

Introduction: Settler colonial studies and Latin America

Lucy Taylor, *Department of International Politics, Aberystwyth University, Aberystwyth, Wales*

Geraldine Lublin, *Department of Modern Languages, Translation and Interpreting, Swansea University, Swansea, Wales*

Abstract:

This introduction to the Special Issue of Settler Colonial Studies on Latin America locates the articles within the field of settler colonial theory and places it within the context of Latin American Studies. It reflects on the potential of settler colonial theory to provide fresh perspectives on the Latin American reality, and opens discussion about how Latin American experiences and critical analysis might complicate and enrich theorizing about settler colonialism in Anglophone locations and beyond. These broad aims are explored in detail in the articles whose main topics and conclusions are also described in the text. Overall, this introduction sets the intellectual scene and identifies for the reader the central arguments developed by the contributing authors, thus providing a solid foundation from which readers – whether they are familiar with Latin America or not – can engage with the articles collected here.

The purpose of this Special Issue is to explore how settler colonial theory might enrich our understanding of Latin America and how Latin American cases might broaden and deepen settler colonial theory (SCT).ⁱ While early work has already begun to build a critical bridge between these two intellectual silos, as we shall see, this Special Issue is a sustained attempt to open an enriching dialogue in both intellectual fields. Its role is to raise questions and identify possibilities rather than provide definitive answers, and we aim to create space for fresh thinking about both the theory and the nature of power relations in the region. To that end, the essays collected here analyse a diverse range of countries, from Bolivia to Brazil via Uruguay, Rapa Nui and Argentina, discussing a range of themes including territory, violence, Blackness, 'nature', the law, Indigeneity, geopolitics, *mestizaje*, nation-building, invisibility and theory. (Please note that English language references have been chosen for this Introduction specifically to promote understanding amongst Anglophone readers, while the articles draw on a mix of Spanish, Portuguese and English language sources.)

Settler colonial theory and Latin American reality – an awkward meeting?

In the early days of what has been described as ‘the settler colonial turn’,ⁱⁱ settler colonial scholars proposed settler colonialism as ‘an important platform for South-South dialogue’.ⁱⁱⁱ Nevertheless, it is very noticeable that settler colonial scholarship conceptualises settler colonialism from experiences in former British imperial settings which often occupy dominant global positions.^{iv} Can these concepts be translated beyond Anglophone contexts? Even linguistic translation proves difficult, as the theory’s name translates very poorly into both Spanish and Portuguese: ‘*colonialismo colono*’ or ‘*colonialismo de colonos*’ are tautological, roughly translating (back) as ‘colony colonialism’. Other formulations like ‘*colonialismo de asentamientos*’ or ‘*colonialismo de assentamento*’ sound equally awkward, expressing something like ‘colonialism of settlements’. As we will discuss later, the fact that an overwhelming majority of the theoretical bibliography of settler colonialism is in English acts as a barrier for many Latin Americans. However, the indifferent reception of ‘*colonialisme de peuplement*’ among Francophone Canadian scholars suggests that the problem of translation exceeds awkward translation. Enlarging the scope of translation to include the world of ideas brings about more knotty problems, particularly epistemological domination, considering the shape of global hierarchies of knowledge production.

Latin America has not translated well into settler colonial studies either. The region’s scenarios (and scholarship) are largely absent from the work of key theorists like Patrick Wolfe and Lorenzo Veracini. When Latin American cases do feature, they are deployed to reinforce paradigms designed to make sense of Anglophone settler colonialism. However, Latin America has not been completely ignored by SCT; indeed, one of the field’s foundational texts places Latin American countries at its core. Donald Denoon’s 1983 book *Settler Capitalism* sets out to compare ‘the quality and quantity of development which occurred in six settler societies in the southern hemisphere: New Zealand, Australia, South Africa, Uruguay, Argentina and Chile’, cases, selected for analysis on account of the ‘sufficient number of geographical and historical features they would share’.^v Denoon identifies settler colonialism as resonating with certain Latin American spaces and epochs, allowing him to note similarities but also to ‘distinguish the settler societies from their tropical neighbours to the north’. Similar factors motivated James Belich to include a chapter on the Southern Cone, especially Argentina, in his more recent landmark book *Replenishing the Earth*.^{vi} Like Denoon, Belich charted the global flows of investment, trade and migrants which built settler colonies and created enduring patterns of capitalist development.

