



THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
Institute for the Oceans and Fisheries

WORKING PAPER SERIES

Working Paper #2020 - 02

Blue Growth and Blue Justice

**Nathan J. Bennett, Jessica Blythe, Carole White &
Cecilia Campero**

Year: 2020

Email: nathan.bennett@ubc.ca

This working paper is made available by the Institute for the Oceans and Fisheries, University of British Columbia, 2202 Main Mall, Vancouver, BC, V6T 1Z4, Canada

Blue Growth and Blue Justice *

Nathan J. Bennett^{1,2, *}, Jessica Blythe³, Carole White⁴ & Cecilia Campero⁵

Affiliations:

¹ The Peopled Seas Initiative, Institute for the Oceans and Fisheries, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada

² People and the Ocean Specialist Group, Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy, International Union for the Conservation of Nature, Global

³ Environmental Sustainability Research Centre, Brock University, St. Catharines, Ontario, Canada

⁴ Global Environmental Justice Group, University of East Anglia, UK

⁵ School of Public Policy and Global Affairs & Institute for Resources, Environment and Sustainability, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada

*Contact information for lead author: nathan.bennett@ubc.ca

Abstract: The oceans are increasingly viewed as a new frontier with huge potential for economic development. Terms such as the ‘Blue Economy’ and ‘Blue Growth’ encapsulate this new framing of the oceans as spaces of opportunity. Yet, as energy prospectors, biotechnology companies, deep-sea mining companies, fisheries corporations, and investment companies race to capitalize on ocean-based resources, substantial risks can arise for both people and the environment. The dominant discourse that frames blue growth as beneficial for the economy, for developing nations, and for coastal communities risks downplaying both the uneven distribution of benefits and the potential for substantial social harms. Indeed, civil society organizations, small-scale fisher organizations, and academics alike have been sounding the alarm and trying to draw attention to the social justice implications of rapid and unchecked development of ocean resources. To draw greater attention to these issues, this paper reviews past evidence of the social injustices that can result from ocean-based development. Our literature review highlights 10 injustices that can be produced by blue growth: 1) dispossession, displacement and ocean grabbing; 2) environmental justice concerns from pollution and waste; 3) environmental degradation and reduction of availability of ecosystem services; 4) undermining livelihoods of small-scale fishers; 5) undermining access to marine resources needed for food security and well-being; 6) inequitable distribution of economic benefits; 7) social and cultural impacts; 8) marginalization of women, 9) human and Indigenous rights abuses; and, 10) exclusion from decision-making and governance. Through a direct critique of past injustices, our aim is to stimulate a rigorous dialogue on how to achieve a more just and inclusive ocean economy. We conclude that a commitment to ‘blue justice’ – including recognitional, procedural, and distributional concerns - needs to be at the core of the blue growth agenda. Achieving a more just ocean economy may require a complete rethinking or transformation of the blue growth paradigm.

Keywords: Environmental justice, social justice, blue justice, blue growth, blue economy, ocean governance

* Citation: Bennett, N.J., Blythe, J., White, C. & Campero, C. (2020). IOF Working Paper #2020 - 02. Institute for the Oceans and Fisheries, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.

1 Introduction

A rapid acceleration of economic development is happening in our oceans (Jouffray et al., 2020). Once vast and remote spaces, mostly traversed by commercial fishing and transport vessels, oceans are now receiving unprecedented attention from an extraordinary diversity of new actors and industries. Energy prospectors, biotechnology companies, deep-sea mining enterprises, and fishing and aquaculture interests, among others, increasingly seek to develop the ocean's resources. Whether it be the enclosure of massive swaths of mangrove forests for globalized carbon markets (Barbesgaard, 2016; M. Cormier-Salem & Panfili, 2016), the rush to develop oil reserves (Ackah-Baidoo, 2013; O'Rourke & Connolly, 2003; Watts, 2012; Zalik, 2009) and marine renewable energy sources (Altamirano-Jiménez, 2017; de Groot et al., 2017; Pomeroy et al., 2015), or the continued push to expand fisheries into new areas (Campling, 2012; Kroodsma et al., 2018; Swartz et al., 2010), examples of ocean commodification and development abound.

Governments and corporate actors are promoting this economic development agenda – using terms such as the 'blue economy' and 'blue growth' to frame the oceans as a place for good business, "ripe for development", and teeming with opportunity to stimulate economic growth (Nathan J. Bennett, Cisneros-Montemayor, et al., 2019; Silver et al., 2015; Voyer et al., 2018). The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, for example, frames ocean industries as the solution to a slowing global economy and projects that their contribution could be doubled from US\$1.5 trillion in 2010 to US\$3 trillion in 2030 (OECD, 2016). The European Union describes oceans "as drivers for the European economy" and articulates that realizing their potential requires "enabling market forces, by removing those barriers and market failures that prevent innovation and investment" (European Commission, 2017, pp. 3–6). The potential of the blue economy to contribute to economic development in developing nations and small-island developing states has also received significant attention from global and regional institutions (World Bank & United Nations, 2017).

The fervor with which future ocean development is projected to occur creates material and discursive risks. Rapid expansion of economic activities in the oceans without precaution will have profound implications for an already overburdened marine environment and resources (Ehlers, 2016; Golden et al., 2017; Klinger et al., 2018; Nash et al., 2017). The dominant discourses that frame blue growth as beneficial for the economy, for developing nations and for coastal communities risks downplaying the uneven distribution of benefits and the potential for substantial social harms if there is not sufficient 'checks and balances' (Bennett, Cisneros-Montemayor, et al., 2019; Cohen et al., 2019). Many civil society organizations, most notably the World Forum of Fisherpeople (WFFP), International Collective in Support of Fisherworkers (ICSF) and the Transnational Institute, are sounding the alarm about "ocean grabbing" and "blue justice" issues that are occurring as a result of development in the oceans (Beerwinkel, 2019; Brent et al., 2018; Pedersen et al., 2014; Sundar, 2017). Researchers have also been documenting environmental and social injustices occurring as a result of ocean-based development activities, including industrial fisheries (Jentoft, 2013; Ratner et al., 2014; Too Big To Ignore, 2019), aquaculture (Page, 2007; Stonich et al., 1997), oil and gas development (Adusah-Karikari, 2015; O'Rourke & Connolly, 2003; Watts, 2012) and blue carbon markets (M.-C. Cormier-Salem, 2017; Thomas, 2016).

The notion of social justice provides useful analytical clarity for conceptualizing the means or processes through which resources and spaces are being re-allocated, and the resultant substantive ends in terms of the distribution of benefits and harms to different groups of people. Moreover, this increasing attention to 'blue justice' – which we define as recognitional, procedural or distributive justice issues occurring in the marine and coastal environment - can be seen as part of an ongoing critique of the restructuring of rules and authority over the access, use, and management of marine resources and areas of the ocean (Bavinck et al., 2017; Nathan James Bennett et al., 2015; Cohen et al., 2019; Mansfield,

2004; Pinkerton, 2017). Yet, in our view, the risks of social and environmental injustices from blue growth are insufficiently recognized by those advocating for substantial growth and development in the oceans. To forefront these issues, this paper reviews past evidence of social and environmental injustices resulting from ocean-based economic development. Through this review, the paper highlights ten risks that can inform recommendations to guide decision-making related to the ocean economy. Ultimately, the aim is to stimulate rigorous discussions of more socially just or alternative future ocean development pathways.

2 Review: Evidence of social injustices resulting from blue growth

In this section, we explore ten ways that ocean-based economic development has produced injustices in the past through a review of the literature. For the purposes of the review, we construed social injustices broadly to include the unequal distribution of benefits and/or burdens as well as unfair decision-making and governance processes (Bullard, 1994; Cutter, 1995; Fraser, 1998; Miller, 1999; Schlosberg, 2009; Walker, 2012). The literature review was guided first by a broad search of the literature in Google Scholar and Web of Science using terms such as “social justice”, “environmental justice”, “social equity”, “social impacts”, “governance”, “coastal communities” or “human well-being”, combined with “ocean*”, “marine” or “coast*”, and “blue growth”, “blue economy”, “ocean development” or different sectors of the ocean economy. This included, for example, fisheries, aquaculture, tourism, mining, oil and gas, renewable energy, desalination, blue carbon, port development and shipping sectors. From this initial search of the literature, ten main themes were identified in an emergent fashion:

1. Dispossession, displacement and ocean grabbing;
2. Environmental justice concerns from pollution and waste;
3. Environmental degradation and reduction of availability of ecosystem services;
4. Undermining livelihoods of small-scale fishers;
5. Undermining access to marine resources needed for food security and well-being;
6. Inequitable distribution of economic benefits;
7. Social and cultural impacts of ocean development;
8. Marginalization of women;
9. Human and Indigenous rights abuses; and
10. Exclusion from decision-making and governance.

Then, once we had a broad categorization of the themes on injustices occurring related to ocean-based development, we searched further for empirical examples across different sectors of the ocean economy. Below, we explore the past injustices that were identified from the literature.

2.1 Dispossession, displacement and ocean grabbing

The specter of “ocean grabbing” and “coastal grabbing” driven by blue growth has been brought to the fore by a number of authors in recent years (Barbesgaard, 2018; Bavinck et al., 2017; Bennett et al., 2015; Pedersen et al., 2014). While the speed and scope of activities may have increased, ocean-based development has long been critiqued as a driver of dispossession of resources from local users through privatization and other means of physical displacement of certain groups or communities from areas of the ocean or coast through spatial enclosures. For example, the extensive past and continuing commodification and privatization of fisheries resources, notably through (re)allocation of fisheries rights and market-based regimes, has led to corporate concentration and loss of resource access for local users in Canada, the U.S., Iceland and elsewhere (Carothers & Chambers, 2012; Chambers et al., 2017;

Hannesson, 2004; Longo et al., 2015; Pinkerton & Edwards, 2009; Wiber, 2000). Global demand for seafood has also led foreign distant water fleets to divert and appropriate fisheries resources, both via legal agreements and illegal means, away from coastal communities and small-scale fishers throughout Africa and other areas of the world (De Schutter, 2012; Mesmain, 2014; Pauly et al., 2014). Though fisheries has received the most attention in the academic literature, the grabbing or appropriation of benefits from other marine resources – e.g., mangroves (M.-C. Cormier-Salem, 2017) and genetic resources (Blasiak et al., 2018) – away from local people is also a concern.

