# 1nc v witchcraft

## cx

can men be witches?

who decides who gets to be a witch?

how does witchcraft decolonize space?

do you defend the whole resolution?

how does the aff break the gender binary?

## 1

**Interpretation and Violation: On the NSDA January/February topic, The affirmative must only defend that appropriation of outer space as a whole by private entities is unjust. They defend cursing private entities.**

#### ‘The’ indicates reference to a noun as a whole

Merriam **Webster’s 19** Online Dictionary, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/the

4 -- **used as a function word before a noun** or a substantivized adjective **to indicate reference to a group as a whole** <the elite>

#### ‘Of’ implies we should consider appropriation as a whole

**CJS 78** Corpus Juris Secundum, 67, p. 200

Of: **The word "of"** is a preposition. It is a word of different meanings, and susceptible of numerous different connotations. It may be used in its possessive sense to denote possession or ownership. It may also be used as a word of identification and relation, rather than as a word of proprietorship or possession. "Of" may denote source, origin, existence, descent, or location, or it may denote that from which something issues, proceeds, or is derived. The term may **indicate the aggregate or whole of** **which the limited word or words denote a part**, or of which a part is referred to, thought of, affected, etc.

#### Unjust means contrary to right and justice

**Black’s Law Dictionary** (Black's Law Dictionary. “What Is Unjust? Definition of Unjust (Black's Law Dictionary).” The Law Dictionary, The Law Dictionary, 7 Nov. 2011, thelawdictionary.org/unjust/.)

What is UNJUST? **Contrary to right and justice**, or to the enjoyment of his rights by another, or to the standards of conduct furnished by the laws.

#### Violation— the word “appropriation” is only qualified by the words “outer space” – no other specification is permitted

**Ellis 53** Judge Advocate in the United States Army, “United States. v. Private Frank Taylor, Jr.”, United States Army Board of Review, 11 C.M.R. 428; 1953 CMR LEXIS 1428, 7-31, Lexis

Appellate defense counsel argued orally that many facts indicated the United States was not at war, for example: there has been no declaration of war; the Coast Guard is still under the supervision of the Treasury Department instead of the Navy Department as it usually is during war; here in the United States, Armed Forces personnel are allowed to wear civilian clothes during off-duty hours; it is not the policy to try Department of the Army civilians serving with the Army in the field in the United States by courts-martial; the various Army posts throughout the United States are still open to public visitation; many reservists and National Guard units are not on active service; and the Table of Maximum Punishments had not been suspended for offenses committed in the United States. He contended that the ratio of the cases cited in support of the war status of the United States was limited to the locale of the hostilities, Korea and its adjacent [\*\*6]  waters, and was inoperative on offenses committed in the United States. Finally, he anchored his argument on the interpretation to be given the language in Article 43f(1) (post) of the Code. He conceded arguendo that the offense at bar fell within the purview of this language, being a fraud against a United States agency, the Army, but reasoned that the subject language contemplated and embraced only "hostilities as proclaimed by the President or by a Joint Resolution of Congress." With this interpretation the board of review cannot agree. **The preposition "of" before the word "hostilities" shows plainly that the phrase "of hostilities" is adjectival, qualifying and limiting the word "termination".** The phrase "termination of hostilities" is in turn modified by the participial phrase "as proclaimed." In our interpretation it is the "termination of hostilities" that must be proclaimed, and such proclamation provides the initial date of a three-year period in which the suspension of the statute of limitations continues to operate rather than determines the date of the beginning of the original suspension (emphasis supplied).

**Vote neg:**

**[1] Preparation and clash – the topic ensures both the aff and neg are on equal footing in terms of research restart and prep – if they get to pick the topic, it allows them to be way more prepped than the neg on the nuances and specificities of their topic since it’s always ex-post-facto – kills fair testing of 1AC. Any 1AR caselist is concessionary and ex-post-facto chosen by debaters which is self serving since you demarcate my ground. They turn debate into a monologue centered around one debater which turns and outweighs all their impacts:**

**[A] Absent clash of ideologies, it’s impossible to have a good discussion, which means any aff offense is useless absent rigorous contestation. Reading the 1AC isn’t liberatory – it’s a question of methods debate**

**[B] Necessary to objectively evaluate who best meets the role of the ballot—impossible if the 1NC had nothing to say bc the aff arbitrarily demarcated the substance under their framing**

**[C] Minimal guidelines to ensure a relative balance in the debate are necessary to effectuate democratic engagement, and the process of argumentative exchange is the best way to solve their offense---their interpretation makes dialogue impossible – turns case because it prevents other queer debaters like me from participating in the aff which leads folx to submit to reigning ideology due to lack of access**

