Settlers, workers, and the logic of accumulation by dispossession

Englert, S.P.

A Radical Journal of Geography
ANTIPODE

Settlers, Workers, and the Logic of Accumulation by Dispossession

Sai Englert

Institute for Area Studies, Leiden University, Leiden, The Netherlands;
s.p.englert@hum.leidenuniv.nl

Abstract: This article offers a critique of the Wolfe-an model, which has become so dominant within contemporary Settler Colonial Studies (SCS). It focuses particularly on the central claim made by Patrick Wolfe, and others after him, that settler colonialism is categorically differentiated from other forms of colonialism by its drive to "eliminate the native", instead of exploiting them. This paper builds on the literature that shows how settler colonies have used elimination as well as exploitation in their relations with indigenous peoples—even transitioning from one to the other. Instead, the paper argues that focusing on accumulation by dispossession allows for an analysis of the specificity of settler social relations to emerge. It highlights the specific ways in which settlers collectively expropriate indigenous peoples and struggle amongst different settler classes over the distribution of the colonial loot.

Keywords: settler colonialism, labour, accumulation, dispossession, primitive accumulation, Zionism, Palestine

It has become customary to start discussions of settler colonialism—those colonial processes organised around the "presence of a settler population intent on making a territory their permanent home while continuing to enjoy metropolitan living standards and political privileges" (Elkins and Pedersen 2005:2)—by engaging with Patrick Wolfe, whose work has defined much of the emergence of Settler Colonial Studies (SCS) as a separate academic field. Wolfe and others after him, primarily Lorenzo Veracini, his self-styled intellectual successor, analysed settler colonialism as structural, eliminatory, and land based, which—they argued—distinguish it from franchise colonialism, which is based on the exploitation of the native population instead.

Yet this approach, as a number of authors have discussed (see for example Kelley 2017; Speed 2017), in its efforts to analyse the specificities of settler colonialism, has ended up limiting its scope unduly. Numerous settler societies were built on the exploitation of indigenous peoples, and therefore on their social reproduction, particularly in the South American and African continents. By assuming that exploitation, by definition, lays outside the realm of its field of study, SCS has privileged the analysis of the Anglo-settler world—primarily North America and Oceania. These privileged case studies have further reinforced Wolfe-an assumptions given these settler states' primary focus on eliminatory practices.

Antipode Vol. 52 No. 6 2020 ISSN 0066-4812, pp. 1647–1666 doi: 10.1111/anti.12659

In an attempt to contribute to the broadening of the field and challenging some of its limiting assumptions, this paper proposes to move away from the stark counter-posing of elimination and exploitation in the study of settler societies. Instead, it turns towards a study of the specificities of social relations in settler societies as a way to understand how policies of exploitation and/or elimination are selected and imposed on indigenous populations. Furthermore, it attempts to show that a closer look at these social relations also helps make sense of the way in which settler labour movements actively participate in, and profit from, the processes of indigenous dispossession.

In the first section ("The Wolfe-an Model"), this paper will start by discussing the intellectual contribution made by Wolfe and built upon by Veracini, before raising concerns with its focus on the logic of elimination being a defining characteristic of the settler colonial form. The paper will show how this focus on elimination alone in the Wolfe-an model has limited the scope of SCS by focusing chiefly on North American and Oceanic Anglo-Saxon settlements. Engaging with existing critiques of the Wolfe-an model in the second section ("An Alternative Reading: Settler Colonies and the Exploitation of the Native"), the paper will emphasise the relevance of exploitation of indigenous labour in other settler contexts, chiefly on the African and South American continents.

The article will then move on, in the third section ("Accumulation by Dispossession, Settler Colonialism, and the Capitalist Transition"), to propose an alternative reading of settler colonialism by mobilising the concept of accumulation by dispossession, as developed by David Harvey (2003). It will argue that what makes settler colonialism, whether eliminatory or not, different from other colonial or capitalist societies, are its specific social relations, and especially its distribution of colonial loot amongst all settler classes.

Indeed, as the fourth section ("Settler Accumulation and Settler Quietism") will show, in settler colonial societies, internal settler class struggle is fought not only over the distribution of wealth extracted from settler labour, but also over the distribution of the loot accumulated through the dispossession of the indigenous population. The outcome of settler class struggle, fought between settler classes and against indigenous peoples, plays an important role in shaping the specific nature of the settler colonial regime—through elimination and/or exploitation. This process is a conscious one and ties settler labour movements to the settler colonial state. It also helps explain their centrality in campaigns for greater exclusion of indigenous workers in different settler colonial contexts, such as South Africa and Palestine. This paper will then illustrate this process with two brief case studies about the Zionist movement in Palestine, in the fifth section ("Case Studies").

Through his approach the paper makes a direct contribution to the growing body of literature that engages both with settler colonialism and SCS, by offering a framework for the analysis of settler social relations. This in turn lays the foundation for a potential de-centring of the Anglo-Saxon settler colonial experience as well as for a greater engagement with the ways in which settler colonialism interacts with colonialism and capitalism more generally.

Finally, a last word is necessary about the absence in this paper of a detailed engagement with indigenous resistance to the process of dispossession, especially given the important concerns raised by scholars about the disappearing place of Indigenous agency in SCS (see for example Bhandar and Ziadah 2016). This is a matter of space and focus on the limitations of the Wolfe-an concept of elimination, rather than an epistemological choice. It will be necessary in the future, and in longer publications, to include indigenous resistance as central in continuously limiting, redirecting, and frustrating settler attempts to dispossess, exploit, and/or eliminate.