Other authors explore this angle in greater depth. Michael Goebel’s chapter ‘Settler Colonialism in Postcolonial Latin America’, included in the recent *Routledge Handbook of Settler Colonialism*, focuses on the Western South Atlantic and the 1870-1930 period, when ‘the region received far more immigrants or settlers than during 300 years of

Spanish/Portuguese rule'.^{vii} He takes a migration studies perspective, and provides rich analysis of the political and social context which led to mass migration in the region, yet its connection to earlier experience of colonization is left unexplored. Similarly, Ricardo Salvatore discusses settlement in Argentina (once again) from the 1850s onwards, but is concerned with understanding the relationship between economic boom-and-bust, and racialized discourses of whitening, adopting a critical global perspective.^{viii} Both provide much-needed nuance and context, but their theoretical contribution is more limited. Another perspective is provided by journalist and author Richard Gott, whose article 'Latin America as a White Settler Society' highlights the role of Eurocentric supremacism and racial oppression, and argues that Latin America 'should be included in the general history of the global expansion of white settler populations.'^{ix} He ambitiously applies his argument outside the Southern Cone – notably to Venezuela and Cuba – but his provocative analysis opens many questions which require further, careful thought.

In contrast, the excellent collection of short essays published in *American Quarterly* in December 2017 paved the way for sustained intellectual engagement based on rigorous research and deep knowledge. In her introduction, M. Bianet Castellanos notes that different strands of scholarship (including Indigenous studies) in North American and Latin American contexts have 'rarely [been] in conversation with each other' and sees that as a symptom of 'entrenched divisions precluding north-south dialogues'.^x However, it is via south-north Indigenous dialogues that the need to theorize the settler colonial state becomes most apparent. Arriving at settler colonial theory from Indigenous studies – from the destructive and oppressive experiences of 'being settled upon' rather than 'settling' – brings a fresh, bottom-up perspective to analysis of the settler regime, one which addresses a central concern of those struggling against injustice in Latin America: Indigeneity.

Notably, it is a focus on Indigenous resistance, and not settler state policy, which underpins the only two Latin American articles previously published in *Settler Colonial Studies*: Melissa Forbis' piece on the Zapatistas, and Magdalena Ugarte, Mauro Fontana and Matthew Caulkins' article on the Mapuche nation.^{xi} A few Latin Americanists are beginning to deploy SCT as a theoretical framework. Gustavo Verdesio's early exploration of the theoretical and critical potential of coloniality of power and settler colonialism in tandem seems to be the first Spanish-language publication to engage with SCT.^{xii} More recently, Piergiorgio Di Giminiani, Martin Fonck and Paolo Perasso have used and developed SCT to make sense of the complex ways in which Indigenous Mapuche in Chile appropriate settler-type ideas in asserting a sense of belonging to the land.^{xiii} Across the Andes, Mattias Borg Rasmussen unpacks complex settler identities – and settler dispossessions – in Argentina's Nahuel Huapi National Park.^{xiv} Settler colonial dispossession is also the focal point of the work of Blake Gentry, Geoffrey Boyce, José García and Samuel Chambers, which uses SCT to explore dynamics of land struggle and migration in the Cedagí Wahia and Wo'oson O'odham communities that straddle the US-Mexico border.^{xv} Moreover, theorists of settler colonialism have begun to think about Latin America; Sai Englert's 2020 article drawing on

the region to argue that an ‘accumulation by dispossession’ model should replace a Wolfenbarger emphasis on ‘elimination of the native’ is a recent example.^{xvi}

More generally, though, SCT has not been embraced by Latin Americanists, whose response to the theory is often cautious. From conversations with colleagues, four sorts of misgivings emerge.^{xvii} Firstly, there is concern that theories developed in colonial settings which are relatively prosperous, ‘developed’ and geo-politically powerful (like the USA or Australia) will impose a conceptual framework that is both inappropriate to Latin America and epistemologically domineering. Indeed, there is a real danger of intellectual colonization, given the location of Latin America in global hierarchies of knowledge and power.^{xviii} It should not be forgotten that ‘First World’ settler colonies are home to hegemonic universities and global publishing enterprises whose scholars and presses create academic products written in English (and about Anglophone cases) which seldom reference publications written in any other language.^{xix} It is feared that Latin America’s inclusion in SCT might further embed its subordination in global hierarchies of knowledge production, eroding important differences within the sweep of a universalizing theory.