**[2] Switch Side Debate solves their offense – if your aff is incompatible with the topic, read the aff on the negative – conviction Based Debate (CBD) results in debates where the debaters have already decided their position in debate and the world such that we do not consider our relationship to Others. It produces insular debates that destroy education, ethics and reproduces anti-blackness because Conviction Based Debate is based off an assumption of mastery embedded in whiteness. Evans 12**

[Evans, Rashad. Revolutionary Blackness debater and extraordinaire and JD, “The 1NC,” Nov 20, http://www.rwesq.com/the-1nc/]

Now, the debate! First, let me look at Casey Harrigan’s (“CH”) definition of SSD. He says that : Definition: switch side debate (SSD) is the practice that requires debaters to argue both for and against a given topic in alternating rounds. In effect, it has meant that debaters’ arguments are divorced from personal conviction and instead made contingently as a means of “testing” the truth value of a proposition. I will accept this definition, but I think it requires some more refinement. In a practical sense, SSD, at a minimum, requires that the affirmative defend the resolution. For the most part, the negative is unconstrained (except by competition) and most debates in which SSD comes up the question is whether the affirmative team should be required to affirm the topic, including some defense of an action by the United States Federal Government (“USFG”). The essential question posed by SSD is whether the affirmative team should be required to defend the resolution even when they (1) fundamentally disagree with all or part of it and/or (2) are compelled to affirm other ideas because of their “personal convictions.” The answer to this question must be yes. First, there are multiple ways to skin a cat and even more ways to affirm the resolution in the world of parametric debate because **one need only affirm an interpretation of the res**olution and not the resolution writ large. Therefore, there are **rare** instances in which **there is no interpretation of the res**olution **that you can**no**t defend** and these rare instances are most likely the product of lack of creativity and research. So in reality, the question is an even simpler one: should the affirmative team be required to defend an interpretation of the resolution. There are immense constitutive and instrumental benefits to SSD that cannot be otherwise obtained and therefore must be required. I ask that the judges: George, Justin and Kyla evaluate this debate holistically, which requires that they evaluate the benefits of SSD to the speaker (constitutive) and to society (instrumental). This also requires that they exclude nothing in their analysis of this debate. The Constitutive Debaters benefit from SSD. It requires that they engage in topics that they may not otherwise engage. The resolution poses a unique question and the debate round is a unique time to answer that question. One is much more likely to consider their personal convictions outside of the debate round than they are to consider the resolution outside the debate round. Therefore, independently of whether one agrees with the resolution or not, there are benefits to defending an interpretation of the resolution in that it requires you to consider something you may not have otherwise considered. These **thought experiments create more informed** and thoughtful **debaters** and citizens. SSD creates a unique opportunity for self-reflexivity. The idea is to let your personal convictions guide you in the debate. The **res**olution **doesn’t require** that **you suppress your identity** or convictions, but is instead an opportunity to infuse that identity and those convictions into the resolution and public policy discussion. So, given who you are, what you believe and what you know what say you regarding energy production? What say you regarding democracy assistance? What say you regarding federal control in Indian Country? Therefore, the resolution is an opportunity for you to **refine** your **personal convictions and put** your **identity in politics instead of relying** exclusively **on identity politics**. SSD allows you to check your own privilege. Here, I will rely on my personal experience. I once participated in a 30 day creative challenge where the challenge leader would pose questions on facebook and the group would answer them in the comments section. One day he asked us to imagine we could be the other gender for 3 days and to discuss what would we do. I thought about this on the A-train from Harlem to Chelsea and again from Chelsea to Harlem and had no answer because I couldn’t imagine being a woman. I explained that as a gay man I don’t need to be a woman to have sex with a man, I don’t want a baby in me and more importantly I don’t want the physical vulnerability of being a woman. This realization really forced me to reevaluate my previous jokes even that as a gay many I was ontologically indistinct from a woman. I am not. I am gay and I am black…in many ways I am the the worlds bottom, but even I could would not want to occupy the body of a woman. That thought experiment taught me a lot about myself, privilege and the world. Sometimes, you have to take a walk in someone else’s stiletto to learn who you really are. Seriously CH, have you walked in stilettos? It will change your life. SSD is both necessary and sufficient to ensure that you debate your personal convictions. Remember, if you are staunchly opposed to the resolution **you get to lodge** those **complaints on the negative**. Also, remember that what is good for the goose is good for the gander and if you don’t have to debate the resolution then no one has to debate the resolution. This loosening of the restrictions on the resolution may mean that no one gets to debate anything they want. I mean lets face it, no one wants to be topical! There’s always a better version of your aff that isn’t topical. Every 2AC considers severance or intrinsicness because the resolution is flawed or insufficient. However, a true debater understands that they both have to debate on the affirmative and the negative and that in order to do either effectively **there must be stability** in the relationship **between the aff**irmative **and** the **neg**ative. Therefore, committing yourself to the resolution is key preserving your own negative ground to engage in your critique of the resolution. As goes the resolution so goes your personal convictions about that resolution. The Instrumental SSD is the only way to organize a fair debate tournament. We must have a topic. There must be rules and allowing any and everyone go rogue because of their “personal convictions” it is a recipe for disaster. I don’t want to live and debate in that world. There must be strict requirements on defending the resolution to allow for fair and predictable negative ground. By the way, protecting **fair negative ground is** easier and **more important** than all other concerns regarding fairness. All people of all convictions have to be negative at some point. Which means that the affirmative-negative dialectic is the only intersectional analysis that can be performed because all people of all identities will eventually find themselves on the affirmative or negative side in debate. Preserving negative ground then preserves the ground of women, minorities and hippies. SSD ensures that we have all hands on deck in these extraordinary times. We need all perspectives and all peoples to engage in all debates. SSD facilitates this. Allowing students to pick their own topic because of their “**personal convictions**” may **mean that important issues get ignored** all together. I mean, what would happen if we let the students set the curriculum? Would they learn anything, ever? How many times have you heard these questions in a classroom: why do I have to learn this? Will this be on the exam? My major is X, why do I need to learn Y? Blah. Yes, students would almost always like to do what they want to do. If we allowed this where would we be as a country? Who will be there to tackle the important questions pertaining to immigration, energy production, the Arab Spring, etc? Engaging the resolution from your specific social location can cause others to change their views. There are several examples of creative interpretations of the resolution that have inspired folk to view the topic and life differently. This is when debate is at its best and when it’s engaging in important knowledge production. Debate and debaters have the potential to infuse new arguments, ideas and perspectives into the resolution and into the broader discussion. Now, the line by line! CH says: 1. It presumes debate as a “pedagogical bull-pen”, which undermines the activity’s potential for radical change. Students are told “you can’t know anything until you debate both sides”, ignoring the VAST WEALTH of lived experience that underwrites specific claims about identity, the world, praxis, and the topic. In some ways, it is like Loyola’s argument about info accumulation – we are told to place a hold on “conviction” until we have “enough information” and “enough testing” when in reality there is either never a point where “enough is enough” OR we have \*already\* crossed that point and should be able to utilize the debate space for advocacy. It makes debate into a game about hypothetical action rather than a potential site for social justice. First, there are radically topical interpretations of the resolution. Second, how does one know that their lived experience is dispositive of any debate without testing it against the research and lived experiences of others. It’s not that you can’t know anything until you debate both sides but more importantly that you debate both sides before you conclude you know anything. Lastly, there is no internal link between resolutional debate and the loss of social justice. In fact, one should always **debate the resolution in a way that produces social justice**. 2. It is anti-Black. The norm of SSD and topic construction mandating USFG action presume that public policy is valuable because it is equally accessible to all participants, when in reality access is ANYTHING BUT that, relies on a belief that USFG action is a locus for change when in reality and history it has produced the opposite, marginalizes individual perspectives as “too local”, and does not account for the specific conditions of Black participation in debate. Your anti-Blackness argument is without warrant. To the extent that anti-Blackness is a problem, SSD is the solution. Certainly, holding on to ones conviction in avoidance of debate has never benefited Black people in the past. Thinking itself is Blackness (whiteness is anti-thought), so **avoiding a debate because of personal conviction is** quintessentially **anti-Black**. In fact, many of debates current ills stem from people avoiding debates and holding fast to their convictions.