The Wolfe-an Model

SCS (re)emerged with the publication of Wolfe's (1999) *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology*. (Re)emerged because while it framed the study of settler colonialism as a new academic approach, it is important to note that the study of settler colonialism (rather than the academic field of SCS) has a much longer genealogy. For example, the understanding of Palestinian dispossession and colonisation by the Zionist movement and the Israeli state as settler colonial was well established in the publications of the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO) decades ago (see for example Jabbour 1970; Sayegh 2012), as well as in the academic output of Palestinian thinkers such as Edward Said (1979). In fact, "the logic of elimination", as Rana Barakat (2018) points out, was already theorised in the 1970s by Rosemary Sayigh's (2007) *The Palestinians: From Peasants to Revolutionaries*.

In his book, Wolfe (1999:3) explained that settler colonies "were (are) premised on the elimination of the native societies. The split tensing reflects a determinate feature of settler colonisation. The colonizers come to stay—invasion is a structure not an event". Wolfe (2006:393) re-iterated his approach in a seminal essay, "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native": "settler colonialism is an inclusive, land-centred project that coordinates a comprehensive range of agencies, from the metropolitan centre to the frontier encampment, with a view to eliminating Indigenous societies". These lines, subsequently quoted *ad nauseam* by other authors, served as a foundational definition in the emergence of SCS as a distinct academic discipline. Wolfe's definitions captured three key aspects of the (re)emerging field: because settler colonialism is about the control of land, it is ongoing, eliminatory, and structural.

First, settler colonialism is an ongoing reality. Against the view that sees the process of settlement ending with the closing of the frontier, Wolfe identified settler colonialism as un-finished. The policies of United States, Canadian, or Australian governments, for example, towards indigenous populations, and the regular militarised clashes over access to natural resources on and in treaty land, are some of the contemporary forms of expansion and elimination on which settler colonialism is premised.

Elimination is the second tenant of this model. Settler colonies differ from franchise colonies through the fact that settlers "come to stay", making the competition for land, for living space, and for resources a key aspect of the settler colonial

process. Furthermore, the presence of indigenous populations constitutes a direct challenge to recurrent settler claims of indigeneity, of having found the land empty (the *terra nullius* paradigm), or of Divine Ordination. This drives settlers, argues Wolfe, to eliminate the natives through a series of practices ranging from genocide to miscegenation.

It is important to point out here also, that the very categories of "settler" and "indigenous" should not be understood as pre-existing and immutable realties, nor should they be understood as universal or stable across time and place. Instead, these are political categories, created, institutionalised and policed always anew. Indeed, as Mamdani (2015:2–3) points out, the "native is the creation of the colonial state: colonised, the native is pinned down, localized, thrown out of civilization as an outcast, confined to custom, and then defined as its product". It is therefore through the process of dispossession, displacement, exploitation and/or elimination that the indigenous and the settler are made and reproduced—the former as its target and the latter as its beneficiary.

Mamdani (2015:3–4) observes: "When does a settler become a native? … [N]ever. The only emancipation possible for settler and native is for both to cease to exist as political identities". It is a similar insight that leads Yellowknives Dene scholar Glen Coulthard (2014), discussed further below, to point out the perpetual need for settler societies to define themselves in opposition to indigenous populations, despite simultaneous attempts to eliminate their collective claim over the land.

To this should be added other populations that do not fit easily within either category. This is most strikingly true, as discussed by Byrd (2011), Vimalassery et al. (2016) or Kelley (2017), in the case of enslaved African populations in the Americas, which are neither settlers afforded the right to exploit, expropriate and/or eliminate the indigenous populations, nor part of the indigenous population whose claim over the land is to be undone. While Kelley's (2017) insistence on their indigeneity in Africa as the original factor making enslavement possible is crucial, it is also true that the regimes of racialisation, exploitation, and/or elimination that these populations face are always different from, if related to, that of indigenous populations in the lands in which they are enslaved (on this later point, see for example Kauanui 2017; Lowe 2015).

Third, Wolfe's definition posits settler colonialism as a holistic structure rather than a series of discreet events, which leads him, and SCS after him, to develop a global analysis of settler colonialism. This approach challenges the vision of settler colonial expansion as a series of discrete (or even accidental) encounters between settlers and indigenous populations, which lead—through disease, mutual rejection, or misunderstanding—to the eventual disappearance of the natives.

These characteristics are held as defining an absolute division between settler and franchise colonialism. Wolfe (1999:1–2) writes: "In contrast to the kind of colonial formation that Cabral or Fanon confronted settler colonies were not primarily established to extract surplus value from indigenous labour. Rather, they are premised on displacing indigenes from (or replacing them on) the land". Here a contradiction already emerges, to which this chapter will return below: Fanon was writing from the Algerian context—a French settler colony, which—as Wolfe

rightly points out, despite missing the implications of his observation—depended on the exploitation of indigenous labour.

