Ayoreo projects of becoming are not a cosmology against the state, but a set of moral responses to the nonsensical contexts of colonial violence, soul-collecting missionaries, radio sound, humanitarian NGOs, neoliberal economic policies, and rampant ecological devastation (Bessire 2014). Only by erasing these conditions could a “non-interiorizable” multinaturalist exteriority be identified. Doesn’t this suggest that ontological anthropology is predicated on homogenizing and standardizing the very multiplicity it claims to decolonize? What does it mean if ontological anthropology, in its eagerness to avoid the overdetermined dualism of nature/culture, reifies the most modern binary of all: the radical incommensurability of modern and non-modern worlds? Charged with getting nature wrong, modernity is rejected out of hand in the ontological turn. While the West mistook Nature for an underlying architecture, indigenous people have long realized a more fundamental truth: the natural world is legion and lively. Yet this supposed distinction between modernity (mononaturalism) and the rest (multinaturalism) seems strangely ~~illiterate~~ [dismissive] of more nuanced accounts of the natural world within capitalist modernity (Williams 1980; Mintz 1986; Mitchell 2002). Attributing the pacification of nature’s vitality to the modern episteme neglects how colonial plantations, industrial farms and factories, national environmental policies, biotechnology companies, and disaster response teams have attempted, in creative and coercive ways, to manage the dispersed agencies of the natural world. The easy dismissal of modernity as mononaturalism disregards the long list of ways that particular format never really mattered in the more consequential makings of our present. It is all the more ironic, then, that ontological anthropology uses climate change to spur a conversion away from the epistemic cage of modernity. We would do well to remember that, in the most concrete sense, modernity did not disrupt our planet’s climate, hydrocarbons did. Such fixation on modernity misses the far more complicated and consequential materiality of fossil fuels (Bond 2013). In the momentum they enable and in the toxicity they enact, hydrocarbons naturalize differences in new ways. Such petro-effects amplify existing fault lines not only in industrial cities but also in the premier fieldsites of ontological anthropology: the supposedly pristine hinterlands. In the boreal forests of the northern Alberta or in the upper reaches of the Amazon Basin or in the snowy expanses of the arctic or in the dusty forests of the Gran Chaco, the many afterlives of hydrocarbons are giving rise to contorted landscapes, cancerous bodies, and mutated ecologies. Such problems form a “slow violence” (Nixon 2011) that the spirited naturalism of ontological anthropology cannot register let alone resist. These observations lead us to formulate the following three theses: First, the ontological turn replaces an ethnography of the actual with a sociology of the possible. Second, the ontological turn reifies the wreckage of various histories as the forms of the philosophic present, insofar as it imagines colonial and ethnological legacies as the perfect kind of village for forward thinking philosophy. Finally, the ontological turn formats life for new kinds of rule premised on a narrowing of legitimate concern and a widening of acceptable disregard, wherein the alter-modern worlds discovered by elite scholars provides redemptive inhabitation for the privileged few, while the global masses confront increasingly sharp forms and active processes of inequality and marginalization

(Beck 1992; Harvey 2005; Appadurai 2006; Wacquant 2009; Stoler 2010; Agier 2011; Fassin 2012). In conclusion, we argue that it is misleading to suggest anthropology must choose between the oppressive dreariness of monolithic modernity or the fanciful elisions of the civilization to come. Both options leave us flat-footed and ill-equipped to deal with the conditions of actuality in our troubled present (Fischer 2013; Fortun 2013). Instead, we insist on a shared world of unevenly distributed problems. This is a world of unstable and rotational temporalities, of semiotic and material ruptures, of unruly things falling apart and being reassembled. It is a world composed of potentialities but also contingencies, of becoming but also violence, wherein immanence is never innocent of itself (Biehl 2005; Martin 2009). In this world, we ask how the wholesale retreat to the ideal future may discard the most potent mode of anthropological critique; one resolutely in our present but not necessarily confined to it.