**[3] TVA – Our interpretation for debate is a floor, not a ceiling, so you don’t access any of your T bad claims. You can defend your aff as long as it concludes in the normative desirability of the resolution, which solves your offense. Multiple TVA’s**

1. **Defend that we ought to end space exploration because it is a form of violent heteropatriarchal liberalism that limits ritual practices abroad and at home**
2. **Defend we ought to end space exploration used to further violent norms of gdner binaries**
3. **Defend a general principle that affirms the resolution**

**The impact is reject the debater – it’s key to endorsing good methodologies—1AR severance prevents effective dialogue on the role of the ballot and having a methods debate sets a norm for other rounds. Arguments are not violent imposition of norms so impact turns are a non-starter – they must prove that their model of debate is better than ours and us testing that is exactly what the aff calls for. Also – impact turns psychically bond debaters to the systems they criticize – they rely on T being read in order to rail against it and define the ballot only relationally to it – means no impact turns, but also if they do make them – that guts case solvency.**

**Competing interps – it's key to generate clear models of debate and ground because otherwise the aff's interpretation can be a moving target. Reasonability is arbitrarily defined and causes a race to the bottom for the "most reasonable" position.**

**T outweighs the aff:**

**[A] Testing – If we win that you preclude us from substantive engagement with the 1ac, then you will obviously win the case—means you can’t cross-apply case impacts or arguments to the other page since we indict your ability to read them in the first place**

## 2

#### CP: We endorse the entirety of the 1AC instead of their performance of poem. Instead we offer our own performance

#### 床前明月光 疑是地上霜 舉頭望明月 低頭思故鄉

**Unintelligibility Net Benefit – this is a far better form of witch-craft that is not palatable to white liberalism since they cannot track or trace the spells we cast --- we break English binaries caused by linguistic otherization – vote neg**

**[Soto and Kharem 06] Only the 1NC performance deviates from the colonizer’s education and the dominant** **– storytelling and transparency are methods that actively give up our agency to represent ourselves to the same systems we criticize – reject that parasitism. The 1NC terrorizes hegemonic spaces – like debate – to fight against language domination and classroom colonization that make it impossible for us to tell our stories. Soto and Kharem 06**

[LOURDES DIAZ SOTO is Professor, College of Education, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park. Haroon Kharem is Assistant Professor of Education at Brooklyn College. He also teaches courses for the Teaching Fellows Program and is a scholar of African American history and studies. “A Post-Monolingual Education”- 2006- (<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ795105.pdf)> AA]

Language also classifies people, serving as an ‘indication of class and cultural background’ and, if not used ‘correctly,’ as a marker of inferiority to the dominant group. Teachers correct and discourage children from speaking or writing in their home language and if teachers are not careful they end up silencing the child thus causing more harm than good (Christensen, 1995). **The English language** thus becomes oppressive as it **builds** a bulwark **to keep people out, only including those who master it enough to serve the colonizer’s needs** (with **the ‘native language’ valued for exotic entertainment**).. Therefore, the colonizer can “weigh the colonized’s language, history, and community experience that it repre- sents, and decide that the value is nil” (Dowdy, 2002, p. 11). In other words, **the subjugated must wear the ‘white mask’ to be successful in the colonizer’s world**, while at the same time “having the freedom to go back and forth” between the language at home and the Queen’s language. This form of language and cultural domination also establishes subordinate social relations whereby the possibility for critical literacy by bicultural, monocultural, and multicultural subjects is denied. **Language domination** by the bilingual education abolitionists’ **constitutes hegemonic forces of class oppression and cultural invasion**. This form of language conflict occurs when there is competition between two lan- guages for exclusive access to the same power-related function-e.g. schools or the government. This is one reason why bilingual education is constantly under attack by the English-only forces in the United States. The paradox lies in the fact that while bilingual education (perceived as language minority education) was being assaulted, there were 253 two- way bilingual immersion programs in 23 states and the District of Columbia (CAL, 2001). Two-way bilingual immersion programs are viewed as benefiting English language speakers although they have been designed to benefit all learners. (See Guadalupe Valdes, 1997 for an insightful critique). **Linguistic domination is the work of the colonizer translating itself into a nightmarish slice of the “American Dream”**. Anzaldua describes the linguistic terrorism of the ‘deslenguados’: Somos los del español deficiente. We are your linguistic nightmare, your linguistic aberration, your linguistic mestizaje, the subject of your burla. Because we speak with tongues of fire we are culturally crucified. Racially, culturally and linguistically somos huerfanos-we speak an orphan tongue. (1999, p.80) **Children are systematically stripped** of their integrity, independence, freedom, and voice **in this form of linguistic colonization. This form of educational violence and slaying of the soul functions to perpetuate social control**. Children are denied their ability to participate in school and community life when **their voices are silenced and they are unable to enter into dialogue and reflect on their daily realities and lived experiences**. Ultimately this **marginalization leads to** multiple and **complex issues** for children including issues **of identity** and biliteracy. As the privileged assert their superiority, bicultural children continue to lead an oppressed existence while continually reaching out to the “other” with love and compassion (Soto, 2002). “To live in the Borderlands means you are neither hispana india negra espanola ni gabachacha, eres mestiza, mulata, half-breed while carrying all five races on your back not knowing which side to turn to, or to run from” (Anzaldua, 1999 p. 216). As long as we continue to struggle against linguistic terrorism in just terms to maintain one’s language, we will never understand what is at stake. The stripping of voice from bicultural children strips them of something more important than just their ability to have voice; it strips them of their world-view, group identification and historical experience, their commitment to their own cultural norms. “**The battle is cultural but more important it is ideological because ideology holds the authority and power to guide activity**; it shapes character, and is the blueprint for thought and behavior” (Abraham, 1962, p. 27). When subjugated children learn the language and literature of the colonizer, the justification of alleged inferiority is embedded. What is amazing is that subjugated children accept this inferiority as they master the language of the colonizer. The ideological underpinning is important because the subjugated are now defined and labeled by the intellectual in academia in “scientific terms.” **Intellectual terrorism is valorized as the colonizer hides behind science claiming not to be impartial, but to be objective in the quest to destroy the knowledge base of the subjugated**. Here lies the power of the colonizer; the few who have access to literacy are the same who set the intellectual and ideological patterns and make decisions for many. They decide what is taught in schools, who is taught what and who benefits from education, which in turn determines access to economic compensation.

#### No perm – non-Asian debaters should not be able to appropriate Asian poetry

## 3

### K

**[Wuthnow 02] Deleuzian notions of identity destabilization are a disappearing act of the past experiences that Native subjecthood relies on. The 1AC is a process of forgetting that exorcises these spiritually present experiences of colonial domination—the 1AC is a site of Native erasure. Look at their Brians 11Wuthnow 02**

[Julie Wuthnow, University of Canterbury, "Deleuze in the postcolonial: On nomads and indigenous politics", 2002, Feminist Theory Sage publishing, pp 187 //Accessed 10/12/16 GK]

I begin with these starkly contrasting passages in order to give a sense of the wide gulf between the perspectives that I will need to negotiate in placing Deleuzian theory and some versions of indigenous politics in conversation with one another. Can they speak to one another at all? More specifically, are indigenous political struggles helped or hindered by what might be called a Deleuzian ‘anti-ontology’?1 I will argue that **Deleuzian frameworks are** potentially **counterproductive to effective indigenous politics and, moreover, that central notions of Deleuzian thinking, such as ‘nomad thought.’ can operate** to enact what Vandana Shiva has termed **a ‘politics of disappearance’ of local or indigenous knowledge systems** (Shiva, 1993: 9) and experiences, thereby **delegitimizing** the politics that might arise out of **those experiences and ways of knowing**. I come to this work as a political theorist most strongly influenced by a combination of Anglo-American feminism and poststructuralist theory, and I have a sense of belonging within the broad and ambiguous terrain captured by the terms postcolonial and cultural studies. What is significant here is that all of these affiliations are linked to fields of study that at least claim to have deeply political groundings and explicit commitments to social justice for all peoples. Thus, in my view, all those working within this broad area of study must be vigilant regarding the effects of their work within the social world in general and, more specifically for the purposes of this article, in the terrain of indigenous struggles; they must work to help rather than hinder these struggles if they are to be consistent with their founding principles. These various fields of study have also been both deeply influenced by, and important contributors to, the theoretical figurations associated with Poststructuralism referred to by Linda Tuhiwai Smith in the above quotation. Thus, I will consider not only the implications of Deleuzian theory for indigenous politics, but also feminist and postcolonial deployments of Deleuzian concepts by Rosi Braidotti and Paul Patton respectively, and the relationship those deployments might have to broad goals of social justice. I have chosen Deleuze in particular because of his clear impact on contemporary social and political theory. Even when he is not directly referred to, **Deleuze’s** persuasive elaborations of **concepts such as ‘nomad thought’, ‘bodies without organs’ and ‘rhizomes’ have led to a plethora of work within poststructuralist theorizing that strongly privileges notions of mobility, movement and becoming over conceptions of being, essence or stable subjectivity**.

**[Wuthnow 2] Your becoming cannot overcome the colonialism in your project and leads to the exclusion of indigenous epistemologies. Wuthnow 2**

[Julie Wuthnow, University of Canterbury, "Deleuze in the postcolonial: On nomads and indigenous politics", 2002, Feminist Theory Sage publishing, pp 187 //Accessed 10/12/16 GK]

In response to a similar critique by Dick Pels, Braidotti reiterates her position, yet with decidedly equivocal results**:** ‘**a location is an embedded and embodied memory**. It is a set of counter-memories which are **activated by the resisting thinker against the grain of the dominant representations of subjectivity**’ (Braidotti, 1999: 89). That a location would be an embedded and embodied memory does not seem problematic, yet it is worth asking why Braidotti positions these memories as necessarily *counter*-memories that ‘go against the grain’ of dominant representations. **This formulation seems to preclude the possibility that the nomadic subject might be positioned as a *privileged* subject** who may be **completely comfortable with hegemonic representations**. Such a **presumption of innocence is worrying and falls far short of locating this nomadic subject** according to the terms laid out by Rich. Braidotti makes a similar move a few pages later in relation to a discussion of accountability, where she refers to ‘a yearning or desire for change’ (1999: 92) embedded in the practice of accountability, which again seems to take for granted that the nomadic subject wishes for progressive political change. That any subject would necessarily be desirous of change with respect to aspects of identity that grant them privilege – for instance, whiteness – seems extremely dubious. While privileged subjects may indeed attempt to change or subvert aspects of identity that grant them privilege (for instance, Adrienne Rich’s attempts as a white woman to subvert white privilege), the path to such change is far from transparent or simple, and to presume that all such (feminist?) **subjects will necessarily attempt and succeed in disavowing privilege is both theoretically and practically untenable**

**[Wuthnow 3] Deconstructing binaries doesn’t solve – our alternative is historicization. That’s key to combat the state – this is in opposition to their openness to the future. Wuthnow 3**

[Julie Wuthnow, University of Canterbury, "Deleuze in the postcolonial: On nomads and indigenous politics", 2002, Feminist Theory Sage publishing, pp 187 //Accessed 10/12/16 GK]

But is the nomad’s ostensible deconstruction of binaries an adequate response to the task of undoing the violence based on these categorizations? A number of critics suggest otherwise. In *Questions of Travel*, Caren Kaplan calls for ‘versions of poststructuralism that destabilize colonial discourses as overtly as they deconstruct logocentrism’ (1996: 24). She also argues that postmodern/poststructuralist configurations may not be as far removed from their modernist forebears as one might assume, and refers to ‘[t]he interdependency of modernist and postmodernist techniques of representation’ (1996: 10). **In order to disrupt these unwitting reproductions of the modern and their concomitant associations with imperialist projects**, one of the strategies **Kaplan advocates is a historicization of terms such as ‘nomad’ and ‘traveller’ in order to discern their operation within colonialist discourses**. Radhika **Mohanram’s discussion of racialized embodiment begins to give a sense of why this task is important and what is at stake if it is neglected**. According to Mohanram, **disembodiment and mobility have a long history as significant features of constructions of the subjectivity of white settlers in colonial contexts**, something that becomes particularly evident **when they are juxtaposed with indigenous peoples constructed as embodied, immobile and objectified**: While the indigene’s body comes into being and is shaped by native bioregions, the settler as exotica spreads like a weed but becomes disembodied not only because he is not in his native bioregion, but also because the Europeanization of the Neo-Europes makes the European the Universal Subject. . . . The Caucasian is disembodied, mobile, absent of the marks that physically immobilize the native. (Mohanram, 1999: 15) **By failing to historicize the concept of mobility and its links to concrete practices of colonization, models of subjectivity that embrace nomad thought as a defining feature necessarily bring very problematic political baggage along for the ride**. As mobile and disembodied, the nomadic subject is not locatable; as unlocatable, the nomadic subject cannot be held accountable for its social location, whether it be one of privilege or marginalization.

## Case

#### Witchcraft as deviance is a Eurocentric impulse –

**VAN WYK Professor of Theology @ The Reformed Theological College @ U of Pretoria 2k4 “**African witchcraft in theological perspective” <https://hts.org.za/index.php/HTS/article/view/575>

Witchcraft has always been a major problem in Africa (Mönnich 1967:78-97; Sundkler 2000:94-95, 347, 358, 378). This statement is underlined by the fact that African Traditional Religion (ATR) and African healing practices have as one of their most important functions the struggle against witchcraft. This problem is one of the most fundamental problems of African existence. Older **scientific studies** on witchcraft (e g Mbiti 1985:195197 and Bosch 1987:42-43) include extensive reports on interviews with Africans enquiring about the reality and actual existence of witches and witchcraft. According to those **reports questions on** whether or not **witchcraft** is a reality, **are typical white man’s questions. Africans never ask such questions, because to them witches and witchcraft are part of their everyday reality.** Older and recent popular-scientific studies report extensively on the living reality of witchcraft or “black magic” (e g Campbell 1998:115-117; Holland 2001). Many lecturers at the various theological faculties and seminaries in South Africa (e g Van Niekerk 1992:44-64), including myself, can recount many stories of what they have personally witnessed in this regard or can recount what they have been told about witchcraft. **We also know that not only witchcraft, but also witch-hunts and witchkillings (killing of witches) have been a serious problem** in South Africa during the last decades. The following statistics highlight the enormity of the problem: In the Limpopo Province of South Africa 445 witchcraft-related cases were reported to the police between 1990 and 1995. During 1996 a total of 1,182 cases were reported; during 1998 a total number of 554 cases and between January and September 1999 a total number of 739 cases were reported. Between 1990 and 1994 over 300 people were killed, and between April 1994 and April 1995, 228 people were allegedly killed as a result of witchcraft accusations/suspicions (Minnaar 1991:54, Mashangoane 2001:489). In the year 2000, 1 300 witchcraft-related crimes were reported to the police in this province (SANPAD 2003:3). In the Bushbuckridge district in the Mpumalanga Province, 21 witches were violently attacked between 1971 and 1985. The comrades (politically motivated youth) attacked 10 witches between 1986 and 1989. Over Christmas time in 1990, 34 witches were attacked in a witch-hunt. In 1993, 8 people and in 1994, 9 people were accused of witchcraft (Niehaus 2001:202207). **The fact that many of these killings took place amidst an extremely unstable political situation, cannot be disputed and the political motives behind many of these murders cannot be disputed** (Niehaus 2001). Together with people such as Minnaar (1991) and Mihálik & Cassim (1993), **I am,** however, **convinced** **that the witch-killings** in South Africa **are not only to be explained in terms of political conflict. This problem is not only a problem characteristic of the struggle years against apartheid** in the former homelands of Lebowa, Gazankulu and Venda. **It problem is an everyday reality in many communities**

