Reel Settler Colonialism : Gazing, Reception, and Production of Global Settler Cinemas

Lahti, Janne

INTRODUCTION:

Reel Settler Colonialism: Gazing, Reception, and Production of Global Settler Cinemas

Rebecca Weaver-Hightower and Janne Lahti

The 1916 South African silent film, *The Voortrekkers: Winning A Continent*, tells the story of "the Great Trek," where hundreds of Dutch settlers in the 1830's moved northward from the Cape Colony to seek independence from British rule by settling a space inhabited by the Zulu.[1] After its title screen, the film gives its first intertitle (the caption screen typical of silent films). Using the two settler colonial languages of South Africa—English and Afrikaans—it reads: "Piet Retief, a farmer in the Cape Colony, has planned a great emigration to the unknown north for the purpose of buying territory from the natives upon which to establish a free Dutch republic." This statement sets up the 53-minute film with several interesting ideological claims. It declares the journey as "great," indicating not only the distance traveled from the "civilized sphere," but the size of the task the early settlers had to master. It makes the settler a farmer, revealing his intentions on the land. It also depicts the journey as "emigration," not conquest or war, thus masking violence by representing that settlers came with peaceful intentions. Then it claims the land "unknown" while at the same time acknowledging native ownership (since they could sell the land). And, by declaring that the land will be bought, the statement disavows the land theft inherent in settlement.

This notion of the land being fairly purchased is continued in the third intertitle screen which explains that this "fair trade" is meant to "thereby gain [the natives'] assistance in establishing a model republic for our posterity." The intertitle presents settlement resulting from the "Great Trek" of 1836-1838 as not an invasion but the beginning of a republic. Moreover, the

"our" in the statement leaves open that the republic might involve collaboration with natives or even equal rights for Africans and Dutch. This notion of fairness is contained in the film's subtitle—"winning a continent"—where settlement is made to appear as a fair contest that could be "won," and where the stakes are all of Africa.

As it progresses, the film shows this plan for a purportedly fair republic despoiled by the actions of two bad colonizers, Portuguese traders, who get labeled as "unwelcome visitors" by the intertitle of the next scene.[2] These traders plan to thwart the Dutch plan of peaceful negotiation and purchase because, as they explain, "if these cursed Dutchmen get into Zululand they will teach the natives trade valuations, and ruin our business." So, these men plan to travel ahead of the Voortrekkers to "poison the mind of the Zulu king against the Boers." And, thus the film proffers an explanation for the real-world hostilities that met the real Voortrekkers, including the killing of Piet Retief's party by the Zulu and the battle between the Zulu and trekkers on the Ncome River on 16 December 1838. This fight, "the Battle of Blood River," derived its name from the superior number of spear wielding Zulu forces that were killed by the smaller number of Voortrekkers with firearms, their blood dying the river red. But in the film, this fight was not an indigenous force trying and failing to repel an invasion but the result of two bad colonizers trying to despoil the peaceful efforts of benevolent colonizers.

The Great Trek remains famous in South Africa as a founding myth of Afrikaner nationalism, and *The Voortrekkers: Winning A Continent* holds a crucial role.[3] This early popular film acted as a propaganda tool, legitimizing settler colonialism and explaining settler righteousness. It was shown for years as part of "Day of the Vow," the annual celebration of the battle that for many Afrikaners was seen as God's sanction of their settlement by granting their victory over the most powerful of the native peoples, the Zulu.[4] This film also related a more

global story of righteous conquest, which settler audiences around the world could recognize and relate to. It spoke a settler "language" of expansion, native threat, settler victory, and promise of settler futures, a discourse that resonated far beyond the ethnic, national, and imperial boundaries of South Africa.

We begin by referencing *The Voortrekkers: Winning A Continent* because it serves as an apt example for the kind of work depicted and scrutinized in *Cinematic Settlers* overall, which intersects film studies and settler colonial studies to better understand how cinema connected the local with the global and captured and furthered a global settlement project. Because the medium came into its own in the twentieth century, films about settlement succeed most of the events they chronicle.[5] *The Voortrekkers: Winning A Continent*, for instance, follows the events it narrates by eighty years. So, for its viewers, who probably weren't alive to witness the Great Trek, the film brought the experience of the Voortrekkers into reality in a way not available through text, tale, or static image (painting, tapestry, drawing, or photograph). Viewers could experience the perilous crossing of a swift-flowing river with horses, oxen, and wagons submerged above their axels. They could marvel over the intimate view of the Zulu village and its dome shaped dwellings surrounded by hundreds of beskirted and shield carrying Zulu. They could relive the danger of the massive battle between the Zulu and Afrikaners and celebrate the tactics and technologies that allowed the Boers to fight off the larger Zulu force. The magic of film provides a verisimilitude necessary to the settler myth, creating through its successive frames a version of reality that replaces (or attempts to) other versions of events and which allows the descendants of settlers to relive the experiences of first-generation settler ancestors to better appreciate their "sacrifice" and legacy. By its nature, film offers viewers a recreation of

the historic events of settlement and also, through its continual replaying of settlement stories, reminds contemporary critics and viewers that settlement is far from accomplished.

That is, *The Voortrekkers: Winning A Continent* is important in 1916 (against the backdrop of the First World War, into which South Africa had been drawn as a member of the British Empire, despite protest from much of its Afrikaner population) not just because it replays an important act of settlement from the prior generation but because it does so in such a way as to justify the continued presence of the white minority as a ruling power. As anthropologist Patrick Wolfe has argued, settler colonialism is a structure and not an event, so it needs to be continually reasserted and legitimized, as the settler's position on the land is constantly challenged. The settler story must be recreated and retold because settlement is never fully accomplished. It is in this context that film as a genre and industry developed, ascended, and morphed into the digital medium of the twenty-first century.

Investigation of the making of *The Voortrekkers: Winning A Continent* says more about this fascinating intersection between cinema and the settler.[6] The film's maker, Herold M. Shaw, an American apprentice of Thomas Edison, had a long career making films in the U.S., England, Russia and for a brief period, South Africa. Shaw's background as an American as well as the film's apologetic stance for white supremacy led to comparisons in its own time and since with D. W. Griffiths' three-and-a-half-hour American epic, *Birth of a Nation*, an infamous defense of white supremacy in the United States. *Birth of a Nation* chronicled white settler conflicts with formerly enslaved Africans instead of conflicts between American settlers and the country's indigenes, collectively known as "Native Americans," but the U.S. settler-indigene conflict would be played over and over in the genre that became known as "the Western," which several

of the essays in this volume, including ones by Sheila McManus and Janne Lahti, work to unpack.

Like film, settler colonialism is a global phenomenon.[7] Settler colonialism stands for both a historical process and a particular way of looking at the past, a field of enquiry. Settler colonialism is typically defined as something that involves conquest and capture of land, long-range migration, permanent settlement (or at least intent of such), the elimination of Natives and/or native sovereignty, and the reproduction of one's own society on what used to be other people's lands. According to Wolfe, settler colonialism is not primarily an effort to build a master-servant relationship interested in exploitation of Native labor or the extraction of natural resources, but instead is more concerned about replacement and access to territory, the land itself. Wolfe underlined that as "settlers come to stay: invasion is a structure not an event" or a series of isolated events. It "destroys to replace," introduces "a zero-sum contest over land," and is characterized by "logic of elimination," a sustained institutional tendency to eliminate the Natives who stand in the way of settlers' ambitions of making the land their own.[8] As settler colonialism spread in North America, Australia, New Zealand, southern Africa, and Asia it relied on transnational circulations, networks, and connections of peoples, ideas, knowledge, and commodities. It was built on exchanges, shared methods, and common mentalities between and within empires.[9]

Settler colonialism also created global settler colonial cinemas with interlinked themes and joint narratives. Films provide a window to the settler, speak to a common, international, audience, and use a shared "language" of settler colonialism in doing so: the stories of empty lands, settler civilizations and righteousness, and of othering and elimination. Yet, a careful reading of settler cinemas can also reveal stories of ambiguity, settler vulnerability, and native

resistance and agency. How this all has been represented in a range of films across the globe is the purview of this collection, which contains analyses of films about settled spaces around the world: from the South Sea islands to the former USSR, from stories of settler ideology in Australia to settler ambivalence in Taiwan, in filmed spaces with settings real and constructed.

Existing at this nexus of the two dynamic fields of film and settler colonial studies, *Cinematic Settlers* builds on prior work, like Peter Limbrick's landmark *Making Settler Cinemas* and Corinn Columpar's *Unsettling Sights: The Fourth World on Film,* to bring insights to both fields that wouldn't otherwise exist. In its focus on form, representation and reception, and production, *Cinematic Settlers* brings valuable insights to settler colonial studies and to films about settlers. Film studies tends to focus on the medium as well as the narrative and how the visual narrative and production process create a unique experience for viewers across time and space. Essays in this book perform that type of analysis, like Dominique Bregent-Heald's and Lawrence Kessler's, which both analyze how film employs the scopophilic pleasure of gazing at the landscape as part of the viewer imaginatively settling the cinematic setting. Likewise, Maria Flood, Ian-Malcolm Rijsdijk, and Natale Zappia examine how settings were created, staged, and choreographed as part of the visual appeal of the settler story.

Film also brings into conversation discussion of representation and reception, working to unpack the experience of a text, as part of understanding its distribution and existence as a commodity. Film is the lingua franca of the twentieth century, the medium to which most of the settled globe had access. In spaces where literacy rates were low, books hard to come by, and television the purview of the privileged, films could still be found. Film could thus be dangerous, since the power of image could incite resistance, as in South Africa, where American films showing black actors on screen were banned. This volume, thus, also addresses reception.

Travis Franks's essay, for instance, reads film as an intervention at a particularly volatile

moment in Australian culture when settler-indigene relations threatened to be explosive.

Similarly, essays that focus on genre inherently address audience reception, as does Sheila

McManus's and Janne Lahti's. Alexander Morrison's analysis of how the USSR adapted the

Western genre under communism would equally bring attention to viewer reception.

Moreover, because film is a global phenomenon, as industries across the globe capture

and in some cases preserve a range of experiences, its recording of the settler experience brings

into comparison different kinds of settlers in different spaces, which is also the aim of settler

colonial studies and *Cinematic Settlers*. For instance, this book contains essays on German

settlers in Africa, as in Wolfgang Fuhrmann's piece, and American settlers in the South Seas,

Delia Malia Konzett's writing, alongside Chinese settlement of Taiwan, by Lin-Chin Tsai, and

even outer space, composed by Lorenzo Veracini. Other essays cover different eras and settler

colonial situations in Australia, New Zealand, Hawaii, the American West, Canada, Latin

America, Russia, France, Algeria, and South Africa.

It is also important to remember that film as an interdisciplinary medium is inherently

collaborative—as writers and directors, cinematographers, editors, actors, and a range of other

technicians and support staff collaborate to produce the feature film. Smaller budget, home-

grown films, as well, would require multiple hands to complete; only with the technology of the

end of the 20th and early 21st centuries could filmmakers with a computer or smart phone be

writer, actor, director, and cinematographer (though none of the films under analysis in this

volume are of that sort). The disciplines drawn upon in this collaborative collection mirror this

interdisciplinary orientation of film. *Cinematic Settlers* blends history, literature, anthropology,

and area and film studies, with authors representing different national backgrounds, originating from America, Europe, Asia, Africa, and Australasia.

Settler colonial studies also has insights to bring to film studies, which make this collection equally useful to scholars and students of film. Postcolonial film has been well examined, but the focus on the settler and settled experience is relatively new.[10] Settler colonial studies brings new topics and conceptualizations to film studies, including a new approach to indigenous studies and to resistance. Film is a structure of settlement but also a means for resistance, as film industries in newly independent countries have been mobilized in the service of creating a post-settler national identity. Essays in this volume—including those by Misha Kavka and Stephen Turner, as well as by Bianet Castellanos and Barry Judd—touch on this issue of film as a complicated and convoluted tool of resistance.

Finally, it is worth considering how film is itself a settler technology—an invention of settlers with early films primarily existing in the US and France to document everyday settler life for other settlers—the gate of a horse, a drive down a settlement street, the working of a snowplow, the routine of workers leaving a factory.[11] Settler colonialism was and is a global historical phenomenon that has a shared history filled with connections, circulations of ideas that are visible in films.

The book is organized into four thematic groupings, representing the major facets and questions of settler colonialism: conquest, settlers, Natives, and space. Each section offers a specific window into the settler cinematic experience, yet, the essays overlap in myriad ways, showing the layered and multidirectional narrative strands of settler cinemas. "Conquest" in this case isn't simply the historical events that first led to settlement but the conquest of reel landscapes and cinematic space. For instance, the first essay in the section, Delia Malia

Konzett's "The South Pacific as the Final Frontier: Hollywood's South Seas Fantasies, the Beachcomber, and Militarization" discusses Hollywood's South Seas genre and its conversion into the Pacific combat genre as contributions to US settler colonialism that validated US expansionism as entertainment. The "conquest" in this essay is of the filmed Pacific space as part of the settler colonial imaginary. Lawrence H. Kessler's "Environments of Settler Colonialism in Statehood-Era U.S. Cinematic Depictions of the Hawaiian Islands" also focuses on the American Pacific in its examination of three U.S. films set in Hawai'i produced shortly after statehood: *Blue Hawaii*, *Diamond Head*, and *Hawaii*. Kessler spotlights descriptions of the natural environment and ways that non-human nature exerts agency in determining settler colonial narratives of conquest, how nature both bolsters and challenges settler colonialism, provoking ambivalence in settler approaches and outlooks in regards to Hawai'i.

In "Settler-Aboriginal Alliance and the Threat of Foreign Invasion in Baz Luhrmann's *Australia*," Travis Franks scrutinizes how traditional conquest narratives get reimaged in present-day Australia through a retelling of the past as a struggle where the settler and indigene together faced an Asian threat. As has been the case with Prime Minister Kevin Rudd's apology to Aboriginal Australians), critics of Luhrmann's film tend to argue that it ultimately serves to alleviate culpability and shame amongst the settler population by promoting a fantasy of triumphant national unity. This chapter adds to this scholarly discourse by discussing the film's reliance on the invasion narrative and its attendant Asian stereotype to forge a bond between settler and Aboriginal characters.

The section on conquest ends with Alexander Morrison's "Settler Bolsheviks in the Soviet 'Eastern'," which analyzes how the Revolutionary and Civil War period in Central Asia became a popular subject for novels and films in the USSR portraying Russians as the main

agents of progress in Central Asia against the villainous Basmachi, bandits who resisted the new Soviet order. Morrison explores how the film Alye Maki Issyk-Kulya (*The Scarlet Poppies of Issyk-Kul*, Bolotbek Shamshiev, 1972) and the novel on which it was based, Alexander Sytin's Kontrabandisty Tian'-Shanya (*The Smugglers of the Tian-Shan*, 1930), follow and challenge the notions of the Eastern as settler colonial narratives.

The second section of the collection, "Settlers," includes four essays that each examine different settler groups as portrayed in film in North American West, German Africa, and Taiwan. Each essay, in its way, explores how cinematic depictions of settler lives betray the cracks in settler ideology in the midst of perpetuating that ideology. The section begins with Sheila McManus's "*Gunless* as Settler Colonial Borderlands Fantasy," which uses the highly portable tropes, themes, and settings of the American "Western" film genre to discuss a "Canadian Western," the 2010 film *Gunless*, which takes many of those classic tropes and themes and puts them to use to tell a nationalist tale about Canadian settler colonialism. Just like settler colonial projects around the world, McManus argues, Canada began by rendering Indigenous peoples and places invisible; it then created its own nationalist tales about multiculturalism and Mounties to create the image of a kinder, gentler West. Next Janne Lahti's "The Unbearable Settler West in *The Ballad of Buster Scruggs*" examines this Western anthology for its typical Western scenarios, which coexist with challenges to classic settler colonial narrative outcomes, but without managing to overcome them. The film, Lahti argues, depicts a settler West that is a twisted and aimless, filled with dread, fear, and violence, making the settler West unbearable. Yet, the settler West is also unbearably white, hiding the ethnic diversity of the historic West and thus, once again, reaffirming the settler colonial West as a white space.

Wolfgang Fuhrmann's "*Unser Haus in Kamerun*: The Restauration of Settler Colonial Memory in German Post-World War II Cinema," examines one of the few German films of the 1950s and 1960s that explicitly deals with Germany's colonial past – *Unser Haus in Kamerun* (Our House in Cameroon) from 1961 – against the background of post-colonial discourses in Germany, especially in regard to Ralph Giordano's provoking two-part TV report *Heia Safari* from 1966. The essay teases the tensions embedded in narratives of settler families and benevolence at a time of decolonization, showing how settler colonial narratives responded, or failed to do so, to changing historical circumstances. The final essay, Lin-chin Tsai's "Negotiating Between Homelands: Settler Colonial Situation and Settler Ambivalence in Taiwan Cinema," moves the conversation to yet another controversial settled space, Taiwan, in order to analyze two Taiwan films by two Han settler directors, Bai Jingrui's *Home Sweet Home* (*Jia zai Taibei*, 1970) and Lee Hsing's *The Land of the Brave* (*Long de chuanren*, 1981). Tsai argues that the two films manifest a specific form of settler ambivalent mentality where Taiwan's settler colonial situation should be comprehended through both the tensions sustaining the metropole China, the settler colony Taiwan, and the Indigenous population, and the circulations linking the exogenous neocolonial power (US), the Han settlers, and the Indigenous peoples.

The essays in the collection's third section, "Natives" examine films about Indigenous peoples in settled spaces, some that seek to recuperate a sense of indigenous agency and others that depict indigenous lives, often in contrast to settlers and with the participation of settler-owned film companies. Barry Judd's "Hero or Dupe: Jay Swan and the Ambivalences of Aboriginal Masculinity in the Films of Ivan Sen" tackles depictions of Aboriginal masculinity – as "lazy," "immoral," and "stupid" – in Australian settler cinema through the films of Aboriginal filmmaker. By discussing the key protagonist, Jay Swan, of the films *Mystery Road* and

Goldstone, Judd argues that the construction of Swan as both Aboriginal man and detective, functions to undermine and question core settler colonial understanding of Aboriginal masculinities in ways that few others have chosen to do.

Natale Zappia's "*In the Land of the Head Hunters*: Kwakwaka'wakw Archives and the Settler Colonial Lens" takes the collection back to an early documentary of an indigenous group, the 1914 motion picture by Edward Curtis of the Kwakwak'wakw in the Pacific Northwest. Like all of Curtis' work, the film was anything but "documentary," as Zappia notes that, while designed to cater to white American expectations of pristine wilderness and the "other," the choreographed scenes, sets, props, and actions were also Indigenous. This delicate and complex relationship between the film reel and Native culture played out in remarkable ways during this process and has taken on new meaning in the twenty-first century as Native communities respond to settler colonialism utilizing technology, film, and narrative.

M. Bianet Castellanos's "Disrupting Settler Innocence in Latin American Films" analyzes Roland Joffé's *The Mission* (1986) and Icíar Bollaín's *Even the Rain* (2010), showing how settler colonial narratives of discovery and Indigenous elimination are fundamental in advancing settler identities as socially progressive, even innocent. Indigenous identities, in turn, Castellanos argues, are rendered sympathetic and at times revolutionary, but these portrayals remain one-dimensional because they are reliant on settler colonial narratives of discovery and elimination. Encounters between the settler and Indian become the focal point through which to understand Indigenous lives. Yet, as Castellanos shows, these encounters cannot account for the complexity of Indigenous lives under settler colonialism. The final essay in the "natives" section, Misha Kavka and Stephen Turner's "Having the "Knack": Post-settlement Cinema in Aotearoa New Zealand," also inspects indigenous people as portrayed in films largely created by and for

white settler audiences. Kavka and Turner focus on Taika Waititi's *Hunt for the Wilderpeople* (2016), which, they argue, is infused with nostalgia for a shared media culture while, at the same time, being interrupted by the oblique assertion of Māori claims. What they call settler colonial jouissance, rooted in a double structure of colonial wound and indigenous history, pervades post-settlement cinema and calls for a director with a particular "knack."

The book ends with the grouping entitled "space" that includes essays that in different ways interrogate the appropriation and portrayal of cinematic spaces within and by films. Dominique Brégent-Heald's "Landscapes, Wildlife, and Grey Owl: Settler Colonial Imaginaries and Tourist Spaces in William J. Oliver's Parks Branch Films, 1920s-1930s" examines a selection of short films by William J. Oliver promoting the scenic, recreational, and wildlife features of Canada's National Parks to the American tourist market. It also discusses Oliver's films featuring Grey Owl, the ersatz Indigenous identity of Englishman Archie Belaney, whom the Parks Branch hired to promote beaver conservation and tourism. Although replete with clichéd tropes of the travelogue genre, upon further examination these short subjects reveal the complex and ongoing legacy of Indigenous expulsion consistent with settler colonial spaces.

Maria Flood's "From Colonial Casbah to Casbah-banlieue: Settlement and Space in *Pépé le Moko* (1937) and *La Haine* (1996)," also focuses on examining space as portrayed in 20th century cinema, but instead of the park landscape, here the space is urban. Flood studies the geographic and symbolic space of the Casbah as an indicator of the unstable narratives of space, settlement, and identity in the two French films. If the Algerian Casbah was a site of French fantasies about the colony, the Casbah-banlieue offers similar projections in the metropolitan space of Paris, even if these projections are mitigated by consideration for the colonized struggle.

Ian-Malcolm Rijsdijk's "Between Sherwood Forest and the Red Sea: Settler Colonial South Africa in early Hollywood" brings to the discussion of cinematic space a literal map, a Paramount Studios location map from 1927 indicating areas in California that could double for different parts of the world. In the south-east of the state, sandwiched between the "Red Sea" and "Sherwood Forest" was "South Africa." Rijsdijk investigates South Africa's appeal through its frontier tales of gold and diamond prospecting, bold colonial adventure, and mythologized Zulus as narrative and aesthetic "place" in Hollywood, principally in the settler cinematic discourses.

The volume ends with an examination of settler space in outer space. In "Settler Evasions in *Interstellar* and *Cowboys and Aliens*: Thinking the End of the World is Still Easier than Thinking the End of Settler Colonialism," Lorenzo Veracini shows how science fiction films tell typically settler colonial stories, with equally typical settler colonial solutions. *Interstellar* faces environmental crisis and proposes a settler colonial way out: colonize somewhere else, thus welcoming displacement. *Cowboys and Aliens* also faces a settler colonial quandary. Settlers need to become indigenous, meaning they want the indigenous land and an indigenous way to enjoy the land – in order to legitimate possession, as Veracini argues. The solution: settler indigenization via nativist struggle. Both films envision the desolation of worlds, and a return: a return to settling in *Interstellar*, and a return to the historical moment of colonizing in *Cowboys and Aliens*.

In all, these essays show how films offer layered, diffused, contested, and dynamic settler colonial narratives that advance not merely settler hegemonic readings, but also nuanced representations, resistances, multiple voices, and continuous reinterpretations of historical

processes and present-day realities. They show us a world made of settler colonial narrative strands, tensions and imagery that shares common mindsets, visual language, colonial knowledge, and views of historical processes, but that also contain openings for multivocal discourses.

---

[1] This film has been widely analyzed. Cf Hannes van Zyl, "'De Voortrekkers' (1916): Some Stereotypes and Narrative Conventions," *Critical Arts: A Journal of South-North Cultural Studies* 1.1 (1980), 24-31; Edwin Hees "The Voortrekkers on Film: From Preller to Pornography," *Critical Arts: A Journal for Cultural Studies* 10.1 (1996), 1-22; and Neil Parsons "Nation-Building Movies Made in South Africa (1916–18): I.W. Schlesinger, Harold Shaw, and the Lingering Ambiguities of South African Union," *Journal of Southern African Studies* 39.3 (2013), 641-659. Parsons's bibliography includes further analyses.

[2] Van Zyl and Hees both speculate that these characters were written as Portuguese instead of British (the colonial competition for the Dutch) because the film production company was British.

[3] Much has been written about these historical events. Recent accounts include….

[4] VanZyl reports that the film was shown for at least three decades to "packed audiences" (24).

[5] Early technologies for moving pictures go back to the 1880's with several inventions linking still cells of film into a fluid connection, but the standard feature film with a unified narrative and editing is thought to have begun in 1906, with Australian Charles Tait's *The Story of the Kelly*

Gang, about the notorious Australian bushranger Ned Kelly, and a settler narrative in its own right. *The Great Grain Robbery* of 1903 also contained a unified narrative but in a short film (12 minutes).

[6] Parsons in "Nation Building Movies" examines the production history of *The Voortrekkers: Winning A Continent* in greater detail.

[7] Beginning as an offshoot of postcolonialism, settler colonialism has become a field in its own right. Leaders like Patrick Wolfe and Lorenzo Veracini have written foundation studies, like Veracini's *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview* (Palgrave, 2010), and an independent journal (*Settler Colonial Studies*) has been established.

[8] Patrick Wolfe, "Land, Labor, and Difference: Elementary Structures of Race," *American Historical Review* 106.3 (2001), esp. 868; Patrick Wolfe, "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native," *Journal of Genocide Research* 8.4 (2006), esp. 388.

[9] James Belich, *Replenishing the Earth: The Settler Revolution and the Rise of the Angloworld* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

[10] For more on this postcolonial background, see *Postcolonial Cinema Studies*, Sandra Ponzanesi, Marguerite R Waller, Routledge, 2002 and *Postcolonial Film: History, Empire, Resistance*, Rebecca Weaver-Hightower, Peter Hulme, Routledge 2018.

[11] One can find some of these early films of everyday settler life, most by Thomas Edison in the 1880s and 1890s here: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dvIrfJnicBk. The 1911 "A Trip Through New York" can be found here: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aohXOpKtns0. Youtube contains many other examples of everyday life in early silent films.