Secondly, there are concerns that looking at the settler state will divert attention from the important intellectual work of Indigenous scholarship and activism in Latin America, and that Indigenous voices will be marginalised or silenced in the production of knowledge about colonialism.^{xx} There is a risk therefore that research on colonialism could, once more, become the study of white colonizers rather than those on the receiving end of dispossession and domination, and at the forefront of decolonial resistance – Indigenous Peoples. This intellectual recolonization would thus reassert racial-colonial hierarchies of ‘who knows’ and ‘who knows best,’ and undermine Indigenous movement campaigns which reject the settler state or seek to do politics ‘otherwise’.^{xxi}

Thirdly, Latin Americanists point out that Anglophone settler colonies are built (ostensibly) on the spatial and intellectual separation of ‘settler’ and ‘indigene’, while Latin America is characterised by social, cultural and racial mixing (known as *mestizaje* in Spanish, *mestizagem* in Portuguese and *créolization*/creolization in the Caribbean region). Moreover, such mixing has involved not just European and Indigenous, but also African societies, given the widespread presence of African slaves and their descendants from the early days of conquest onwards.^{xxii} Societies that are generated through mixing — rather than separation on reservations or plantations— operate according to different racial logics and as a result require different intellectual approaches and decolonizing strategies. Theories built on binaries are thus predestined to fail to explain colonial relations and decolonial struggle in Latin America.

Finally, sceptics point to the striking differences between the state in Anglophone and Latin American contexts. Settler colonial theory focuses on the actions of the settler state and assumes that its laws are implemented to the letter and that public servants like the police, bureaucrats and judges will obey the rules and behave as expected, according to

the norms of a liberal order. This makes settler colonialism appear relatively predictable and the experiences of both settlers and Indigenous appear to be common across different locations and scenarios. In Latin America, by contrast, states are sometimes less certain: a fragile rule of law, politicised armed forces, the influence of patronage and the regular appearance of anti-institutional populism can make the results of state policy less predictable. Laws may be passed but not implemented, sometimes through lack of political will but other times because money is scarce or diverted. On the other hand, it is precisely because the state apparatus in Latin American countries is less coherent that space for contestation by social movements, including Indigenous ones, can be better exploited to demand change from below. Yet make no mistake: their militancy and visibility are no defence against the extreme violence they often face, especially when they encounter major business and political interests in a context of gross impunity, as in Guatemala or Honduras.^{xxiii}

These critiques and dangers are very real and great care is needed to try and avoid falling into the traps. Identifying them is a crucial first step. Much benefit might accrue both to Latin American studies *and* settler colonial theory by considering what each might bring to the other. Yet while theorists might be able to accommodate differences in history, racial configuration, state and mobilization (points three and four), the political, epistemological and geopolitical concerns (points one and two) will require ongoing vigilance, reflection and persistent critique in order to guard against the reassertion of hegemonic habits of thought and hierarchies of knowledge.

Cross-field encounters – fresh ideas

In Latin American studies – and indeed in grassroots activism – colonialism has been interrogated, critiqued and denounced from the position of Indigenous experience and demands. This is an immense strength because it places injustice and resistance at the heart of the project and links these to capitalist exploitation and the fallacy of liberal equality. In contrast to Anglophone contexts, though, Indigenous voices within academia are as yet relatively few notwithstanding such widespread and important Indigenous activism (notable exceptions include Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui and Julieta Paredes^{xxiv}). In the meantime, non-Indigenous academics like Catherine Walsh, Daniel Mato and Boaventura de Sousa Santos have disseminated Indigenous thinking in the academy.^{xxv} The focus of such work is on giving air to Indigenous voices, foregrounding Indigenous knowledges, decolonizing the academy and exposing the violation of Indigenous rights. Nevertheless, theorizations of the state remain less developed: the state is denounced as corrupt and racially biased but deeper reflection on the nature and foundations of that state – of its colonial DNA – are pending. Here, settler colonial theory can offer two key intellectual tools: critical thinking on land and assimilation/elimination.

Settler colonial theory takes as its foundation the question of land, an issue which is central to Indigenous rights struggle but takes a conceptual backseat. Settler colonial theory digs deep into Eurocentric ideas which configure land thus: as a physical terrain to be claimed; as the seat of political sovereignty; as the resource of capitalist development; and as the homeland of the settler. It combines these facets in the conceptual study of *terra nullius*^{xxvi} and the empirical analysis of practices which enact the desire to 'eliminat[e], in order to replace'.^{xxvii} Yet SCT's logic is founded on conceptually separating 'land' and 'labour', a move which many have critiqued.^{xxviii} Thinking through the processes of land dispossession and their entanglement with labour exploitation would add deeper insight into the practices and logics which enable Indigenous oppression. As Castro and Picq demonstrate, these techniques are as potent today as they were in the sixteenth century, and breaking such practices and logics is essential work for decolonization.^{xxix} Although links between the removal of Indigenous peoples and the maintenance of Black enslavement have been explored in the context of the US, greater dialogue between SCT and Latin American scholarship could add depth, complexity and nuance to a theory which overlooks the intimate link between land dispossession and labour exploitation, and arm decolonial theory with incisive tools which can dissect the logics of settler thinking about land.

