## FRAMING

#### The value is justice.

#### The value criterion is mitigating structural violence.

#### Structural violence is based in moral exclusion, which is fundamentally unjust because exclusion is based on arbitrarily perceived differences – only action based off our theory of power can mitigate.

**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. Knowledgeable in the fields of social psychology, peace psychology, and justice and intergroup responses to transgressions of justice] “Peace, conflict, and violence: Peace psychology in the 21st century.” Pg 4-5 ghs//VA

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 become 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 appreciation 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 justice and living wages, providing prenatal care, alleviating sexism, and celebrating local cultures, will be our most surefooted path to building lasting peace.

## ADV

#### Western narratives of property ownership that dominate space exploration promote settler colonialism and indigenous erasure

**Neilson and Cirkovic 21** (Hilding Neilson - David A. Dunlap Department of Astronomy & Astrophysics, University of Toronto. and Elena E. Ćirković - HELSUS, University of Helsinki : the first being a Mi’kmaw astronomer who grew up in Newfoundland and is a status member of the Qalipu Nation, and second, a legal scholar of minority background. / “Indigenous rights, peoples, and space exploration: A response to the Canadian Space Agency (CSA) Consulting Canadians on a framework for future space exploration activities” / Accessed 12-19-21) (<https://arxiv.org/pdf/2104.07118.pdf>) (SPHS, AL)