In his theoretical overview of SCS, Veracini (2010:34) echoes Wolfe when he writes that "while the suppression of indigenous and exogenous alterities characterises both colonial and settler colonial formations, the former can be summarised as domination for the purpose of exploitation, the latter as domination for the purpose of transfer". Five years later, he states as one of his four fundamental principles of settler colonialism that "settler colonialism is not colonialism" (Veracini 2015:6, 27, 40). Despite this categorical separation, in seemingly contradictory statements, Veracini (2015:26, 27, 40) acknowledges that "[c]olonial and settler colonial forms are also intertwined in any actual situation, and a determination to exploit indigenous 'Others' is always mixed with a will to displace them". He then returns to his original premise that "the analytical distinction between colonial and settler colonial forms should be emphasised, because in the case of colonialism what is reproduced is a relationship, a fundamentally unequal one, while in the case of settler colonialism, what is reproduced is a biopolitical entity" and, even more emphatically, "colonialism and settler colonialism should be interpreted as antithetical modes of domination, even if they always interact and overlap in complex and fluid ways in the real world".

Wolfe and Veracini draw a sharp analytical separation, between settler colonies as eliminatory formations and franchise colonies as exploitative ones. Yet it is difficult to see how this approach reflects the realities of franchise and settler colonial formation. Not only is elimination a continuous reality across the colonial world (see, amongst many others, Davis 2002; Newsinger 2010), it also raises the question of how a body of work that understands the exploitation of indigenous labour as antithetical to the settler colonial experience accounts for such varied cases as South Africa, Algeria, Bolivia or Mexico where the settler colonial economy developed primarily upon the exploitation of indigenous labour.[1]

Despite its insights, it appears that the Wolfe-an model is based on the theorisation of an abstracted "pure" settler colonial model—understood as those settler colonies which aimed at eliminating the indigenous population and replacing it with settlers. It is not clear, however, that this process of abstraction is acknowledged as such. It is instead presented as a material fact, a solid division between franchise and settler colonial realities.

There are however moments when this un-avowed abstraction comes to the fore. For example, Wolfe, in *Land, Labor, and Difference: Elementary Structures of Race*, after discussing the limited use of indigenous labour in Tasmania and the Torres Straight Islands immediately qualifies it by explaining that:

> Although these and other variations are significant and need to be acknowledged, they do not alter the primacy of the dominant pattern, manifest most clearly in the south and east of the continent, *where settler colonialism practically approximated its pure or theoretical form*. (Wolfe 2001:871, emphasis added)

This insistence can lead to odd formulations within SCS. For example, Veracini's (2015) attempt to divide Israeli control over Palestine between settler colonialism in the lands occupied in 1948 and franchise colonialism in the lands occupied in

1967, on the grounds that whereas Palestinians in the former territories where mainly displaced and dispossessed, those in the latter generally remained inside the occupied Palestinian territories (oPt) and were increasingly exploited in Israeli industry. This analysis fails to understand, as Barakat (2018) shows, the continuities between the two phases of Israeli expansion, as well as the shared history of displacement, expropriation, *as well as* exploitation of Palestinians who were brought under Israeli control in either 1948 or 1967. The expansion of settlements across the oPt following the 1967 occupation of the whole of historic Palestine, as well as the ongoing transfer of settlers from inside the Green Line to these settlements, should further underscore the shortcoming of this approach.

Wolfe (2001) similarly attempted to save the model of sharp differentiation between franchise and settler colonialism by arguing that 20th century settler colonial formations should be considered as separate from their predecessors because of their reliance on indigenous labour—which, as we have seen, he theorised as antithetical to the settler colonial paradigm, despite the presence of exploitative processes of indigenous populations by settlers well before the 20th century across, for example, the Americas (see below).

These theoretical moves, however, appear more as attempts to salvage an abstracted model, rather than analytical categories capable of offering satisfactory readings of reality.

An Alternative Reading: Settler Colonies and the Exploitation of the Native

By focusing on an ideal form of settler colonialism, SCS directs much of its analytical focus to the Anglo-Saxon settler colonial world, in particular, to North America and Australia. There are important exceptions, including for example, the excellent collection edited by Elkins and Pedersen (2005), Saranillio's (2013) focus on Asian settler colonisation, or the 2018 special issue of *Settler Colonial Studies* on Algeria (Barclay et al. 2018), but these remain outliers. The near absence of studies of South American or African settler colonies is striking, as has been remarked on by a host of different scholars including Kelley (2017), Vimalassery et al. (2016) and Speed (2017). These authors also make the connection between these silences and the identification of elimination as the specific characteristic of settler colonial regimes.

Kelley (2017:269) points out that the African encounter with settler colonialism was primarily marked by exploitative processes. He demonstrates this not only through the case of enslaved African population, discussed above, but also through the centrality of exploitation in the case of settler colonialism in South Africa. He shows convincingly how, in the construction of white settler social relations in the country, "the expropriation of the native from the land was a fundamental objective, but so was proletarianization. They wanted the land and the labour, but not the people—that is to say, they sought to eliminate stable communities and their cultures of resistance". The attempted elimination of

collective peoplehood, Kelley shows, is here a political goal pursued through exploitation, unsettling the sharp division theorised by Wolfe and Veracini.

Following a similar critique with a focus on South American settler regimes, Speed (2017:784) argues they have remained largely outside of the framework of SCS precisely because Spanish settlers did not *either* exploit or eliminate but did both, in different ways, depending on time and place. The issue of labour *alongside* that of land defines much of these experiences, as does indigenous labour resistance: "In places like Mexico and Central America, such labour regimes … were often the very mechanisms that dispossessed indigenous peoples of their lands, forcing them to labour in extractive undertakings on the very land that had been taken from them".