In addition, SCT invites us to highlight 'elimination', an aspect to which, as Walter Mignolo has pointed out, '*Latin America*' may testify from its very name, as it foregrounds the European element whilst erasing Indigenous and Black populations.^{xxx} As in settler locations everywhere, Indigenous peoples in the region have been subject to physical elimination efforts including massacre^{xxxi} and sterilization campaigns.^{xxxii} Still, 'elimination' also works through logics which understand assimilation to be a 'kind of death' derived from ontological and epistemological erasure.^{xxxiii} Understanding the everyday processes of erasure to be a technique of settler colonial elimination everywhere potentially brings a sharp theoretical edge to Latin American analysis of *mestizaje*. It might place the existing sophisticated analysis in global perspective, opening space for learning about this oppressive technique through critical comparison of erosive practices beyond the Latin American realm. In turn, the rich heritage of thought and empirical study of *mestizaje* from Latin America would provide sophisticated concepts and well-worked analyses of the varied top-down techniques (from whitening to *indigenismo* via multiculturalism) which promote assimilation.^{xxxiv} Settler colonial theorists might adapt and deploy this work to make sense of mixed-heritage experience in Anglophone settings, unpacking the rather simplistic settler/indigene binary which underpins settler colonial theorizing. Moreover, theorists like Rita Segato and Gloria Anzaldúa have already begun theorizing *mestizo* subjectivity as a site of decolonial resistance, a move which counters Wolfe's rather nihilistic visions of assimilation as 'a kind of death'.^{xxxv}

Latin American scholarship on the colonial condition could also make two other important contributions to settler colonial theory: 'other' knowledges and geopolitics. SCT undertakes important work in its focus on the legal, territorial and economic aspects of

Indigenous oppression, but pays much less attention to ‘other’ knowledges and modes of epistemological domination. By contrast, Latin American approaches foreground knowledge as a central arena of ‘settlement’, a strategy which can bring fresh insight. For example, Mignolo argues that it is knowledge hierarchies that underpin the portrayal of ‘Indians’ as ‘savages’ (superstitious beings who ‘know nothing’ and ‘can’t write’), and demonstrates how racial markers map onto knowledge markers such as language, ethics and existential practices.^{xxxvi} Moreover, the revindication of ‘other’ knowledges is central to struggles for Indigenous dignity, and has framed key policy concerns, especially linked to human-nature relations and bio-destruction.^{xxxvii} Questions of knowledge have also been central to intercultural education projects, now widely established in Latin America, which (with varying degrees of will and success) teach Indigenous languages and life-ways in (settler) state schools.^{xxxviii} Importantly, foregrounding Indigenous knowledge emphasises Indigenous subjectivity and agency as *people who know*, albeit within a highly oppressive colonial context.

Secondly, Latin America offers a distinctive geopolitical vantage point from which to think about settler colonialism. This in turn suggests two important new perspectives. To begin with, Latin American decolonial thinking invites us to detach our ideas about settler colonialism from the eighteenth century, from the British Empire and from the Anglophone world today, and shift our intellectual imagination to the Atlantic Ocean in the fifteenth century. This places our attention on the crucible that ‘made’ Europe and the Americas together —financially, intellectually, geopolitically, philosophically and racially— and on the birth of the capitalist state. It is often forgotten that Immanuel Wallerstein’s World Systems approach, most commonly associated with this perspective, was developed with Peruvian Anibal Quijano.^{xxxix} Quijano’s later work drew together not only global processes of economic and political inequality, but also Indigenous dispossession (colonialism) and the racial division of labour (slavery), as seen through 500+ years of Latin American history.^{xl} Even before Quijano, Enrique Dussel developed a distinctive interpretation of the nexus between the global dynamics of capitalism, liberal thinking, Eurocentrism and race, creating his Philosophy of Liberation.^{xli} The insistence that colonialism, race and knowledge is at the heart of global capitalism is what inspired Latin American decolonial philosophy to match the ground-breaking South Asian Subaltern Studies work of the 1990s, and to create a ‘postcolonial’ intellectual approach that spoke to and for Latin American reality.^{xlii} Indeed, this work built on even earlier intellectual efforts by thinkers such as Peruvian José Carlos Mariátegui (who sought to ‘indigenize’ Marxism),^{xliii} Cuban Fernando Ortíz (who developed theories of transculturation),^{xliv} and fellow Cuban anti-imperialist thinker José Martí.^{xlv} This rich heritage of thought and political engagement remains largely hidden from sight outside of Latin American Studies, and offers a rich seam of inspiration for settler colonial studies – and Indigenous studies – in the English-speaking world.