The Narratives of Space Exploration Human space exploration has been part of the social and political conscious since Dr. Werner von Braun published his seminal guidebook for a human settlement of Mars (von Braun & White 1953). The possibility of human settlement in space, has also prompted the consideration of **parallels** between the narratives of space exploration and colonization. These parallels include simple phrases such as “colonization” and “frontier” but are related in the concepts of the Doctrine of Discovery, Manifest Destiny and Terra Nullius. These parallels are well understood in popular culture and science fiction (e.g., King, 2017). Indeed, as and further, since the beginning of the space race, the drafters of the 1967 Outer Space Treaty (OST), to which Canada is a party, agreed that “colonization” or the possibility of a “land grab” in outer space, was to be avoided. For this reason, outer space became a “global commons”. The first issue is our choice of words with respect to space exploration. The words that are typically chosen, such as colonization, is exclusive to peoples who have a lived experience of negative impacts of colonization. In Canada, the impacts of this colonization includes recent land defense protests in Wet’su’weten, southern Ontario; the ongoing and historical removal of Indigenous children from their families that is traced back to the 60’s scoop; the intergenerational traumas of Residential School; the government-sanctioned starvation and abuse of Indigenous peoples in the early history of Canada as a nation state; the bounties offered for scalping First Nation peoples, and so on (e.g., Diabo 2020, King 2013, Palmater 2011). These histories have been well documented in scholarship on the Canada’s history in relation of the First Nations and is beyond the scope of our commentary. However, we stress that focusing on the ideas of “frontiers” or “colonization”, when discussing the human presence in outer space, echoes the remnants of this history and excludes Indigenous peoples from participating in the goal of space exploration. One counterargument to such concerns could be that human exploration in space will not impact “life” as there is **no “life”** as we know it, on the Moon and that most likely, there is no life on Mars. Responses to this are as follows: 1) Definition of “life” is rooted in **dominant ontologies**, and a particular understanding of physical entities that have biological processes and are distinguished from inorganic matter. However, many Indigenous peoples in Canada and around the world have different perspectives of life and being. For many peoples **there is a kinship relation between humans and nature, humans and the land, and humans and celestial objects such as the planets, Moon, stars, and the Sun as well as the Universe. This is an axiom of relationality that places Indigenous peoples as equal and to above any other element in nature.** 2) The argument that outer space and space objects are “empty” are a space-based transposition of the terra nullius (Latin: nobody’s land) or res nullius (nobody’s thing) principles in international law (or the early law among the nations). Terra Nullius and the Doctrine of Discovery are principles developed by colonizing European Nations, and philosophies and laws, which declared territories as empty, and **avoid recognition of the existence of Indigenous peoples**. For instance, both, the idea that Indigenous peoples’ land was empty land, and the Doctrine of Discovery, are exemplified in the 1494 Treaty of Tordesillas, which declared that only non-Christian lands could be colonized under the Doctrine of Discovery. In the nineteenth century, the famous 1823 US Supreme Court case Johnson v. M'Intosh 1823 affirmed the doctrine of discovery as part of international law. As Chief Justice John Marshall noted in his opinion as follows: On the discovery of this immense continent, the great nations of Europe ... as they were all in pursuit of nearly the same object, it was necessary, in order to avoid conflicting settlements, and consequent war with each other, to establish a principle which all should acknowledge as the law by which the right of acquisition, which they all asserted, should be regulated as between themselves. This principle was that discovery gave title to the government by whose subjects, or by whose authority, it was made, against all other European governments, which title might be consummated by possession. ... The history of America, from its discovery to the present day, proves, we think, the universal recognition of these principles. These are examples of how doctrine of discovery was used as a legal instrument. However, in 2021, and in the context of current general international law, colonialism is no longer legal (McWhinney 2008). 3) These policies allowed European nations to claim territory through colonialism and erase the connections between Indigenous peoples and the lands on which they lived on by declaring those Indigenous peoples as not civilized and often as not ‘human’-and therefore, not as subjects of law. While we have no reason to expect there are any humans nor any living creature that western science would recognize as “intelligent” living currently on the Moon or Mars, the concept of Terra Nullius, or Lunar Nullius or Martian Nullius **impacts all living beings** in the respective areas regardless of **perceived intelligence**. Terra Nullius impacted humans in what came to be the sovereign Canada, as well as bison, wolves, bears, cod, salmon, great auk, and so on. It is arguable that Terra Nullius negatively impacted the rights of the land, through dam building, water and air pollution, and so on. We don’t know what the impact of Martian Nullius is, or will be, and our narratives and discussions must be inclusive of these issues from the perspective of Indigenous knowledges and ontologies, in Canada. Megaconstellations of Satellites is Colonization The launch of Starlink by SpaceX has had a dramatic and damaging impact on research in astronomy and astrophysics (Clery 2020, Kocifaj 2021). These satellites have added to the amount of light pollution and future satellite constellations could have far greater impact depending on the legal requirements and the purpose of those satellites. Hamacher et al (2020) presented a compelling argument that light pollution is a form of cultural genocide (please note that in the context of the Final Report of the Truth & Reconciliation Commission we will use the term Indigenous erasure instead). In their article, the authors noted that a significant amount of Indigenous knowledge is based on star lore and observations of the sky. Those observations are connected to Indigenous stories about the land and nature - for some peoples the sky is a reflection of the land (Cajete 2000). Those observations, however, are based on a dark night sky without substantive light pollution. As such, light pollution acts to disconnect Indigenous peoples from the land they live, and as such, is a form of erasure. In the same vein, we argue that constellations of satellites are also a form of colonization, especially those that are bright enough to be visible from the ground. If light pollution results in an erasure of knowledges, then megaconstellations of satellites would also constitute an attempt to rewrite that knowledge. There is a second issue that the CSA should consider with respect to space exploration and the impact of new satellites. That issue is at what height do treaties and agreements with Indigenous peoples, end? It is understood that treaties have impact on Indigenous rights and responsibilities with respect to mining, water resources, hunting, etc. but Indigenous communities should be consulted with the impacts on the skies above. This is especially true for satellites that contribute to light pollution, but also satellites that are designed to offer services to communities (such as wireless internet), satellites designed for groundbased or remote imaging such as mapping satellites and LIDAR imaging. The CSA has an obligation to consult with Indigenous communities and Indigenous-led organizations with respect to the legalities of how satellites that impact communities operate.Preserving the Moon and Mars One of the key elements of the Artemis Accords is the commitment to preserve Outer Space Heritage (Section 9). On the other hand, Sections 3 and 10 of the Accords are designed to allow countries to peacefully exploit the Moon and Mars. However, these accords presuppose that Space Heritage refers to only landing sites and rovers. This definition ignores Indigenous people’s perspectives and elements of space heritage for Indigenous cultures. It is also notable that the accords allow for exploitation by humanity for industry such as mining. This idea implies that nation-states on Earth have the right to exploit the Moon and Mars for their own purposes and those rights supersede the principle that the Moon and Mars might have its own rights as viewed from Indigenous perspectives. In Aotearoa (New Zealand), the settler government recognized that the Whanganui River is a living entity that belonged to no one, hence has its own rights as a living entity. This means that the river cannot be exploited by humans. Because the river cannot express its own interests in ways that humans can interpret a committee was appointed to act as guardian for the river. That committee includes local Maori representatives. The importance of the Moon and Mars as part of the cultures and knowledge systems of Indigenous peoples from around the world and that part for many peoples is one of relation (Cajete, 2000). In the situation of relationality, the Moon and Mars and other Solar Systems objects have their own rights to exist and be. Those rights are not necessarily incongruent with exploration and mining. However, they do require a significant reconsideration of what constitutes a human right to interact with the Moon and Mars. For instance, the environmental impact on the Earth is significant but the Earth could heal from most mining events given enough time. It is not likely the Moon would recover over the age of the Universe because of the lack dynamic mechanisms found on the Earth. We have an ethical duty to consider the rights of the Moon and Mars from environmental and Indigenous perspectives to better share the benefits and sustainability of space exploration. Those rights should be represented by Indigenous peoples as well as traditional nation-state governance

