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### Part 1: The New Age of Exploration

#### A space boom is in progress now, and the uberrich are its head. Under a façade to solve existential crises, these expansionists are advancing colonization – Deudney 20:

Deudney, Daniel. *Dark Skies: Space Expansionism, Planetary Geopolitics, and the ends of humanity.* Oxford University Press. (2020). pg 23-24 // LHP BT + LHP PS

**A new space boom is also beginning because of the emergence of space entrepreneurs with deep pockets and ambitious visions**. A handful of very rich e-capitalists who are also strong space expansionists have initiated several highly visible and ambitious space ventures.54 Elon Musk (cofounder of PayPal) has founded Space X to build reusable rockets to launch payloads at much lower costs. Amazon founder and CEO Jeff Bezos has established his own space com- pany, Blue Origin, which is building a fleet of successively larger rockets, to carry supplies, then tourists and ultimately settlers into space.55 Richard Branson, the British airline magnate, has established Virgin Galactic to build space vehicles to carry passengers to the edge of outer space for a few minutes, for a ticket costing about a quarter of a million dollars. **Space advocates widely hail Musk, Bezos, and others as visionary organiza- tional pioneers of a fundamentally novel “new space” approach to storming the heavens, embodying the fierce “Move fast and break things” ethos propelling the rapid rise of tech and internet companies**. **Although lavishly lauded by space enthusiasts for bringing the dynamism of the free market to replace supposedly sluggish and unimaginative government space agencies, these initiatives are being propelled more by space expansionist visionaries than profit-making opportunities. The key figures in “new space” are first and foremost space expansionists, and their business ventures and the wealth they have produced are of prime value, they say, for making large-scale space expansion possible.** **Bezos was an undergraduate student of the space colonization visionary Gerard O’Neill at Princeton University and president of its campus chapter of Students for the Exploration and Development of Space**. He speaks of a future in which millions, then billions, and eventually trillions of people will live and work in space. **For Bezos, the goal is free-floating space colonies. For Musk, near-term colonization of Mars is the paramount—and quite achievable—goal**. **And the rationales they offer for these ventures are straight from space expansionist thought: expanding human habitat, solving Earth problems, and avoiding extinction by getting our eggs out of one basket**. **In Bezos**, the world’s wealthiest person, with a fortune of some $150 billion, **the space cause may not have found its Messiah, but it may have found its Croesus.**  **The celebrity prominence and booster rhetoric of these superwealthy individuals has kindled optimism among advocates that a new era of rapid space progress has arrived. Space advocates herald these initiatives as a decisive break from previous government-led space efforts and have high expectations of dra- matically lower costs and large new markets**.56 As these efforts have unfolded, space advocates increasingly speak the language of American libertarianism, with its conviction that government is primarily a problem and progress is assured only when market forces are fully unleashed. But whether these ventures are a critical step to renewed expansion into space, modest rearrangements in corporate-government roles, or vanity projects of space enthusiasts with too much money remains to be seen.57

#### You can’t take the colonization out of space col – it’s always going to be an expansion of settler logic like Manifest Destiny, and claims to the contrary are moves to settler innocence, Johnson 20,

Johnson, Matthew. 2020. “Mining the high frontier: sovereignty, property and humankind’s common heritage in outer space” [http://hdl.handle.net/10453/142380 //](http://hdl.handle.net/10453/142380%20//) LHP AB