#### Appeals to witchcraft is cultural appropriation.

**Khan 17** [By Aysha Khan, 10/27/17"Is Tumblr witchcraft feminism – or cultural appropriation?," Religion News Service <https://religionnews.com/2017/10/27/is-tumblr-witchcraft-feminism-or-cultural-appropriation/> ghs-am]

 New York-based writer Jaya Saxena isn’t Wiccan. She’s no pagan, either. She grew up with a Hindu grandmother, attended a Quaker high school and has Jewish in-laws, but isn’t at all religious herself. Jaya Saxena is not a witch. So how did she end up publishing a guide to modern witchcraft? “We see ourselves as continuing a long line of unruly women,” Saxena explained. She and her “Basic Witches” co-author, Jess Zimmerman (an atheist who doesn’t believe in the occult or mysticism), aim to arm women – ordinary women who may scoff at spirituality or magic – with the subversive feminist powers of traditional witches. “We make no claim to the religious practice of Wicca, paganism or any other faith,” Saxena told RNS. “But we see the cultural image of a witch as a separate and valid identity.” That image is the kind of dark, witchy aesthetic you’ve probably seen while scrolling through Instagram or millennial women’s magazines. It’s the kind of empowered identity promoted in podcasts about toppling the patriarchy and Facebook posts about the radical importance of self-care. But even as these basic witches become increasingly popular, actual practitioners of magic still exist on the margins of society. And “real” witches, who’ve historically faced persecution and execution, aren’t all happy with the new trends. Critics say a perfect storm of Instagram-era online branding combined with leftist political posturing has made witchcraft the latest victim of cultural appropriation. In some ways, 2017’s witch obsession is nothing new. Those who grew up in the ’90s may remember TV shows like “Charmed” and “Sabrina the Teenage Witch.” There were, of course, the Harry Potter series’ Hermione Granger and Bellatrix Lestrange; and there were also Silver RavenWolf’s [guides](https://www.llewellyn.com/product.php?ean=9781567187250) to “Wicca for a new generation” and “practical witchcraft for the millennium.” But today’s digital witches are a little different. Many fuel their aesthetic with stylish Instagram accounts and overpriced sage sticks items sold at Urban Outfitters and magick Etsy shops. Take a minute to scroll through the [emoji spells](http://popculturewitches.tumblr.com/post/139227855349/emoji-spells-a-companion-to-my-post-emoji) and tarot card selfies on [Instagram](https://www.instagram.com/explore/tags/witch/) and [Tumblr](https://tumblr.com/tagged/witch)‘s #witch tags. Glance at blogs like those of 21-year-old [Maddie](https://closet-earth-witch.tumblr.com/), a “solitary Christian witch” from Utah, or 26-year-old [A.J.](http://stonesandsigils.tumblr.com/), who sells handmade tarot deck bags from her home in Boston. Check out the [School of Witchery](http://www.schoolofwitchery.net/) and other online classes like it. Or look at the [many](https://www.whitewitchbox.co.uk/) ([many](https://www.cratejoy.com/box-insider/10-magickal-subscriptions-for-the-witchy-woman/), [many](https://www.racked.com/2016/8/4/12250160/witch-subscription-boxes), [many](https://boxes.hellosubscription.com/subscriptions/wiccan-pagan-subscription-boxes/)) subscription boxes aimed at witchy millennials. For many young women, participating in online witchcraft communities – re-blogging spells, recommending essential oils, posting selfies with crystal collections – is a [digital shelter](https://psmag.com/news/why-is-digital-witchcraft-so-appealing-to-young-women), an alternative identity from the real world. And online witchcraft’s DIY culture paired with its innate sisterhood is compelling to young women. The numbers are growing offline, too. In her 2015 book, “Witches of America,” Alex Mar estimates there are some 1 million practitioners of witchcraft throughout the country. And a quick search will reveal [Meetups,](https://www.meetup.com/topics/witches/us/) [covens](http://www.witchvox.com/vn/gr/usco_gra.html) and witchy [bookstores](https://store.isisbooks.com/) sprinkled across the country. Berlin-based writer Mikaella Clements [divides](https://theestablishment.co/a-brief-history-of-the-tumblr-witch-8f30657849f) witches on the microblogging site Tumblr into three categories: Witches who are devoted to magic, not religion. They often share spell books, like a [love spell](http://birdywitch.tumblr.com/post/161352979354/love-spell-to-find-a-partner), and “kitchen witchery,” like a honey-lemon-ginger [tea](http://lindentea.tumblr.com/post/30330134011/paganthings-cdnpgn-winter-sore-throat-tea) for sore throats or a magical laundry [detergent](http://birdywitch.tumblr.com/post/161278383235/diy-magical-laundry-detergent-i-love-using). Clements points to Tumblr’s base among digital-savvy teens who tend to be disenchanted with religion. The witches who are religious, and affiliate