#### The violence of sett col is especially true of outer space appropriation and it’s a slippery slope – private, unregulated entities will go unchecked and open opportunities for labor exploitation, dehumanization, and literal indentured servitude

**Hore-Thorburn 21** (Isabelle, Current social media editor at highsnobiety with a masters in heritage studies, bachelor of international and global studies, and extensive experience in journalism, research, and communications / “TRUST ELON MUSK TO MAKE GOING TO SPACE SOUND SHIT” / January 2021 / Highsnobiety / Accessed 12-18-21) (<https://www.highsnobiety.com/p/elon-musk-colonizing-mars-indentured-slavery/>) (SPHS, AL)

​Elon Musk, aka the newly anointed [richest man in the world](https://www.businessinsider.com/worlds-richest-person-elon-musk-dedicate-wealth-mars-colony-2021-1?r=DE&IR=T), has revealed more details of his plan to move people into space. However, before you get excited, everything he just detailed makes us want to stay firmly on earth. He's bringing indentured servitude to Mars. In a recent interview with [Business Insider](https://www.businessinsider.com/elon-musk-interview-axel-springer-tesla-accelerate-advent-of-sustainable-energy?r=DE&IR=T), Musk predicted that life as we know it "will be dramatically improved if we're a multiplanet species as a spacefaring civilization." But dramatically improved for who exactly? Musk's utopian project aims to see an estimated **1 million people** relocate to Mars by 2050, many of whom will need to pay back their journey on arrival. The tech billionaire intends for there to be “loans available for those who don’t have money,” and jobs on the Red Planet for settlers to **pay off their debts.** Sound familiar? That’s because his plan for colonizing Mars sounds a lot like **OG colonialism.** The idea of [**indentured servitude**](https://www.pbs.org/opb/historydetectives/feature/indentured-servants-in-the-us) was born of a need for **cheap labor** in America in the decade following the settlement of Jamestown by the Virginia Company in 1607. Settlers soon realized that they had too much land to care for, but no one to care for it and so they developed the system of indentured servitude to attract workers. The life of an indentured servant was harsh and restrictive, but it wasn't slavery. There were laws that protected some of their rights. However, their contract could be extended as punishment for breaking a law, such as running away, or in the case of female servants, becoming pregnant. Now **imagine that** setup but **in space**. Over the last couple of years, Musk has demonstrated a less than impressive attitude to the rights and safety of his workers. In 2019 a judge found that he violated national labor laws when he implied via tweet that [Tesla workers who unionized would have to give up their company stock options.](https://www.cnbc.com/2019/09/27/tesla-violated-labor-laws-by-blocking-union-organizing-judge-rules) Then, as the pandemic ravaged California last year, [Tesla workers said they were fired after opting to stay home](https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2020/07/01/tesla-plant-firings/) from the Fremont factory rather than risk being potentially exposed to the coronavirus. “The company, Elon included, they don’t really care about the health and well-being of the employees,” said ex-Tesla employee, Nayo Miller. “The manufacturing of the vehicles supersedes our safety.” Musk's Martian pay-away scheme sounds like the setup for an extremely stressful space-mutiny blockbuster or yet **another reminder** that we have yet to learn from or even acknowledge the failures of colonialism. In the wake of George Floyd’s death and the BLM protests, [colonial monuments were torn down by protesters](https://www.highsnobiety.com/p/anti-racism-protests-statues-toppled/) around the world who saw them as a constant reminder of racism and subjugation. Defenders of statues dedicated to slave traders and colonists argued that to deface and remove these monuments was to “erase history.” Musk’s plan to simply **repackage colonial techniques** is arguably a greater, not to mention deeply sinister, act of erasure.