**The trope of the frontier speaks to both violent appropriation and – as it appears in NewSpace discourse – redemption and freedom. Frontier mythology has a highly emotive resonance: it appeals to individual and collective psyches through the frontier’s promise of liberation, salvation and re-birth**. As Blouet notes, “**states are clever in promoting ambitions in the cloak of emotional appeals**” (1994, p.285). The **European colonial powers claimed theirs was a ‘civilising mission’** (Said 1995), a valorous project of **“bringing light, faith and trade to ‘the dark places’ of the earth” as they murdered and subordinated indigenous populations on the imperial horizon** (Lindqvist 2002, p.12). Ever since the Apollo program, **outer space has held an important place in the emotional fabric of American national culture**. What mythic elements can we discern in NewSpace cosmopolitics? **What stories is NewSpace telling to render its colonial project as commensurate with the ‘benefit of all mankind’?** Political mythologies are not opposed to political rationality – they permeate and are indissociable from them (Dean 2006). Political economist Mitchell Dean has illustrated that “**mythic, poetic and symbolic elements” permeate spatial and cartographic notions of political order** (2006, p.1). Deploying Connery’s term ‘geo-mythography’ (2001), he describes the mythic foundations of Schmitt’s conceptions of *nomos*. For instance, Schmitt begins *The nomos of the earth* by saying: “In mythical language, the earth became known as the mother of law…” (Schmitt 2003, p.42). Pagan concepts of the Earth Mother are evident in Schmitt’s account, which also drew on his conservative Catholicism in noting the herdsman or shepherd in the etymological roots of *nomos* (ibid, p.339-340). Indeed, Schmitt focuses on the *nomos* of medieval Europe’s *respublica Christiania*, an empire with Holy Rome at its centre acting as *katcheon* or ‘restrainer’ of the Antichrist (ibid, pp.58-62; Dean 2006). **The contrasts that Schmitt makes between *terra firma* and *mare libre* arrive at a sort of telluric mythos, his genealogy of spatial law and order invoking the “consecrated sites” and “sacred orientations” of landed existence** (Schmitt, in Dean 2006, p.10). The **NewSpace imaginary of course involves a break from the ‘Earth Mother’** – a point Ormrod has argued while drawing on Freudian psychoanalytics (2007, pp.266-7) – but **geo-myths are nonetheless an important part of their public justifications for space colonisation. ‘Manifest Destiny’** is a geopolitical discourse that emerged from Enlightenment progress ideology and **is evident in** many phases of American history and in **the NewSpace vision** (Parker 2009). Beginning with the 19th century impulse to “**conquer and civilize the ‘empty continent’”, it was the United States’ destiny to continue expanding** (Ó Tuathail 1994, p.159). Like *lebensraum*, which had been inspired by Friedrich Ratzel’s visit to frontier America, **manifest destiny was a means of justifying imperial expansionism.** This geo-mythography was **wedded to American exceptionalism: if expansionism was America’s ‘destiny’, the violence of this expansionism was morally justifiable.** The political geographer Gerard Ó Tuathail **summarises Manifest Destiny with the following quote from founding father Thomas Paine: “The cause of America…is in great measure the cause of all mankind”** (1994, p.159). **The idea that humanity needs space to expand on the off-world frontier is a techno-utopian version of Manifest Destiny.** In his essay ‘Capitalists in Space’ (2009), Parker has noted the **parallels between off-world expansionism and westward frontiers in American culture.** He draws attention to the US historian Frederick Jackson Turner (1893), who had argued that **when the westward journey ended on the Pacific Coast and the American frontier was effectively closed, it “augured badly for the future of the USA. American character was defined by novelty, adaptation and growth, so without this imaginative geography of a frontier, there was a danger of atrophy”** (Parker 2009, p.89). I am reminded here of Gerard O’Neill’s remark that a steady state economy would allegedly produce a constriction of innovation and creativity that would be “abhorrent” (in Kilgore 2003, p.159). **For NewSpace and neoliberalism, Property represents Progress.** Yet the **notion of private property as inherently virtuous rests upon unstable myths** (Christman 2014). Like American exceptionalism, the **valorisation of private property rights in the NewSpace and neoliberal imaginary requires erasing or simply forgetting the violence of enclosure and colonialism.** Space writer and policy analyst Rand Simberg produced *Homesteading the Final Frontier* (2012) for the Atlas Network’s Competitive Enterprise Institute. He asserts that: “…under the view of the universe as a frontier full of potential, the resources that could be developed from it offer great opportunity for human flourishing. **Centuries of history demonstrate that the best means of doing that is via the free exchange of goods and services**, undergirded by legally enforceable private property rights” (Simberg 2012, p.4). **In Simberg’s view, ‘centuries of history’ validate private property – and not common property – as the driver of human flourishing.** With the ahistoricity characteristic of neoliberalism and neoclassical economics, Simberg **sweeps aside centuries of appropriation, displacement and violence that followed in capitalism’s imperial wake. The** **history of private property is tainted with discrimination, coercion and the heavy hand of empire** – this is **inconsistent with the truth claims of universal beneficence inherent in NewSpace private property advocacy (regardless of how violent or peaceful space colonisation ends up being).** In his *Mythologies* (1973), Roland Barthes looked to capitalist myths. His description of the ‘privation of history’ offers some insight into NewSpace’s erasure of property’s violent past. According to Barthes, **the privation of history was a myth of estrangement that divorced objects from their history.** “Myth deprives the object of which it speaks of all History. In it, history evaporates. It is a kind of ideal servant: it prepares all things, brings them, lays them out, the master arrives, it silently disappears: all that is left for one to do is enjoy this beautiful object without wondering where it came from” (1973, p.165). **Severing an object from its history** – this is **clearly taking place in NewSpace’s revisionist history of private property. Consider the following remark from Moon Express’ Bob Richards:** “As a **country built on the foundations of Earth’s frontiers, the United States stands unique in all the world with the opportunity to focus the power of its entrepreneurial history and enterprising vision to open up the space frontier, and in so doing, create a peaceful, prosperous and boundless future for all humanity**” (Richards 2017, p.1). **The United States *was* actually built upon ‘foundations of the frontier’, but only because the expansion of Anglo-American sovereignty involved the imposition of European law upon the foundational *nomoi* of native American law.** The (un)settling of the American frontier was ultimately not a ‘peaceful, prosperous and boundless’ process for all Americans. The **privation of property history excises the violence, so that colonial power can be ascribed a measure of ‘innocence’** (Whyte 2018, p.237), **“as if one can take the good parts of a metaphor, setting the unseemly ones aside”** (Messeri 2017). **In NewSpace representations** of property and discussions of space colonisation that appear in neoliberal advocacy (see also Singal 2018), **the off-world frontier presents a zone of guilt-free appropriation, an opportunity to escape what Hegel described as the “slaughter-bench” of history** (2001, p.35). Hegel’s *Philosophy of History* described how, in the name of progress, “the happiness of peoples, the wisdom of States, and the virtue of individuals have been victimized” (ibid, p.33). Hegel viewed the violence of western civilisation as ultimately worthwhile, if it meant the eventual realisation of Freedom – a teleological account of human history that NewSpace appears to share with Hegel, that “the History of the world is none other than the progress of the consciousness of Freedom” (2001, p.33). **For NewSpace libertarians, off-world property represents a paradoxical freedom *from* the empire that is enabled *by* the empire.** In their heroic colonisation of the off-world, they are relieved from repressing resistant ‘commoners’, from negotiating over prior land rights and from managing the ecological impacts of resource exploitation – all that needs to be done is undermine international treaty law (e.g. Gump 2018). Escaping history, the NewSpace salvationist narrative renders unilateral private property law as commensurate with “the common interest of all mankind in the progress of the exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes” (*Outer Space Treaty* 1967, preamble).

### Part 2: Colonialism

#### We can’t escape our planetary imagination by escaping the planet – settler colonialism will be perpetuated through spacecol, Scharmen 21:

Scharmen, Fred. Space Forces: A Critical History of Life in Outer Space. Verso Books, 2021. // LHP BT + LHP PS

