The Necropolitical Order: Indigenous Marginality and Sovereign Power in Settler Colonialism

Mehak Bakshi[1] and [2]Dr Sandeep Kumar Sharma

[*1,2]Department of English, School of Liberal and Creative Arts, Lovely Professional University, Punjab, India
* mehakbakshi01@gmail.com
 sandeep.12800@lpu.co.in

Abstract

This paper examines the concept of the necropolitical order as it manifests within the context of settler colonialism, focusing on the relationship between Indigenous marginality and sovereign power. Drawing on the work of scholars such as Achille Mbembe, Patrick Wolfe, and Aileen Moreton-Robinson, we argue that settler colonialism operates as a distinct form of necropower, one that seeks to eliminate Indigenous peoples not only physically but also culturally and politically.

The paper analyses how land dispossession, genocide, legal frameworks, and ongoing systemic inequalities function as mechanisms of necropolitical control, producing and maintaining Indigenous marginality. We explore how settler states assert sovereignty through the control of life and death, shaping the life chances of Indigenous populations and limiting their ability to exercise self-determination. Furthermore, the paper examines Indigenous resistance movements and decolonial struggles as forms of counter-necropower, challenging the settler colonial order and asserting Indigenous sovereignty and self-determination. This paper aims to contribute to a deeper understanding of the ongoing struggles for Indigenous rights and justice by analysing the necropolitical dimensions of settler colonialism.

Keywords: Necropolitics; Settler Colonialism; Indigenous Marginality; Sovereign Power; Decolonization; Indigenous Resistance.

1. INTRODUCTION

The enduring legacies of settler colonialism continue to shape the lives and experiences of Indigenous peoples globally. Unlike traditional colonialism, which often sought to extract resources and labour from colonised populations, settler colonialism is characterised by the permanent occupation and appropriation of Indigenous lands to eliminate the Indigenous presence and replace it with a settler. This project of elimination operates not only through physical violence but also through a range of legal, political, and social mechanisms that produce and maintain Indigenous marginality.

Central to understanding the dynamics of settler colonialism is the concept of necropolitics, a term coined by Achille Mbembe to describe how sovereign power operates through the control of life and death. In the context of settler colonialism, necropolitics manifests in the ongoing dispossession of Indigenous lands, the legacy of genocide and forced assimilation, and the systemic inequalities that continue to disproportionately impact Indigenous communities. Understanding the necropolitical dimensions of settler colonialism is crucial for contemporary social movements and struggles for decolonisation because it reveals how power operates beyond overt violence. This paper argues that settler colonialism constitutes a distinct form of necropolitical order, one that seeks to eliminate Indigenous peoples not only physically but also culturally and politically. By examining the intersections of Indigenous marginality, sovereign power, and necropolitics, this paper aims to contribute to a deeper understanding of the ongoing struggles for Indigenous rights and justice within settler colonial contexts (Acosta, 2022).

Imagine a force so insidious it doesn't just claim bodies, but entire futures. This is the reality of settler colonialism, a structure, not an event, that operates through the logic of replacement, seeking to erase Indigenous peoples not just physically, but culturally and politically. This erasure, however, is not a passive process of history (Fish, 2022). It is actively maintained through what we call the **necropolitical order**. The concept of necropolitics – the power to dictate who lives, who dies, and how – this paper argues that settler colonialism thrives by controlling Indigenous life chances (Barp & Mitjavila, 2019). This control manifests not only through historical traumas like genocide and forced assimilation, but also through the mundane violence of systemic inequalities woven into law, policy, and everyday life (Allinson, 2015).

By placing Indigenous marginality at the heart of this analysis, we aim to expose how settler states assert their sovereignty through a continuous process of dispossession and debilitating control. This paper, however, goes beyond simply documenting oppression (Allinsion, 2015). By tracing the necropolitical dimensions of settler colonialism, we aim to illuminate the ongoing resistance of Indigenous peoples, who, despite facing elimination, continue to fight for self-determination and reclaim their rightful place within a decolonised future.

Despite growing awareness of settler colonialism's enduring legacies, dominant narratives continue to frame it as a historical phenomenon with a clean break from the present. This framing obscures the ongoing operation of settler colonial power, particularly its necropolitical dimensions, which actively maintain Indigenous marginality and undermine Indigenous sovereignty (Bevilacqua, 2021). This problem is further compounded by a lack of scholarship that explicitly connects the theoretical framework of necropolitics to the everyday realities of settler colonial governance. This paper addresses this gap by examining how the necropolitical order of settler colonialism operates through seemingly mundane policies and practices that, while often presented as benign or even beneficial, ultimately function to control Indigenous life chances and limit Indigenous self-determination (BiÇer, 2023). While there's increasing scholarship on both settler colonialism and necropolitics, several research gaps remain in understanding their intersection, particularly concerning Indigenous experiences.

