#### **The standard is mitigating structural violence. Prefer for three reasons.**

1. **Structural violence is a form of oppression that is formed through moral exclusion. Recognition of this is key to stopping it**

**Winter and Leighton 99**

**[Deborah DuNann Winter and Dana C. Leighton  Winter :Psychologist that specializes in Social Psych, Counseling Psych, Historical and Contemporary Issues, Peace Psychology. Leighton: PhD graduate student in the Psychology Department at the University of Arkansas. “Peace, conflict, and violence: Peace psychology in the 21st century.” 1999]**

Finally, **to recognize** **the operation of structural violence forces** us to ask **questions about how and why we tolerate it,** questions **which** **often have painful answers for the privileged elite** who unconsciously support it. A final question of this section is how and why we allow ourselves to be so oblivious to structural violence. Susan Opotow offers an intriguing set of answers, in her article Social Injustice. She argues that **our normal perceptual/cognitive processes divide people into in-groups and out-groups. Those outside** our group **lie outside our scope of justice.** Injustice that would be instantaneously confronted if it occurred to someone we love or know is barely noticed if it occurs to strangers or those who are invisible or irrelevant. We do not seem to be able to open our minds and our hearts to everyone, so **we draw conceptual lines between those who are in and out of our moral circle.** **Those who fall outside are morally excluded, and be- come either invisible, or demeaned in some way so that we do not have to acknowledge the injustice they suffer.** Moral exclusion is a human failing, but Opotow argues convincingly that it is an outcome of everyday social cognition. To reduce its nefarious effects, **we must be vigilant in noticing and listening to oppressed**, invisible, outsiders. **Inclusionary thinking can be fostered by relationships, communication, and apprecia tion of diversity**. Like Opotow, all the authors in this section point out that **structural violence is not inevitable if we become aware of its operation**, and build systematic ways to mitigate its effects. Learning about structural violence may be discouraging, overwhelming, or maddening, but these papers encourage us to step beyond guilt and anger, and begin to think about how to reduce structural violence. All the authors in this section note that the same structures (such as global communication and normal social cognition) which feed structural violence, can also be used to empower citizens to reduce it. In the long run, reducing structural violence by reclaiming neighborhoods, demanding social jus- tice and living wages, providing prenatal care, alleviating sexism, and celebrating local cultures, will be our most surefooted path to building lasting peace.

1. **Prereq to debate- unless we deconstruct structural violence, debate becomes unfair and uneducational as different groups will be excluded from having a voice making this framework necessary to participating in the activity**
2. **Moral Relevance- The primary debate around social policies revolves around structural violence, this framing is more relevant and necessary for the resolution which means neg can’t just prove that on average their framing is a better method unless they prove it’s a better method in the context of the resolution**

**contention 1: Space ableism**

**Private enties allow Disabled bodies equal access to space where NASA has not**

**Grush 21** Grush, L. (2021, October 20). The mission to break barriers to space travel for people with disabilities. *The Verge*. https://www.theverge.com/2021/10/20/22734331/mission-astro-access-disability-zero-g-flight-space-travel

It’s a goal that would certainly [shake up the current model for who is allowed to fly to space](https://www.wired.com/story/its-time-to-rethink-whos-best-suited-for-space-travel/). To become a NASA astronaut, for instance, a candidate must be in excellent health and has to undergo a stringent physical to be considered for the program. NASA astronauts used to need 20/20 vision, though the space agency now allows individuals who wear glasses or who have had surgical procedures to correct their vision to 20/20. But **NASA will not consider individuals who are blind, and any other major medical disabilities related to deafness or mobility will automatically disqualify someone from the application process.** **However, human spaceflight is in the midst of a major transformation. For one thing, it’s not just NASA’s game anymore. Numerous private companies have sprung up in the last few decades aiming to send humans to various parts of space.** V**irgin Galactic and Blue Origin have both developed suborbital vehicles that are designed to take paying customers to the edge of space and back** so that flyers can experience a brief glimpse of Earth from above. Meanwhile, **SpaceX has started flying people to low Earth orbit on its new Crew Dragon spacecraft.** While the company built the vehicle primarily to carry NASA astronauts to and from the International Space Station, [**SpaceX recently flew a** crew of four civilians to orbit](https://www.theverge.com/2021/9/15/22675793/spacex-inspiration4-launch-first-all-civilian-private-crew) on the vehicle during a private three-day mission. One of those **passenger**s, Hayley Arceneaux, **had an internal prosthesis in her leg — something that would have disqualified her from flying as a NASA astronaut.**

**Accessible changes should be incorperated into future space craft not only for the allowence of disabled bodies to space travel but to make space travel safer for everyone- NASA has historically over looked this while private entities already have the data and ideas to take next steps**

**Grush 21** Grush, L. (2021, October 20). The mission to break barriers to space travel for people with disabilities. *The Verge*. https://www.theverge.com/2021/10/20/22734331/mission-astro-access-disability-zero-g-flight-space-travel

**“**A lot of customization was done to people’s flight suits, specifically with openings, pockets, extra straps, and different ways of helping their body function in zero gravity,” Modesta, a singer and performance artist who had her left leg amputated below the knee years after an accident at birth, tells *The Verge*. Having such highly tailored suits became critical for some of the mobility crew to have the best possible experience. For instance, one of the ambassadors had a suit with special straps that held his legs together, which made it easier to focus on maneuvering through the space. And when some of the mobility crew found themselves floating, it was the first time in years that they could move around without the use of their chair. Each experience was different for each ambassador, and now Mission: AstroAccess has plenty of new data to help suggest what kind of **accessibility-related changes should be incorporated in future spacecraft. That might include directional fabrics on the walls, for instance, to help those with limited vision determine their orientation. Bahram argues that making these kinds of updates is not just about being inclusive but also about making flights safer for every astronaut.** He cited one instance in which **astronaut** Chris Hadfield **went temporarily blind during a spacewalk when cleaning solution squirted into his eye.** **“That is a failure of the system,” Bahram says. “There is no reason whatsoever that that should have been as dangerous as it was. It was because NASA has not considered persons with disabilities as viable candidates. That could have been a complete non-issue.”** **With more accessible tools, all astronauts — from the able-bodied ones to those with disabilities — might have more options to remain safe during an emergency scenario. And it starts with designing a space with all types of bodies in mind.** **“It’s one of these things where this level of ableism has been built into our society, and we need to understand that it is our environments that are disabling, not individuals that are disabled,”** Bahram says.

**And this is a nessesary consideration as everyone in space will be Disabled in new ways**

Techanddis 18 techanddis, V. all posts by. (2018, October 14). *Disabled people in space – becoming interplanetary*. Technology and Disability. https://techanddisability.com/2018/10/14/disabled-people-in-space-becoming-interplanetary/

**Everyone in space will be disabled, if they are not yet already**. And people might want to be disabled to be in space. Examples include:

* + Wheelchair Users & Movement in Space: CripsInSpace and Sam de Leve have pointed out how wheelchair users and other mobility device users are often use to figuring out how to navigate spaces in a more creative way that involves a lot of pushing off in ways that nondisabled people rarely experience. (As a person who loves her rollator, I can confirm that the beauty of pushing off an moving in this way is wonderful – and something you get better at doing the more time you spend on wheels.)
  + Some medical conditions being better: People with certain medical conditions might make better space travellers under particular conditions, either because they’d do better in lower gravity or because their bodies can tolerate high g’s. For instance, people with hearts closer to their brains are less likely to pass out in high g’s since blood can make it to the brain faster. People with some bone conditions might do better where their skeleton is less compressed by gravity over time. (In individual conversations with folks, it’s always surprising to me how many people have thought about how their bodies would do in space!)
  + It’s not just physical disability, though: Mental health in space: We already know that Seasonal Affective Disorder has higher incidence in places where people get less light from the sun. Imagine the high incidence of SAD we might see from people travelling away from the Earth. It might make sense to send people who have already learned how to manage their mental health here on Earth if we hope for good space travellers who have a track record of learning and adapting to various conditions already.
  + Cyborgs/Cripborgs\* wanted — there are many examples of people who have medical devices and monitors installed that would make it easier to do some things in space. My fave example is from my pal Mallory Kay Nelson: people with ostomy bags will have a much easier time with the current pooping in lower gravity situation. Read about the [history of pooping in space](https://www.popsci.com/brief-history-pooping-in-space)while you consider this.
  + Even if we aren’t sending disabled people out, we’ll be bringing disabled people home or sending them further out. **We’ll have new disabilities in space, and people who are nondisabled here will become disabled through the environmental changes in space – gravity and radiation being the two most anticipated**, but in other ways too.

**I want to add that it’s discriminatory + ridiculous to populate our ideas about space and who has “the right stuff” with only nondisabled people**. The fact is that some disabled people may have an edge as space travellers — and **what our bodies will need to do and become in space is far from the niche requirements set here on Earth. Even if we start out nondisabled and recruit for peak abledness, the toll of space on human bodies will bring about disabilities we have yet to imagine. Considering the future of space travel in any serious way requires thinking about being and becoming disabled, about accepting disability as a normal part of life – one that will follow us to the stars.**

# **Solvency con 2: Teamwork**

### The Public Sector is Designed to collaborate with the Private Sector

**Fernholz 19,** Tim. “How to Build a Space Economy That Avoids the Mistakes of Terrestrial Capitalism.” Quartz, Quartz, qz.com/work/1767415/can-nasa-build-a-space-economy-that-leaves-capitalisms-problems-behind/.

The good news is that we aren’t close to a world like the one depicted in the movie Elysium, where the ultra-wealthy repair to space and leave the rest of us behind. Our **public and private interests will be far more intertwined**, in part **because governments have designed it that way. Most** of the **major space agencies** are compelled by law in their home countries to **support private economic activity**, which means for example that **NASA**, by law, **views the success of US companies in space as part of its mission, and not a distraction or a threat.** The reality is that public space agencies, particularly NASA in the United States, remain the largest spenders in space and control the conditions for private organizations acting in orbit. Their challenge—and opportunity—is to manage the transition to a new, multi-stakeholder world in orbit by successfully subsidizing new initiatives without letting the benefits escape the public at large.

**If we choose to not allow for cooperation between the two sectors, we hold back both from completing important tasks.**

**Houser 17**

“Private Companies, Not Governments, Are Shaping the Future of Space Exploration.” Futurism, Futurism, 12 June 2017, futurism.com/private-companies-not-governments-are-shaping-the-future-of-space-exploration.

“We’re starting to see **advances made by private entities** that **are more significant than any** advances in the last three years **that were made by the government**,” Chris Lewicki, CEO and President of Planetary Resources, tells Futurism. Amazon CEO Jeff Bezos’s Blue Origin and Tesla CEO Elon Musk’s SpaceX are arguably the two companies that are setting the pace. In November 2015, the former completed the first successful vertical rocket landing after sending their New Shepard 100 kilometers (62 miles) into the air. SpaceX landed its own rocket a month later, only they did so with a craft twice as heavy as Blue Origin’s and traveled all the way into space first. A month after that, **in** January **2016, Bezos’s company became the first entity to re-launch and re-land a previously used rocket. SpaceX followed suit** in 2017. “**The government was never able to [build reusable rockets], but** now, two **private companies** within the space of the same year **have** done that,” points out Lewicki. If all goes according to plan, when **SpaceX’s Falcon Heavy** launches in September, it’ll **take the title of the world’s most powerful rocket away from NASA**’s Saturn V. Virgin Galactic is already selling tickets for what it expects to be the first private spaceflights, which will take place aboard the sleek VSS Unity. SpaceX plans to send space tourists to the Moon in 2018, and then in 2024, the company hopes to launch a system that will take people all the way to Mars…roughly 5-15 years before NASA expects to do the same. Private companies may be in the lead, but the finish line for this Space Race isn’t exactly clear. The first iteration was arguably “won” when Neil Armstrong took his first steps on the Moon, so does this sequel end when we establish the first Moon base? When a human walks on Mars? When we leave the solar system? Truthfully, the likelihood of humanity ever calling it a day on space exploration is slim to none. The universe is huge, with galaxy estimates in the trillions, so the goalpost will continue moving back (to bring another sport into the analogy). Rather than focusing on competing in what is ultimately an unwinnable race, **private and government-backed space agencies can actually benefit from collaboration thanks to their** inherent **differences.** “The way that SpaceX, Planetary Resources, or Virgin Galactic approaches space exploration is going to be very different from NASA or the Air Force,” explains Lewicki. **Private companies aren’t beholden to the same slow processes that often stall government projects,** and they can secure or reallocate funding much more swiftly if need be. However, unlike agencies like NASA, they do have shareholders to keep happy and a need to constantly pursue profitability. **The two sectors**, therefore, **have a tremendous opportunity to help one another. Private companies can generate revenue through government contracts** —for example, NASA has contracted Boeing to transport astronauts to the International Space Station (ISS), and SpaceX just closed a deal with the U.S. Air Force to launch its secretive space drone. **This leaves the government agencies free to pursue the kind of** forward-thinking, **longer-term research that might not immediately generate revenue**, but that can be later streamlined and improved upon in the private sector. Ultimately, Space Race 2.0 has no losers. The breakthroughs happening in space exploration benefit us all, and truly, a little friendly competition never hurt anyone (unless you count the egos bruised by those tweets).

**3. Therefore, by allowing for cooperation, we ensure we can make the most progress in helping society by allowing both parties into space. \**