Whether humans eventually go and live permanently in space or not, we will continue to see an ever more complicated and visible relationship between the creation and control of worlds and the collective subjectivity within them. Regarding the climate crisis, the historian and postcolonial scholar Dipesh Chakrabarty told interviewer James Graham in a 2016 book, *Climates: Architecture and the Planetary Imaginary*, “**The moment we ask ‘what should we do?’ we discover that the ‘we’ needs to be constructed.”**[6](about:blank) If the catastrophic changes in Earth’s climate, produced without conscious intention by human intervention, are to be addressed, then deliberate effort will have to be brought to bear on conditions that were previously considered unintended consequences. One way or another, a new world must be constructed, along with Chakrabarty’s new “we.” A reduction in global carbon production, and a hold on, or reversal of, temperature rise, would be a demonstration of what sociologist and theorist Saskia Sassen calls a “capability”: a new technical skill that hadn’t been available before, whose implications and capacity might not be obvious right away.[7](about:blank) Sassen points out that **a capability derived to accomplish one purpose might eventually be used to achieve other, yet unknown goals.** After all, the first rockets that went to space were developed from missiles that carried deadly warheads. **The capability to design and prescribe every aspect of a total environment in space brings in the possibility for more and more unknowns—future uses to which those powers might be applied. These unknowns arise, ironically, even as a side effect of the attempt to broaden the ability to control and optimize for predictability**. The specification of environmental parameters as part of the construction and control of a world is the general case that describes a central issue in both long-term space settlement and climate crisis mitigation. Specificity creates its own kind of crisis. And the specificity of that future world’s conditions is deeply entangled with the construction of a “we.” **Sociologist Lisa Messeri has a term for the kind of thinking that deals with the constitution and experience of worlds: “the planetary imagination.”**[8](about:blank) Messeri studies the way **astronomers, researchers, and planetary scientists start to conceive of the objects of their study in space as *places*** instead of databased abstractions. **That conception, and the practice of the planetary imagination, is mediated by technology, analogy, representation, and even fiction. The planetary imagination has to do with all the ways in which humans organize their perceptions of, and relationships with, worlds. In this sense, the capability to mitigate climate crisis would be an exercise in applied planetary imagination**. So too would be the practice of conceiving a plan for living in space. If **each** of the seven **space narratives** in this book reveals assumptions about the nature of the subjects within its world, then each also **depends on some specific worldview. Each of the stories is sustained by unique imaginations, planetary and otherwise. Living off of Earth is a kind of world-making, and any variation on that practice will need some basic idea of what a world is, and what a world is *for*. After all, and again, the current climate crisis is the result of the application of a specific kind of unexamined planetary imagination—that this world is for some groups of humans to use and instrumentalize toward certain ends. Colonization is** **another very particular kind of planetary-scale imagination**. The **phrase “space colony” is often used uncritically, without any thought for the larger implications of the second term in it. If the fraught history of colonization on Earth is considered at all, it’s usually dismissed in the next breath. Proponents of the term “space colony” point out that in uninhabited outer space, there are no preexisting people to be “colonized.” However, this is a narrow view of the historical process of colonization; besides the displacement and subjugation of indigenous people, colonization is a matter of forcible redirection of whole systems of social life, biology, politics, and material infrastructure. Even when it comes to supposedly “empty” spaces, colonization depends on massive amounts of forced immigration combined with coerced labor.** Colonization doesn’t begin or end with the arrival of armed men in boats, taking away someone else’s territory. **Colonization is the ongoing production and maintenance of social hierarchies. It is the economic arrangement of places into center and edge, with one feeding off of the other.** **It is an approach to resource management that sees ecosystems and geography solely in terms of their use value. More than anything, colonization is another attitude about what worlds are for, and the result of that attitude is ongoing global trauma. Moreover, as we’ve seen and will see, the total production of an environment—necessary in space—is also the total production of the human subject within it. If the paradigm for space habitation is a colonial one, then the inhabitants will literally be colonial subjects.** And **those who are outside of these habitats will be there by design**, as effectively displaced as any other people on Earth. But models for living in space don’t have to be colonial. In the scenarios in this book, unless it appears in quotes, the phrase “space colony” and its variants won’t be used without consideration. If the model is an explicitly colonial one—and sometimes the protagonist insists that it is—it will be called out as such.As geophysicist and researcher Mika McKinnon says, for human life, “Earth is easy mode.”[9](about:blank) There are a lot of conditions here that are taken for granted, and a lot of unknown challenges to living in space. Space scientists and writers often repeat an old homily when things go wrong: “Space is hard.” But often, as astronomer and writer Lucianne Walkowicz observes, “what happens in space happens on Earth.”[10](about:blank) The challenges of going to, and living in, space demand an accelerated pace of technological innovation, many products of which have been brought back to Earth. The Dustbuster, freeze-dried food, and improvements in water purification and solar cell technology, among other inventions, owe their origins to various space programs. But space is also a laboratory for the ways that new technologies will impact social and political life on the home planet. **As human presence, public and private, expands in space, the capacity for technical and social change will expand too. But as more techno-social experimentation takes place in space, the consequences of failure also grow. Fragile artificial worlds are not the best place for large-scale, large-stakes experiments. And their successes, where reimported to Earth, could carry huge costs—especially if their new applications include means of social or political control.**

#### Thus, the plan: the colonization of outer space by private entities is unjust. We need to stop modern murdercraft – don’t let billionaires leave and doom us, PSA 19:

“Don't Let Them Leave: An ‘Anti-Space’ Zine.” PUGET SOUND ANARCHISTS, 5 Sept. 2019, https://pugetsoundanarchists.org/dont-let-them-leave-an-anti-space-zine/. // LHP BT + LHP PS

**8. Space exploration is colonialism*!* We should all know by now what colonialism is: hatred, racism, genocide, capitalism, land theft, and ecological destruction. Forever**. **For those of us who are descendants of Europeans, if our grandparents’ grandparents had known this, they could have stood on the docks in Spain, England, and Portugal and torched the ships of the conquistadors and conquerors**: The Nina, the Pinta, and the fucking Santa Maria. They could have burned those ships of war, death, and disease to the waterline and then walked to the castles and cathedrals and done the same. **But they didn’t know what was to become of the world across the seas. But we do! It is our great challenge to stop these modern murdercraft from killing the universe**. ***These men, particularly* Musk*, are not only heavily* invested *in who can get their rocket into space first, but* in colonizing *Mars****.* ***The* desire to col*onize — to have unquestioned, unchallenged and automatic access to something, to any type of body, and to use it at will —* is *a* patriarchal *one****. Indeed, there is no ethical consideration among these billionaires about whether this should be done; rather, the conversation is when it will be done. Because, in the eyes of these intrepid explorers, this is the only way to save humanity. Rather, the impulse to colonize — to colonize lands, to colonize peoples, and, now that we may soon be technologically capable of doing so, colonizing space — has its origins in gendered power structures. Entitlement to power, control, domination and ownership. The presumed right to use and abuse something and then walk away to conquer and colonize something new.* **- Marcia Bianco** Is there anyone alive with an ounce of empathy, a beating heart, who thinks that the conquest of the so-called Americas was a wonderful thing? That Manifest Destiny and the opening of the West was justified ? Only a soulless patriot could justify the death and slaughter of over 100 million people. We don’t get a second chance to pretend that we are all alone in the universe. Yet this is exactly what NASA and all these bootlicking capitalists are pursuing while throwing stars in our eyes: nothing less than the destruction of the heavens, so that they can mine asteroids and save some make-believe “humanity.” *It’s a truism that capitalism never solves its problems but only moves them around. Finally it’s running out of space. The conditions necessary not only for social but biological life are being eroded. It’s running out of minerals; it’s running out of value (the amount of debt on the planet now exceeds the total value of everything on Earth). And all this is accompanied by ghastly mocking nebulae and the idea that the greatest possible course of action for humanity is for us to go about exploring the galaxy, turning void into value, giving capital an infinite field in which to work its sinister magic.* **- Sam Kriss** Decolonize space! **7. *We will* all *be* left behind*; you, me, your mother, your friends.* Everyone*.* They will not be offering us a scholarship to outer space, or to Mars, or anywhere but the kitchen, to do the dishes, create the food, and entertain them in servitude forever. The very goal of manned space travel is to get away from the masses, for the billionaires to free themselves of the workers, the poor, and people of color.** Traveling to the vacuum of space costs some serious first-class money, and you and your mother aren’t going to be invited. **Manned space travel is the final battle in the class war they’ve waged against us. Next time you travel on an airplane, go look at first class and the flight deck. That is the space program.** **Now chop off the back of the plane where we are all smushed together and throw it away. That is the world they will let us have: crashing down, on fire, destroyed, and sapped of all its resources.** Another of Stephen Hawking’s famous quotes reiterates his position that we need to get off the planet relatively soon. “I don’t think the human race will survive the next 1,000 years unless we spread into space.” *The problems with Hawking’s solution is that while it may save a “seed” of human life--a few lucky specimens--it won’t save Earth’s inhabitants. The majority of Earthlings would surely be left behind on a planet increasingly unfit for life.* **- Tina Nguyen They will choose who gets to leave this place. They will make us pay for their escape with our sweat, our toil, our taxes, and our labor. They will use up our air, our water, and our resources. They will make sure that this planet is completely used up. And then they will leave: a select few, the carefully- vetted wealthy, and their property. Off to start a new chapter, a new myth for mankind, without the pesky masses and our squalor**. And you know who they are. Of course you do. They own all the banks and all the land and all the cities. They are the so-called Kings, Queens, and super-wealthy. They own the cops and all the troops. They live on islands and in penthouses and estates. They have ruled the earth since before the flutter of flags and borders on maps drawn with our blood. The idea of space is the idea that we, those left behind in gravity wells, will not be allowed to see the new maps, the new stories built on new worlds. **The very idea of space is a future without the baggage of our oppression and suffering blemishing tomorrow’s history.**

### Part 3: Doomed

#### Space colonization will lead to extinction – violent histories of colonization will be multiplied in space as a result of uncertainty, lack of restraints, and new species multiplication, Deudney 20,

Deudney, Daniel. *Dark Skies: Space Expansionism, Planetary Geopolitics, and the ends of humanity.* Oxford University Press. (2020). pg 345-47 [links provided if u ask]

Systems vary from open to closed. **With the movement of humans into the solar system, a frontier is opened and the system shifts from closed to open. And un- like previous terrestrial expansions, which eventually reached limits and closure, space expansion will produce a permanent frontier and perpetually open system**. **Like terrestrial frontiers, the space frontier will be primed for conflict. The writ of institutional restraints from the core will be attenuated by distance. Ownership rights will be weakly established, and the benefits of seizing assets and excluding others will be high**. **Core powers can be drawn into conflicts and wars over frontier access and control. The opening of frontiers also often leads to highly asymmetrical and horrifically violent encounters between previously separated peoples. The permanence of the space frontier ensures that the number of actors in the system and the distribution of powers among them will be in perpetual flux**. **The existence of a permanent frontier also guarantees that the Earth will eventually be overmatched in power. And as the frontier extends deeper into space, the system will come to have a concentric pattern of interction capacity, with a dense core and successively less interactive peripheries**. Eventually the pattern of Archipelago Earth, of peoples previously unknown to each other coming into violent conflict, will return. Overall, historical analogies of Terran frontier opening indicate more reasons why solar space will be very violent. **Space expansionists frequently compare future space frontiers with historical Earth frontiers**.12 Across Earth history, many groups of humans have moved across many frontiers, but the four most commonly deployed as geohistorical analogs to solar space expansion are the original human movement out of Africa, the spread of Polynesians across the Pacific Ocean,13 the early modern explosion of Europe across the global oceans, and the westward expansion of the United States across North America.14 Overall their similarities diminish desirability, while their differences diminish feasibility. **One fundamental similarity between these** four **expansions and solar space expansion is their dependence on technological advances**, a point routinely made by advocates. From clothes and the control of fire to industrial trans- port, violence, and medicine, new technologies made possible human migra- tion into new environments. **Another fundamental similarity, rarely noted by expansionists, is that historical expansions were often violent and generated severe conflicts and produced greater differences among human societies**. Even without indigenous peoples to conquer and despoil in space, historical similarities suggest solar space expansion will be quite violent. **In the European global expansion, imperial states waged numerous wars among themselves over frontier possessions, borders, and resources. Successful settler colonies waged wars to become independent, particularly in the Americas. Then independent settler colonies fought to expand at each other’s expense, as the United States did with Mexico. If the analog of human global expansion is a reliable guide, solar expansion will be chronically violent and thus less desirable than advocates believe.** But in another way, all four of these terrestrial expansions are unlike space ex- pansion because their prospects and pacing were mainly shaped by interaction with indigenous human groups and with the many other organisms inhabiting terrestrial environments. The human expansion on Earth is a social and eco- system story in ways completely unlike the prospective expansion of humans into the sterile wastes of space. All successful human terrestrial expansions were successful because they moved into ecosystems with rich resources for human exploitation and frequently other human groups who could be despoiled and exploited. Human expansion on Earth was unsuccessful in the environments on the Earth that most resemble those of space, such as the great deserts and polar ice caps; it was successful in places that are radically unlike space environments. But human expansion on Earth was also significantly shaped by disease patterns, as diseases that had evolved in one part of the planet were inadvertently introduced into others. If potent pathogens evolve in new space environments, disease might also play a powerful but largely unpredictable role in shaping the course of human space expansion. The earliest human expansion, out of Africa, gave rise to the dispersed habitations of Archipelago Earth and the great diversification in group identities. When *Homo sapiens* expanded out of Africa into Eurasia, they encountered other species of tool-using hominins who were less capable. But everywhere *sapiens* arrived, their marginally less capable close relatives vanished, displaced and destroyed. Only when humans first came much later to the Americas did they expand into spaces without proto-human competitors. **Thus early human expansion was marked by competition with other intelligent tool-using species, a pattern that is assuredly not going to happen in solar space expansion. It is also notable that at the same time other species within the genus *Homo* were being pushed to extinction, *sapiens* was beginning to biologically radiate,** most notably with regard to skin pigmentation, variations that emerged rapidly in response to reductions in the intensity of solar insolation in northern climate zones.15  **The extremities of violence and oppression stimulated by these cosmetic differences should serve as a warning of the horrors likely to result from substantial species radiation in solar space. In thinking about the interactions between different intelligent species in solar space, the multitude of horrifically violent, often genocidal encounters between peoples with different cultures and dif- ferent levels of technology across Terran history is probably a reliable guide.** It was, after all, the near annihilation of the native Tasmanians by British colonists in the early nineteenth century that inspired Wells’s classic story of a Martian invasion aiming to exterminate humanity in *War of the Worlds*.**16 And the fact that the discourse of genocide so routinely characterizes victim populations as inhuman is also a loud warning of what will be likely when humans interact with nonhuman intelligent life in solar space**. These differences have significant implications for the desirability and feasi- bility of space expansion. Expansion into space will be colonialism without im- perialism and without guilt. Terrestrial expansions involved mass extinctions, but there will be no ecological destruction in the lifeless wildernesses of solar space. The global European expansion was possible because there were peo- ples to subjugate and exploit, but there will be no indigenous populations in solar space. And no conquest, domination, or displacement will be needed in order to begin space colonization. But feasibility will be diminished. The diverse ecosystems yielding a wide range of goods unavailable in other climatic zones provided the crucial economic foundation for the great expansion of the global trading system that motivated and sustained imperial and colonial expansion; these will be absent in solar expansion. The pace and prospects for solar expan- sion will be a function of the capabilities and incentives of humans interacting with the extraterrestrial physical environment and each other, and not in any way shaped by the relative power of the newcomers against the original inhabitants. Overall the frontier geohistorical analogy is both alarmingly illuminating and partially misleading. **Space and terrestrial expansion are similar in being de- pendent on technological advance. And they are likely to be similar in having violent conflict among expanding rivals. If solar space comes to be inhabited by additional intelligent species, the record of violent encounters and genocides across Earth history suggests even more extreme levels of violence**. On the other hand, space is harshly desolate, utterly lifeless, and uninhabited, while historical terrestrial expansions were into commodious environments, filled with rich ecosystems of readily usable organisms and often inhabited by peoples that could be plundered and exploited. Life was everywhere humans went on Earth, but will be nowhere they go in space. As a result, solar expansion will be much harder to accomplish and will occur in radically different ways. Human expansions on Terra have been part of the shifting story of life on Earth, while solar expansion will involve the introduction of life into lifeless wastelands.