Much research on necropolitics within settler colonial contexts focuses on overt forms of violence like genocide and land dispossession. There's a need for more analyses of how necropower operates through seemingly mundane policies and practices (e.g., healthcare disparities, environmental racism, and legal frameworks that limit sovereignty (Minca, 2006). Mbembe's concept of necropolitics is valuable, but there's a need to refine it further within the specific context of settler colonialism. This work aims to examine how the necropolitical order of settler colonialism operates in settler colonial contexts, e.g., Canada, Australia, and the United States by analysing the seemingly mundane policies and practices that contribute to Indigenous marginality and undermine Indigenous sovereignty (Israel et al., 2002).

Aileen Moreton-Robinson, a prominent Goenpul woman of the Bundjalung nation in Australia, stands as a leading Indigenous scholar whose work has profoundly shaped the understanding of settler colonialism. As a distinguished professor and researcher, she has delved into the intricacies of power, race, and gender within colonial contexts. Her groundbreaking book, **Talkin' Up to the White Woman: Indigenous Women and Feminism** ('I have never stopped': Aileen Moreton-Robinson on 20 years of Talkin' Up to the White Woman), is a seminal text in Indigenous feminist thought. In it, she critiques the limitations of Western feminism and highlights the unique experiences and perspectives of Indigenous women within settler colonial societies (Aileen).

Moreton-Robinson's work extends beyond feminist theory to encompass a broader analysis of settler colonialism's enduring legacies. She argues that settler colonialism operates through a "possessive logic" that seeks to control Indigenous lands, resources, and ultimately, Indigenous existence itself. This logic, she contends, underpins the construction of whiteness as property and the assertion of white sovereignty over Indigenous peoples. Her work is crucial to understanding the necropolitical dimensions of settler colonialism because it reveals how this possessive logic translates into concrete policies and practices that have life-or-death consequences for Indigenous communities (Whyte, 2016). By centring Indigenous voices and experiences, particularly those of Indigenous women, Moreton-Robinson provides invaluable insights for challenging the necropolitical order and advancing Indigenous self-determination (Kingston, 2015).

Giorgio Agamben, the Italian philosopher, has been highly influential in developing the concept of necropolitics, particularly through his work *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. His analysis of sovereign power, the state of exception, and the concept of *homo sacer* provides a critical framework for understanding how power operates through the control of life and death. Agamben argues that sovereign power is fundamentally defined by its ability to decide who is worthy of life and who can be killed with impunity (Ndika,

2013). This power isn't just about physical killing, but also about creating conditions where certain populations are exposed to death or excluded from the political and social order. Central to Agamben's work is the concept of the "state of exception" a situation where the sovereign suspends the rule of law and operates outside the bounds of normal legal constraints (Lea et al., 2018). This creates a space where certain individuals or groups are stripped of their rights and reduced to "bare life" – existing solely at the mercy of sovereign power. This concept resonates strongly with the experiences of Indigenous peoples under settler colonialism, where states of exception have been routinely declared (through martial law, land confiscations, forced assimilation policies) to justify violence and dispossession . He argues that biopolitics is inherently linked to necropolitics, as the power to manage and optimize life also implies the power to decide who lives, who dies, and under what conditions (Lauderdale, 1997) .

Some scholars argue that his reliance on European philosophical and historical examples limits the applicability of his concepts to non-Western contexts. Critics point out that necropower operates through various actors and institutions beyond the state, including corporations, paramilitary groups, and even cultural norms. Despite these critiques, Agamben's work remains crucial for understanding how power operates through the control of life and death, providing a valuable framework for analysing the necropolitical dimensions of settler colonialism and other forms of oppression (Bignall & Svirsky, 2012).

The relationship between settler-colonial states and the Indigenous populations they have dispossessed is profoundly unequal, defined by a necropolitical logic that renders Indigenous bodies and spaces disposable and unworthy of the full exercise of sovereign power . Through mechanisms of administrative violence, the colonial project has systematically marginalised and criminalized Indigenous peoples, denying them the basic rights and protections afforded to the settler population (Nicholls, 2021) . The management of this marginality is carried out through a range of policing and security practices that constitute a broader strategy of "pacification", aimed at containing and suppressing Indigenous resistance to settler-colonial dispossession . These practices, while ostensibly concerned with public order and security, are deeply entangled with the colonial project, relying on a logic of security and liberal legalism to uphold the territorial and political integrity of the settler state . Crucially, the entrenchment of this necropolitical order is not a passive process but is actively resisted by Indigenous communities through various forms of organizational and legal-political struggle .

This division is maintained and reinforced through the instrumentalization of law and other bureaucratic apparatuses, which serve to confirm and perpetuate the colonial hierarchy (Brennan, 2024). Even as Indigenous peoples have resisted and subverted these structures of domination, the forces of settler colonialism have proven tenacious, adapting to new technological and organizational forms to maintain their hegemony (Lee, 2019) —a process that has been particularly evident in the digitalization of colonial power, which has enabled the settler-colonial state to exert new modalities of hyper-visibility and control over Indigenous communities, further solidifying their marginality within the social and political order (Brennan, 2024). Even as Indigenous peoples have resisted and subverted these structures of domination, the forces of settler colonialism have proven tenacious, adapting to new technological and organizational forms to maintain their hegemony. This process has been particularly evident in the digitalization of colonial power, which has enabled the settler-colonial state to exert new modalities of hyper-visibility and control over Indigenous communities, further entrenching their marginality within the social and political order (Park, 2022) . Despite the ongoing efforts of Indigenous communities to assert their sovereignty and challenge the necropolitical logic that underpins the settler-colonial project, the state has continued to wield its administrative and legal apparatuses to reinforce the unequal power dynamics that relegate Indigenous peoples to the margins of society. The necropolitical order thus persists, sustained by the relentless drive of the settler-colonial state to maintain its dominance over the Indigenous populations it has dispossessed.

Yet, as the literature suggests, Indigenous movements have sought to counter these forces through multifarious strategies that challenge the very foundations of the settler-colonial order. logic that underpins the settler-colonial project, the state has continued to wield its administrative and legal apparatuses to reinforce the unequal power dynamics that relegate Indigenous peoples to the margins of society (Islekel, 2022) . The necropolitical order thus persists, sustained by the relentless drive of the settler-colonial state to maintain its dominance over the Indigenous populations it has dispossessed (Bujon, 2023).

Indeed, the literature points to the emergence of Indigenous "resurgence" movements that seek to disrupt and transform the colonial structures that have marginalized them, pursuing independent programs of social and

cultural rejuvenation as a means of asserting their inherent sovereignty and challenging the normative-discursive environment that continues to reflect the imperative of Indigenous elimination (Rouse, 2021).

The spatial and racial dimensions of settler colonialism are inseparable, working in tandem to dispossess Indigenous peoples and assert control over land. Settler colonialism views Indigenous lands as territory to be conquered and exploited, disregarding Indigenous relationships with the land as a source of livelihood, identity, and spirituality (Israel et al., 2002). This perspective is rooted in racist ideologies that position Indigenous peoples as inherently inferior and incapable of properly managing their lands. The act of mapping itself becomes a tool of colonial power, imposing artificial boundaries that fragment Indigenous territories and disregard traditional land tenure systems. This fragmentation weakens Indigenous claims to land and facilitates the imposition of settler legal frameworks. Even in urban contexts, settler colonialism manifests spatially through segregation, displacement, and marginalisation of Indigenous communities. This can take the form of forced relocation to reserves or urban ghettos, as well as ongoing economic and social exclusion (Mako, 2012).

It's crucial to understand that Indigenous resistance is not a monolith. It takes on diverse forms, evolving across time and place. Challenging colonial narratives and asserting Indigenous perspectives on history, land, and identity is fundamental. This can involve reviving traditional knowledge systems, promoting Indigenous languages, and reclaiming control over cultural representations (Yang, 2011). Indigenous communities have utilised legal systems, international forums, and national politics to advance land claims, treaty rights, and self-determination. This includes engaging in court cases, lobbying governments, and forming political organisations. From blockades and occupations to marches and demonstrations, direct action has been a powerful tool for raising awareness, disrupting colonial projects, and asserting Indigenous presence (Chatterjee, 2018). Revitalising traditional practices, languages, and ceremonies is a powerful act of resistance. It affirms Indigenous identity, transmits knowledge to future generations, and strengthens community bonds .

Indigenous sovereignty goes beyond mere recognition; it's about self-determination and the inherent right to govern their lands, peoples, and futures. There are strategies for Asserting Sovereignty. Firstly, holding settler governments accountable to treaty obligations and advocating for the full implementation of treaty rights is essential (Whyte, 2016). Secondly, establishing Indigenous-led governance structures, such as tribal councils, land trusts, and community justice systems, asserts autonomy and self-determination . Another way is to develop Indigenous-controlled economies, based on traditional knowledge and sustainable practices, challenge colonial dependency and promote self-sufficiency (Marasco, 2017). Lastly, preserving and protecting sacred sites, burial grounds, and culturally significant landscapes is vital for maintaining spiritual connections to land and asserting Indigenous sovereignty over those spaces (Stewart & Delgado, 2023).

The concept of "Sovereign Power" in this context emphasizes that Indigenous sovereignty is not granted by the settler state but is inherent and rooted in pre-colonial histories, laws, and relationships to land . By highlighting the ongoing struggle for sovereignty, these keywords encourage research on the diverse ways in which Indigenous peoples resist assimilation, assert their rights, and revitalise their cultures. This includes legal challenges, political activism, cultural revitalisation, and spiritual practices. These have fostered interdisciplinary conversations between Indigenous Studies, Postcolonial Studies, Critical Race Studies, Legal Studies, and Geography. This has led to more nuanced and intersectional analyses of colonial power dynamics (Cunneen & Tauri, 2019). This research work has widened the decenter eurocentric perspectives, exposed the ongoing violence of settler colonialism, recognised the diversity of Indigenous resistance, reframed sovereignty as inherent and rooted in Indigenous worldviews, and fostered interdisciplinary dialogue. By pushing the boundaries of traditional Postcolonial Studies, these concepts have opened up new avenues for understanding the complexities of settler colonialism and Indigenous experiences in the 21st century (Spiwak et al., 2012).

1.1 the spatialization of necropolitics

One of the key ways in which the necropolitical order operates in settler-colonial contexts is through the control and management of space. As Patrick Wolfe famously argued, settler colonialism is a "structure, not an event". Wolfe's book Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology is characterised by the ongoing dispossession of Indigenous lands and the imposition of settler sovereignty. This process of dispossession is not simply about the physical taking of land, but also about the symbolic and discursive construction of Indigenous spaces as inherently "empty," "undeveloped," or otherwise in need of settler intervention (Weiss, 2013). This spatial logic of settler colonialism is deeply intertwined with necropolitics. By relegating Indigenous peoples to geographically and symbolically marginalised spaces, the settler state creates the conditions for their social,

economic, and political death. This can be seen in the forced removal of Indigenous communities to reservations and reserves, the denial of access to traditional territories, and the ongoing environmental destruction of Indigenous lands (Lowman & Barker, 2015) .

Wolfe talks about how Indigenous peoples are often constructed as inherently "backward," "primitive," or otherwise incapable of participating in the modern nation-state. This racialised discourse serves to justify their exclusion from the full benefits of citizenship and their subjection to ongoing forms of state violence. This racialisation of necropolitics is evident in the over-representation of Indigenous peoples in the criminal justice system, the disproportionate impact of poverty and health disparities on Indigenous communities, and the ongoing denial of Indigenous self-determination (Shymko & Frémeaux, 2021) . Despite the pervasive nature of the necropolitical order, Indigenous peoples have never passively accepted their marginalization. From the earliest days of colonization, Indigenous communities have resisted settler-colonial violence and dispossession through a variety of means, including armed resistance, legal challenges, cultural revitalization, and the assertion of Indigenous sovereignty (Martin & Ortiz-Ceberio, 2020) . In recent decades, there has been a growing movement for Indigenous resurgence, which seeks to move beyond simply resisting colonialism to actively reclaiming Indigenous lands, languages, cultures, and self-determination. This resurgence movement represents a powerful challenge to the necropolitical order of settler colonialism, offering a vision of a future in which Indigenous peoples are no longer subject to the whims of the settler state (Swyngedouw & Ernstson, 2018) .

1.1 1.2 Indigenous Resurgence and the Deconstruction

While the previous section outlined the grim realities of the necropolitical order within settler-colonial contexts, it is crucial to recognize that Indigenous peoples have never been passive recipients of colonial violence. This section delves into the dynamic forces of Indigenous resistance and resurgence, highlighting how they challenge deeply rooted ideas of power and offer pathways towards dismantling the necropolitical order. Challenging rooted ideas of power begins with moving beyond simplistic binaries of oppressor/oppressed (Dafnos, 2013) . While acknowledging the very real power imbalances inherent in settler colonialism, it's essential to recognize the agency, knowledge systems, and forms of power that Indigenous communities have always possessed and continue to exercise. As Audra Simpson argues, Indigenous peoples possess "ethnographic refusal," a form of resistance that challenges the colonial gaze and asserts the validity and power of Indigenous knowledge systems . Simpson's Mohawk Interruptus challenges the settler-colonial claim to sole authority over knowledge production and legitimacy. The very act of maintaining cultural practices, languages, and ceremonies in the face of colonial attempts at erasure is a powerful form of resistance. As Taiaiake Alfred emphasizes, Indigenous self-determination is intrinsically linked to cultural survival and resurgence (Alfred's Peace, Power, Righteousness). For many Indigenous communities, their relationship to the land is fundamental to their identity, spirituality, and political existence (Martin & Ortiz-Ceberio, 2020) . The struggle to protect and reclaim ancestral lands is thus not merely about economic resources but about asserting inherent sovereign rights and challenging the settler-colonial claim to territorial control (Coulthard, 2014).

2. METHODOLOGY

This research employs a multi-method approach to comprehensively analyse the concept of Necropolitics by Achille Mbembe. Through a thorough literary analysis, the study delves into the concept of Necropolitics, who must live and die. Colonialism is a complex and deeply entrenched system of power that continues to have devastating consequences for Indigenous peoples around the world. By understanding how this order operates, we can begin to develop strategies for dismantling it and creating a more just and equitable future for all. Information about marginalized communities most affected by necropolitics is often under-reported or overlooked. Simultaneously, the research applies a theoretical framework anchored on existing power structures and societal biases that shaped who was most impacted and how governments responded. This study traces the historical roots of necropolitics and its evolution over time, analysing the social structures and inequalities that contribute to necropolitical power and Comparing necropolitics to other theoretical frameworks by discussing indigenous Resistance.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The article "The Gendered Necropolitics of Migration Control in a French Postcolonial Periphery" by Nina Sahraou, analyses the postcolonial dynamics of migration control in Mayotte, an overseas department of France, and posits that these dynamics have necropolitical implications. It highlights the gendered aspects of this

necropolitical authority by examining the experiences of undocumented Comorian women about their lives and border crossings. The persistent obstacles to the regularisation of their administrative status jeopardize their access to healthcare and undermine their long-term living conditions. Additionally, the continual threat of arrest and large-scale deportations contribute to perilous border crossings, each of which places individuals at risk of fatal outcomes (Mbembe, 2003). The article further emphasises that these necropolitical conditions are intensified by the postcolonial dilemmas faced by Mahoran elites, particularly in light of the growing support among Black and Muslim elites for the French far-right political party.