Spatial displacement of local resource users, small-scale fishers and Indigenous Peoples out of areas they previously used is also evident across a number of sectors, including aquaculture (Bavinck et al., 2017; Galappaththi & Nayak, 2017; Veuthey & Gerber, 2012), oil and gas development (Obi, 2010; Quist & Nygren, 2015; Zalik, 2009), seawater desalination plants (Liu et al., 2013), and tourism (Benjaminsen & Bryceson, 2012). These spatial enclosures were already occurring. However, with the implementation of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) and the establishment of exclusive economic zones (EEZ) in the 200NM maritime area bordering nations came clear authority and a mechanism through which states could allocate use and property rights in the ocean (UN, 1982). This likely sped up the process of enclosing areas for development – with some viewing marine spatial planning (MSP) as a tool that facilitates enclosures for the purposes of blue growth (European Commission, 2018; Josse et al., 2019). Within this enabling policy environment and an increasingly busy ocean, a major concern for many coastal communities has been the creeping and cumulative enclosures resulting from multiple development activities rather than a single sector and development (Hadjimichael et al., 2014; Murray et al., 2010). Finally, displacements as a result of ocean development can extend into the foreshore and coastal environments that people use for resource harvesting or where coastal communities are located due to on shore processing plants and transportation infrastructure (Chalfin, 2018; Hadjimichael, 2018; Liu et al., 2013).

2.2 Environmental justice concerns from pollution and waste

Economic development activities can produce numerous pollutants, and other forms of waste, that are harmful to both the environment and to people. Toxins and wastes from blue growth can create environmental injustices. For example, the impacts of harmful substances are often disproportionately borne by certain groups (e.g., marginalized racial groups, women, Indigenous Peoples, small-scale fishers) and regions of the world (Bullard, 2005; Cutter, 1995; Mohai et al., 2009). Environmental injustices caused by the oil industry have received substantial attention (Adekola et al., 2017; Croisant & Sullivan, 2019; Gill et al., 2012; O'Rourke & Connolly, 2003; Palinkas et al., 1993, 2004). Broadly, this research highlights how oil development activities and spills have led to substantial physical and mental health impacts for local communities, resource-dependent fishers and Indigenous groups. The physical infrastructure, including pipelines and rigs, left behind by the oil industry may continue to release toxins for years (O'Rourke & Connolly, 2003). Many other local development activities – including tourism (Lee & Jamal, 2008; Meletis & Campbell, 2009), aquaculture (Page, 2007; Stonich, 1995; Stonich et al., 1997), nuclear energy (Shrader-Frechette, 2012), and port development (Cohan et al., 2011; Fredrickson, 2013) – have also been shown to have environmental justice implications. These examples show how pollution and waste from ocean-based economic development can produce substantial impacts on water, sediment, air, and food sources with implications for human health and wellbeing.

Many of the environmental justice implications of blue growth may be global in nature. Demaria (2010) and Frey (2015), for example, show how environmental hazards and harms produced by the global shipping industry are distributed offshore to peripheral regions. At Alang-Sosiya in India, which is one of the world's largest shipbreaking yards, ship owners and ship breakers earn substantial profits by offloading toxic waste onto local shipyard workers, fishers and farmers (Demaria, 2010).

Furthermore, the negative impacts stemming from the production and dumping of other environmental hazards – e.g., carbon or heavy metals, such as mercury and lead – may circulate globally and disproportionately impact resource-dependent groups and marginalized populations in developing countries. For instance, oceanic mercury accumulates in fish that are vital to the food security and cultural continuity of coastal Indigenous communities (Donatuto et al., 2011) who are 15 times more dependent on fish for food than non-Indigenous communities (Cisneros-Montemayor et al., 2016). The rapid global development of the cruise industry has also raised environmental justice concerns (Dawson et al., 2014). For example, a recent study highlighted increased stress levels in communities that host large cruise ships (Jordan & Vogt, 2017). Pallis et al. (2017) document irregular charging practices for waste disposal at European ports, which creates challenges and potentially incentivizes unsustainable waste management. In the now infamous case, Carnival Cruise Line was fined \$40 million USD for illegal dumping of oil byproducts at sea (Urbina, 2019). Three years later, Carnival pleaded guilty to six probation violations, including the dumping of plastic mixed with food waste in Bahamian waters and was fined \$20 million USD (Kennedy, 2019). Evidence of the social and environmental damages associated with the largely ungoverned cruise industry continues to mount. Similarly, examples of desalination frequently show how air pollution and chemicals used (e.g. arsenic, cadmium, cyanide and chloride) – aside from brine disposal – are disrupting the livelihood of low-income coastal communities (Cooley et al., 2006; Food & Water Watch, 2009).

2.3 Environmental degradation and reduction of ecosystem services

Coastal communities and resource-dependent populations are reliant on marine ecosystem services (Blythe et al., 2020). Essential marine ecosystem services include provisioning ecosystem services such as food, water, wood and other materials, regulating services such as flood protection, erosion control or hazard mitigation is also a concern, supporting services such as providing nurseries and wildlife refugia, nutrient cycling or primary production, and cultural services such as heritage, recreational and educational values (Lopes & Videira, 2013; Newton et al., 2018). Environmental degradation resulting from various forms of ocean and coastal development can undermine the abundance and the quality of ecosystem services. For example, shrimp farming in Latin America and Southeast Asia have led to the destruction of vast areas of mangrove forests that previously provided food and material needs to local populations (Bavinck et al., 2017; Benessaiah & Sengupta, 2014; Primavera, 2006; Stonich et al., 1997). Sand mining – a growing industry in many parts of the global south – can degrade estuaries, water quality, and marine habitats with resultant impacts on coastal fish populations (Lamb et al., 2019). Globally, overfishing, destructive fishing, and foreign fleets have also led to productivity declines that are undermining local catches for subsistence needs and food security (De Schutter, 2012; Pauly et al., 2005, 2014). The appetite for fishmeal required for commercial aquaculture production has worsened these problems – for example, in Thailand and Africa - through employing fishing practices that target smaller pelagic and juvenile fish undermining the ecosystem and abundance (John, 2020; Primavera, 2006). Furthermore, the ocean is subject to multiple forms of development simultaneously that have cumulative effects on the marine environment (Crain et al., 2008; Halpern et al., 2015); yet, the cumulative impacts of multiple forms of development on multiple coastal ecosystem services is a topic that has received scant attention.

2.4 Undermining livelihoods of small-scale fishers

Ocean-based growth can also negatively impact or even lead to the exclusion of the livelihoods of small-scale fishers (Cohen et al., 2019; Pinkerton & Davis, 2015). Evidence from the Philippines

demonstrates that small-scale fishers' livelihoods can be compromised by the government's push to develop the coastal tourism industry (Fabinyi, 2010). In an extreme example, a fishers' boat was confiscated by the foreign owner of a resort and fishers reported that the local government was afraid to confront the resort owner on their behalf because of the influence he exerted over tourism revenues (Fabinyi, 2010). Both non-renewable and renewable energy developments can also present significant challenges for SSF livelihoods. In Ghana, for example, small-scale fishers have been excluded from fishing within 1000 meters of foreign oil rigs and experienced physical violence by members of the Fisheries Enforcement Units (Adjei & Overå, 2018). In the US, the development of marine renewable energy has been rife with space-use conflicts between small-scale fishers and state and federal agencies, where fishers hold a relatively weak position in the negotiations over spatial zoning that directly impacts their livelihoods (Pomeroy et al., 2015).

Within the fishery sector, a focus on privatization, capitalization, and profits have led to increased industrialization of fisheries, concentration of ownership and corporate capture of revenues (Carothers & Chambers, 2012; Haas et al., 2016). Privatization of catch shares, for example, have been shown to undermine the livelihoods of small-scale fishers (Olson, 2011). In the ocean quahog and surf clam fishery of the eastern US, the adoption of individual transferable quotas (ITQs) led to a reduction in vessels numbers, as owners decided to lease out their quotas, which ultimately resulted in the loss of employment for local fishers (Brandt, 2005). Moreover, these examples highlight some of the risks associated with growth-based policies that privilege large-scale enterprises and net economic growth over the rights and livelihoods of small-scale fishers.

2.5 Undermining access to marine resources required for food security and well-being

As the push to develop the Blue Economy increases, so do the empirical examples of how this growth can undermine the ability of coastal communities to access and derive benefits from marine resources required to secure food security and well-being. Empirical examples show that this can occur in three ways: 1) through undermining formal access and harvesting rights, 2) through increased competition over resources or areas of the ocean, and 3) through influencing people's capacity to access resources.

First, blue growth initiatives can erode formal access and harvesting rights of local individuals and groups. For example, Kerr et al. (2015) highlight the loss of marine access rights of Indigenous and local communities through the enclosure of large swaths of ocean for marine renewable energy projects in Scotland, Canada, New Zealand and Australia. Similarly, Blythe et al. (2015) documented how a foreign owned export-oriented shrimp farm leased public land in central Mozambique and, thus, formally blocked access to tidal flats that local communities relied on for making salt. Through a case study in Papua New Guinea, Lau et al. (2020) document how the shift to a cash economy has changed the legitimacy of customary institutions – and the access to marine resources that they entail – in ways the benefit some individuals and groups (young men) and exclude others (women). These examples illustrate how blue growth initiatives are changing which groups and individuals have recognized rights to access marine resources.

Second, many threats to access stem from increased competition over resources or spatial conflicts among the ever-growing stakeholder groups vying for ocean resources. Competition between extractive industries, such as offshore oil, and fisheries have been well document (Arbo & Thùy, 2016; Uhre & Leknes, 2017; Zalik, 2009). Offshore oil also competes with coastal tourism for coastal environments (Stoddart & Graham, 2018). The rapid expansion of renewable energy projects has increased spatial competition in coastal and open oceans areas - for example, Yates et al. (2015) show significant trade-offs between renewable energy and fisheries activities. Offshore wind has also created conflicts with coastal tourism operations (Rudolph, 2014). In Germany and Scotland, for example, opponents of

offshore wind energy projects argue that they disrupt visual aesthetics, local character and identities, degrade the experience of coastal tourists, interfere with recreational activities, and increase environmental impacts (Rudolph, 2014).

Third, barriers to access extend beyond spatial or physical barriers to include institutional, regulatory, financial, capacity, and social barriers among others (Bennett et al., 2018). For example, the privatization and corporatization of fisheries has often led to rising costs for fishing licenses and quota, which in Canada prevents many younger fishers from entering the fishing industry (Foley et al., 2013).