Another key aspect of Latin America’s geopolitical location is its subordinate position. While all settler colonies have ambiguous relationships to the metropolises which spawned them,

those on the lower rungs of the ladder feel a heightened sting of marginality, being caught up in relationships of emulation and rejection which reference not only a wealthier, globally powerful 'Europe' but also other settler states, especially the USA.^{xlvi} Such desires and antagonisms shape policy and national identity in settler regimes, and ought to be foregrounded in analyses of political strategies. Most obviously, global subordination is economic, and questions of poverty, inequality and capitalist exploitation play a key role in shaping the concerns and policies of settler governments as global capitalism plays out differently in economies outside the core.^{xlvii} This vast topic remains undervalued in settler colonial theory, perhaps because the relative economic comfort experienced by settler-descendants diffuses this source of anxiety and struggle within 'mainstream' society. Yet in less prosperous settler nations —like those of Latin America— competition for resources and state benefits is fierce, not only for the poor but also for settler-descendant and *mestizo* classes. Inserting settler colonial theory within wider frameworks of global hierarchies — both geopolitical and economic — would take SCT beyond the British Empire as its main point of reference, and shift attention away from nation-states to global flows of power, money, people and knowledge. Indeed, decentring the former British empire is a critical next step for settler colonial studies in achieving its aims. It is essential that the geopolitical hierarchy of settler states is not unwittingly reproduced in settler colonial studies. Incorporating the experiences and conditions that shape settler society and Indigenous struggle outside the Anglophone world is important in pluralizing, complicating and thus enriching our understanding of settler colonial relationships.

Our contribution

The articles collected here demonstrate the potential for rich cross-fertilisation between SCT and Latin American Studies. While Latin Americanists may benefit from the particular vantage point that settler colonial theorists offer, Latin American case studies may enhance settler colonial studies. That Latin America can help to refine the settler colonial framework is the thrust of Lucy Taylor's article, which explores four foundations of settler colonial theory. The article explores the discrepancies between SCT and Latin American reality, using Latin America's divergences from the Anglo-norm in order to 'think afresh about settler colonial theory'. Anchoring her analysis in the paradigmatic case of Argentina, Taylor reads against the grain four conceptual foundations embedded in SCT in order to show how Latin American experience may enhance the settler colonial theoretical apparatus: the labour/land distinction; *terra nullius*; the Black/slavery category; and the settler/native binary.

A good number of these themes are tackled in the context of specific case studies by the other articles in this special issue, covering a diverse range of countries, from the more predictable 'usual suspects' in the Southern Cone to cases seldom associated with the theory. Amongst those countries deemed more amenable to settler colonial theorisations is Uruguay, which is the focus of Gustavo Verdesio's contribution. As well as revisiting some of

the tenets of this specific mode of enquiry, Verdesio uses some of its concepts to account for Indigenous resurgence in Uruguay. He foregrounds the Charrua who are subjected to both disavowal and ridicule, mechanisms which expose this settler society's deep anxieties and generate ongoing discursive elimination. The article highlights the centrality of the land for settler colonial states and its links with primitive accumulation, spelling out how the very existence of the Charrua poses a challenge to the Uruguayan national narrative by puncturing the myth of *terra nullius* that confers legitimacy to the state.

As the Latin American country perhaps most often associated with settler colonialism, it is no surprise to find an analysis of Argentina included in this issue. Nevertheless, as Geraldine Lublin argues, scholars of settler colonialism have tended to focus on the country's links with Britain (as part of the so-called 'British Informal Empire') rather than examine its exceptionalist Myth of Whiteness as a narrative of elimination and replacement. Lublin addresses this gap by using the theory to explore the endurance of Argentina's mythical Whiteness not only as a discursive construction of racial domination but also as a fundamental structure of the (settler) state. Taking the state's occupation of Patagonia as a point of departure, the article explores how Argentina's settler colonial structure is sustained as a form of common sense that normalises and naturalises settler sovereignty^{xlviii} despite more than three decades of growing Indigenous activism. Attention is drawn to the role Argentina's European creation myth has played not only in shaping nation-building but most importantly in the current cycle of 'progressive neoextractivism'. Lublin debunks accounts of Argentinean exceptionalism by locating it within global logics of settler colonial domination. She suggests that focusing on the key role that Indigenous dispossession plays in sustaining the settler structure of the Argentine state is key to understanding why anti-racist policies on their own will not dismantle the country's mythical Whiteness.