History is full of tragic instances where necropolitics shaped the colonial experience. One such example is the establishment and operation of the San Lazaro Crematorium in Manila, the Philippines, under American colonial rule in the early 20th century (Mbembé & Meintjes, n.d.). In this paper, Morley talks about how The American colonization of the Philippines significantly altered the character of local civilization. A prominent change instigated by American colonial governance was the introduction of new public health practices. Although these measures were intended to enhance the health and life expectancy of Filipinos, their implementation faced considerable resistance. This paper specifically examines the establishment of the Philippines' first crematory facility, the San Lazaro Crematorium, which was inaugurated in 1903 in Manila. Consequently, this study provides an overview of Filipino responses to the American colonial authorities' modernisation initiative (Gromkowska-Melosik, 2021). The analysis addresses three key aspects: first, the objectives that American colonial policymakers aimed to achieve concerning public health; second, how the American colonial framework directly confronted Filipino cultural practices related to disease prevention and death management; and third, the significance of the San Lazaro Crematorium as a unique lens through which to understand the nature of America's initial governance in the Philippines. This exploration holds dual significance: it enhances understanding of the administration's operations and the corresponding native resistance. It also highlights the crematorium's current state of disrepair as a dark heritage site that merits preservation (Ek, 2006).

In the article "Necropenology: Conquering New Bodies, psychics, and Territories of Death in East Jerusalem" by Nadera Shalhoub-Kevorkian talks about the theoretical exploration of penal politics by examining the representation of colonised individuals through an analysis of state violence inflicted upon deceased bodies (Verghese, 2021). It provides a detailed examination of the political context in which the state, via its judicial system, military, and law enforcement agencies, leaves corpses in a state of disarray, retains them in carceral facilities, and inflicts suffering upon their communities. This phenomenon is conceptualised as "necropenology." Drawing on the testimonies of families from Jerusalem whose children have been imprisoned posthumously, the paper posits the expansion of carceral spaces and the criminalisation of the deceased (Lea et al., 2018). This framework asserts control over new bodies, psyches, and territories, both in life and death, through the exercise of power that designates both the living and the deceased as expendable. Families from Jerusalem articulate their experiences, revealing how this form of power undermines emotional autonomy, perpetuates indignities, and perpetuates the perception of the colonised as inherently threatening, subject to perpetual scrutiny in both life and death.

Another article The Sovereign Right to Kill: A Critical Appraisal of Israel's Shoot-to-Kill Policy in Gaza by Noura Erakat (2019), introduces a new framework for understanding armed conflict that has blurred the lines between civilian and combatant, thereby broadening the definition of legitimate targets and allowing for the increased killing of Palestinians under legal justifications; this concept is referred to as the 'shrinking civilian' (Van Genugten, 2010). In "Colonial management of death: To be or not to be dead in Palestine", discusses how Israel employs its necropolitical and biopolitical authority to control Palestinian mortality, as well as the resistance tactics employed by Palestinian families to counteract this control (Farrell et al., 2021). The study posits that necropolitics encompasses the coloniser's regulation of the grief and mourning experienced by the colonized and the choices regarding the circumstances of their death. In essence, it refers to the power to dictate the framework and process of 'allowing to die' and the state of being deceased.

3.1 The Logic of Elimination: Fueling the Engine of Necropower in Settler Colonialism

The logic of elimination, a defining characteristic of settler colonialism, is intrinsically intertwined with the deployment of necropower. It's not simply about conquering territory, but about eliminating the Native presence to claim it as rightfully belonging to the settler society. This operates on multiple levels, shaping how necropower manifests. The logic of elimination frames Indigenous peoples as obstacles to settler-colonial progress, their presence deemed incompatible with the desired future. This justifies violence, both physical and structural, as a

necessary means to achieve settler goals. Clearing of land often takes the form of literal elimination through massacres, forced removals, and policies designed to eradicate Indigenous cultures and lifeways. The land itself is cleansed of its Indigenous presence, paving the way for settler dominance (Wolfe, 2006).