As these cases show, here are settler colonies that were deeply dependent on the labour of the indigenous population and although displacement and expropriation were definitely a central part of their *modus vivendi*, as was the undermining of collective indigenous claims over the land, so was the exploitation of their labour. Furthermore, as O'Brien (2017) points out, even within SCS' favoured settings, such as North America, the overemphasis on elimination as foundational can have complicated consequences. She points out—alongside others discussed above—that an important distinction should be made between "logics" of political elimination and actual elimination. Failing to do so can overstate the power of settler regimes and fail to capture the ongoing importance of indigenous resistance. O'Brien (2017:254) instead argues that "Indigenous resistance to colonial power … continues to override the logic of elimination".

This critique is not only important in terms of understanding different forms of settler colonial regimes, but also in reflecting on processes of de-colonisation. It is striking, for example, that settler colonies based primarily on the exploitation of the indigenous population more often achieved their independence from both the settler state and the metropolis. Acknowledging this, Mamdani (2015:596) notes that "[f]or students of settler colonialism in the modern era, Africa and America represent two polar opposites. Africa is the continent where settler colonialism has been defeated; America is where settler colonialism triumphed". While taking seriously the unfinished nature of this triumph, pointed out above, and the ongoing nature of indigenous resistance, the difference in outcomes so far can be accounted for through the different treatment by the settler colonial regimes of the indigenous populations.

It was the very dependence of settler colonial regimes in Africa on native labour, which laid the foundation for their destruction. It was the ability of indigenous resistance movements in Algeria and Southern Africa to shut down the settler economy as well as challenge the colonial states militarily that made decolonisation possible.[2] This is also a reality that settlers themselves understood. As Lockman (2012) argues, it was, in part, the example of resistance by indigenous labour in other settler colonial settings, in particular in South Africa, that convinced Labour Zionists in Palestine to reject a model based on the exploitation of the indigenous population and opt for its exclusion instead (see below).

In fact, some scholars, such as Fieldhouse (1982) in his *The Colonial Empires*, made the existing variety of labour regimes central to the study of settler

colonialism. He took the presence of settlers, and the establishment of European societies within the colonial territories, as the determining characteristics of "colonies of settlements" as opposed to "colonies of occupation". Fieldhouse then divided settler colonies in three categories: "pure", "mixed", and "plantation" settlements, which denote, respectively, settler societies based on imported settler labour, those constructed around a significant but minoritarian settler population where indigenous labour continued to play a central role, and those where imported enslaved populations worked on plantations for small settler minorities.

Importantly, Fieldhouse's approach (and that of others after him, such as Shafir 1996) demonstrates the danger of supposing a hermetic separation between different models. Instead, settler colonies have a *variety of different strategies at their disposal, which can include exploitation, elimination, or both*. One strategy can morph into another through such processes as the development of new strategic necessities for the colonial powers, interactions with indigenous resistance, or changing economic relations with the metropolis. Fieldhouse (1982:181) shows how the French colonisation of Algeria started as a colony of occupation in the North of the country. It was only in response to the 1834 Algerian revolt that France annexed more of the country and established French settlements in an attempt to pacify the indigenous peoples. In South Africa, Fieldhouse (1982:188–189) argues that the interaction between Boer and British colonisation, indigenous resistance, and the discovery of precious metal and diamonds in the second half of the 19th century, changed the nature of the settler colonial enterprise from pure to mixed.

The question of labour (and therefore exploitation) is then a crucial aspect in the organisation of settler colonialism. This is true both in terms of the relationship between the settler colonial power and the native populations, but also in terms of social relations within the settler colonial polity. In fact, the labour movement within settler colonies has often been at the forefront of the imposition of racial segregation through colour bars, limits on racialised migration, and "whites-only" policies. The reasons behind this tendency will be discussed in greater detail below, but for now it will suffice to point out that from the late-19th century onwards, white working class movements across the settler colonial world organised over the question of limiting, excluding, or containing the use of indigenous and/or racialised workers. They furthermore rebelled against the settler states, or united with indigenous workers for collective improvement to their labour rights.

In the United States, white workers organised against the competition of African American workers in the aftermath of emancipation, as well as the barring of Chinese migration to California, which successfully passed into law in the late 19th century (see Day 2016; Karuka 2019). Similar campaigns where waged in both South Africa and Australia against the immigration of Asian workers in the early 20th century. In fact, the formation of the Australian Labour Party took place on the basis of taking the "white Australia" campaign into parliament (Hyslop 1999; Shafir 1996). Perhaps the most emblematic example of these labour campaigns for the exclusion of racialised workers is that for the colour bar in South Africa (and later for the imposition of Apartheid) by the white workers' movement. In a

strange mixture of internationalist rhetoric and settler colonial racism the white miners in 1922 raised the slogan: "Workers of the World, Unite and Fight for a White South Africa" (Reddy 2016:101).

In the case of the Zionist colonisation of Palestine, the labour movement even became the social actor behind which the entire settler polity united. As Shafir (1996) has shown, Zionist colonial strategy in Palestine transformed, under the leadership of the Labour Zionist movement in the early decades of the 20th century, from a settler colonial project based primarily on exploited Palestinian labour to one which emphasised their exclusion and reliance on "Hebrew labour" instead. The change was brought about by the campaigns led by the settler labour movement, colonial responses to Palestinian resistance, and the material problems faced by the Zionist movement in attempting to attract new settlers to Palestine.