This link between the state's eliminatory narrative and settlement is the focus of Peter Baker's article, this time in the perhaps unexpected context of Bolivia. Whilst questioning some of SCT's assumptions regarding the applicability of settlement processes to settler colonial states on the one hand, Baker explores how the notion of 'settlement' might be applied to Latin American and Caribbean countries that do not support either the native/settler nor the land/labour binaries that underpin settler colonial theorisations on the other. An analysis of recent Indigenous mobilisations and the shift in racial discourses in Bolivia reinforces the view of discourses of racial mixing, not as the mere result of historical miscegenation but as ideological narratives, comparable to those seen in traditional settler colonial states. The article argues for a broader and more nuanced understanding of settlement as 'a general process of capitalist accumulation' which affects both the land and the livelihoods of those living on it. Such a view may help to expose narratives of racial inclusion as vehicles for the reproduction and legitimation of settlement processes, as well as the reinforcement of state hegemony and resistance to it.

Another approach to *mestizaje* and elimination, this time in dialogue with Blackness, is offered in Desiree Poets's contribution to this special issue. Tracing the continuities of settler colonialism in independent Brazil, the article explores the country's dynamics of assimilation/elimination, focusing on the lived experiences of two different urban communities: an Indigenous group and an urban Afro-descendent *quilombo*. On the basis of these case studies, Poets calls into question the settler colonial land-labour binary, arguing that both Black and Indigenous populations have suffered elimination, dispossession, labour exploitation and exclusion/racism. Exploring strategies of resistance in these communities also leads Poets to challenge Wolfe's notion of miscegenation/assimilation as 'a kind of death',^{xlix} however, as she describes how these communities have used these processes in their decolonial struggles as a site for resurgence, survival and breakthrough, thus 'persisting through transformation'.

The notion of refusal also features in Forrest Wade Young's contribution to this special issue, as his article explores Indigenous resistance to Chile's attempts to territorialise Rapa Nui as 'Easter Island'. The article traces Chile's legally ambiguous imposition of colonial rule in Rapa Nui in 1888 and places it in juxtaposition with 21st century policy to claim that it has turned the island 'from a broadly colonial space to a formally settler colonial condition'. This argument is based, not only on Chile's vigorously contested patrimonialisation of Rapa Nui territories for the sake of tourism, but also on the state's construction of a Marine Protected Area (MPA) on what it considers 'the Chilean sea'. Countering the greenwashing alibi that this initiative supports sustainable development and helps to fight climate change, Young understands the MPA as a biopolitical strategy of environmentality that strengthens Chilean settler colonialism and expands it from the land to the ocean, from green-grabbing to blue-grabbing. While throwing light on the transnational entanglements associated with Chilean settler colonialism in a globalised world, the analysis also emphasises how Rapa Nui biopower continues to unsettle the boundaries of settler colonial Latin America.

Overall, these articles offer a thought-provoking reflection on the capacity of settler colonial theory to travel – and translate – into contexts, histories and social settings very different from the Anglophone colonies that sparked early work in the field. It is clear that settler colonial theory can inspire fresh thinking and provide new tools with which to interrogate colonialism. It will not fit everywhere in Latin America, and indeed should not be imposed as a monolithic explanatory block but rather viewed as a resource to provoke different kinds of research questions which arise, in part, by considering comparative cases beyond the Americas. In turn, Latin American experience asks provocative questions of settler colonial theory, exposing and questioning its assumptions. While we have generated far more questions than answers in this special issue, our aim was to promote an intellectually enriching encounter between these two fields. We are sure that the readers of this Special Issue will agree that we have succeeded in this objective, and much more.

ⁱ This special issue originated during discussions at a workshop kindly supported by the Institute of Latin American Studies and the OWRI Cross-Language Dynamics project. Held at Swansea University in June 2017, it brought together an interdisciplinary group of scholars engaging with settler colonial theory and its application in Latin America and the Caribbean. Some of the contributors also participated in a subsequent panel at LASA 2018 which focused exclusively on settler colonialism in Latin America.

ⁱⁱ Lorenzo Veracini, *The Settler Colonial Present* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), 1.

ⁱⁱⁱ Lorenzo Veracini, 'Lorenzo Veracini on Settler Colonialism', *Southern Perspectives* (22 October 2010). Online: <http://www.southernperspectives.net/ips-series/lorenzo-veracini-on-settler-colonialism> (accessed 02/09/2018).

^{iv} For example, Lorenzo Veracini, *Settler Colonialism: an Overview* (Houndsmills: Palgrave Macmillan 2010), and *The Settler Colonial Present* (Houndsmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015); Patrick Wolfe, *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology: the Politics and Poetics of an Ethnographic Event* (London: Cassel, 1999) and *Traces of History: Elementary Structures of Race* (London: Verso, 2016).

^v Donald Denoon, *Settler Capitalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), 2.