#### There is no acceptable amount of profit-incentive violence – capitalism ensures violence on a universal\* scale.  Our primary responsibility is to challenge the organizing principles which found systems of oppression

**Zizek and Daly in 4** (Slavoj and Glyn, *Conversations with Zizek* pg. 14-16) \*see what i did there? Ba dum tsh

For Zizek **it is imperative that** we cut through this Gordian knot of postmodern protocol and recognize that **our ethico-political responsibility is to confront the constitutive violence of today's global capitalism and its obscene naturalization/ anonymization of the millions who are subjugated by it throughout the world**. Against the standardized positions of postmodern culture – with all its pieties concerning 'multiculturalist' etiquette – Zizek is arguing for **a politics t**hat might be called 'radically incorrect' in the sense **that** it **breaks with** these types of positions' and focuses instead **on the very organizing principles of today's social reality: the principles of global liberal capitalism. This requires some care and subtlety. For far too long, Marxism has been bedevilled by an almost fetishistic economism** that has tended towards political morbidity. With the likes of Hilferding and Gramsci, and more recently Laclau and Mouffe, crucial theoretical advances have been made that enable the transcendence of all forms of economism. In this new context, however, Zizek argues that the problem that now presents itself is almost that of the opposite fetish. That is to say, the prohibitive anxieties surrounding the taboo of economism can function as a way of not engaging with economic reality and as a way of implicitly accepting the latter as a basic horizon of existence. In an ironic Freudian-Lacanian twist, the fear of economism can end up reinforcing a de facto economic necessity in respect of contemporary capitalism (i.e. the initial prohibition conjures up the very thing it fears). This is not to endorse any kind of retrograde return to economism. Zizek's point is rather that **in rejecting economism we should not lose sight of the systemic power of capital in shaping the lives and destinies of humanity and our very sense of the possible**. In particular **we should not overlook** Marx's central insight **that** in order **to create a universal global system the forces of capitalism seek to conceal the politico-discursive violence of its construction through a kind of gentrification of that system.** What is persistently denied by neo-liberals such as Rorty (1989) and Fukuyama (1992) is that the gentrification of global liberal capitalism is one whose 'universalism' fundamentally reproduces and depends upon a disavowed violence that excludes vast sectors of the world's population. In this way, neo-liberal ideology attempts to naturalize capitalism by presenting its outcomes of winning and losing as if they were simply a matter of chance and sound judgement in a neutral marketplace. Capitalism does indeed create a space for a certain diversity, at least for the central capitalist regions, but it is neither neutral nor ideal and its price in terms of social exclusion is exorbitant. That is to say, **the human cost in terms of inherent global poverty and degraded 'life-chances' cannot be calculated within the existing economic rationale and, in consequence, social exclusion remains mystified and nameless** (viz. the patronizing reference to the 'developing world'). And Zizek's point is that this mystification is magnified through capitalism's profound capacity to ingest its own excesses and negativity: to redirect (or misdirect) social antagonisms and to absorb them within a culture of differential affirmation. Instead of Bolshevism, the tendency today is towards a kind of political boutiquism that is readily sustained by postmodern forms of consumerism and lifestyle. **Against this Zizek argues for a new universalism whose primary ethical directive is to confront the fact that our forms of social existence are founded on exclusion on a global scale**. While it is perfectly true that universalism can never become Universal (it will always require a hegemonic-particular embodiment in order to have any meaning), what is novel about Zizek's universalism is that it would not attempt to conceal this fact or to reduce the status of the abject Other to that of a 'glitch' in an otherwise sound matrix.

#### Disruptive and transformative environmental education is key to material spillover since education shapes our subjectivity.

**Stevenson et al. 17** (Robert B., Professor of Education for Sustainability, James Cook University. Arjen E. J. Wals, Professor of Transformative Learning for Socio-Ecological Sustainability at Wageningen University. Joe E. Heimlich, COSI Director of Research, Center for Research and Evaluation; Professor Emeritus, Ohio State Univ. Ellen Field, Assistant Professor focused on k-12 environmental education / “Urban Environmental Education Review — CHAPTER 5: CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION”/pp 51/ 2017/ Cornell University Press/ Accessed 8-3-21) (<https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7591/j.ctt1qv5qhq.9>) (SPHS, AL)