2.6 Inequitable distribution of economic benefits

Potential economic benefits are an oft-used rationale for blue growth – these developments are needed, it is argued, because they will produce jobs, increase local incomes, contribute to local and national economies, and provide rents and taxes to national coffers (European Commission, 2017; World Bank & United Nations, 2017). Yet, there may be significant gaps between rhetoric and reality: the distribution of the economic benefits of marine resource harvesting and ocean-based development is often highly inequitable (Österblom et al., 2020). For example, local communities are often left out of the economic benefits and few local jobs may materialize. Oil development, which often produces substantial economic benefits, is one example where both hiring and the procurement of goods and services may not flow through nearby coastal communities or cities (Ablo, 2015; Obi, 2010; Oteng-Ababio, 2018). While there may be other opportunities in local service jobs, many local people in “oil cities” may be worse off economically due to rising costs of living (Obeng-Odoom, 2013; Oteng-Ababio, 2018). Resource-based livelihoods – e.g., fishers and farmers – can experience substantial impacts (Elum et al., 2016; Obeng-Odoom, 2013). Globalization and market integration may also be an issue – in Mexico, Cruz-Torres (2001) argue, economic benefits are being undermined by environmental degradation driven by intensified and export-oriented commercial fishing and aquaculture. Furthermore, vulnerable and marginalized groups – e.g., women, Indigenous Peoples, small-scale fishers, and low-income populations – may also receive less of the benefits. For example, aquaculture development in mangrove areas around the world has often lead to “elite capture” of the benefits by a select few while traditional resource users and small-scale fishers often lose out and few jobs can be produced in local communities (Bergquist, 2007; Nickerson, 1999; Primavera, 1997; Stonich et al., 1997; Toufique & Gregory, 2008). This is due to a number of factors that are unfavorable to the rural poor, such as high rents, privatization and land prices, unfavorable policies for concessions and subsidies, and lack of access to technology, technical assistance and markets.

One reason that economic benefits are inequitably distributed is because ownership and control of resources is already centralized and increasingly uneven. For example, more than 47% of patents for marine genetic resources are registered to a single corporation and 98% are registered to actors from 10 countries (Blasiak et al., 2018). Similarly, wealthy countries dominate global fishing efforts both on the high seas (98%) and in the exclusive economic zones of low income countries (78%) (McCauley et al., 2018). In many coastal fisheries, there has also been an increasing concentration of fishing licenses and quota with fewer individuals and corporations, which has reduced economic benefits to small-scale independent fishers and coastal communities (Carothers & Chambers, 2012; Haas et al., 2016; Pinkerton & Edwards, 2009). Many new forms of blue economy development – such as aquaculture and tourism – may show similar patterns of concentrated ownership and benefits. The above examples demonstrate the dangers of aggregate thinking – i.e., net economic benefits – and how blue growth might instead lead to local marginalization (Sabau & van Zyll de Jong, 2015) and “unjust uneconomic growth” that does not account for social and environmental externalities (Nogué-Algueró, 2019). The latter argument is made by Nogué-Algueró (2019) with reference to port development in Barcelona. When the primary responsibility of corporations is to their investors not to local people and communities, without

government oversight and mechanisms requiring local hiring or benefit sharing, corporations may feel that they have little reason to share profits.

2.7 Social and cultural impacts of ocean development

As coastal areas shift towards a ‘blue economy’, often through external investments and interests, local people are experiencing profound social and cultural changes. In many cultures, coastal areas and the sea have deep social and cultural significance for people (Aswani, 2019; Jackson, 1995; Poe et al., 2014). Particular places and species hold cultural values and meanings that have been reinforced over time through historical use and shared practices (Poe et al., 2014). For this reason, people in many traditional cultures and societies come to see themselves as interconnected with the ocean (Jackson, 1995). In these communities, fishing livelihoods and subsistence harvesting represent more than a source of income or food; they are also the basis for their social and cultural identity (Pollnac & Poggie, 2008). However, under a model of blue growth that prioritizes economic development, uses and values that can be monetized tend to be privileged over social and cultural values that cannot. As a result, the consideration of social and cultural impacts from coastal and ocean development also tend to be ignored. Yet access to traditional grounds and resources, traditional practices, and fishing livelihoods can be severely disrupted by blue growth, leading to a re-definition of relationships with the ocean that are fundamental to cultural identity and continuity (Barbesgaard, 2018; Cohen et al., 2019; Herr et al., 2019). For example, blue carbon initiatives have struggled to integrate local knowledge, traditional customs, livelihoods, and rights, in island states of the Indo-Pacific region (Contreras & Thomas, 2019; Herr et al., 2019). What begins as a more subtle form of cultural erasure, can lead to even more egregious actions that displace livelihoods and communities. For example, in Tanzania and elsewhere, restrictions and closures first motivated by marine conservation have enabled capital accumulation by coastal tourism interests in ways that have excluded local people from livelihood opportunities and dispossessed coastal lands and areas of the ocean (Benjaminsen & Bryceson, 2012).

Social relations and cohesion can also be disrupted by blue growth. For example, in the Pacific where subsistence fisheries are fundamental to social relations, the development of export-orientated tuna industries from the 1970s across the Pacific has transformed community life in many ways (Barclay, 2010). Social tensions erupted following labour migration to fill workforce demands, due to ethnic mixing and issues around housing capacity, in PNG and the Solomon Islands (Barclay, 2010). Historically dispossessed local groups in Madang, PNG asked to be compensated by the tuna company who now occupied their land and were privileging other Papua New Guineans for employment opportunities (Sullivan et al., 2003). Other island states – including the Dominican Republic and Indonesia - also embarked on neoliberal policies in the 1970s that led to the development of large-scale mass tourism with wide ranging social impacts including lost access to resources, resident displacement, loss of agency, and declining social cohesion (Duffy et al., 2016; Hampton & Jeyacheya, 2015).

2.8 Marginalization of women

Women play significant but often “invisible” roles in the coastal economy. Their contributions, for instance in fisheries, where nearly half of the workforce is estimated to be female, are often unrecognised, unpaid or underpaid (FAO, 2018; Harper et al., 2013; Kleiber et al., 2014). Yet, broader “structures of discrimination” continue to produce and reproduce inequalities that lead to their marginalisation in fisheries (Locke et al., 2017; Weeratunge et al., 2010) and other sectors (e.g. tourism, aquaculture, oil & gas, blue carbon) of the ocean economy (Boohene & Peprah, 2011; M.-C. Cormier-

Salem, 2017; C. Ukeje et al., 2002; Charles Ukeje, 2004). When existing gender inequalities are ignored, they risk being exacerbated by blue growth.

As women are often primarily responsible for household management, childcare and “supporting activities” such as fish processing, new jobs are often targeted at men. With better access to capital, the required skills and education and the capacity to migrate for work, men are also better positioned to take up new opportunities (Overå, 2017). For instance in Indonesia, women were excluded from the planning stages of a growing marine tourism sector (Ismail, 2015). In Kenya, access to finance was found to be a key constraint in women’s participation in coastal tourism where a majority of SMEs are owned by men (Rogerson et al., 2018). Women’s roles thus tend to be limited to traditional, labour-intensive activities. Gendered pay discrimination is also pervasive with women receiving the lower wages and less for their contributions in the blue carbon credit market compared to men (Bohler-Muller et al., 2019). Additionally, when new sectors lead to male labour migration, women are left with reduced means of supplementing their household income. Without this, their level of agency and bargaining power within the household diminishes, making them more vulnerable to marginalization, exploitation and abuse (Coulthard et al., 2019; Josse et al., 2019).

Finally, women’s exclusion from consultation, decision-making or mapping processes puts them at risk of losing access to the resources they depend on (Josse et al., 2019). This is problematic as resource use and access are highly gendered and shaped by access to capital, assets, knowledge and relationships across the life course (Hapke & Ayyankeril, 2004). Around the world, women rely on inshore areas to harvest shellfish for income and subsistence or depend on fishers to supply them with fish for processing (Santos, 2015). Female shellfish harvesters have been marginalized in West Africa following blue carbon policies that ignored the role of mangroves in local women’s livelihoods (M.-C. Cormier-Salem, 2017). Similarly, expansion of oil development in Nigeria reduced women’s access to unpolluted farmlands and fishing areas (Charles Ukeje, 2004). Whereas men are offered compensations for the loss of their fishing grounds, women lose out if their livelihood depends on more informal tenure (Coulthard et al, 2019; Josse et al., 2019).

2.9 Human and Indigenous rights abuses

Opening the seas to economic development can undermine the rights of small-scale fishers and Indigenous Peoples, who have specific rights related to their historical use, tenure, and cultural reliance on specific areas or resources (FAO, 2015; United Nations, 2007). The right to fish, linked to Indigenous Peoples’ subsistence and food security, is also closely tied to human rights (Capistrano, 2010; Davis & Jentoft, 2001). The common starting place is a framing of the ocean as ‘*mare nullius*’ (Latin expression meaning nobody’s ocean) – vacant of pre-existing users and Indigenous tenure (Mulrennan & Scott, 2000) – which negates the need to consider rights to participate in decisions and other fundamental rights (e.g., to food, to health, to a livelihood). For example, the marginalization of Indigenous Peoples from management systems is also often tied with ignorance of tenure, resource rights and privatization of fisheries access; examples are found in Alaska, Hawaii, Australia and Canada (Carothers, 2010; Mulrennan & Scott, 2000; Richmond, 2013). Tensions over Indigenous Peoples’ rights are problematic not only because of their relationship with political status within the nation-state, but also because of their influence on negotiations and opportunities to improve employment, income and social conditions (Davis & Jentoft, 2001; Lalancette, 2017). In Scotland, Canada, New Zealand and Australia, marine renewable energy has been found to create pressure on Indigenous Peoples ownership and rights, reigniting debates about marine governance, access and control of marine resources (Kerr et al., 2015). Potential enclosures of coastal sea areas can also limit rights to fishing and navigation for Indigenous Peoples and small-scale fishers. Examples include aquaculture for First Nations in Canada (Page, 2007) and sea water desalination in Chile (Campero et al., forthcoming).

In extreme cases, unregulated ocean development can also lead to human rights abuses against workers through exploitation, mistreatment and enslavement. Exploitative labour practices (e.g. safety, over-work, non-payment of wages, forced eviction, child labour and gender violence) and human trafficking (e.g. physical abuse, confinement and murder) are documented in several countries. Global analyses are identifying labour abuses on fishing vessels (Tickler et al., 2018) and in small-scale fishing (Ratner et al., 2014). A study by Stringer et al. (2016) shows how human rights abuses are not restricted to illegal, unregulated and unreported fishing vessels and industrial fisheries. For example, in New Zealand's fisheries management system, despite being recognised internationally as world leading, exploitation of migrant fishing crews (primarily Indonesian) was found on foreign charter vessels (Simmons & Stringer, 2014). Within this body of work examples of human trafficking are described by the experience of Cambodian migrants working on Thai fishing vessels (Derks, 2010). What these critical studies highlight above all is that 'modern slavery' is facilitated by jurisdictional complexities and the pursuit of economic efficiency e.g. higher levels of subsidies, economic disparity in labour markets, and an interest in maximizing economic returns (Simmons & Stringer, 2014; Tickler et al., 2018).