#### It is the responsibility of settlers to tie their politics to place as the baseline for decolonization.

Sium et al 12

(Aman Sium, Chandni Desai, Eric Ritskes, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, Sium identifies as being Tigrinya, indigenous, African, and Eritrean, Ritskes is Zhaganash, Towards the ‘tangible unknown’: Decolonization and the Indigenous future, Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society ¶ Vol. 1, No. 1, 2012, pp. I-XIII, JKS)

Decolonization does not exist without a framework that centers and privileges Indigenous life, community, and epistemology. In that regards, it becomes vitally important, despite our goals of understanding and promoting a global Indigenous undertaking, to center and recognize the local settler colonial contexts on which we, as authors, are situated. As we write this, we are on unceded Haudenosaunee and Mississauga land. We do not state this to signal a particular understanding of the complexity of issues, resistance and life that this statement entails, nor in belief of an (perceived and imposed) alliance with Anishinaabeg peoples. Too often talk of ¶ solidarity and alliance gets co-opted in these ways, as ‘magic words’ to state and dispense with complexity, not understanding why they are said or what responsibility and action they might entail. We state these words as a contestation of colonial logic that, as Andrea Smith (2006) notes, “holds that Indigenous people must disappear. In fact, they must always be disappearing, in order to allow non-Indigenous peoples rightful claim over the land” (p. 68). The history of settler colonialism is one of displacement and replacement and we are each implicated in this. We state these words in recognition of the Anishinaabeg peoples’ continued right to this land, to sovereignty, and indeed, their right to exist beyond the often fetishized historical memory of settler colonialism. We do not need to state this to make it true, it simply is. ¶ It is important to recognize this particular history of colonialism, and subsequent (temporary) interruption of sovereignty, because it affects each of us. There is no escaping complicity within a settler colonial state, especially for those of us who have settled here, though complicity looks different for each of us. Complicity cannot be collapsed into simple and neat categories without historicizing the political legacy of colonialism and the way in which it manifested and continues to manifest itself both here and across the globe. It is important to consider the process and logics of colonial modernity and white supremacy, the way in which Europeans defined and classified people – as human and non-human – and then used this as a basis to conquer land and subjugate populations through enslaving, indenturing in labour, genociding and warring (Wynter, 2003, Smith, 2006). It is crucial to consider the particularities of forced movement and involuntary migrations of various diasporas and their distinction from (European) settlers that colonized and settled various lands for the purpose of capitalist expansion rooted in notions and the epistemology of “possessive individualism” (Mohanram, 1999). ¶ That being said, for those who have settled here, we have a history of interruption to recognize and rectify; as Waziyatawin (in this issue) notes, Indigenous peoples recognized, from the beginning, how Western thought and presence displaced and endangered Indigenous ways of knowing and relationships to the earth, as well as the earth itself. We have a responsibility to honor the Indigenous ‘laws of the land’ and to restore right relationships. Often the call for sustainability and ecological responsibility is framed from a settler vantage point, in belief that “this land is your land, this land is my land” so we must take care of it. For those of us who are not Indigenous to Turtle Island, we must recognize our particular responsibility to this land and its stewards.

All of this is interwoven into this work and our beginning point. ¶ As such, the starting point of decolonization is not a rejection of colonialism. Rather than replace the dominant with the marginalized, or as Fanon (1968) puts it, make it so “the last shall be first and the first last” (p. 37), the decolonizing project seeks to reimagine and rearticulate power, change, and knowledge through a multiplicity of epistimologies, ontologies and axiologies. Decolonization cannot take place without contestation. It must necessarily push back against the colonial relations of power that threaten Indigenous ways of being. Alfred (2009b) and others have suggested that decolonization can only be “achieved through the resurgence of an Indigenous consciousness *channeled into contention with colonialism*” (p. 48; emphasis ¶ added). Indigenous knowledges are the starting point for resurgence and decolonization, are the medium through which we engage in the present, and are the possibility of an Indigenous future. Without this power base, decolonization becomes a domesticated industry of ideas. Decolonization is not always about the co-existence of knowledges, nor knowledge synthesis, which inevitably centers colonial logic. Whiteness does not ‘play well with others’ but, rather, fragments and marginalizes - so it must be asked: Co-existence at what cost and for whose benefit? Decolonization necessarily unsettles. In the face of the beast of colonialism, thirsty for the blood of Indigeneity and drunk on conquest, assimilation is submission and decolonization calls on those who will “beat the beast into submission and teach it to behave” (Alfred, 2009a, p. 37).

#### Settler colonial theories fracture solidarity by foreclosing shared histories of oppression in favor of an over-determined, essentialized structuralism.