#### Without being foregrounded by a recognition of indigenous erasure, recognition of collective vulnerability through the deployment of collective extinction only reinforces colonialist practices – Salih and Corry 21:

Salih R, Corry O. Displacing the Anthropocene: Colonisation, extinction and the unruliness of nature in Palestine. Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space. January 2021. doi:10.1177/2514848620982834 // LHP BT + LHP PS

-in order for epochal consciousness to work, it has to be pre-political – if it’s supposed to produce solutions to this, bc all possible concrete solutions will be partial.departmental

-what ppl refer to as “small” conflicts/differents in aspirations are the sites through which violent processes create extinction of indigenous ppl

With these considerations in mind, let us go back to **Chakrabarty’s notion that the Anthropocene scenario of collective extinction requires that ‘we’ the ‘human’ species activate a ‘common’ ethical or pre-political stance that might take humans beyond the divisive (in)justices of politics**. For that purpose, he borrows the notion ‘epochal consciousness’ from philosopher Carl Jaspers who coined it in the 1950s while contemplating the potential and imminent destruction of the planet by the atomic bomb: An epochal consciousness cannot be charged with the function of producing solutions for an epochal crisis because all possible concrete solutions of an epochal problem—and Jaspers welcomes them all—will be partial or departmental, one important department being that of politics, the specialization of politicians (2016: 146) Epochal consciousness therefore has to be pre-political, leading humans to feel as one whole: ‘It is about how we comport ourselves with regard to the world under contemplation in a moment of global crisis; it is what sustains our horizon of action’ (2016: 146). It is, for Chakrabarty, ‘a thought space that came before and above/beyond politics, without, however, foreshortening the space for political disputation and differences’ (2016: 181). **Despite the notion of epochal consciousness being precarious and at risk of shattering into fragments again, for Chakrabarty ‘it remains a thought experiment in the face of an emergency that requires us to move toward composing the common’** (2016: 146–147). **What Chakrabarty refers to as ‘our smaller histories of conflicting attachments, desires and aspirations’ (2016: 183) are, from the vantage points of Palestinian Indigenous nature and people, shown to be the very sites through which – historically and in the present day – profoundly unequal and violent processes have effected techniques of extinction (fossilisation) of Indigenous Life. The supposed aggregate merging of ‘human’ and ‘natural’ in the Anthropocene is not merely an unfortunate bi-product of economic and technical development or nuclear testing. The pervasive and strenuous – yet unfinished and fractured – endeavour to make the settlers and settler-Nature Indigenous, show the centrality of colonial geonto-politics in ordering and reordering the boundaries between Life and Nonlife. From this point of view, rather than a single species ‘impacting’ upon nature, threatening extinction for a common humanity, it is more appropriate to argue that the very possibility of human and non-human Life is determined by past and ongoing colonial architectures of power. Although the ‘Anthropocene’ offers us a fuller and more complex understanding of the ontological depth and temporal scales of violence, it does not in itself offer hope that this violence might be subsumed under the planetary whole. In this sense, while recognising the heuristic potential of calling for an epochal consciousness in the face of threats of collective extinction, we would argue that a mood of common vulnerability must reinforce and expand, rather than suspend or defer, attention to local and time-bound injustices. Recognising and resolving such injustices should be a necessary prelude to facing, in an ethical mood, the common threat we do face as a species.** This is particularly so when, as the case of Palestine shows, **Indigenous populations have historically been – and continue to be – de-humanised, disposed of, violently erased or consigned to the sphere of Nonlife**. Conclusions In this article, we have explored the **historical and contemporary example of settler colonialism in Palestine suggesting that the recasting of the Life/Nonlife divide has been not incidental to, but part-constitutive of, the political operation of this project. As constitutive modalities of settler colonialism, Life and Nonlife are always discursively assigned rather than being straight forward ontological givens, and this assigning is the result of intra-human injustices and political struggles albeit through their entanglement with the nonhuman. By reading settler colonialism in Palestine through the lens of geontopower, we aimed to offer a case in point to challenge suggestions that questions of intra-human justice can be occluded by a more encompassing Anthropocene condition of collective vulnerability.** From the vantage point of Palestine, we argue the contrary: **given that power and politics are at the very core of the ways in which nature and humans become enmeshed or forcibly separated, only when these inequalities are conceived, and then foregrounded, is there a possibility of recognising a common or global vulnerability**. **For Palestinian refugees and their nature, the threat of collective extinction is not a future common risk, but a process entrenched in their everyday reality since 1948.** Like aboriginal Australians and other native populations, Palestinians were ‘fossilised’ and their entanglements with nature were forced to the Nonlife side of the geonto-political distinction (the ‘desert’ and the ‘virus’, to use Povinelli’s evocative figures). Importantly, however, we also showed how these operations are fractured and unfinished. Drawing from sources as diverse as personal memories, ethnographic explorations, novels and works of art, we showed that ecological ruins not only bring to light what has been destroyed, allowing the recovery of traces of a previous life, but also most crucially have an afterlife, unsettling politically drawn Life/Nonlife boundaries**. Far from a nostalgic claim to a pristine and authentic life-world that preexisted the settler colonial intervention, indigeneity thus signifies an intimate form of reciprocation of native people to their vegetation and animals – an Indigenous entanglement, which proved recalcitrant to taming and fossilisation. It is perhaps no coincidence that Sabr, the Arabic name for the cacti fruits, also means patience and signifies endurance as a natural and human virtue.**

### Part 4: Move to Guilt

#### Settler colonialism is a structure not an event that infiltrates the status quo on every level. Thus, the role of the ballot is to vote for the best methodology that actively resists the project of settler colonialism. Shaw 20:

Shaw, Devin Z., [Devin Zane Shaw teaches philosophy at Douglas College, British Columbia. He is author of several books, including Philosophy of Antifascism: Punching Nazis and Fighting White Supremacy (Rowman and Littlefield International, 2020).] “The Politics of the Blockade” (February, 2020). // LHP PS

**We settlers face a choice: decolonization or white suprem-acy.** **The status quo is settler colonialism: a project of white supremacy, capital accumulation, resource extraction, and Indigenous dispossession. We, settlers, have made excuses for too long.** **For too long we have repeated our homilies as settler moves to innocence: "strategies or positionings that attempt to relieve the settler of feelings of guilt or respon-sibility without giving up land or power or privilege, with-out having to change much at all.**"4 **In Canada, we celebrate Reconciliation because Reconciliation ensconces colonial-ism in the distant past.** When **Indigenous peoples reoccupy Parliament Hill during Canada's sesquicentennial, we say that we gave them the former U.S. embassy for a cultural centre.** **When Indigenous peoples demand the recognition of Indigenous title, we deliver land acknowledgements**. **When Gerald Stanley is acquitted for the death of Coulton Boushie, we say that there are concrete flaws in the judicial system, but due process is fundamentally sound.** When **the RCMP invades unceded Wet'suwet'en territory** now, **we say** that **all peoples must recognize** **the** rule of **law**. **But Wet'suwet'en claims to title were legally recognized in Delgamuukw v. British Columbia in 1997 (the precedent, in fact, of the Tsilhqot'in decision of 2014) though without the adjudication of their specific land or territorial claim**. **Every time Indigenous peoples are given to wait, for justice will come, only the RCMP shows up.** **We settlers cannot place the burden of decolonization on Indigenous peoples alone, though we must also recognize that decolonization demands that we uproot long-standing structures of our world,** **that we must struggle against our own self-interests and our identities, for we have come to recognize ourselves in the institutions of settler-colonialism and in the prospects of settler futurity.** Such a struggle will be fraught with numerous failures. But g**iven the status quo, our choices are either decolonization or white supremacy.** Perhaps I have cast the choice as too stark a dilemma. I would suggest, however, that **we begin** from this dilemma **to measure our responsibility for the status quo.** **Black and Indigenous voices demand this of us.** But **our own intellectual traditions do, too**. I **think** here **of Jean-Paul Sartre's existen**-**talism**, which emphasized the freedom, agency, and respon-sibility of every human being. In Being and Nothingness, **Sartre** also **asserts** that **our individual freedom and the choices we make only make sense in our given historical and social situation.** Given that he was writing in the early 1940s, **Sartre characterizes human freedom and responsibility in the con-text of the Second World War and the Occupation of France.** He writes: the situation is mine because it is the image of my free choice of myself, and everything which it presents to me is mine in that this represents me and symbolizes me.…Thus there are no accidents in a life; a community event which suddenly bursts forth and involves me in it does not come from the outside. If I am mobilized in a war, this is my war; it is in my image and I deserve it.5 Philosophers often discuss this account of freedom and responsibility as if they were making choices in Sartre's cir-cumstances, as if we could readily transplant those circum- stances to our present situation. We consider the responsi-bilities attendant on joining the military to fight Germany, becoming an accomplice of Occupation, or ignoring the war because it would not affect us. We consider how each choice impinges on us due to circumstances that are not of our choos-ing. But the choices are easy, for we will never be forced to choose in those precise historical circumstances. **However, if we take Sartre's concept of responsibility seriously, we ought to consider our own situation before its possibilities have been decided. We ought to consider moral choices that implicate our actions and our responsibility.** **North America as we know it is premised on centuries of set-tler colonialism, but the future of settler colonialism has yet to be decided. We settlers have for too long made excuses. We have buried colonization in our past**, but as Patrick **Wolfe argues, settler colonialism is a structure (with legal, cultural, and social ramifications) and not an event (a moment in the past, now over).** That is, **settler colonialism is an ongoing project, and thus it is a situation that demands that we make a choice. For too long, we've evoked the politics of civility and tone-policing to silence the legitimate anger and indignation of Indigenous peoples. For too long, we've evoked the rule of law, as if it weren't already the law of the settler-colonizer. For too long, we've pointed toward historical progress and social justice, as if it will arrive inevitably, regardless of our actions and choices, but not now.** **For too long, we've chosen the status quo because we have refused to imagine an alter-native -or imagine, pitifully, all the alternatives to be worse. And for our pusillanimity, we bear responsibility for the ongo-ing project of settler colonialism, white supremacy, capital accumulation, and Indigenous dispossession. These choices have led us to our present, which prioritizes yet another pipe-line over the rights of the Wet'suwet'en, or, writ large, white settler futurity over Indigenous futurity. It does not have to be that way. Now we settlers must choose our future.** The ques-tion is: where do you stand?

#### This is especially key for debate, where we can willingly immerse ourselves in indigenous scholarship and combat exhausting tendencies towards inclusion rather than understanding, Skott-Myhre et al,
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Stengers and Pignarre (2011) go on to suggest that **we cannot answer our fear with guilt**. As Western subjects, **guilt is an ever-present retreat from accountability**. Instead, they tell us that “fright calls for creation” (p. 63). We need to **learn new habits and routines and abandon our familiar modes of practice and knowledge**. To do this, we need to **understand how colonial modes of power have shaped us.** The process is not terminated in the past nor even in the present. Not only do **systems of power connect across axes of identity**, but they are also **conjugated over time**. As Eve Tuck, an Unangax2 scholar, and her colleague Wayne Yang (2012) argued, **the violence of settler colonialism “is not temporally contained in the arrival of the settler but is reasserted each day of occupation**” (p. 5). Lorenzo Veracini (2008) argued that **settler disavowal of Indigenous histories is used to discredit Indigenous political rights and sovereignty and anachronistically position Indigenous peoples as entering settler space after the onset of colonization**. In a later work, Veracini (2011) called this disavowal of Indigenous presence and history **a “non-encounter” that structures settler colonialism**. As a structure, he added, settler colonialism erases the distinction between colony and metropole and works toward self-fulfillment as a settled state. A **decolonized account of time and history, however, is about the persistence of Indigenous life, land, and culture through time.** It is also an account that **calls colonialism the genocide it was and continues to be.** As settlers, **it is up to us to question our neocolonial governments and challenge their claims on legitimacy**, which are based on false accounts of temporal priority (Kouri, 2015). More importantly, it is also **up to us to attend to Indigenous peoples’ accounts of time and recognize the legitimacy of the political systems that have endured attempts at colonial erasure**. While this accounting of our set of relations as settlers calls us into the present moment with its implications for possible futures, **we can only truly access the creative capacities of desettlering and decolonization to the degree that we leave behind Western teleological notions of progress and historical imperatives**. It is essential to understand that **when we enter the circle cast as Indigenous space, we are entering a space of radical temporal alterity.** Time is not the same. In her examination of former prime minister Steven Harper’s June 2008 “apology”, Mohawk scholar Audra Simpson (2016a) discussed the temporality of recognition, arguing that **recognition of historical injustice leaves open the innocence or rightness of the past by making the truth of atrocity a revelation in the present.** In a speech that many called a non-apology, **Harper indicated that the residential school system was a mistake, but did not name the genocide that transpired or any criminal or political intent.** Far from redressing settler colonialism, **such forms of recognition obfuscate historical harms and also obscure the ongoing dispossession and violence of colonialism. Simpson** (2017) criticized the government’s position for dismissing historical injustice as a fait accompli, and argues that **settler narratives enact “notions of a fixed past and settled present”** (p. 18). She instead **theorized refusal as a longstanding form of Indigenous resistance and politics**. According to Simpson (2016b), refusal “**maintains and produces sociality through time”** (p. 329) and is acutely aware of the conditions of production: **Refusal holds on to a truth, structures this truth as stance through time, as its own structure and comingling with the force of presumed and inevitable disappearance and operates as the revenge of consent — the consent to these conditions, to the interpretation that this was fair, and the ongoing sense that this is all over with.** (p. 330) Refusal is, therefore, **an intervention into the narratives and politics of the past and present that aims to open a “sociality through time” that is not bound to the settler regime.** Joanne Barker (2018) explained that **the attempt to set things right in “the future is never about the future” (p. 215, italics in original) but instead is about reclaiming the past and present. It is about Indigenous people reclaiming the lands upon which their histories are told, retold, and made meaningful.** Barker **criticized the imperial and democratic utopic vision of a perfected future that can be achieved through eradicating the remaining terror and anarchy of the present.** Barker has held out an **alternative, Indigenous vision of a future woven with the “alterity of Indigenous reckonings of territorial and by (non)human relational interdependence now”** (p. 215). Tuck and Yang (2016) go further to explain that “justice is a colonial temporality, always desired and deferred, and **delimited by the timeframes of modern colonizing states** as well as the selfhistoricizing, self-perpetuating futurities of their nations” (p. 6). **How do we, as settlers, listen to these Indigenous voices, these refusals, and these objections to our lives, our attempts at recognition, and our very presence**? As majoritarian people, not only are our engagements with alternative forms of knowledge laden with ethical dilemmas around respectful engagement, appropriation, and issues of identity, but the very consciousness-raising that makes oppression visible to us often comes at the expense of others. These problems are particularly fraught in Indigenous–settler relations as Indigenous cultures, knowledges, and symbols are increasingly fetishized and commodified. As settlers hoping to bring about material change, **we require new forms of listening, taking action, and relating to Indigenous peoples and cultures**. Roderick Haig-Brown (2010) **contrasted deep learning with appropriation, arguing that the former takes years of immersive education in Indigenous contexts**. Such deep learning is **in line with cultural protocols, done through lasting relationship, and connected to the places where the knowledge was generated and lives**. Appropriation, by contrast, is mediated by power imbalances, takes without permission, is dislocated from context, and shows no recognition for context, intellectual or cultural property, or continuity. **If we are to seriously engage in the circles cast as Indigenous space, we would argue that it is essential to enact a settler ethics that is not appropriative, imitative, or disconnected, but instead accountable and respectful.** For us to connect with the creativity that exceeds our fright, it is necessary to be honest and vulnerable in our failures. **To go beyond fear is to articulate a politicized praxis of working with the affects of failure, crisis, and engaging the unknown**. As we reflect on the conference, our omissions of our accountabilities to the Indigenous space become more visible. **In our panel on radical youthwork, we can now see there was a tendency towards inclusion, rather than acknowledgment**. In the workshops and papers that we gave, we have to wonder how accountable we were to the circle cast. Our reflections on these things have driven our attempts here to articulate our humility and our celebration of what happened there. As we think about the conference and our participation, we acknowledge the profound impact of Western scholarship on our work. At times, that impact is detrimental to our processes of desettlering our work. While as settlers it can be important to reconfigure Western concepts and ideas to undo colonial patterns of thought without leaning too heavily on Indigenous literature and scholarship, **settler ethics are also about how we attend to Indigenous and other marginalized voices.** Kathy Snow (2018) explained that **researching Indigenous contexts as a settler ally requires clarity of intention, motivation, processes, and roles.** Snow also emphasized the importance of **being able to sit with discomfort yet continue to commit time, energy, and resources to sustain allyship in the face of resistance.** While deep self-reflection is invaluable to personal transformation, it is the messy and complicated work of embodied allyship that produces webs of living relationships capable of resistance and change. For us, settler ethics is an **ethical, embodied, affective, relational, and localized process of relating and acting with Indigenous peoples, with other settlers, and with the conditions of active colonialism that sustain our current world order**. In Indigenous spaces such as the conference, this requires that we actually “arrive”. The concept of arrival, which is derived from the CYC literature (Garfat & Fulcher, 2011; Krueger, 2007), calls on us to **be fully present in mind and body**

in the encounter with others. Being fully present is a challenging and complex set of practices that **requires that we be attentive to how we feel in our bodies, how we are affected by and affect others, and the thoughts that arise as we act and feel**. It calls on us to be immanently attentive and responsive to the circle of care, resistance, and **concrete material change** that is the imperative of living allyship. We acknowledge that we enter Indigenous spaces composed of elements and locations. To overcome our fright and **engage in ethical, creative desettlering includes taking our own locations** as White cis male settler, White cis female settler, and mixed-race cis male settler **as the starting point for an analysis of our subjectivities, actions, and thoughts**. This is work that should precede entry into Indigenous spaces. It should be a kind of **taking inventory of our colonial subjectivity** so that we know where it all is and how it works **before we inadvertently trouble Indigenous spaces with our colonial ambivalences and messy sets of guilt, shame, reactionary acts, and settlersplaining**. In short, we propose that **before engaging in the circle cast by our Indigenous colleagues, we attempt to undo the overlay of colonialism that continues to wedge contradictions between ourselves and the horizon of an ethical life**. Our learnings from working with young people in various contexts can inform us about the importance of arriving into people’s lives. We might remind ourselves how those young people that we have engaged in our work have taught us how **colonialism continues to cause harm in their lives**. We can learn as settlers to reflect on how we continue to be complicit in perpetuating the current world order in our work. If we pay attention, the **lived space of our work with young people is saturated with racialized, gendered, and colonial experiences that perpetuate a system we as settlers continue to benefit from**. While these experiences can bring guilt and shame, they also bring heightened awareness and ethical incitement that can move us to creativity over fear. The process of ethical desettlering **calls for ongoing self-reflexivity that goes well beyond Western narcissistic forms of self-care or self-actualization**. We are concerned that our **tendency as Western settlers includes hundreds of years of assuming the world and other peoples were there for our benefit**. We have exploited and appropriated without mercy species, other humans, and geographies. It is far too easy for us to fall into patterns that call for others to care for us in our interactions with Indigenous colleagues, people of color, and women. We need to reverse the polarity. **We do not require self-care as much as we require learning to care for all of us.** We do not require self-actualization as much as we require **actualizing an equitable world** for all persons, species, and lands. Some would argue that to do this, we need to care for ourselves and become all we can be as evolved human beings. We would argue that these **ideas are saturated with a peculiar variety of Western psychosis that holds us aside from the rest of the world and isolates us within the individual body in painful loneliness and isolation**. Entering the circle cast as Indigenous space as desperately lonely and isolated individuals is likely to skew all our relations into complexities of emotional and cultural exploitation. **To prepare ourselves as Western settler subjects to enter Indigenous conference space, we might well consider scrutinizing the ways that our Westernized settler identity informs our research and how our affects and emotions, interests, and investments are involved in knowledge generation and action.** Of course, **this would be easier** and probably more effective **if we as settlers engaged in forums where we collectively worked on the processes of desettlering**. However, the very premise of the problem, which is rooted in toxic masculinist rugged individualism, can preclude such possibilities. Indeed, attempting such scrutiny can alienate us from our settler peers and bring about backlash and even blacklisting within segments of the CYC community. We regard this as a predictable outcome of confronting our shame. **Despite this, we would suggest that we not turn to Indigenous people, women, or people of color for support and healing.** It is our work to do, and we have already taken so much. **We, as settlers**, must **find ways to discuss, account for, disrupt, analyze, unsettle, and challenge settler identities.** We need to work toward new ways that CYC settlers can get together to explore and amplify how we are challenged to undo our heteronormative, racial, class, and colonial attachments and, through our work, open onto new practices of supervision, solidarity, and peer collaboration (Kouri & Smith, 2016; Reynolds, 2010a). It is our work as settlers to find ways to **connect our lines of creative desettlering with the circles cast by our non-settler colleagues and friends.** Carrie Gaffney (2016) argued that allyship begins with identity as a means of locating power and standing with people or groups who are experiencing oppression. This “standing with”, however, requires **commitments to complex, ongoing processes that resist institutional power, silence, and violence.** It means holding one another accountable for ensuring material change for colonized peoples (Tuck & Yang, 2012) and **opening doors only to get out of the way so that Indigenous people might determine their processes, responses, and paths of transformation**. Desettlering includes showing up, making connections between different forms of oppression, supporting resistance and resurgence, and working with other settler people on our forms of witnessing, being present, taking action when appropriate, and representing our relationships. Indeed, as Karlee Fellner and colleagues (2016) have noted, “a key difference in ethical professional practice between non-Indigenous and Indigenous counsellors is that the latter observe the same traditional ethics both inside and outside the office” (p. 138). Living a life outside our places of CYC work and research that is congruent with our ethics is precisely a learning we might carry with us as settler CYC workers. **To prepare to enter Indigenous spaces, we might well investigate how our work might be grounded in principles and processes whereby settlers become accountable for their embodied subjectivity within reiterations of colonialism. After years of working in Indigenous academic and practice contexts, we have become aware of how the axioms of colonialism are so ingrained that they can perpetuate themselves even when settlers are seeking to be allies.** One example, particular to our conference reflections, is how **settlers can advance their academic and practice careers by knowing and speaking about Indigenous issues. With the privileges of access to higher education and safer spaces for critical debates, White settlers quickly advance their academic knowledge of Indigenous issues and can reiterate the language of decolonization**. With the power and privilege of access to publishing in academic journals, settlers often have greater access to speaking about Indigenous issues than Indigenous people themselves. **The reiteration of colonialism is nearly impossible to prevent, particularly in hyper-colonized spaces of privilege like research universities and professional practice settings. We need to be always mindful and name how colonialism and capitalism will appropriate even efforts to contest them.** Reynolds (2010b) talks about imperfect allies, noting that **there will always be mistakes when allies attempt to buffer the effects of power and to be mindful of the space that those in power take up. It is up to allies to work with other people in power and prevent the continual usurpation and misuse of power and space, thereby making greater space for those who are oppressed to speak and seek justice. Practices of solidarity and building cultures of critique are two ways in which Reynolds inspires us to think about how our conversations with young people and each other can be more fully connected with justice movements.**