2.10 Exclusion from decision-making and governance

A final risk of ocean-based economic development, and one that likely precedes or exacerbates the previously discussed injustices, is exclusion from decision-making and governance processes. Governance refers to the policies, institutions and processes that determine who makes decisions, how decisions are made, and what impact this has on actions taken (Bennett & Satterfield, 2018; Lockwood et al., 2010). Externally driven and top-down decision-making and agenda-setting related to the ocean development might, for example, result in: the de-peopling and de-politicization of the seascape and coastal landscape and homogenizing narratives that ignore local social and cultural contexts and the economic impacts of blue growth (Bennett, 2019; Clarke & Flannery, 2019; Hadjimichael et al., 2014; McFarlane-Morris, 2019; Page, 2007). Perhaps it is more convenient, where development is concerned, to portray the oceans as unused, underdeveloped, and unpeopled. Lack of adequate participation or consideration of local people's voices and perspectives are common across different sectors of the ocean economy – including aquaculture (Irmak Ertör & Ortega-Cerdà, 2015; Hadjimichael et al., 2014; Page, 2007), tourism (McFarlane-Morris, 2019), oil and gas development (Ablo & Asamoah, 2018), marine renewable energy development (Reilly et al., 2016), sea water desalination (Cooley et al., 2006; Liu et al., 2013) and mining (Rosyida et al., 2018). Key issues included lack of inclusion of key stakeholders, choreographed participation processes where decisions have been pre-determined, lack of advance communication about meetings, as well as inadequate transparency and information about both the benefits and negative consequences. In the above examples, these factors also led to dissatisfaction with the process and perceived or real negative social impacts. Marine spatial planning, as a mechanism that facilitates blue growth (European Commission, 2018), is one arena where the rhetoric of participation is high. Yet, a number of authors have critiqued marine spatial planning process for not including all stakeholders from early stages to shape the process, tokenistic participation processes, poor communication, dismissal of experiential knowledge of local resource users, inadequate specificity regarding social impacts and benefits, and inability to incorporate feedback or change directions due to path dependency (Clarke & Flannery, 2019; Flannery et al., 2018; G. Smith & Jentoft, 2017; Tafon, 2018, 2019). At a much higher scale, Sparks and Silva (2019) show that low income states are less represented and have less influence in international marine policy processes such as the UN Negotiations for the High Seas which will lead to inequitable benefits for them and disproportionate impacts on their human security.

3 Discussion: Transforming the ocean economy to achieve blue justice

In this paper, we have identified 10 injustices that can result from ocean-based development which include recognitional, procedural and substantive concerns. Our review of the literature purposefully focuses on highlighting negative examples and past injustices. While we recognize that there is also positive potential in ocean-development for coastal communities and developing nations (Michel, 2017; UN, 2012; World Bank & United Nations, 2017), and indeed many industries likely produce a complex combination of negative and positive social impacts, this explicit critique of injustices is necessary for helping to clearly articulate past harms in order to inform future development. Through this paper, our aim is to promote a rigorous dialogue about not only avoiding worst-case scenarios and mitigating harms but also increasing benefits from the ocean economy. It is only through recognizing and addressing past social injustices related to the ocean economy directly that we can hope to achieve the UN Sustainable Development Goals' pledge to "Leave No One Behind" (United Nations, 2015). Consequently, we now turn our attention to the question "How can we achieve a more just ocean economy?"

An obvious starting place is to offer the opposite of the 10 social injustices that we have identified in the paper as a set of recommendations for avoiding injustices and more importantly promoting more just outcomes during blue growth. Following this logic, our review suggests the subsequent recommendations:

1. Recognize and protect resource and spatial tenure and access rights;
2. Take a precautionary approach to reduce pollution and ensure that environmental burdens are not placed on marginalized populations;
3. Minimize the impacts of development on habitats, resources, and ecosystem services;
4. Consider and safeguard the access rights and livelihoods of small-scale fishers;
5. Maintain and promote access to marine resources needed for food security and well-being;
6. Develop policies and mechanisms to foster and ensure the equitable distribution of economic benefits;
7. Monitor, mitigate and manage the social and cultural impacts of ocean development;
8. Recognize, include and promote the equal role of women in the ocean economy;
9. Recognize and protect human and Indigenous rights; and,
10. Develop inclusive and participatory planning and governance processes for ocean development.

These recommendations are also supported by numerous international declarations and voluntary agreements – such as the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, United Nations Declaration on Indigenous Rights, the Voluntary Guidelines for Small-Scale Fisheries among others (FAO, 2015; United Nations, 1948, 1966, 1986, 2007) - and codified in corporate social responsibility (CSR) principles (Hopkins, 2012; Jenkins & Unies, 2001; McKague & Cragg, 2007).

Furthermore, we argue that an explicit justice framing ought to guide decision-making processes related to the ocean economy. The literature on social justice, environmental justice, just transitions, and just transformations defines three dimensions: recognitional justice, procedural justice, and distributional justice (Agyeman et al., 2003; Bennett, Blythe, et al., 2019; Bullard, 1994; Cutter, 1995; Fraser, 1998; Miller, 1979, 1999; Schlosberg, 2009; Swilling & Annecke, 2012; Walker, 2009, 2012; Williams & Doyon, 2019). The three dimensions of justice can be defined as follows: "Recognitional justice refers to the acknowledgement of and respect for pre-existing governance arrangements as well as the distinct rights, worldviews, knowledge, needs, livelihoods, histories and cultures of different groups in decisions; Procedural justice refers to the level of participation and inclusiveness of decision making and the quality of governance processes; and, Distributional justice can be defined as fairness in the distribution of benefits and harms of decisions and actions to different groups." (Bennett, Blythe, et al., 2019 p 4-5). These dimensions of justice provide a broad overarching framework – or a set of key

considerations - that might guide the design, implementation and management of ocean-based development activities (Table 1).

Table 1 – Key considerations for advancing blue justice in the ocean economy

Key considerations for advancing Blue Justice in the Ocean Economy
Recognitional Justice
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifying and differentiating rights holders and stakeholders; • Acknowledging pre-existing rights and tenure; • Incorporating pre-existing practices, institutions, and knowledge systems; • Integrating diverse worldviews, perspectives, and values.
Procedural Justice
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitating inclusive, participatory, transparent, and accountable planning and management; • Ensuring that participants perceive that institutions, policies, managers and management actions are legitimate; • Creating adaptive and context-appropriate decision processes; • Supporting local capacity for participation and co-management; • Ensuring stakeholders have access to justice and conflict resolution mechanisms.
Distributional Justice
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considering equity in distribution of costs and benefits over time, space, and between groups; • Designing fair compensation and mitigation mechanisms; • Adapting management to improve social and distributional outcomes.

Yet, transforming the ocean economy to achieve blue justice may not be a simple task and tinkering at the margins of state or corporate led economic development may be insufficient (Blythe et al., 2018). Achieving “blue justice” may require a substantial change to ocean governance, a rethinking of our fundamental assumptions regarding development, a reimagining of novel or alternative development models of development, or a paradigm shift regarding the need for growth. A transformation of ocean governance may entail a substantial change in who is involved in decision-making processes and in the way that decisions are made – for example, what if global decision-making bodies involved greater representation of and influence from small island developing states (SIDS), civil society organizations, or Indigenous Peoples (Bennett, Cisneros-Montemayor, et al., 2019; Sparks & Sliva, 2019). Rethinking our fundamental assumptions regarding ocean-based development would require us to start by asking “Why are these injustices occurring?” and “Why do they persist?” – responses to these questions may yield challenging answers about unequal global power differentials and resource grabs (Barbesgaard, 2018; Bennett et al., 2015; Brent et al., 2018), neoliberal and capitalist models of governance (Mallin & Barbesgaard, 2020; Mansfield, 2004; Pinkerton & Davis, 2015), and corporate cultures that place profits before people and planet. Imagining new or alternative models of development would require the flipping of this logic to instead place environmental sustainability (planet) and human wellbeing (people) before corporate profits – ideas such as regenerative ocean development (Klain et al., 2019; Sisson, 2016; B. Smith, 2019), community-based blue economies (Bradford et al., 2020; United Nations Development Programme, 2018) or community supported fisheries (Brinson et al., 2011; Campbell et al., 2014) show some promise. However, scaling these ideas up and out may be challenging. Finally, some authors might go much further and ask whether it is wise to even consider increasing the scale and scope of economic development (local or otherwise) in the ocean, and instead argue for a “blue de-growth” paradigm (Bogadóttir, 2019; Ertör & Hadjimichael,

2020). Blue de-growth should especially be a consideration when there is evidence of drawing down of natural resources that people rely on for food security or human well-being (Österblom et al., 2020).

4 Conclusion

This review paper has demonstrated how rapid and unchecked blue growth can produce numerous environmental and social injustices. Through a direct critique of past injustices, our aim is to stimulate a rigorous dialogue on how to achieve a more just and inclusive ocean economy. We conclude that a commitment to ‘blue justice’ – including recognitional, procedural, and distributional concerns - needs to be at the core of the blue growth agenda. In order to minimize social harms and maximize benefits, human well-being and environmental sustainability must be prioritized alongside economic profits. However, transforming the current growth paradigm may require a more fundamental rethinking of its assumptions, a re-imagining of alternative development models, or even a de-growth mindset. Creative thinking and bold solutions will be needed to continually envision and enact a radically different future where blue growth and ocean-based economic development does not undermine the environment and (re)produce social injustices.

5 References

- Ablo, A. D. (2015). Local content and participation in Ghana’s oil and gas industry: Can enterprise development make a difference? *The Extractive Industries and Society*, 2(2), 320–327. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2015.02.003>
- Ablo, A. D., & Asamoah, V. K. (2018). Local participation, institutions and land acquisition for energy infrastructure: The case of the Atuabo gas project in Ghana. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 41, 191–198. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2018.03.022>
- Ackah-Baidoo, A. (2013). Fishing in troubled waters: Oil production, seaweed and community-level grievances in the Western Region of Ghana. *Community Development Journal*, 48(3), 406–420. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cdj/bst022>
- Adekola, J., Fischbacher-Smith, M., Fischbacher-Smith, D., & Adekola, O. (2017). Health risks from environmental degradation in the Niger Delta, Nigeria. *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space*, 35(2), 334–354. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263774X16661720>
- Adjei, M., & Overå, R. (2018). Opposing discourses on the offshore coexistence of the petroleum industry and small-scale fisheries in Ghana. *The Extractive Industries and Society*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2018.09.006>
- Adusah-Karikari, A. (2015). Black gold in Ghana: Changing livelihoods for women in communities affected by oil production. *The Extractive Industries and Society*, 2(1), 24–32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2014.10.006>
- Agyeman, J., Bullard, R. D., & Evans, B. (2003). *Just Sustainabilities: Development in an Unequal World*. MIT Press.
- Altamirano-Jiménez, I. (2017). “The sea is our bread”: Interrupting green neoliberalism in Mexico. *Marine Policy*, 80, 28–34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2017.01.015>
- Arbo, P., & Thùy, P. T. T. (2016). Use conflicts in marine ecosystem-based management—The case of oil versus fisheries. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 122, 77–86. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2016.01.008>
- Aswani, S. (2019). Perspectives in coastal human ecology (CHE) for marine conservation. *Biological Conservation*, 236, 223–235. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2019.05.047>
- Barbesgaard, M. (2016). *Blue Carbon: Ocean Grabbing in Disguise?* Transnational Institute. <https://www.tni.org/en/publication/blue-carbon-ocean-grabbing-in-disguise>

- Barbesgaard, M. (2018). Blue growth: Savior or ocean grabbing? *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 45(1), 130–149. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2017.1377186>
- Barclay, K. (2010). Impacts of tuna industries on coastal communities in Pacific Island countries. *Marine Policy*, 34(3), 406–413. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2009.09.003>
- Bavinck, M., Berkes, F., Charles, A., Dias, A. C. E., Doubleday, N., Nayak, P., & Sowman, M. (2017). The impact of coastal grabbing on community conservation – a global reconnaissance. *Maritime Studies*, 16(1), 8. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40152-017-0062-8>
- Beerwinkel, E. (2019, July 23). Blue Justice for small-scale fisheries. *Plaas*. <https://www.plaas.org.za/blue-justice-for-small-scale-fisheries/>
- Benessaiah, K., & Sengupta, R. (2014). How is Shrimp Aquaculture Transforming Coastal Livelihoods and Lagoons in Estero Real, Nicaragua?: The Need to Integrate Social-Ecological Research and Ecosystem-Based Approaches. *Environmental Management*, 54(2), 162–179. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00267-014-0295-x>
- Benjaminsen, T. A., & Bryceson, I. (2012). Conservation, green/blue grabbing and accumulation by dispossession in Tanzania. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 39(2), 335–355. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2012.667405>
- Bennett, Nathan J. (2019). Marine Social Science for the Peopled Seas. *Coastal Management*. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/08920753.2019.1564958>
- Bennett, Nathan J., Blythe, J., Cisneros-Montemayor, A. M., Singh, G. G., & Sumaila, U. R. (2019). Just Transformations to Sustainability. *Sustainability*, 11(14), 3881. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11143881>
- Bennett, Nathan J., Cisneros-Montemayor, A. M., Blythe, J., Silver, J. J., Singh, G., Andrews, N., Calò, A., Christie, P., Franco, A. D., Finkbeiner, E. M., Gelcich, S., Guidetti, P., Harper, S., Hotte, N., Kittinger, J. N., Billon, P. L., Lister, J., Lama, R. L. de la, McKinley, E., ... Sumaila, U. R. (2019). Towards a sustainable and equitable blue economy. *Nature Sustainability*, 1–3. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-019-0404-1>
- Bennett, Nathan J., Kaplan-Hallam, M., Augustine, G., Ban, N., Belhabib, D., Brueckner-Irwin, I., Charles, A., Couture, J., Eger, S., Fanning, L., Foley, P., Goodfellow, A. M., Greba, L., Greg, E., Hall, D., Harper, S., Maloney, B., McIsaac, J., Ou, W., ... Bailey, M. (2018). Coastal and Indigenous community access to marine resources and the ocean: A policy imperative for Canada. *Marine Policy*, 87, 186–193. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2017.10.023>
- Bennett, Nathan J., & Satterfield, T. (2018). Environmental governance: A practical framework to guide design, evaluation, and analysis. *Conservation Letters*, 11(6), e12600. <https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12600>
- Bennett, Nathan James, Govan, H., & Satterfield, T. (2015). Ocean grabbing. *Marine Policy*, 57, 61–68. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2015.03.026>
- Bergquist, D. A. (2007). Sustainability and local people's participation in coastal aquaculture: Regional differences and historical experiences in sri lanka and the philippines. *Environmental Management*, 40(5), 787–802. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-006-0108-y>
- Blasiak, R., Jouffray, J.-B., Wabnitz, C. C. C., Sundström, E., & Österblom, H. (2018). Corporate control and global governance of marine genetic resources. *Science Advances*, 4(6), eaar5237. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aar5237>
- Blythe, J., Armitage, D., Alonso, G., Campbell, D., Esteves Dias, A. C., Epstein, G., Marschke, M., & Nayak, P. (2020). Frontiers in coastal well-being and ecosystem services research: A systematic review. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 185, 105028. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2019.105028>
- Blythe, J., Flaherty, M., & Murray, G. (2015). Vulnerability of coastal livelihoods to shrimp farming: Insights from Mozambique. *AMBIO*, 44(4), 275–284. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-014-0574-z>

- Blythe, J., Silver, J., Evans, L., Armitage, D., Bennett, N. J., Moore, M.-L., Morrison, T. H., & Brown, K. (2018). The Dark Side of Transformation: Latent Risks in Contemporary Sustainability Discourse. *Antipode*, 50(5), 1206–1223. <https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.12405>
- Bogadóttir, R. (2019). Blue Growth and its discontents in the Faroe Islands: An island perspective on Blue (De)Growth, sustainability, and environmental justice. *Sustainability Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-019-00763-z>
- Bohler-Muller, N., Steyn-Kotze, J., Zikhali, T., & Sekyere, E. (2019). *Women's economic empowerment and the blue economy* (p. 6). Human Sciences Research Council.
- Boohene, R., & Peprah, J. A. (2011). Women, livelihood and oil and gas discovery in Ghana: An exploratory study of Cape Three Points and surrounding communities. *Journal of Sustainable Development*, 4(3), 185.
- Bradford, J., Filgueira, R., & Bailey, M. (2020). Exploring community-based marine aquaculture as a coastal resource management opportunity in Nova Scotia, Canada. *FACETS*. <https://doi.org/10.1139/facets-2019-0010>
- Brandt, S. (2005). The equity debate: Distributional impacts of individual transferable quotas. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 48(1), 15–30. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2004.12.012>
- Brent, Z., Barbesgaard, M., & Pedersen, C. (2018). *The Blue Fix: Unmasking the politics behind the promise of blue growth*. The Transnational Institute.
- Brinson, A., Lee, M.-Y., & Rountree, B. (2011). Direct marketing strategies: The rise of community supported fishery programs. *Marine Policy*, 35(4), 542–548. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2011.01.014>
- Bullard, R. D. (1994). *Unequal Protection: Environmental Justice and Communities of Color*. Sierra Club Books.
- Bullard, R. D. (2005). *The quest for environmental justice: Human rights and the politics of pollution*. Sierra Club Books.
- Campbell, L. M., Boucquey, N., Stoll, J., Coppola, H., & Smith, M. D. (2014). From Vegetable Box to Seafood Cooler: Applying the Community-Supported Agriculture Model to Fisheries. *Society & Natural Resources*, 27(1), 88–106. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920.2013.842276>
- Campero, C., Bennett, N. J., & Arriagada, N. (forthcoming). *Technologies of dispossession in the blue economy: Social impacts of seawater desalination in the Antofagasta mining Region of Chile*.
- Campling, L. (2012). The Tuna ‘Commodity Frontier’: Business Strategies and Environment in the Industrial Tuna Fisheries of the Western Indian Ocean. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 12(2–3), 252–278. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-0366.2011.00354.x>
- Capistrano, R. C. G. (2010). Reclaiming the ancestral waters of indigenous peoples in the Philippines: The Tagbanua experience with fishing rights and indigenous rights. *Marine Policy*, 34(3), 453–460. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2009.09.012>
- Carothers, C. (2010). Tragedy of commodification: Displacements in Alutiiq Fishing Communities in the Gulf of Alaska. *Maritime Studies*, 9(2), 95–120.
- Carothers, C., & Chambers, C. (2012). Fisheries Privatization and the Remaking of Fishery Systems. *Environment and Society: Advances in Research*, 3(1), 39–59. <https://doi.org/10.3167/ares.2012.030104>
- Chalfin, B. (2018). On-shore, off-shore Takoradi: Terraqueous urbanism, logistics, and oil governance in Ghana. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 0263775818800720. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263775818800720>
- Chambers, C., Helgadóttir, G., & Carothers, C. (2017). “Little kings”: Community, change and conflict in Icelandic fisheries. *Maritime Studies; Heidelberg*, 16(1), 1–26. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s40152-017-0064-6>

- Cisneros-Montemayor, A. M., Pauly, D., Weatherdon, L. V., & Ota, Y. (2016). A Global Estimate of Seafood Consumption by Coastal Indigenous Peoples. *PLOS ONE*, *11*(12), e0166681. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0166681>
- Clarke, J., & Flannery, W. (2019). The post-political nature of marine spatial planning and modalities for its re-politicisation. *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning*, *0*(0), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1523908X.2019.1680276>
- Cohan, A., Wu, J., & Dabdub, D. (2011). High-resolution pollutant transport in the San Pedro Bay of California. *ATMOSPHERIC POLLUTION RESEARCH*, *2*(3), 237–246. <https://doi.org/10.5094/APR.2011.030>
- Cohen, P. J., Allison, E. H., Andrew, N. L., Cinner, J., Evans, L. S., Fabinyi, M., Garces, L. R., Hall, S. J., Hicks, C. C., Hughes, T. P., Jentoft, S., Mills, D. J., Masu, R., Mbaru, E. K., & Ratner, B. D. (2019). Securing a Just Space for Small-Scale Fisheries in the Blue Economy. *Frontiers in Marine Science*, *6*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2019.00171>
- Contreras, C., & Thomas, S. (2019). The role of local knowledge in the governance of blue carbon. *Journal of the Indian Ocean Region*, *15*(2), 213–234. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19480881.2019.1610546>
- Cooley, H., Gleick, P., & Wolff, G. H. (2006). *Desalination, With a Grain of Salt-A California Perspective*. The Pacific Institute.
- Cormier-Salem, M., & Panfili, J. (2016). Mangrove reforestation: Greening or grabbing coastal zones and deltas? Case studies in Senegal. *African Journal of Aquatic Science*, *41*(1), 89–98. <https://doi.org/10.2989/16085914.2016.1146122>
- Cormier-Salem, M.-C. (2017). Let the Women Harvest the Mangrove. Carbon Policy, and Environmental Injustice. *Sustainability*, *9*(8), 1485. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su9081485>
- Coulthard, S., White, C., Paranamana, N., Sandaruwan, K. P. G. L., Manimohan, R., & Maya, R. (2019). Tackling alcoholism and domestic violence in fisheries—A new opportunity to improve well-being for the most vulnerable people in global fisheries. *Fish and Fisheries*, Online. <https://doi.org/10.1111/faf.12426>
- Crain, C. M., Kroeker, K., & Halpern, B. S. (2008). Interactive and cumulative effects of multiple human stressors in marine systems. *Ecology Letters*, *11*(12), 1304–1315. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-0248.2008.01253.x>
- Croisant, S., & Sullivan, J. (2019). Studying the Human Health and Ecological Impacts of the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill Disaster (Part 2): Introduction to This Special Issue of New Solutions. *New Solutions-a Journal of Environmental and Occupational Health Policy*, *28*(4), 563–569. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1048291118813584>
- Cruz-Torres, M. L. (2001). Local-Level Responses to Environmental Degradation in Northwestern Mexico. *Journal of Anthropological Research*, *57*(2), 111–136.
- Cutter, S. L. (1995). Race, class and environmental justice. *Progress in Human Geography*, *19*(1), 111–122. <https://doi.org/10.1177/030913259501900111>
- Davis, A., & Jentoft, S. (2001). The challenge and promise of indigenous peoples' fishing rights—From dependency to agency. *Marine Policy*, *25*, 223–237.
- Dawson, J., Johnston, M. E., & Stewart, E. J. (2014). Governance of Arctic expedition cruise ships in a time of rapid environmental and economic change. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, *89*, 88–99. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2013.12.005>
- de Groot, J., Campbell, M., Reilly, K., Colton, J., & Conway, F. (2017). A sea of troubles? Evaluating user conflicts in the development of ocean energy. In G. Wright, S. Kerr, & K. Johnson (Eds.), *Ocean Energy: Governance Challenges for Wave and Tidal Stream Technologies* (pp. 169–190). Routledge.

- De Schutter, O. (2012). "Ocean-grabbing" as serious a threat as 'land-grabbing'—UN food expert. United Nations Human Rights. http://www.srfood.org/images/stories/pdf/press_releases/20121030_fisheries_en.pdf
- Demaria, F. (2010). Shipbreaking at Alang–Sosiya (India): An ecological distribution conflict. *Ecological Economics*, 70(2), 250–260. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2010.09.006>
- Derks, A. (2010). Migrant Labour and the Politics of Immobilisation: Cambodian Fishermen in Thailand. *Asian Journal of Social Science*, 38(6), 915–932. <https://doi.org/10.1163/156853110X530804>
- Donatuto, J. L., Satterfield, T. A., & Gregory, R. (2011). Poisoning the body to nourish the soul: Prioritising health risks and impacts in a Native American community. *Health, Risk & Society*, 13(2), 103–127. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13698575.2011.556186>
- Duffy, L. N., Stone, G., Chancellor, H. C., & Kline, C. S. (2016). Tourism development in the Dominican Republic: An examination of the economic impact to coastal households. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 16(1), 35–49. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1467358415613118>
- Ehlers, P. (2016). Blue growth and ocean governance—How to balance the use and the protection of the seas. *WMU Journal of Maritime Affairs*, 15(2), 187–203. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13437-016-0104-x>
- Elum, Z. A., Mopipi, K., & Henri-Ukoha, A. (2016). Oil exploitation and its socioeconomic effects on the Niger Delta region of Nigeria. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 23(13), 12880–12889. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-016-6864-1>
- Ertör, I., & Hadjimichael, M. (2020). Editorial: Blue degrowth and the politics of the sea: rethinking the blue economy. *Sustainability Science*, 15(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-019-00772-y>
- Ertör, Irmak, & Ortega-Cerdà, M. (2015). Political lessons from early warnings: Marine finfish aquaculture conflicts in Europe. *Marine Policy*, 51, 202–210. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2014.07.018>
- European Commission. (2017). *Report on the Blue Growth strategy: Towards more sustainable growth and jobs in the blue economy*. European Commission. https://ec.europa.eu/maritimeaffairs/sites/maritimeaffairs/files/swd-2017-128_en.pdf
- European Commission. (2018). *Marine Spatial Planning (MSP) for Blue Growth* [Technical Study]. Executive Agency for Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (EASME) Maritime Spatial Planning (MSP) for Blue Growth.
- Fabinyi, M. (2010). The intensification of fishing and the rise of tourism: Competing coastal livelihoods in the Calamianes Islands, Philippines. *Human Ecology*, 38(3), 415–427. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10745-010-9329-z>
- FAO. (2015). *Voluntary guidelines for securing sustainable small-scale fisheries in the context of food security and poverty eradication*. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. <http://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/21360061-9b18-42ac-8d78-8a1a7311aef7/>
- FAO (Ed.). (2018). *The state of world fisheries and aquaculture: Meeting the sustainable development goals*. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
- Flannery, W., Healy, N., & Luna, M. (2018). Exclusion and non-participation in Marine Spatial Planning. *Marine Policy*, 88, 32–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2017.11.001>
- Foley, P., Mather, C., & Neis, B. (2013). *Fisheries allocation policies and regional development: Successes from the Newfoundland and Labrador shrimp fishery*. Leslie Harris Centre of Regional Policy and Development, Memorial University. <https://www.mun.ca/harriscentre/reports/arf/2011/11-12-ARF-Final-Mather.pdf>
- Food & Water Watch. (2009). *Desalination: An ocean of problems*. Food & Water Watch. <https://www.foodandwaterwatch.org/sites/default/files/Desalination%20Report%20Feb%202009.pdf>

- Fraser, N. (1998). Social Justice in the Age of Identity Politics: Redistribution, Recognition, and Participation. *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values*, 19, 2–67.
- Fredrickson, A. (2013). The California Coastal Act and Ports: The Unintended Environmental Justice Implications of Preserving California's Coastline. *Coastal Management*, 41(3), 258–271. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08920753.2013.784888>
- Frey, R. S. (2015). Breaking Ships in the World-System: An Analysis of Two Ship Breaking Capitals, Alang-Sosiya, India and Chittagong, Bangladesh. *Journal of World-Systems Research*, 21(1), 25–49. <https://doi.org/10.5195/jwsr.2015.529>
- Galappaththi, E. K., & Nayak, P. K. (2017). Two faces of shrimp aquaculture: Commonising vs. decommonising effects of a wicked driver. *Maritime Studies*, 16, 12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40152-017-0066-4>
- Gill, D. A., Picou, J. S., & Ritchie, L. A. (2012). The Exxon Valdez and BP Oil Spills: A Comparison of Initial Social and Psychological Impacts*. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 56(1), 3–23. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764211408585>
- Golden, J. S., Virdin, J., Nowacek, D., Halpin, P., Benneer, L., & Patil, P. G. (2017). Making sure the blue economy is green. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, 1(2), 0017. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-016-0017>
- Haas, A. R., Edwards, D. N., & Sumaila, U. R. (2016). Corporate concentration and processor control: Insights from the salmon and herring fisheries in British Columbia. *Marine Policy*, 68, 83–90. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2016.02.019>
- Hadjimichael, M. (2018). The stealing of the seashore as a second wave of the enclosure movement: Examples from the Mediterranean. *Ocean & Coastal Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2018.01.019>
- Hadjimichael, M., Bruggeman, A., & Lange, M. A. (2014). Tragedy of the few? A political ecology perspective of the right to the sea: The Cyprus marine aquaculture sector. *Marine Policy*, 49, 12–19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2014.04.003>
- Halpern, B. S., Frazier, M., Potapenko, J., Casey, K. S., Koenig, K., Longo, C., Lowndes, J. S., Rockwood, R. C., Selig, E. R., Selkoe, K. A., & Walbridge, S. (2015). Spatial and temporal changes in cumulative human impacts on the world's ocean. *Nature Communications*, 6, 7615. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms8615>
- Hampton, M. P., & Jeyacheya, J. (2015). Power, Ownership and Tourism in Small Islands: Evidence from Indonesia. *World Development*, 70, 481–495. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2014.12.007>
- Hannesson, R. (2004). *The Privatization of the Oceans*. MIT Press.
- Hapke, H. M., & Ayyanketil, D. (2004). Gender, the work-life course, and livelihood strategies in a South Indian fish market. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 11(2), 229–256. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0966369042000218473>
- Harper, S., Zeller, D., Hauzer, M., Pauly, D., & Sumaila, U. R. (2013). Women and fisheries: Contribution to food security and local economies. *Marine Policy*, 39, 56–63. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2012.10.018>
- Herr, D., Blum, J., Himes-Cornell, A., & Sutton-Grier, A. (2019). An analysis of the potential positive and negative livelihood impacts of coastal carbon offset projects. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 235, 463–479. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2019.01.067>
- Hopkins, M. (2012). *Corporate Social Responsibility and International Development: Is Business the Solution?* Routledge.
- Ismail, K. (2015). Gender Inequality on Marine Tourism Development in Small Island. *IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science*, 20(7), 53–58.

- Jackson, S. E. (1995). The water is not empty: Cross-cultural issues in conceptualising sea space. *Australian Geographer*, 26(1), 87–96. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00049189508703133>
- Jenkins, R., & Unies, N. (2001). *Corporate codes of conduct: Self-regulation in a global economy*. United Nations Research Institute for Social Development Geneva. <http://www.adapttech.it/old/files/document/18111JENKINS.pdf>
- Jentoft, S. (2013). Social Justice in the Context of Fisheries – A Governability Challenge. In M. Bavinck, R. Chuenpagdee, S. Jentoft, & J. Kooiman (Eds.), *Governability of Fisheries and Aquaculture* (pp. 45–65). Springer Netherlands. http://link.springer.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/chapter/10.1007/978-94-007-6107-0_4
- John, H. (2020, January 2). Fish meal and fish oil industries pose threat to the fishing sector in India. *Mongabay*. <https://india.mongabay.com/2020/01/fish-meal-and-fish-oil-industries-pose-threat-to-the-fishing-sector-in-india/>
- Jordan, E. J., & Vogt, C. A. (2017). Residents’ Perceptions of Stress Related to Cruise Tourism Development. *Tourism Planning & Development*, 14(4), 527–547. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568316.2017.1287123>
- Josse, T., Hadiwinata, M., Pratama, H., Brent, Z. W., & Barbesgaard, M. (2019). *Marine Spatial Planning: Resolving or entrenching conflicts*. Transnational Institute.
- Jouffray, J.-B., Blasiak, R., Norström, A. V., Österblom, H., & Nyström, M. (2020). The Blue Acceleration: The Trajectory of Human Expansion into the Ocean. *One Earth*, 2(1), 43–54. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2019.12.016>
- Kennedy, M. (2019, June 4). Carnival Cruise Lines Hit With \$20 Million Penalty For Environmental Crimes. *NPR*. <https://www.npr.org/2019/06/04/729622653/carnival-cruise-lines-hit-with-20-million-penalty-for-environmental-crimes>
- Kerr, S., Colton, J., Johnson, K., & Wright, G. (2015). Rights and ownership in sea country: Implications of marine renewable energy for indigenous and local communities. *Marine Policy*, 52, 108–115. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2014.11.002>
- Klain, S., Satterfield, T., Lindberg, K., & Chan, K. M. A. (2019, August 14). *Rethinking renewable energy: High willingness to pay for ecologically regenerative offshore wind farms*. 2019 ESA Annual Meeting (August 11 -- 16). <https://eco.confex.com/eco/2019/meetingapp.cgi/Paper/77835>
- Kleiber, D., Harris, L. M., & Vincent, A. C. J. (2014). Improving fisheries estimates by including women’s catch in the Central Philippines. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 71(5), 656–664. <https://doi.org/10.1139/cjfas-2013-0177>
- Klinger, D. H., Maria Eikeset, A., Davíðsdóttir, B., Winter, A.-M., & Watson, J. R. (2018). The mechanics of blue growth: Management of oceanic natural resource use with multiple, interacting sectors. *Marine Policy*, 87(Supplement C), 356–362. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2017.09.025>
- Kroodsma, D. A., Mayorga, J., Hochberg, T., Miller, N. A., Boerder, K., Ferretti, F., Wilson, A., Bergman, B., White, T. D., Block, B. A., Woods, P., Sullivan, B., Costello, C., & Worm, B. (2018). Tracking the global footprint of fisheries. *Science*, 359(6378), 904–908. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aao5646>
- Lalancette, A. (2017). Creeping in? Neoliberalism, indigenous realities and tropical rock lobster (kaiar) management in Torres Strait, Australia. *Marine Policy*, 80, 47–59. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2016.02.020>
- Lamb, V., Marschke, M., & Rigg, J. (2019). Trading Sand, Undermining Lives: Omitted Livelihoods in the Global Trade in Sand. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, 109(5), 1511–1528. <https://doi.org/10.1080/24694452.2018.1541401>
- Lee, S., & Jamal, T. (2008). Environmental Justice and Environmental Equity in Tourism: Missing Links to Sustainability. *Journal of Ecotourism*, 7(1), 44–67. <https://doi.org/10.2167/joe191.0>

- Liu, T.-K., Sheu, H.-Y., & Tseng, C.-N. (2013). Environmental impact assessment of seawater desalination plant under the framework of integrated coastal management. *Desalination*, 326, 10–18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.desal.2013.07.003>
- Locke, C., Muljono, P., McDougall, C., & Morgan, M. (2017). Innovation and gendered negotiations: Insights from six small-scale fishing communities. *Fish and Fisheries*, 18(5), 943–957. <https://doi.org/10.1111/faf.12216>
- Lockwood, M., Davidson, J., Curtis, A., Stratford, E., & Griffith, R. (2010). Governance principles for natural resource management. *Society & Natural Resources*, 23(10), 986–1001. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920802178214>
- Longo, S. B., Clausen, R., & Clark, B. (2015). *The Tragedy of the Commodity: Oceans, Fisheries, and Aquaculture*. Rutgers University Press. <https://muse.jhu.edu/book/45428>
- Lopes, R., & Videira, N. (2013). Valuing marine and coastal ecosystem services: An integrated participatory framework. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 84, 153–162. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2013.08.001>
- Mallin, F., & Barbesgaard, M. (2020). Awash with contradiction: Capital, ocean space and the logics of the Blue Economy Paradigm. *Geoforum*, S0016718520301184. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2020.04.021>
- Mansfield, B. (2004). Neoliberalism in the oceans: “Rationalization,” property rights, and the commons question. *Geoforum*, 35(3), 313–326. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2003.05.002>
- McCauley, D. J., Jablonicky, C., Allison, E. H., Golden, C. D., Joyce, F. H., Mayorga, J., & Kroodsma, D. (2018). Wealthy countries dominate industrial fishing. *Science Advances*, 4(8), eaau2161. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aau2161>
- McFarlane-Morris, S. (2019). “But we were here first:” Mass tourism development and contestation over space in coastal Jamaica. *Turizam : Međunarodni Znanstveno-Stručni Časopis*, 67(1), 22–33.
- McKague, K., & Cragg, W. (2007). *Compendium of Ethics Codes and Instruments of Corporate Responsibility*. York University.
- Meletis, Z. A., & Campbell, L. M. (2009). Benevolent and Benign? Using Environmental Justice to Investigate Waste-related Impacts of Ecotourism in Destination Communities. *Antipode*, 41(4), 741–780. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2009.00696.x>
- Mesmain, M. (2014). Ocean Grabbing: Plundering a Common Resource. In H. W. Wilson (Ed.), *U.S. national debate topic, 2014-2015. The ocean.: Vol. 86 (3)*. Grey House Publishing.
- Michel, J. A. (2017). *Rethinking the Oceans: Towards the Blue Economy*. Paragon House.
- Miller, D. (1979). *Social Justice*. OUP Oxford.
- Miller, D. (1999). *Principles of Social Justice*. Harvard University Press.
- Mohai, P., Pellow, D., & Roberts, J. T. (2009). Environmental Justice. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 34(1), 405–430. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-082508-094348>
- Mulrennan, M. E., & Scott, C. H. (2000). Mare nullius: Indigenous rights in saltwater environments. *Development and Change*, 31(3), 681–708. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-7660.00172>
- Murray, G., Johnson, T., McCay, B. J., Danko, M., Martin, K. S., & Takahashi, S. (2010). Cumulative effects, creeping enclosure, and the marine commons of New Jersey. *International Journal of the Commons*, 4(1), 367–389.
- Nash, K. L., Cvitanovic, C., Fulton, E. A., Halpern, B. S., Milner-Gulland, E. J., Watson, R. A., & Blanchard, J. L. (2017). Planetary boundaries for a blue planet. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, 1(11), 1625. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-017-0319-z>
- Newton, A., Brito, A. C., Icely, J. D., Derolez, V., Clara, I., Angus, S., Schernewski, G., Inácio, M., Lillebø, A. I., Sousa, A. I., Béjaoui, B., Solidoro, C., Tosic, M., Cañedo-Argüelles, M., Yamamuro, M., Reizopoulou, S., Tseng, H.-C., Canu, D., Roselli, L., ... Khokhlov, V. (2018).

- Assessing, quantifying and valuing the ecosystem services of coastal lagoons. *Journal for Nature Conservation*, 44, 50–65. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnc.2018.02.009>
- Nickerson, D. J. (1999). Trade-offs of mangrove area development in the Philippines. *Ecological Economics*, 28(2), 279–298. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0921-8009\(98\)00044-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0921-8009(98)00044-5)
- Nogué-Algueró, B. (2019). Growth in the docks: Ports, metabolic flows and socio-environmental impacts. *Sustainability Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-019-00764-y>
- Obeng-Odoom, F. (2013). Resource curse or blessing in Africa’s oil cities? Empirical evidence from Sekondi-Takoradi, West Africa. *City, Culture and Society*, 4(4), 229–240. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ccs.2013.07.001>
- Obi, C. I. (2010). Oil Extraction, Dispossession, Resistance, and Conflict in Nigeria’s Oil-Rich Niger Delta. *Canadian Journal of Development Studies / Revue Canadienne d’études Du Développement*, 30(1–2), 219–236. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02255189.2010.9669289>
- OECD. (2016). *The Ocean Economy in 2030*. https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/economics/the-ocean-economy-in-2030_9789264251724-en
- Olson, J. (2011). Understanding and contextualizing social impacts from the privatization of fisheries: An overview. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 54(5), 353–363. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2011.02.002>
- O’Rourke, D., & Connolly, S. (2003). Just Oil? The Distribution of Environmental and Social Impacts of Oil Production and Consumption. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 28(1), 587–617. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.energy.28.050302.105617>
- Österblom, H., Wabnitz, C. C. C., Tladi, D., Allison, E. H., Arnaud-Haond, S., Bebbington, J., Bennett, N. J., Blasiak, R., Boonstra, W., Choudhury, A., Cisneros-Montemayor, A., Daw, T., Fabinyi, M., Franz, N., Harden-Davies, H., Kleiber, D., Lopes, P., McDougall, C., Resosudarmo, B. P., & Selim, S. A. (2020). *Towards Ocean Equity* (p. 64). World Resources Institute.
- Oteng-Ababio, M. (2018). ‘The Oil is Drilled in Takoradi, but the Money is Counted in Accra’: The Paradox of Plenty in the Oil City, Ghana. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 53(2), 268–284. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021909616677371>
- Overå, R. (2017). Local Navigations in a Global Industry: The Gendered Nature of Entrepreneurship in Ghana’s Oil and Gas Service Sector. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 53(3), 361–374. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2016.1184250>
- Page, J. (2007). Salmon Farming in First Nations’ Territories: A Case of Environmental Injustice on Canada’s West Coast. *Local Environment*, 12(6), 613–626. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13549830701657349>
- Palinkas, L., Downs, M., Petterson, J., & Russell, J. (1993). Social, Cultural, and Psychological Impacts of the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill. *Human Organization*, 52(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.17730/humo.52.1.162688w475154m34>
- Palinkas, L., Petterson, J. S., Russell, J. C., & Downs, M. A. (2004). Ethnic Differences in Symptoms of Post-traumatic Stress after the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill. *Prehospital and Disaster Medicine*, 19(1), 102–112. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049023X00001552>
- Pallis, A. A., Papachristou, A. A., & Platias, C. (2017). Environmental policies and practices in Cruise Ports: Waste reception facilities in the Med. *SPOUDAI - Journal of Economics and Business*, 67(1), 54–70.
- Pauly, D., Belhabib, D., Blomeyer, R., Cheung, W. W. W. L., Cisneros-Montemayor, A. M., Copeland, D., Harper, S., Lam, V. W. Y., Mai, Y., Le Manach, F., Österblom, H., Mok, K. M., van der Meer, L., Sanz, A., Shon, S., Sumaila, U. R., Swartz, W., Watson, R., Zhai, Y., & Zeller, D. (2014). China’s distant-water fisheries in the 21st century. *Fish and Fisheries*, 15(3), 474–488. <https://doi.org/10.1111/faf.12032>

- Pauly, D., Watson, R., & Alder, J. (2005). Global trends in world fisheries: Impacts on marine ecosystems and food security. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, 360(1453), 5–12. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2004.1574>
- Pedersen, C., Feodoroff, T., Reuter, R., Franco, J., Buxton, N., Barbesgaard, M. C., & Vervest, P. (2014). *The Global Ocean Grab: A Primer* (p. 50). Transnational Institute, Masifundise, Afrika Kontakt and World Forum of Fisher Peoples.
- Pinkerton, E. (2017). Hegemony and resistance: Disturbing patterns and hopeful signs in the impact of neoliberal policies on small-scale fisheries around the world. *Marine Policy*, 80, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2016.11.012>
- Pinkerton, E., & Davis, R. (2015). Neoliberalism and the politics of enclosure in North American small-scale fisheries. *Marine Policy*, 61, 303–312. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2015.03.025>
- Pinkerton, E., & Edwards, D. N. (2009). The elephant in the room: The hidden costs of leasing individual transferable fishing quotas. *Marine Policy*, 33(4), 707–713. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2009.02.004>
- Poe, M. R., Norman, K. C., & Levin, P. S. (2014). Cultural Dimensions of Socioecological Systems: Key Connections and Guiding Principles for Conservation in Coastal Environments: Cultural dimensions of coastal conservation. *Conservation Letters*, 7(3), 166–175. <https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12068>
- Pollnac, R. B., & Poggie, J. J. (2008). Happiness, Well-being and Psychocultural Adaptation to the Stresses Associated with Marine Fishing. *Human Ecology Review*, 15(2), 194–200. JSTOR.
- Pomeroy, C., Hall-Arber, M., & Conway, F. (2015). Power and perspective: Fisheries and the ocean commons beset by demands of development. *Marine Policy*, 61, 339–346. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2014.11.016>
- Primavera, J. H. (1997). Socio-economic impacts of shrimp culture. *Aquaculture Research*, 28(10), 815–827. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2109.1997.00946.x>
- Primavera, J. H. (2006). Overcoming the impacts of aquaculture on the coastal zone. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 49(9–10), 531–545. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2006.06.018>
- Quist, L.-M., & Nygren, A. (2015). Contested claims over space and identity between fishers and the oil industry in Mexico. *Geoforum*, 63, 44–54. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2015.05.015>
- Ratner, B. D., Åsgård, B., & Allison, E. H. (2014). Fishing for justice: Human rights, development, and fisheries sector reform. *Global Environmental Change*, 27, 120–130. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.05.006>
- Reilly, K., O'Hagan, A. M., & Dalton, G. (2016). Moving from consultation to participation: A case study of the involvement of fishermen in decisions relating to marine renewable energy projects on the island of Ireland. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 134, 30–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2016.09.030>
- Richmond, L. (2013). Incorporating Indigenous Rights and Environmental Justice into Fishery Management: Comparing Policy Challenges and Potentials from Alaska and Hawaii >> i. *Environmental Management*, 52(5), 1071–1084. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-013-0021-0>
- Rogerson, C. M., Benkenstein, A., & Mwongera, N. (2018). *Coastal tourism and economic inclusion in Indian Ocean RIM association states* (p. 30). Global Economic Governance (GEG) Africa programme.
- Rosyida, I., Khan, W., & Sasaoka, M. (2018). Marginalization of a coastal resource-dependent community: A study on Tin Mining in Indonesia. *The Extractive Industries and Society*, 5(1), 165–176. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2017.11.002>
- Rudolph, D. (2014). The Resurgent Conflict Between Offshore Wind Farms and Tourism: Underlying Storylines. *Scottish Geographical Journal*, 130(3), 168–187. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14702541.2014.914239>

- Sabau, G., & van Zyll de Jong, M. (2015). From unjust uneconomic growth to sustainable fisheries in Newfoundland: The true costs of closing the inshore fishery for groundfish. *Marine Policy*, *61*, 376–389. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2014.11.012>
- Santos, A. N. (2015). Fisheries as a way of life: Gendered livelihoods, identities and perspectives of artisanal fisheries in eastern Brazil. *Marine Policy*, *62*, 279–288. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2015.09.007>
- Schlosberg, D. (2009). *Defining Environmental Justice: Theories, Movements, and Nature*. Oxford University Press.
- Shrader-Frechette, K. (2012). Nuclear Catastrophe, Disaster-Related Environmental Injustice, and Fukushima, Japan: Prima-Facie Evidence for a Japanese “Katrina.” *Environmental Justice*, *5*(3), 133–139. <https://doi.org/10.1089/env.2011.0045>
- Silver, J. J., Gray, N. J., Campbell, L. M., Fairbanks, L. W., & Gruby, R. L. (2015). Blue Economy and Competing Discourses in International Oceans Governance. *The Journal of Environment & Development*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1070496515580797>
- Simmons, G., & Stringer, C. (2014). New Zealand’s fisheries management system: Forced labour an ignored or overlooked dimension? *Marine Policy*, *50*, 74–80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2014.05.013>
- Sisson, M. (2016). *Regenerative Aquaculture: Designing for Resilience of the Chesapeake Tidewater* [Thesis]. <https://doi.org/10.13016/M23V2Z>
- Smith, B. (2019). *Eat Like a Fish*. Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group.
- Smith, G., & Jentoft, S. (2017). Marine spatial planning in Scotland. Levelling the playing field? *Marine Policy*, *84*(Supplement C), 33–41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2017.06.024>
- Sparks, J. L. D., & Sliva, S. M. (2019). An intersectionality-based analysis of high seas policy making stagnation and equity in United Nations negotiations. *Journal of Community Practice*, *27*(3–4), 260–278. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705422.2019.1647325>
- Stoddart, M. C. J., & Graham, P. (2018). Offshore Oil, Environmental Movements, and the Oil-Tourism Interface: The Old Harry Conflict on Canada’s East Coast. *Sociological Inquiry*, *88*(2), 274–296. <https://doi.org/10.1111/soin.12192>
- Stonich, S. C. (1995). The environmental quality and social justice implications of shrimp mariculture development in Honduras. *Human Ecology*, *23*(2), 143–168. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01191647>
- Stonich, S. C., Bort, J. R., & Ovaras, L. L. (1997). Globalization of shrimp mariculture: The impact on social justice and environmental quality in central America. *Society & Natural Resources*, *10*(2), 161–179. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08941929709381016>
- Stringer, C., Whittaker, D. H., & Simmons, G. (2016). New Zealand’s turbulent waters: The use of forced labour in the fishing industry. *Global Networks*, *16*(1), 3–24. <https://doi.org/10.1111/glob.12077>
- Sullivan, D. N., Warr, T., Rainbubu, J., Kunoko, J., Akauna, F., Angasa, M., & Wenda, Y. (2003). *A Social Impact Study of Proposed RD Tuna Cannery at Vidar Wharf, Madang* (p. 142). Nancy Sullivan and Associates.
- Sundar, A. (2017, November 17). Fishing Community Protest Against Ocean Grabbing Highlights Growing Need to Protect Blue Economy. *The Wire*. <https://thewire.in/197853/fishing-community-protest-ocean-grabbing-highlights-growing-need-protect-blue-economy/>
- Swartz, W., Sala, E., Tracey, S., Watson, R., & Pauly, D. (2010). The Spatial Expansion and Ecological Footprint of Fisheries (1950 to Present). *PLOS ONE*, *5*(12), e15143. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0015143>
- Swilling, M., & Annecke, E. (2012). *Just Transitions: Explorations of Sustainability in an Unfair World*. UCT Press.

- Tafon, R. V. (2018). Taking power to sea: Towards a post-structuralist discourse theoretical critique of marine spatial planning. *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space*, 36(2), 258–273. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2399654417707527>
- Tafon, R. V. (2019). Small-scale fishers as allies or opponents? Unlocking looming tensions and potential exclusions in Poland's marine spatial planning. *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning*, 0(0), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1523908X.2019.1661235>
- Thomas, S. (2016). Between Tun Mustapha and the deep blue sea: The political ecology of blue carbon in Sabah. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 55, 20–35. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2015.08.017>
- Tickler, D., Meeuwig, J. J., Bryant, K., David, F., Forrest, J. A. H., Gordon, E., Larsen, J. J., Oh, B., Pauly, D., Sumaila, U. R., & Zeller, D. (2018). Modern slavery and the race to fish. *Nature Communications*, 9(1), 4643. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-07118-9>
- Too Big To Ignore. (2019). Blue Justice for Small-Scale Fisheries. *Too Big to Ignore: Global Partnership for Small-Scale Fisheries*. <http://toobigtoignore.net/blue-justice-for-ssf/>
- Toufique, K. A., & Gregory, R. (2008). Common waters and private lands: Distributional impacts of floodplain aquaculture in Bangladesh. *Food Policy*, 33, 587–594.
- Uhre, A. N., & Leknes, E. (2017). When the oil and fishing industries live side by side. *Marine Policy*, 75, 108–115. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2016.11.001>
- Ukeje, C., Odebiyi, A., Sesay, A., & Aina, O. (2002). *Oil and violent conflicts in the Niger Delta*. Obafemi Awolowo University Press.
- Ukeje, Charles. (2004). From Aba to Ugborodo: Gender identity and alternative discourse of social protest among women in the oil delta of Nigeria. *Oxford Development Studies*, 32(4), 605–617. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360081042000293362>
- UN. (1982). *United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS)*. United Nations.
- UN. (2012). *Blue Economy Concept Paper: Rio+20 United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development*. United Nations Development Programme. <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/2978BEconcept.pdf>
- United Nations. (1948). *The Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. United Nations General Assembly.
- United Nations. (1966). *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Article 27*. United Nations Office of the High Commissioner on Human Rights.
- United Nations. (1986). *Declaration on the right to development (A/RES/41/128)*. United Nations General Assembly. <http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/41/a41r128.htm>
- United Nations. (2007). *United nations declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples* (pp. 1–18). United Nations. <http://www.converge.org.nz/pma/DRIPGA.pdf>
- United Nations. (2015). *Sustainable Development Goals*. United Nations. <http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/oceans/>
- United Nations Development Programme. (2018). *Blue Economy: Community Solutions*. UNDP.
- Urbina, I. (2019). *The Outlaw Ocean: Journeys Across the Last Untamed Frontier*. Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group.
- Veuthey, S., & Gerber, J.-F. (2012). Accumulation by dispossession in coastal Ecuador: Shrimp farming, local resistance and the gender structure of mobilizations. *Global Environmental Change*, 22(3), 611–622. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2011.10.010>
- Voyer, M., Quirk, G., McIlgorm, A., & Azmi, K. (2018). Shades of blue: What do competing interpretations of the Blue Economy mean for oceans governance? *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning*, 20(5), 595–616. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1523908X.2018.1473153>
- Walker, G. (2009). Beyond Distribution and Proximity: Exploring the Multiple Spatialities of Environmental Justice. *Antipode*, 41(4), 614–636. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2009.00691.x>

- Walker, G. (2012). *Environmental Justice: Concepts, Evidence and Politics*. Routledge.
- Watts, M. J. (2012). A Tale of Two Gulfs: Life, Death, and Dispossession along Two Oil Frontiers. *American Quarterly*, 64(3), 437–467.
- Weeratunge, N., Snyder, K. A., & Sze, C. P. (2010). Gleaner, fisher, trader, processor: Understanding gendered employment in fisheries and aquaculture. *Fish and Fisheries*, 11(4), 405–420. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-2979.2010.00368.x>
- Wiber, M. G. (2000). Fishing Rights as an Example of the Economic Rhetoric of Privatization: Calling for an Implicated Economics*. *Canadian Review of Sociology/Revue Canadienne de Sociologie*, 37(3), 267–288. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-618X.2000.tb00591.x>
- Williams, S., & Doyon, A. (2019). Justice in energy transitions. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, 31, 144–153. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eist.2018.12.001>
- World Bank, & United Nations. (2017). *The Potential of the Blue Economy: Increasing Long-term Benefits of the Sustainable Use of Marine Resources for Small Island Developing States and Coastal Least Developed Countries*. World Bank.
- Yates, K. L., Schoeman, D. S., & Klein, C. J. (2015). Ocean zoning for conservation, fisheries and marine renewable energy: Assessing trade-offs and co-location opportunities. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 152, 201–209. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2015.01.045>
- Zalik, A. (2009). Zones of Exclusion: Offshore Extraction, the Contestation of Space and Physical Displacement in the Nigerian Delta and the Mexican Gulf. *Antipode*, 41(3), 557–582. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2009.00687.x>