Conceptual Thinking Theory, research, and practice up until the mid-1980s all focused on the perceived ultimate goal of environmental education, especially in the United States, as being the development of responsible environmental behavior. Much of this early research and much current education and communication practice assumed a linear relationship, that is, that developing appropriate environmental awareness, knowledge, and attitudes would directly lead to changing individual behaviors. City councils adopted this approach for changing urban citizens’ behaviors. In time, however, researchers recognized that changing behaviors was not a simple linear process. Further, the arbitrary separation of cognition from affect and emotion in learning is challenged when we add intention and motivation for attempting, practicing, or ending a behavior. Learning, especially outside the formal schooling system, blurs distinctions among thought, ideas, facts, values, passions, and beliefs, and it entails understanding how an individual makes meaning from all his or her sources of information and emotion. The ancient Greek concept of conation already suggested that behaviors are guided by the blend of an individual’s unique framing of what they know, feel, and then, as a result, intend to do. Recent theory and research centered on the goal of fostering pro-environmental behaviors and actions have gone beyond an individual focus to acknowledge the importance of collective action (Gough, 2013) in transitioning to sustainable cities. Collective action is considered to be necessary when two conditions occur: (1) the negative effects of the issue are widespread and (2) extreme adverse outcomes could be reduced if many participants at a variety of levels take action (Ostrom, 2010). Collective action via the Internet is also important in considering how individuals can inspire the collective (Postmes and Brunsting, 2002) and in exploring the role of social movements in addressing environmental issues (Rydin and Pennington, 2010). From the late 1980s, a group of mainly Australian scholars argued not only that institutional arrangements and wider social structures influence individual behavioral choices, but also that education systems continue to reproduce and maintain rather than question and transform current social conditions (e.g., passive consumerism), and they do little to foster a critical consciousness of social ecological issues. An alternative socially critical approach to environmental education advocated engaging students in issue- or problem-based inquiries, including inquiries into the influence of cultural and structural features of society (e.g., prioritizing of economic concerns) on people’s positions and actions related to human-environment relationships (Fien, 1993; Robottom, 1987). These inquiries were intended first to develop students’ critical and analytical thinking about the values, interests, and ideologies involved in particular positions on a local or global social-ecological issue. Further, this approach emphasizes building decision-making and action capacity through deep engagement, reflection, and working individually and collectively toward (re)solutions of local issues. Within cities, this means that the urban governing structures should model and reflect multiple perspectives and provide avenues for residents to become engaged in addressing local problems. Related action inquiry approaches emerged in the United States, South Africa, Canada, and, most notably, in Denmark in the form of action competence (Jensen and Schnack, 1997), while similar critical and conscientization (the process of developing a critical awareness of one’s social reality through reflection and action) orientations to environmental education stemming from the work of Paulo Freire took hold in Mexico (e.g., the work of Edgar González-Gaudiano) and Brazil (e.g., the work of Moacir Gadotti). (See chapter 18.) The socially critical perspective calling for participation is particularly relevant when trying to engage citizens in sustainability challenges. Science and society increasingly recognize that we now need to better address urgent and wicked sustainability issues such as climate change, species extinction, rising inequity, and increased toxicity of water, soil, air, and living bodies. Urban populations in low-elevation coastal zones are vulnerable to sea-level rise, stronger storms, and other coastal hazards induced by climate change (130 countries have their largest urban populations in low-elevation coastal zones) (McGranahan, Balk, and Anderson, 2007). These issues can be seen as manifestations of “global systemic dysfunction” that cannot be dealt with from a single perspective. Their complexity requires the engagement of multiple stakeholders holding different perspectives and understandings of what it means and takes to become sustainable. Addressing wicked sustainability issues like climate change calls for forms of education and governance that create new spaces for collaborative and social learning; at times these spaces will need to be “disruptive” to break away from unsustainable routines and vested powers and interests that are not serving the well-being of people and planet (e.g., Hopkins, 2013). New Spaces and Partnerships for Environmental Learning in Urban Communities Given that moving toward sustainable cities demands creative engagement in emergent change, new learning approaches and ways of organizing learning that might contribute to the transformation of unsustainable urban systems, values, and routines are needed. One way to begin is to take locally relevant urban sustainability issues as a starting point for education and learning, advancing integrative ways of thinking, and engaging learners in change and transformation. Doing so calls for a different way of designing spaces for learning, or ecologies of learning arenas, that allow not only for boundary crossing between different disciplines, perspectives, interests, and values, but also blending formal, nonformal, and informal forms of learning, both virtual and real. We see plenty of examples where such new ways of learning embedded within socially critical participatory approaches are being supported and developed. In recent decades, opportunities for intergenerational environmental learning through the creation of local partnerships have expanded with the considerable growth in popularity of community gardens in urban areas, especially in North America, where abandoned vacant lots have been used as sites for multigenerational, cultural, and science learning and action (Krasny et al., 2013). Further, school gardens that produce fresh locally grown food have been shown to have a range of educational, environmental, health, and social benefits for children, citizens, and communities (Bell and Dyment, 2008). Often such initiatives represent forms of resistance to limited availability of affordable fresh and healthy food in neighborhoods. Besides contributing to a sense of community, improving participants’ health through increased vegetable consumption and exercise, and reducing reliance on fossil fuels for transporting food from rural farms, urban gardeners learn about the source of their food as well as engage in intergenerational sharing of knowledge of food production. In Edible School Gardens and similar projects, schoolchildren grow their own food in an educational garden they have designed with the support of local government, businesses, and community organizations, while simultaneously inquiring into and learning about food production, different foods, and nutrition.

#### Thus, I affirm the appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust.