

Research narrative (2500 words maximum, not including bibliography). Please lay out your primary research question, scope of your research, methodology, and where you are in the research process.

Introduction and Research Question

Settler-colonies are places of tremendous inequality and violence. In Israel-Palestine, Jewish settlers attempted to set up a separate economy employing strictly Jewish labor and engaged in a protracted struggle with indigenous Palestinians over land and sovereignty (Metzer 1998; Segev 2001; Morris 2004). In Algeria, European settlers forced the political exclusion and the labor exploitation of Algerian Arabs and Berbers (Bennoune 2002; Ruedy 2005). In Southern Rhodesia and South Africa, British and Afrikaner settlers expropriated indigenous land and coercively employed indigenous labor (Mutambirwa 1980). In short, where European powers engaged in efforts to colonize and settle much of the globe, entrenched ethnic, economic, and political inequality and systemic violence developed. And yet settler-colonies are also places in which representative institutions flourish. Israel has held vibrantly contested elections since the nation's founding and in pre-state Zionist institutions (Shafir 2016). In Algeria, settlers built representative institutions with budgetary autonomy at the municipal, regional, and colonial levels (Ruedy 2005; Lustick 1985). Settlers in South Africa and Rhodesia elected representatives to national assemblies and parliaments that chafed against imperial Britain (Crais 1992; Mutambirwa 1980). Whether a majority or a minority, despite varying imperial goals, settlers pressed for representative institutions, and in many cases won them.

My dissertation will seek to explain the relationship in settler-colonies between entrenched economic and political inequality and political institutions built on principles of elections, rights, freedoms, and democracy. Why and how did settler populations demand and form elected

representative institutions instead of remaining under direct colonial governance? Such an outcome is made more puzzling for several reasons. First, settlers developed elected representative institutions while attempting to maintain extreme societal stratification along economic, ethnic, and racial lines, subverting ideologies of equality undergirding such institutions. Second, elections in settler-colonies were frequently highly competitive: elections were no fig-leaf authoritarian exercise but were keenly important for participating settlers and excluded non-settlers alike. Those excluded from participation—primarily indigenous and enslaved populations—could see in elected representation the very key to their emancipation. Finally, representative institutions were not the default mode of governance: colonial powers ruled many colonies despotically and set up institutions that facilitated efficient resource extraction (Acemoglu, Johnson, and Robinson 2000).

In my dissertation, I will argue that the takings and expropriations, the exclusions and exploitations characteristic of settler-colonial contexts come to constitute the regularized grammar of representative government itself. I hypothesize that the interaction of two central variables, *property accumulation* and *alliance formation*, explains the formation of representative institutions. I posit that settlers pressed for elected representative institutions and the devolution of political power to the colony because these institutions gave them direct control over the disposal of their own (increasing) property and the means to accumulate more. To the extent that settlers accumulated wealth and gained control over labor sources, then, settlers established property interests in need of protection, both from frequently arbitrary colonial governance and from challenges by indigenous peoples. However, colonial powers—metropoles—often viewed settlers as extensions of imperial power and were thus unlikely to grant new representative institutions simply upon request. Instead, settlers had to develop or manipulate splits in imperial governance, turning, for instance, a chartered company and a colonial government against each other, or

exploiting existing parliamentary divisions to gain influence. In short, I will argue that settlers succeeded in gaining representation only when they gained the *resources* to argue for self-governance and created *opportunities* through alliance formation. Otherwise, their rulers rebuffed efforts to establish settler democracy and maintained despotic control over all colonial subjects.

Case Selection, Scope, and Methodology

To explore the plausibility of this hypothesized causal chain, I will undertake comparative-historical analysis of three cases of settler-colonialism: South Africa, Israel-Palestine, and Algeria. The three-case design allows me to triangulate the effects of the variables of interest across different colonial and temporal contexts and rule out competing explanations for the same outcome. In the South African context, I will focus on the early period of British rule (1806-1870), in which settler institutions slowly cohered, although I will also explore why representative institutions did not appear under Dutch rule (1652-1795). In that of Israel-Palestine, I will study the formation of institutions in the Mandate period (1920-1948) and the formation of settler institutions in present-day Judea and Samaria (the West Bank) and Gaza (1967-present). In that of Algeria, I will chart variations in settler institutions as the metropolitan regime changed from Republic to Empire to Republic (1830-1917).

To analyze these periods, I will examine archival records in each of these countries and their former colonial rulers. To support the South African case, I will draw on the Cape Town and Pietermaritzburg Archives Repositories, which contain records of the colonial government under Dutch and British rule, including records of property ownership and legislative proceedings, as well as the UK National Archives, which house the records of the British Colonial Office and government-settler correspondence. For the Algerian case, I will use the detailed records of settler land ownership and institutional affiliation, including the settler press, housed in the Archives

Nationales d'Outre-Mer in Aix-en-Provence, France. In Israel, data on Zionist institutional formation in the pre-state period will come from the Central Zionist Archives and Labor Party Archives, as well as the Mandatory Government and Colonial Office records in the UK National Archives. In the final case, that of present-day settler institutional formation in the West Bank and Gaza Strip, I will also draw on semi-structured interviews with settlers involved in the formation of the Yesha Council, the federation of local councils for settlements in Judea and Samaria (and formerly Gaza), to explore linkages between settlers and Israeli government officials that facilitated the rise of Yesha as a pan-settler institution over other settlement organizations. I will utilize interviews in addition to archival sources here because, unlike the other cases, settlement of the West Bank is an ongoing project, and many settlers who planned the organization of settlements are still alive and politically active.

In each of the cases, I will collect data in three distinct domains. First, to explore settler strategies of property accumulation, I will seek records of land ownership and purchases and those of key businesses and industries, from which I will generate a list of people and institutions with property claims. Second, to document representative institutional structures, I will examine the legal mechanisms of participation in colonial political institutions and the extent to which property ownership served as the baseline for political participation. Third, to investigate alliance formation, I will read intra-settler and settler-metropole correspondence, seeking out instances in which settler interests cohere or clash internally, with metropolitan interests, or with those of corporations tasked with running the colonial enterprise. In order to link these three aforementioned fields of data into a coherent narrative for each case, I will deploy a research technique called “process-tracing,” a method of historical inquiry involving the generation of hypotheses prior to the analysis of data, and the systematic judgment of the researcher’s argument *and* competing explanations for the same

outcome against the data (Bennett and Checkel 2014; Bennett and Elman 2006; Collier 2011; Morgan 2016). The goal is to establish the validity of the argument while weakening or ruling out its competitors; in this case, I will pit my argument about property accumulation and alliance formation against rival explanations for the rise of representative institutions reliant on culture, metropolitan political regime, and other factors.

To link the narratives of the country cases together and to establish medium-range generalizable theory from these cases, I will deploy two strategies: comparative historical analysis (CHA) and comparative area studies (CAS). CHA involves the careful selection of cases and the exploration of political processes across these cases, with the goal of identifying causal factors responsible for large-scale outcomes, such as the formation of political institutions (Mahoney and Rueschemeyer 2003; Falletti and Mahoney 2015). CAS is one mode of CHA that adds self-conscious effort to take into account contextual factors deemed relevant by area studies specialists (Sil 2018). Recognizing the dangers of engaging solely in secondary-source analysis, which runs the risk of drawing only on sources that support the researcher's own argument (Lustick 1996), CAS researchers immerse themselves holistically in an area studies literature alongside in-region fieldwork, using this immersion as inspiration for insights into other cases outside their area of specialization. Building on previous academic work in Israel and Jordan, as well as sustained engagement with the area studies literature of the Middle East and North Africa (MENA), this proposed fieldwork will allow me to account for the intricacies of settler institutional formation in Israel and Algeria. Refinements to my approach suggested by fieldwork there will in turn inform my study of South Africa.

Relationship to Literature

This project will contribute to both the study of democratization and to the study of settler-

colonialism. First, the political science literature on democratization has focused particularly on the extension of suffrage laws to cover increasing numbers of people and less on representative institutions themselves. Recently, scholars have identified robust correlations between levels of economic development (Przeworski et al. 2000; Przeworski and Limongi 1997) or levels of economic inequality (Boix 2003; Acemoglu and Robinson 2006; Ansell and Samuels 2014) and changes in political regime from authoritarianism to democracy (or vice versa). I extend this literature by adopting an approach that similarly centers on the accumulation of property and material interests (similar to Ansell and Samuels 2014), rather than ideologies of equality. But, unlike these arguments, I apply an economic logic focused on the exploitation of land and labor to the formation of representative bodies directly, not just to the gradual expansion of suffrage laws. Additionally, the literature on democratization has not seriously taken into consideration the interaction of empire with political institutional formation, allowing, for instance, the United Kingdom to be coded as a democracy in 1885 while the British Empire ruled despotically over much of the globe. By examining settler-colonies, polities nested within empires that also exhibit their own internal imperial dynamics, I hope to draw attention to the processes of exclusion and exploitation that as yet have been treated as theoretically unrelated to the formation of elective representative institutions.