Joanne BARKER 17, Professor of American Indian Studies at San Francisco State University, former Visiting Scholar in the American Indian Studies Program of the Inter-American Cultures Institute at UCLA, has received fellowships from the University of California, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the Ford Foundation, self-identifies as an enrolled member of the Delaware Tribe of Indians, holds a Ph.D. in the History of Consciousness from the University of California-Santa Cruz [“The Analytic Constraints of Settler Colonialism,” *Tequila Sovereign*, February 2, 2017, https://tequilasovereign.wordpress.com/2017/02/02/the-analytic-constraints-of-settler-colonialism/]

I’d like to re-frame my critique of the constraints of settler colonialism with the twelve little women in mind. I am going to try to show that a certain analytic within the studies has, however unwittingly, foreclosed and even chilled understandings of Black and Indigenous histories and identities in ways that derail our understandings of U.S. imperialism as a social formation and so our work with one another. One of the consequences of this goes to our ability to think through how #BlackLivesMatter, #SayHerName, #NoDAPL, and #MMIW are co-generative — even as I recognize the reasons why each of these movements have at different times demanded we respect their particularity. Drawing from Marxist structuralism, Patrick Wolfe defines the settler colonial society through two key differentiations. The first is between the structure and the event of invasion. Wolfe maintains that the permanence of invasion distinguishes the structure of a settler society, which originates with the withdrawal of the empire and the rise to power of a land-holding class who always intended to stay. Wolfe defines the ideology that cements this structure together as the logic of elimination. The settler exploits Indigenous labor but more importantly seeks to eliminate all vestiges of Indigenous land claims by the elimination of Indigenous cultures and identities. The quickest way I can explain my concerns with Wolfe’s definition is to mark how it rearticulates the problematics of structuralism. It treats society as a fixed, coherent thing that can be objectively described. The descriptions are simultaneously over‑determined by the historical event of the empire’s withdrawal and the exceptionalism of a permanent invasion. We’ve been in this trouble before – we know structuralism generates all kinds of ahistorical and apolitical problems, not to mention essentialisms, even as it is conditioned by the intersectionalities of originary events and political identities. For instance, Lorenzo Veracini argues that settler colonialism is “characterized by a settler capacity to control the population economy” as a marker of sovereignty and that this situation is “associated with a particular state of mind” and “narrative form” so powerful that “the possibility of ultimately discontinuing/decolonizing settler colonial forms remains problematic.” Veracini maintains that “settlers do not discover: they carry their sovereignty and lifestyles with them. As they move towards what amounts to a representation of the world, as they transform the land into their image, they settle another place without really moving.” I would argue that the settler colonial is a contested and unstable concept. Drawing from critical Indigenous, race, and feminist approaches — such as those developed by Jodi Byrd, Mishuana Goeman, Jennifer Denetdale, and Elle-Máijá Tailfeathers — that understand colonialism, racism, sexism, and homophobia as permanent features of U.S. society, I would argue that society is not an objectively settled structure to be described, nor an imaginary that travels as an integral whole around the world. It is a set of contested meanings caught up in struggles over power and knowledge. And resistance is most certainly not futile. The second differentiation on which Wolfe’s settler colonialism rests is between the settler and the Indigenous. While many assume the settler to be white – and perhaps more so to be a white heterosexual male – Wolfe, Veracini, and others characterize the settler as both white and all other non-Indigenous people irrespective of gender and sexuality. Pressed on the politics of such characterizations, particularly of figuring Blacks as settlers, Wolfe explains: Willingly or not, enslaved or not, at the point of a run or not, they arrived as part of the settler-colonial project. That doesn’t make them settlers in the same sense as the colonizers who coerced them to participate—of course not—but it does make them perforce part of the settler-colonial process of dispossession and elimination. — Patrick Wolfe (2012) As the work of Circe Sturm, Tiya Miles, Sharon Patricia Holland, and so many others have demonstrated, Black and Indigenous histories and identities (not necessarily distinct) are intersectional messes of racialized and gendered contestation over and within the ongoing colonial forces of U.S. imperialism. We need their analyses to understand these histories and identities and the ways we have inherited them. We need to be careful about grouping all racial, ethnic, diaspora, and immigrant communities in with settlers and pitting them and their presumably shared struggles for civil rights against Indigenous sovereignty