Necropower isn't always about immediate death. It thrives on slow violence, attrition through poverty, inadequate healthcare, environmental destruction, and systemic neglect. These conditions become normalized, seen as unfortunate but inevitable consequences of "progress," rather than deliberate acts of elimination. The Settler-colonial states often control how Indigenous deaths are understood and represented. By silencing Indigenous voices and framing deaths as isolated incidents or the fault of Indigenous peoples themselves, the systemic nature of necropower is obscured. Settler colonialism also grants differential citizenship rights, creating hierarchies of "liveness." Indigenous peoples are often denied full citizenship or subjected to policies that limit their political and economic power, rendering them more vulnerable to the effects of necropower (Mbembé & Meintjes, n.d.). The logic of elimination deems Indigenous lives as less worthy of protection and care. This justifies environmental racism, resource extraction on Indigenous lands, and inadequate access to healthcare and social services, all of which contribute to Indigenous mortality and morbidity. Importantly, Indigenous peoples have never passively accepted this logic of elimination. Their resistance movements, cultural revitalization efforts, and assertions of sovereignty directly challenge necropower by reclaiming control over their bodies, lands, and futures (Verghese, 2021). It is the insidious undercurrent that fuels the deployment of necropower in settler-colonial contexts. By understanding this connection, we can better identify and challenge the ways in which necropower operates, working towards a decolonial future that upholds the inherent right to life and self-determination for all peoples (Hesketh, 2023).

3.2 Patrick Wolfe: Unveiling the Logic of Elimination in Settler Colonialism

Patrick Wolfe (1950-2016) was a renowned historian and anthropologist whose work has been foundational to understanding the ongoing nature and profound violence of settler colonialism. While his analysis of settler colonialism's *logic of elimination* provides a framework for understanding how power, particularly necropower, operates in these contexts. Wolfe argued that settler colonialism isn't a past event but an enduring structure that continues to shape the present. This challenges narratives that portray colonialism as a historical injustice that has been resolved, highlighting its ongoing impact on Indigenous peoples (Elliott, 2017).

Wolfe's work reveals how necropower operates through seemingly mundane policies and practices that, while not always directly lethal, contribute to the ongoing dispossession and premature death of Indigenous peoples. This includes policies related to land rights, resource extraction, healthcare, and education. He showed how settler-colonial societies construct narratives that justify and naturalize the elimination of Indigenous peoples (Arendt, 1961). This includes portraying Indigenous peoples as primitive, backwards, or a threat to progress, legitimizing violence and dispossession.He recognized the resilience and agency of Indigenous peoples, highlighting their ongoing struggles for self-determination and cultural survival. This challenges narratives that portray Indigenous peoples as passive victims, emphasizing their active resistance to necropolitical power (Fish, 2022). Wolfe emphasised that power in settler-colonial contexts is relational and contested. While settler societies wield significant power, Indigenous peoples resist, adapt, and survive, challenging the settler-colonial project in myriad ways.

4. CONCLUSION

The struggle against the necropolitical order is ultimately a struggle for a different kind of future—one based on principles of justice, equity, and respect for Indigenous self-determination. This requires recognising Indigenous land rights as fundamental to decolonization and working towards the return of stolen lands, honouring existing treaties engaging in meaningful dialogue towards reconciliation and redress, and providing resources and platforms for Indigenous communities to lead the way in shaping their futures. By challenging rooted ideas of power and asserting their inherent rights, Indigenous peoples are not only resisting the necropolitical order but also offering a powerful vision for a more just and sustainable future for all (García & Fold, 2022). This research, by centring the experiences and resistances of Indigenous peoples within the framework of necropolitics and settler colonialism, aims to contribute to a decolonial future in several significant ways. By highlighting Indigenous experiences of marginalization and resistance, this research disrupts dominant narratives that often erase or minimize Indigenous perspectives (Minca, 2006) .

Centering Indigenous knowledge on Indigenous scholarship and lived experiences, this work contributes to the growing body of knowledge that challenges colonial paradigms and asserts the validity and importance of

Indigenous ways of knowing and being . Building bridges of understanding and raising awareness about the ongoing legacies of settler colonialism and the resilience of Indigenous resistance, this research can foster greater understanding and empathy among non-Indigenous audiences. This understanding can inspire action and solidarity, encouraging individuals and institutions to support Indigenous-led movements for social justice, land rights, and self-determination.

The application of necropolitics to settler colonialism provides a useful framework for analysing power dynamics, colonial legacies, and Indigenous resistance movements. This research highlights key themes and questions that warrant further investigation, such as the role of digital technologies in contemporary forms of necropolitics, the intersections of settler colonialism with other forms of oppression, and the possibilities for decolonial futures (Gavroche, 2020).

REFERENCES

Allinson, J. (2015). The Necropolitics of Drones. *International Political Sociology*, *9*(2), 113–127. https://doi.org/10.1111/ips.12086

Arendt, H. (1961). Freedom and Politics. In *Springer eBooks* (pp. 191–217). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-010-3665-8_11

Barp, L. F. G., & Mitjavila, M. R. (2019). Necropolítica nas mortes contemporâneas. *Revista Internacional Interdisciplinar INTERthesis*, *16*(1), 143–147. https://doi.org/10.5007/1807-1384.2019v16n1p143

Bevilacqua, I. (2021). E-scaping apartheid: Digital ventures of Zionist settler colonialism. *Human Geography*, *15*(2), 220–228. https://doi.org/10.1177/19427786211055780

BiÇer, A. G. (2023). Biopolitical Imperialism and Necropolitics: David Hare's Via Dolorosa. *SÖYLEM Filoloji Dergisi*, *8*(1), 139–147. https://doi.org/10.29110/soylemdergi.1254387

Bignall, S., & Svirsky, M. (2012). Introduction: Agamben and Colonialism. In *Edinburgh University Press eBooks* (pp. 1–14). https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748643950-002

Brennan, E. (2024). Necropolitics and Surplus Life: Mbembe and Beyond. *Theory Culture & Society*, *41*(3), 3–19. https://doi.org/10.1177/02632764241229203

Bujon, H. (2023). In Excess of Decolonization: The Sovereignty of Childhood in The Wretched of the Earth by Frantz Fanon. *Theory Culture & Society*, *41*(3), 21–35. https://doi.org/10.1177/02632764231205031

Chatterjee, S. (2018). Immigration, anti-racism, and Indigenous self-determination: towards a comprehensive analysis of the contemporary settler colonial. *Social Identities*, *25*(5), 644–661. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504630.2018.1473154

Cunneen, C., & Tauri, J. M. (2019). Indigenous Peoples, Criminology, and Criminal Justice. *Annual Review of Criminology*, *2*(1), 359–381. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-criminol-011518-024630

Dafnos, T. (2013). Pacification and Indigenous Struggles in Canada. *Socialist Studies*, *9*(2). https://doi.org/10.18740/s49g6r

Ek, R. (2006). Giorgio agamben and the spatialities of the camp: an introduction. *Geografiska Annaler Series B Human Geography*, *88*(4), 363–386. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0435-3684.2006.00228.x

Elliott, M. (2017). Indigenous Resurgence: The Drive for Renewed Engagement and Reciprocity in the Turn Away from the State. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, *51*(1), 61–81. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0008423917001032

Farrell, J., Burow, P. B., McConnell, K., Bayham, J., Whyte, K., & Koss, G. (2021). Effects of land dispossession and forced migration on Indigenous peoples in North America. *Science*, *374*(6567). https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abe4943

Fish, A. (2022). Reforesting Native America with Drones: Rooting Carbon with Arborescent Governmentality and Decolonial Geoengineering. *Theory Culture & Society*, *40*(7–8), 157–177. https://doi.org/10.1177/02632764221096815

García, N. A., & Fold, N. (2022). The coloniality of power on the green frontier: commodities and violent territorialisation in Colombia's Amazon. *Geoforum*, *128*, 192–201. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2021.11.025

Gavroche, J. (2020, May 13). *Giorgio Agamben: Biosecurity and politics*. Autonomies. https://autonomies.org/2020/05/giorgio-agamben-biosecurity-and-politics

Gromkowska-Melosik, A. (2021). Cross-Cultural Research: Insider/Outsider Dichotomy Reconsidered. *Przegląd*

Badań Edukacyjnych, *1*(32), 205. https://doi.org/10.12775/pbe.2021.012

Hesketh, C. (2023). Indigenous resistance at the frontiers of accumulation: Challenging the coloniality of space in International Relations. *Review of International Studies*, 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0260210523000268

Islekel, E. S. (2022). Gender in Necropolitics: Race, sexuality, and gendered death. *Philosophy Compass*, *17*(5). https://doi.org/10.1111/phc3.12827

Israel, M., Lyons, T., & Mason, C. (2002). Women, Resistance and Africa: Armed Struggles in Zimbabwe, South Africa and Eritrea. *Humanity & Society*, *26*(3), 196–213. https://doi.org/10.1177/016059760202600302

Kingston, L. (2015). The Destruction of Identity: Cultural Genocide and Indigenous Peoples. *Journal of Human Rights*, *14*(1), 63–83. https://doi.org/10.1080/14754835.2014.886951

Lauderdale, P. (1997). Indigenous North American Jurisprudence1. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, *38*(1–2), 131–148. https://doi.org/10.1177/002071529703800108

Lea, T., Howey, K., & O'Brien, J. (2018). Waging Paperfare: Subverting the Damage of Extractive Capitalism in Kakadu. *Oceania*, *88*(3), 305–319. https://doi.org/10.1002/ocea.5203

Lee, H. J. S. (2019). Female Sexuality and Sovereignty : Reading 'Necropolitics' and 'Work of Death.' *Journal of Japanology*, *48*, 325–343. https://doi.org/10.21442/djs.2019.48.13

Mako, S. (2012). Cultural Genocide and Key International Instruments: Framing the Indigenous Experience. *International Journal on Minority and Group Rights*, *19*(2), 175–194. https://doi.org/10.1163/157181112x639078

Marasco, R. (2017). Red Skin/White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition. By Glen Sean Coulthard (University of Minnesota Press, 2014). *Constellations*, *24*(1), 137–139. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8675.12273

Martin, A., & Ortiz-Ceberio, C. (2020). The Power of Necropolitics: Affect Theory and Violence in Perspective. *Investigaciones Feministas*, *11*(2), 263–271. https://doi.org/10.5209/infe.66087

Mbembe, A. (2003). Necropolitics. *Public Culture*, *15*(1), 11–40. https://doi.org/10.1215/08992363-15-1-11

Mbembé, J. A., & Meintjes, L. (n.d.). *Necropolitics*. https://muse.jhu.edu/article/39984

Minca, C. (2006). Giorgio agamben and the new biopolitical nomos. *Geografiska Annaler Series B Human Geography*, *88*(4), 387–403. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0435-3684.2006.00229.x

Montenegro, M., Pujol, J., & Posocco, S. (2017). Bordering, exclusions and necropolitics. *Qualitative Research Journal*, *17*(3), 142–154. https://doi.org/10.1108/qrj-08-2017-089

Morgensen, S. L. (2011). The Biopolitics of Settler Colonialism: Right Here, Right Now. *Settler Colonial Studies*, *1*(1), 52–76. https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473x.2011.10648801

Ndika, N. (2013). Acculturation. *SAGE Open*, *3*(4), 215824401351568. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244013515687

Nicholls, H. (2021). Colonial and Decolonial Resignification: US Empire-state Sovereignty in Hawai'i. In *Political power and social theory* (pp. 191–220). https://doi.org/10.1108/s0198-871920210000038010

Park, G. (2022). Nora Okja Keller's Fox Girl: Biopolitics, Necropolitics and a State of Exception. *Modern Studies in English Language & Literature*, *66*(2), 65–85. https://doi.org/10.17754/mesk.66.2.65

Richardson, C., Carriere, J., & Boldo, V. (2017). Invitations to dignity and well-being: cultural safety through Indigenous pedagogy, witnessing and giving back! *AlterNative an International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, *13*(3), 190–195. https://doi.org/10.1177/1177180117714413

Rifkin, M. (2009). Indigenizing Agamben: Rethinking Sovereignty in Light of the "Peculiar" Status of Native Peoples. *Cultural Critique*, *73*(1), 88–124. https://doi.org/10.1353/cul.0.0049

Romeyn, E. (2014). Anti-Semitism and Islamophobia: Spectropolitics and Immigration. *Theory Culture & Society*, *31*(6), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276413519482

Rougier, A. (2021). Necropolitics. *Wasafiri*, *36*(2), 105–107. https://doi.org/10.1080/02690055.2021.1879525

Rouse, C. M. (2021). Necropolitics versus Biopolitics: Spatialization, White Privilege, and Visibility during a Pandemic. *Cultural Anthropology*, *36*(3). https://doi.org/10.14506/ca36.3.03

Sahraoui, N. (2023). The Gendered Necropolitics of Migration Control in a French Postcolonial Periphery. *Migration and Society*, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.3167/arms.2024.0701of2

Shewly, H. J. (2013). Abandoned spaces and bare life in the enclaves of the India–Bangladesh border. *Political Geography*, *32*, 23–31. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2012.10.007

Shymko, Y., & Frémeaux, S. (2021). Escaping the Fantasy Land of Freedom in Organizations: The Contribution of Hannah Arendt. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *176*(2), 213–226. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-020-04707-x

Spiwak, R., Sareen, J., Elias, B., Martens, P., Munro, G., & Bolton, J. (2012). Complicated grief in Aboriginal populations. *Dialogues in Clinical Neuroscience*, *14*(2), 204–209. https://doi.org/10.31887/dcns.2012.14.2/rspiwak

Stewart, K. B., & Delgado, T. A. (2023). Necropolitics and Trans Identities: Language Use as Structural Violence. *Humans*, *3*(2), 106–125. https://doi.org/10.3390/humans3020010

Swyngedouw, E., & Ernstson, H. (2018). Interrupting the Anthropo-obScene: Immuno-biopolitics and Depoliticizing Ontologies in the Anthropocene. *Theory Culture & Society*, *35*(6), 3–30. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276418757314

Thompson, V. E. (2018). Repairing Worlds: On Radical Openness beyond Fugitivity and the Politics of Care: Comments on David Goldberg's Conversation with Achille Mbembe. *Theory Culture & Society*, *35*(7–8), 243–250. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276418808880

Van Genugten, W. (2010). Protection of Indigenous Peoples on the African Continent: Concepts, Position Seeking, and the Interaction of Legal Systems. *American Journal of International Law*, *104*(1), 29–65. https://doi.org/10.5305/amerjintelaw.104.1.0029

Verghese, N. (2021, March 10). What Is Necropolitics? The Political Calculation of Life and Death. *Teen Vogue*. https://www.teenvogue.com/story/what-is-necropolitics

Weiss, L. M. (2013). Intellectual property rights and sovereign claims; water, diamonds and rights in the Central Kalahari Game Reserve. *Settler Colonial Studies*, *3*(2), 157–171. https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473x.2013.781928

Whyte, K. (2016). Indigenous Experience, Environmental Justice and Settler Colonialism. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2770058

Wolfe, P. (2006). Settler colonialism and the elimination of the native. *Journal of Genocide Research*, *8*(4), 387–409. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623520601056240

Yang, M. M. H. (2011). Postcoloniality and Religiosity in Modern China. *Theory Culture & Society*, *28*(2), 3–44. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276410396915