More will be said about this in the fifth section of this paper. For now it will suffice to point out that the Labour Zionist movement fought for this form of settler organisation against Palestinian workers as well as against settler bosses and their project for a settler economy based on the exploitation—not the elimination—of the natives. The guiding principle of this movement was that to make settlement effective Jewish workers needed to be granted higher wages and living standards, while indigenous workers needed to be excluded from the labour market all together. It is this logic of full separation, that Sayegh (2012:214), described as lying at the root of the Zionist project in Palestine: "[R]acial self-segregation, racial exclusiveness and racial supremacy".

A series of important points emerge from this alternative view of settler colonialism. Firstly, the exclusive Wolfe-an focus on elimination of the native as opposed to exploitation, although of central importance within *some* periods and locales of settler colonialism, does not allow one to develop an effective general axiomatic analysis of the settler colonial form and its social relations. Secondly, the racial organisation of labour—whether settler, enslaved, or indigenous—and the struggle over its organisation between settlers and indigenous populations, as well as between settlers themselves, are a crucial aspect of settler colonialism, both in its eliminatory and/or exploitative forms (on which more below). Thirdly, the participation of settler labour movements in the colonial project, particularly in the process of control and/or expulsion of racialised, enslaved, and/or indigenous population appears as a key characteristic across the settler colonial world.

The task, then, is to account for the specificities of colonial projects that developed around the creation of settler societies without falling into the twin trap of privileging a specific settler colonial strategy, nor building arbitrary analytical walls between different colonial projects. Moreover, if different strategies of control and accumulation are available to settler colonial regimes, a further question arises over the way in which the decision is made to pursue one over the other. In order to address these issues, this paper turns to the concept of accumulation by dispossession. It argues that the specificities of settler colonial social relations emerge from the dispossession of indigenous populations by settlers and the struggle between settler classes over its distribution amongst themselves.

Accumulation by Dispossession, Settler Colonialism, and the Capitalist Transition

In the first volume of *Capital*, Marx (1887) discusses the centrality of colonialism, slavery, and violence (at home and abroad) to the birth of capitalism. He famously wrote:

> The discovery of gold and silver in America, the extirpation, enslavement and entombment in mines of the aboriginal population, the beginning of the conquest and looting of the East Indies, the turning of Africa into a warren for the commercial hunting of black-skins, signalled the rosy dawn of the era of capitalist production. These idyllic proceedings are the chief moments of primitive accumulation. On their heels treads the commercial war of the European nations, with the globe for a theatre.

What Marx was stressing was that the emergence of the rule of capital was a violent and international affair in which new areas, peoples, and resources were forcefully brought under its control or eliminated. Marx highlighted the connection between colonial expansion, racial violence, and capitalist development. A similar observation is made by Byrd (2011:xxiii) more recently when she writes that "[r]acialisation and colonisation have worked simultaneously to other and abject entire peoples so they can be enslaved, excluded, removed, and killed in the name of progress and capitalism".

Central to this process was the simultaneous establishment of private property and the separation of workers from their own means of production and reproduction the world over. This process, Marx discusses as "so-called primitive accumulation"—a concept he borrowed from the classical political economists. The example Marx uses to illustrate this process is the clearing of the commons in England, whereby land, forests, and natural resources, which were previously held to be the common property of all, were privatised. The inhabitants were forced off the land and into the growing urban workshops to sell their labour power (this same process later pushed them towards the settler colonies). Marx showed that far from relying on "silent compulsion", capitalist production needs violent coercion to function, by making any alternative form of subsistence outside of the market unavailable to the working classes.

Building on these insights, David Harvey has pointed out that this process takes place continuously under capitalism, preferring therefore to describe it as "accumulation by dispossession" in order to undermine the idea that it was temporally limited to the origins of capitalism. Harvey (2007:34–35) identifies a series of processes through which this takes place today.

> These include: (1) the commodification and privatisation of land and the forceful expulsion of peasant populations (as in Mexico and India in recent times); (2) conversion of various forms of property rights (common, collective, state, etc.) into exclusively private property rights; (3) suppression of rights to the commons; (4) commodification of labour power and the suppression of alternative (indigenous) forms of production and consumption; (5) colonial, neocolonial, and imperial processes of appropriation of assets (including natural resources); (6) monetisation of exchange and taxation, particularly of land; (7) the slave trade (which continues,

> particularly in the sex industry); and (8) usury, the national debt, and, most devastating of all, the use of the credit system as radical means of primitive accumulation.

This is not to equate the privatisation of the NHS in the UK and the imposition of a pipeline through indigenous land at Standing Rock as *identical*. Neither should this lead to the conclusion that neoliberalism "indigenises us all" (Veracini 2015:93). It is however developing an analytical framework through which both processes can be understood as taking place within the logics of capital.

A growing number of authors have made the link between settler colonialism and primitive accumulation (for example, Coulthard 2014; Harris 2004; Nichols 2017; Simpson 2014). Most important here is Coulthard, already discussed above, who, in his *Red Skins, White Masks*, has emphasised the centrality of primitive accumulation to the settler colonial world and its specific expression in that context. He showed convincingly that in North America primitive accumulation had taken place by eliminating the indigenous population and replacing it with a new—settler—population, which would in turn be submitted to the tyranny of the market in its stead.