Second, the literature on settler-colonialism itself has scarcely dealt with the question of what kinds of political institutions settlers are likely to form. Instead, the literature has been captivated by Wolfe's (2006: 387) "logic of elimination," the assertion that settler-colonialism is reliant on the elimination of "the native," whether or not such elimination is implicit or explicit. Thus, scholarship on settler-colonialism has focused almost exclusively on the question of land ownership and the eviction, expulsion, or genocide of indigenous populations. Such a focus has

led to the use of settler-colonialism as a simplistic and polemical epithet rather than as an analytic tool. But even beyond polemics, to argue that the elimination of the native constitutes settler-colonialism is to ignore indigenous incorporation in colonial projects. While indigenous *land* is purchased, conquered, and otherwise expropriated, the employment of indigenous *labor* is also essential to understanding settler-colonialism. Indigenous peoples often physically work for settlers, act as sources of economic value, present political questions of inclusion and exclusion, and are placed in particular positions in racial hierarchies as race emerges as a coherent concept. I build on the important work done in this literature around mechanisms of land expropriation (Veracini 2010; Ruedy 1967) but extend this literature to analyzing the use of indigenous labor and the wealth generated from it to the benefit of settlers. In my research, I will explore the impact of land *and* labor accumulation on the formation of settler political institutions, thus linking not only the expropriation of indigenous peoples but also their employment to settler politics.

Stage in Research Process

I have completed preliminary research in each of my three cases (South Africa, Israel-Palestine, and Algeria), including a first-stage archival research trip to the United Kingdom National Archives in July 2018, and will complete extensive primary-source research in Israel-Palestine from October 2018-April 2019. Following participation in the Political Economy Summer Institute, I will embark on eight months of multi-site field research in South Africa, the United Kingdom, Israel, and France, supported by a Fulbright-Hays Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad Fellowship.¹ I have prepared a first draft, drawing primarily on secondary sources and archival sources from my July 2018 fieldwork in London, on the formation of elected representative institutions in the Cape Colony in the early 19th century. Additionally, I have written

¹ This fellowship was additionally to include fieldwork in Algeria, but for administrative reasons my fieldwork in Algeria was not supported by the Fulbright-Hays.

a preliminary process-trace analysis, drawing entirely on secondary sources, on the formation of the Jewish Elected Assembly in 1920s Palestine, including its legitimation by British authorities under the Mandate. By the time the Political Economy Summer Institute begins, I will have prepared a draft chapter on this period for circulation to the participants and presentation at the Institute.

I am currently conducting intensive archival research in Jerusalem and will conclude in April 2019. Funded through the Palestinian American Research Center (PARC), this research focuses on the formation of initial representative institutions in late Ottoman and Mandate Palestine (1882-1948); currently the literature only discusses these institutions' workings, not the processes that led to their adoption in the first place (Horowitz and Lissak 1978; Shafir and Peled 2002; Burstein 1934; Seger 1971) or focuses on strictly economic institutions rather than on political ones (Shafir 1989). I am utilizing the resources of the Central Zionist Archives in Jerusalem in a "first run" of the data collection strategy outlined previously: documenting property accumulation and the backgrounds of those who pushed for representative institutions, detailing the legal mechanisms behind elections in Mandate Palestine, and tracing the linkages of settlers to ruling political institutions and settler strategies for gaining representation. In line with my CAS framework, this phase of research will generate context-specific insights into Israel-Palestine that can be used as guides to understanding other cases. Finally, I will travel to South Africa (July-September 2019), the United Kingdom (September-October 2019), Israel (October-December 2019), and France (December 2019-February 2020) to conduct primary-source archival and interview-based research in each of my cases. I expect to deploy the theoretical and methodological apparatuses I learn at the Political Economy Summer Institute in this period of fieldwork.