^{vi} James Belich, *Replenishing the Earth: the Settler Revolution and the Rise of the Anglo-World, 1783-1939* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

^{vii} Michael Goebel, 'Settler Colonialism in Postcolonial Latin America', in *Routledge Handbook of Settler Colonialism* ed. Edward Cavanagh and Lorenzo Veracini (London: Routledge, 2017), 139–51, here 139.

^{viii} Ricardo Salvatore, 'The Unsettling Location of a Settler Nation: Argentina, from Settler Economy to Failed Developing Nation', *South Atlantic Quarterly* 107, no. 4 (2008).

^{ix} Richard Gott, 'Latin America as a White Settler Society', *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 26, no. 2, (2007): 269–89, here 270.

^x M. Bianet Castellanos, 'Introduction: Settler Colonialism in Latin America', *Atlantic Quarterly* 69, no. 4 (2017), 777–81.

^{xi} Melissa Forbis, 'After Autonomy: the Zapatistas, Insurgent Indigeneity, and Decolonization', *Settler Colonial Studies*, 16, no. 6 (2016); Magdalena Ugarte, Mauro Fontana & Matthew Caulkins 'Urbanisation and Indigenous Dispossession: Rethinking the Spatio-legal Imaginary in Chile vis-à-vis the Mapuche Nation', *Settler Colonial Studies*, online only, (2017).

^{xii} Gustavo Verdesio, 'Colonialismo acá y allá: Reflexiones sobre la teoría y la práctica de los estudios coloniales a través de fronteras culturales', *Cuadernos del CILHA* 13, no. 2 (2012).

^{xiii} Piergiorgio Di Giminiani, Martin Fonck and Paolo Perasson, 'Can Natives be Settlers? Emptiness, Settlement and Indigeneity on the Settler-colonial Frontier in Chile' *Anthropological Theory* (2019) <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/1463499619868088#articleCitationDownloadContainer> (accessed 02/02/2021).

^{xiv} Mattias Borg Rasmussen 'Institutionalizing Precarity: Settler Identities, National Parks and the Containment of Political Spaces in Patagonia' *Geoforum* (2019) <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0016718519301927> (accessed 02/02/21).

^{xv} Blake Gentry, Geoffrey Boyce, José García and Samuel Chambers' Indigenous Survival and Settler Colonial Dispossession on the Mexican Frontier: the Case of Cedagí Wahia and Wo'oson O'odham Indigenous Communities' 18, 1 (2019).

^{xvi} Sai Englert, 'Settlers, Workers and the Logic of Accumulation by Dispossession' *Antipode* 52, 6 (2020).

^{xvii} Points 1 and 2 are shared by many Indigenous and non-Indigenous activists and scholars of the former British dominions.

^{xviii} For example, Edgardo Lander, *La colonialidad del Saber: Eurocentrismo y Ciencias Sociales* (Buenos Aires: Ediciones Circus, 2011).

-
- ^{xix} Adriana Díaz 'Challenging Dominant Epistemologies in Higher Education: The Role of Language in the Geopolitics of Knowledge (Re)Production' *Multilingual Education Yearbook* (New York: Springer, 2018)
- ^{xx} Arturo Escobar *Pluriversal Politics: the Real and the Possible* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2020).
- ^{xxi} Julie Cupples and Ramón Grosfoguel, *Unsettling Eurocentrism in the Westernized University* (London: Routledge, 2019); Bonaventura de Sousa Santos, *The End of the Cognitive Empire: the Coming of Age of Epistemologies of the South* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2018).
- ^{xxii} Amongst a vast literature, see: Marisol de la Cadena *Indigenous Mestizos; the politics of race and culture in Cuzco, Peru, 1919-1991* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2000); Shona Jackson *Creole Indigeneity: Between Myth and Nation in the Caribbean* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press); Javier Sanjinés *Mestizaje upside-down: aesthetic politics in Modern Bolivia* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2004). Reference book about Guyana and classic texts on mestizaje
- ^{xxiii} Juan Castro, Juan and Manuela Lavinás Picq, 'Stateness as Landgrab: a Political History of Maya Dispossession in Guatemala' *American Quarterly* 69, no. 4(2017); Christopher Loperena, 'Settler Violence? Race and Emergent Frontiers of Progress in Honduras' *American Quarterly* 69, no. 4 (2017).
- ^{xxiv} Julieta Paredes, 'Despatriarcalización: Una Respuesta Categórica Del Feminismo Comunitario (Descolonizando La Vida),' *Revista de Estudios Bolivianos*, 21 (online only) (2015), <https://bsj.pitt.edu/ojs/index.php/bsj/article/view/144>; Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui, *Violencias (re)encubiertas en Bolivia* (Santander: Otra America, 2012).
- ^{xxv} Boaventura de Sousa Santos, *Epistemologies of the South: Justice against Epistemicide* (London: Routledge, 2014); Daniel Mato, 'Indigenous People in Latin America: Movements and Universities. Achievements, Challenges, and Intercultural Conflicts', *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 37, no. 3, (2014); Catherine Walsh 'Interculturalidad, Plurinacionalidad y Decolonialidad: las Insurgencias Político-epistémicas de Refundar el Estado', *Tabula Rasa*, 9, 2008.
- ^{xxvi} Carole Pateman 'The Settler Contract' in Carole Pateman and Charles Mills *The Contract and Domination* (Oxford: Polity Press, 2013).
- ^{xxvii} Patrick Wolfe, 'Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native', *Journal of Genocide Research* 8, no. 4 (2006), 388.
- ^{xxviii} Breny Mendoza, 'Decolonial Theories in Comparison' *Journal of World Philosophies* 5, 2 (2020); Shannon Speed, 'Structures of Settler Capitalism in Abya Yala' *American Quarterly* 69, 4 (2017); Juanita Sundberg (2008) 'Tracing Race: Mapping Environmental Formations in Environmental Justice Research in Latin America' in David Carruthers *Environmental Justice in Latin America: Problems, Promise and Practice*. Cambridge Mass: the MIT Press, pp 25-47.
- ^{xxix} Juan Castro and Manuela Levinas Picq, 'Stateness as landgrab' *American Quarterly* 69, 4 (2017).
- ^{xxx} Walter D. Mignolo, *The Idea of Latin America* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2005).
- ^{xxxi} Jorge Cuéllar, 'Elimination/Deracination: Colonial Terror, La Matanza, and the 1930s Race Laws in El Salvador' *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 42, 2 (2018).
- ^{xxxii} Ñusta P. Carranza Ko 'Making the Case for Genocide, the Forced Sterilization of Indigenous Peoples of Peru' *Genocide Studies and Prevention* 14, 2 (2020).
- ^{xxxiii} Wolfe, 'Settler Colonialism', 388.
- ^{xxxiv} See footnote xix; also Peter Wade, *Degrees of Mixture, Degrees of Freedom: Genomics, Multiculturalism and Race in Latin America* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2017).
- ^{xxxv} Rita Laura Segato 'Los cauces profundos de la raza latinoamericana: una relectura de mestizaje' *Crítica y Emancipación* 3, (2010); Gloria Anzaldúa *Borderlands/La Frontera: the New Mestiza* (San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books, 1987).
- ^{xxxvi} First expressed in Walter D. Mignolo, *The Darker Side of the Renaissance: Literacy, Territoriality and Colonization* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995).
- ^{xxxvii} Among many, see: Escobar, *Pluriversal Politics*; De Souza Santos *Epistemologies*.
- ^{xxxviii} Robert Aman *Decolonizing Intercultural Education: Colonial Differences, the Geopolitics of Knowledge and Inter-epistemic Dialogue* (London: Routledge, 2017)

-
- ^{xxxix} Anibal Quijano and Immanuel Wallerstein 'Americanity as a Concept, or the Americas in the Modern World System' *International Social Science Journal* 44 (1992)
- ^{xl} Anibal Quijano 'Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America' *Nepantla: Views from South* 1, 3 (2000).
- ^{xli} Enrique Dussel *Philosophy of Liberation* (Eugene: WIPF and STOCK, 1985).
- ^{xlii} Ileana Rodriguez (ed) *The Latin American Subaltern Studies Reader*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2001).
- ^{xliii} Mike Gonzalez, *In the Red Corner: The Marxism of José Carlos Mariátegui*, (Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2019).
- ^{xliv} Fernando Ortíz, *Cuban Counterpoint: Tobacco and Sugar* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1947).
- ^{xlv} Miguel Gualdrón Ramírez 'Resistance and Expanse in *Nuestra América*: José Martí, with Édouard Glissant and Gloria Anzaldúa' *Diacritics* 46, 2 (2018)
- ^{xlvi} See Taylor, this volume.
- ^{xlvii} Arturo Escobar *Encountering Development: the Making and Unmaking of the Third World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995); Santiago Castro-Gómez 'The Missing Chapter of Empire: Postmodern Reorganization of Coloniality and Post-Fordist Capitalism' in Walter D. Mignolo and Arturo Escobar, *Globalization and the Decolonial Option* (London: Routledge, 2010).
- ^{xlviii} Mark Rifkin, *Settler Common Sense: Queerness and Everyday Colonialism in the American Renaissance*. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014).
- ^{xlix} Patrick Wolfe, 'Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native', 397.