It was this attention to settler accumulation that led Coulthard (2014:125) to identify settler colonialism as "territorially acquisitive in perpetuity", thereby complicating, as already pointed out in the first section, the concept of elimination as an outcome rather than a strategy. He further writes:

> In the specific context of Canadian settler-colonialism, although the means by which the colonial state has sought to eliminate Indigenous peoples in order to gain access to our lands and resources have modified over the last two centuries … the ends have always remained the same: to shore up continued access to Indigenous peoples' territories for the purposes of state formation, settlement, and capitalist development. (Coulthard 2014:125)

This approach, by focusing on the aims of settler colonial regimes rather than fetishising its methods, further leaves open an analysis, developed in this paper, of the multiplicity of settler strategies within an overall strategy of accumulation. This can include, as Harris (2004:172) shows within the late 19th century Canadian context, incorporation of indigenous populations into the workforce. If Canadian settler colonialism has pursued "state formation, settlement, and capitalist development" primarily through elimination, other settler states in different contexts could pursue similar goals by different means. It is this point that Kelley (2017) made in relation to South Africa (see above), where settler colonial dispossession removed indigenous populations from the land and forced them into the colonial labour market.

More recently, Nichols (2015, 2017), echoing Harvey and Coulthard, has discussed the importance of considering the relationship between primitive accumulation in the original formation of capitalism and in its later reproduction and spread across the globe, with a specific focus on settler colonial contexts. He argues that the incorporation of indigenous people into the workforce is not a necessity for settler regimes because the colonial process is incorporating their land into an existing global capitalist system, which has already generated surplus

labour in other places. As such labour could be extracted from indigenous people or from settler populations proletarianised in different locales. This approach then also underlines the diversity of strategies available to settler regimes, including exploitation and/or elimination of the natives.

This analysis of accumulation by dispossession, lays the theoretical foundations to approaching contemporary settler colonialism as a process within a broader framework of capitalist accumulation. This can both open up reflections about its specific characteristics as well as its continuities with broader logics of exploitation and/or dispossession.

Settler Accumulation and Settler Quietism

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 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. (2012:83) 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] 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) 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.

Case Studies

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 (1996:155): "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), 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] and the early Zionist militias were all born out of the process of organising this campaign (Lockman 1996). 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). 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.

This approach is not only applicable to historical processes but also contemporary ones. In 2011, an Israeli social movement emerged from a small activist encampment protesting the cost of housing in Tel Aviv into a two and a half month long protest in which hundreds of thousands of people joined demonstrations and square occupations all over the country. The movement was supported by a large majority of Israelis, regardless of political persuasion or ethnic background (Perugorria et al. 2016), as well as by key institutions of the historic Labour Zionist movement, including the Histadrut and the national students' union.

It was an expression of class struggle within the settler population, where the victims of neoliberal economic reforms fought for greater redistribution of wealth. This process was self-consciously an internal one: the movement actively presented itself as made up of loyal, serving, citizens—an impression that was reinforced by the organisations that supported it—while keeping Palestinians and their demands at arm's length. The Palestinian question remained taboo (Honig-Parnass 2011).

The Netanyahu government's response to the movement's demands was to deepen settler dispossession. The question of unaffordable housing could be resolved easily, so the argument went, by expanding settlements. MK Arye Eldad argued that "[t]ens of thousands of Israelis can live in Judea, Samaria [the West Bank] and Jerusalem" (quoted in Harkov 2011). Similar proposals were a

significant current among Israeli politicians. In August 2011, a group of 41 MKs (out of 120), including representatives from the Labour Zionist camp, called on Netanyahu to expand settlement construction in response to the demonstrators' demands. Indeed, governmental initiatives have since focused on developing housing in East Jerusalem on the one hand, and in the Israeli periphery—more specifically within areas with high Palestinian populations, such as the Naqab in the south—on the other.

An interesting episode in the summer of 2015 highlighted this approach. The government was in the process of negotiating a new agreement with the Chinese state over permits for up to 20,000 Chinese construction workers to come to Israel. When criticised, Netanyahu defended the deal on the basis that "the ability to build many apartments, thereby increasing supply, will, in the end, allow us to change price trends" (quoted in Reed 2015). Moshe Kahlon, the then finance minister, also explained that "the plan to bring thousands of Chinese workers into the country is intended to speed up construction work to solve the housing problem and bring down prices" (MEMO 2015). The government's response to the demonstrations has been to provide affordable housing to the settler working class while simultaneously increasing its control over Palestinian land.

A "settler colonial fix" is available to the Israeli elites, through which they can soften the blow of internal inequality through colonial expansion. The state's response to the 2011 social movement's demand for affordable housing through the intensification of indigenous dispossession, and the silent acceptance of this solution by a movement that had gathered such considerable public support, further underscores the claims made by this paper. Settler class struggle is waged over both the distribution of wealth within the settler population, but also over the distribution of the settler colonial loot.

The participation of the settler workers' movement in the process of accumulation by dispossession, through capturing land, resources, and labour, or through the expulsion of the indigenous population is a specific characteristic of settler colonial regimes. Indeed, whereas the theoreticians of accumulation by dispossession, discussed above, understood it as a process directed against workers and peasants, we see here settler workers actively participating in the process and enjoying its spoils. Furthermore, the discussion of this process within the framework of Zionism in Palestine, shows that this struggle takes place both within exploitative (first case study) and eliminatory (second case study) contexts. It is in part through this internal struggle over the distribution of the settler colonial loot, alongside the struggle against the indigenous population, that the nature of the settler colonial regime is determined, as discussed in the first case study, which described the shift in the process of settler accumulation from exploiting the indigenous population to attempting to eliminate it.

Conclusion

Two observations emerge from this paper. Firstly, a number of different strategies of control and wealth extraction are available for settler colonial regimes. These cannot be accurately or helpfully described as being based on the elimination of

the natives *alone*, as done by Wolfe and those ascribing to his paradigm. Indeed, this paper has built on existing literature that shows how many settler colonies—notably in Africa and Latin America—were built on the exploitation of indigenous populations. It is also important to note, as a number of authors have done, and the first case studies above have illustrated, that the particular regime adopted by a settler colony is neither static nor predetermined. Instead, it is the outcome of struggle and can, therefore, change over time.

Secondly, this paper focused both on thinking through what links settler colonial regimes to broader political and economic structures *as well as* what separates them as distinct social formations. In this light, it highlighted the processes of accumulation by dispossession, which occurs across capitalist economies, while also taking on a specific character in the settler colonial context.

The paper has argued that accumulation by dispossession in a settler context is specific because it is carried out by all classes of settlers, including by workers who are traditionally understood as its victims. It further points out that this also leads to specific social relations in settler colonial contexts, in which settler labour movements fight simultaneously over the distribution of wealth generated through their labour and the distribution of the colonial loot accumulated through the dispossession of the indigenous population. This leads to a greater identification of settler labour with the settler colonial project and state, as it is dependent on the latter for its participation in the redistributive process. Both points were then demonstrated through two case studies taken from the history of Zionism in Palestine.

This paper has built on existing literature that shows that although the elimination of the native is key to some settler colonial regimes, in certain periods, *it does not accurately define the overall logic of settler colonialism*, as claimed by Wolfe. In fact settler colonial states and movements have and continue to mobilise a wide variety of policies towards indigenous peoples, including exploitation, which the Wolfe-an model positions outside of the realm of settler colonial relations. This paper instead proposes another analytic approach, which highlights the specificity of social relations within settler colonial contexts in which settler workers participate in the process of accumulation by dispossession. This in turn, the paper has shown, shapes both the internal class struggle within settler societies, as well as the collective assault by the settler polity against the indigenous populations it colonises and dispossesses.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank James Eastwood and Elian Weizman for their thoughts and comments on early drafts of this paper, as well as the three anonymous reviewers for their insightful and constructive feedback.

Endnotes

[1] See, for example, Fieldhouse's (1982) classic study of colonialism for a detailed discussion of the different forms of settler colonial economies; Emmanuel (1972) for a comparison of

settler societies across Africa; and Eduardo Galeano (2009) for an overview of Spanish and Portuguese colonial empires in Latin America.

[2] Even though the depth of decolonisation can—and should—remain an issue of concern; see, for example, in the South African case, Bond (2000) or Clarno (2017).

[3] It is important to underline here once more, the understanding of settlers as those who are integrated into the settler state and have access to its extractive functions. This does not include, for example, enslaved populations. I am grateful to anonymous reviewer 3 for encouraging this clarification.

[4] See Jonathan Hyslop (1999) for a discussion of the relationships between these movements.

[5] There are some notable exceptions, often emerging from communist or syndicalist traditions, but these have remained very limited in scale and were continuously outflanked by their segregationist and exclusionary counterparts. In the case of Palestine, see Budeiri (2010) and Lockman (1996); in the case of South Africa, see Van Der Walt (2007).

[6] The Histadrut was and still is Israel's main trade union federation.

References

Barakat R (2018) Writing/righting Palestine studies: Settler colonialism, indigenous sovereignty, and resisting the ghost(s) of history. *Settler Colonial Studies* 8(3):349–363

Barclay F, Chopin C A and Evans M (2018) Settler colonialism and French Algeria. *Settler Colonial Studies* 8(2):115–130

Bhandar B and Ziadah R (2016) Acts and omissions: Framing settler colonialism in Palestine studies. *Jaddaliya* 14 January http://www.jadaliyya.com/pages/index/23569/acts-and-omissions_framing-settler-colonialism-in- (last accessed 24 July 2017)

Bond P (2000) *Elite Transition: From Apartheid to Neoliberalism in South Africa*. London: Pluto

Budeiri M (2010) *The Palestine Communist Party, 1919–1948*. Chicago: Haymarket

Byrd J A (2011) *The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Clarno A (2017) *Neoliberal Apartheid: Palestine/Israel and South Africa After 1994*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Coulthard G S (2014) *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Davis M (2002) *Late Victorian Holocausts: El Niño Famines and the Making of the Third World*. London: Verso

Day I (2016) *Alien Capital: Asian Racialization and the Logic of Settler Colonial Capitalism*. Durham: Duke University Press

Elkins C and Pedersen S (2005) *Settler Colonialism in the 20th Century: Project, Practices, Legacies*. New York: Routledge

Emmanuel A (1972) White-settler colonialism and the myth of investment imperialism. *New Left Review* 73:35–57

Fanon F (2001 [1961]) *The Wretched of the Earth* (trans C Farrington). London: Penguin

Fieldhouse D K (1982 [1966]) *The Colonial Empires: A Comparative Survey from the 18th Century*. New York: Dell

Galeano E (2009) *Open Veins of Latin America*. London: Serpent's Tail

Hanegbi H, Machover M and Orr A (2012 [1971]) The class nature of Israeli society. In M Machover (ed) *Israelis and Palestinians: Conflict and Resolution* (pp 76–98). Chicago: Haymarket

Harkov L (2011) 42 MKs: Settlement building would solve housing crisis. *Jerusalem Post* 2 August http://www.jpost.com/Diplomacy-and-Politics/42-MKs-Settlement-building-would-solve-housing-crisis (last accessed 4 March 2016)

Harris C (2004) How did colonialism dispossess? Comments from an edge of empire. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 94(1):165–182

Harvey D (2003) *The New Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Harvey D (2007) Neoliberalism as creative destruction. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 610(1):22–44

Honig-Parnass T (2011) The 2011 uprising in Israel: The inherent limitation of a middle-class protest in a settler-colonial state. *Israeli Occupation Archive* 9 January http://www.israeli-occupation.org/2012-01-09/tikva-honig-parnass-the-2011-uprising-in-israel/#sthash.SOqZsrK2.dpuf (last accessed 3 March 2016)

Hyslop J (1999) "The Imperial Working Class Makes Itself 'White': White Labourism in Britain, Australia, and South Africa Before the First World War." Seminar Paper 449, Institute for Advanced Social Research, University of Witwatersrand

Jabbour G (1970) *Settler Colonialism in Southern Africa and the Middle East*. Beirut: Palestine Liberation Organisation Research Centre

Karuka M (2019) *Empire's Tracks: Indigenous Nations, Chinese Workers, and the Transcontinental Railroad*. Berkeley: University of California Press

Kauanui J K (2017) Tracing historical specificity: Race and the colonial politics of (in)capacity. *American Quarterly* 69(2):257–265

Kelley R D G (2017) The rest of us: Rethinking settler and native. *American Quarterly* 69(2):267–276

Lockman Z (1996) *Comrades and Enemies: Arab and Jewish Workers in Palestine, 1906–1948*. Berkeley: University of California Press

Lockman Z (2012) Land, labor, and the logic of Zionism: A critical engagement with Gershon Shafir. *Settler Colonial Studies* 2(1):9–38

Lowe L (2015) *The Intimacies of Four Continents*. Durham: Duke University Press

Mamdani M (2015) Settler colonialism: Then and now. *Critical Inquiry* 41(3):596–614

Marx K (1887 [1867]) *Capital, Volume I* (trans S Moore and E Aveling). https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/index.htm (last accessed 1 August 2017)

MEMO (2015) China tells Israel "Don't send workers to settlements". *Middle East Monitor* 8 June https://www.middleeastmonitor.com/20150608-china-tells-israel-don-t-send-workers-to-settlements/ (last accessed 27 July 2016)

Newsinger J (2010) *The Blood Never Dried: A People's History of the British Empire*. London: Bookmarks

Nichols R (2015) Disaggregating primitive accumulation. *Radical Philosophy* 194:18–28

Nichols R (2017) Theft is property! The recursive logic of dispossession. *Political Theory* 46(1):3–28

O'Brien J M (2017) Tracing settler colonialism's eliminatory logic in traces of history. *American Quarterly* 69(2):249–255

Perugorría I, Shalev M and Tejerina B (2016) The Spanish Indignados and Israel's social justice movement: The role of political cleavages in two large-scale protests. In M Ancelovici, P Dufour, H Nez, J Duyvendak and J Jasper (ed) *Street Politics in the Age of Austerity: From the Indignados to Occupy* (pp 91–118). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press

Reddy T (2016) *South Africa, Settler Colonialism, and the Failures of Liberal Democracy*. Johannesburg: Wits University Press

Reed J (2015) Israel rights groups attack plan to import 20,000 Chinese workers. *Financial Times* 20 September https://next.ft.com/content/1f0cdc62-5f9a-11e5-9846-de406ccb37f2#axzz4FoXnLfYT (last accessed 27 July 2017)

Said E W (1979) Zionism from the standpoint of its victims. *Social Text* 1:7–58

Saranillio D I (2013) Why Asian settler colonialism matters: A thought piece on critiques, debates, and indigenous difference. *Settler Colonial Studies* 3(3/4):280–294

Sayegh F (2012 [1965]) Zionist colonialism in Palestine. *Settler Colonial Studies* 2(1):206–225

Sayigh R (2007) *The Palestinians: From Peasants to Revolutionaries* (new edn). London: Zed

Shafir G (1996 [1989]) *Land, Labour, and the Origins of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict, 1882–1914*. Berkeley: University of California Press

Simpson A (2014) *Mohawk Interruptus: Political Life Across the Borders of Settler States*. Durham: Duke University Press

Speed S (2017) Structures of settler capitalism in Abya Yala. *American Quarterly* 69(4):783–790

Van Der Walt L (2007) The first globalisation and transnational labour activism in Southern Africa: White Labourism, the IWW, and the ICU, 1904–1934. *African Studies* 66(2/3):223–251

Veracini L (2010) *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan
Veracini L (2015) *The Settler Colonial Present*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan
Vimalassery M, Pegues J H and Goldstein A (2016) On colonial unknowing. *Theory and Event* 19(4) https://muse.jhu.edu/article/633283 (last accessed 12 June 2020)
Wolfe P (1999) *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology: The Politics and Poetics of an Ethnographic Event*. London: Cassell
Wolfe P (2001) Land, labour, and difference: Elementary structures of race. *American Historical Review* 106(3):866–905
Wolfe P (2006) Settler colonialism and the elimination of the native. *Journal of Genocide Research* 8(4):387–409