themselves with Wicca or other neo-pagan spiritual paths. They tend to focus more on the nonpractical uses of magic: “good energy and the natural world, rather than any concrete potions or charms,” Clements said. The Tumblr witch, who Clements said is “tied up in intersectional feminism, in a desire to reclaim power, and to laugh as she does so.” She posts pentacles for the aesthetic, and exults in hipster consumerism. She is politically aware, as are many on Tumblr’s social justice-friendly platform, and embraces the iconography of the angry satanic witch with irreverent irony. Do the first and second covens count as cultural appropriation? Is removing the spirituality behind spells and pentacles the same as, say, wearing a Native American headdress to a music festival? Can you compare it to a white person wearing his hair in dreadlocks or an Afro? There’s a reason the witch’s aesthetic has captured the imaginations of young, digital-minded women. “Beneath all that glossy packaging hums the same idea that has tantalized girls for millennia,” Anne Theriault [writes](https://theestablishment.co/the-real-reason-women-love-witches-647d48517f66) on The Establishment. “The fact that to be a witch is to be a woman with power in a world where women are often otherwise powerless.” Sometimes that radical feeling of subverting society’s standards comes from hexes, crystals and herbs. For others, a dark lipstick and long black dress do the trick. Just as ideas of women’s empowerment and self-care have become [marketable consumer trends](http://inthesetimes.com/article/19272/marketplace-feminism-and-the-commodification-of-empowerment), so has witchcraft, coinciding with rising interest in yoga, meditation and sex positivity (a movement that embraces safe, consensual sex). And the markers that caused witches in 1600s Europe to be persecuted – singlehood, financial independence, providing for oneself with a well-stocked herb garden – tend to be things today’s young liberal feminists prize. Saxena said her book’s view of witchcraft focuses on “the tradition that people who were accused of witchcraft were typically undermining dominant power structures, whether it was because they were performing abortions or refusing to marry or generally not acting ‘ladylike.'” For her and Zimmerman, her co-author, a general interest in the occult as youths “morphed into something secular but meaningful in our lives.” When they realized many other people out there felt that same pull to witchcraft’s elements of feminism and self-empowerment, they ended up writing “Basic Witches.” Powerful women always have been feared and silenced as “witches.” Protestant reformer Martin Luther’s wife, a nun named Katharina von Bora, was [branded a witch](http://www.credomag.com/the-radical-marriage-of-katharina-and-martin-luther/) by many a biographer for hundreds of years after her death. Tens of thousands of supposed witches were executed in Europe from the 1300s to the 1600s. In the U.S., the Salem witch trials, at the tail end of that period, ended in the deaths of 20 people, 14 of them women. Now, women want to reclaim that power. In a year when some 5 million women exerted their power in the [Women’s March on Washington](https://www.womensmarch.com/) and in cities around the world, that power takes a political angle. Witches around the world have joined forces to serve justice to convicted rapist Brock Turner, whose light sentence turned the internet’s viral ire on him. In June 2016, witches from around the world organized a [mass hexing ceremony](https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/brock-turner-witch-hex_us_575af73be4b0e39a28ad754d) to turn Turner impotent and cause him the “constant pain of pine needles in (his) guts.” Witches also have grabbed headlines with [public hexes](https://www.vox.com/2017/6/20/15830312/magicresistance-restance-witches-magic-spell-to-bind-donald-trump-mememagic) on President Trump. The loosely organized “resistance witches,” including neo-pagans, activists and a diverse array of magic practitioners, number at least 13,000. They’re building on the legacy of socialist feminists involved in the 1960s Women’s International Terrorist Conspiracy from Hell (W.I.T.C.H.), who used their spellbinding powers to take on [patriarchy and capitalism](https://broadly.vice.com/en_us/article/43gd8p/wicked-witch-60s-feminist-protestors-hexed-patriarchy). Two years ago, liberal witchy women across the country launched revivals of W.I.T.C.H., hosting ritual performances to strengthen the rights to [housing](http://witchchicago.tumblr.com/2-6), [abortion](http://witchchicago.tumblr.com/6-3) and [education](http://witchchicago.tumblr.com/4-23). Along with their counterparts in [Portland, Ore.,](http://hautemacabre.com/2017/01/w-i-t-c-h-pdx-portland-brings-back-the-womens-international-terrorist-conspiracy-from-hell/) and other U.S. cities, the anonymous group has turned its powers toward “dismantling the white supremacist patriarchy” and fueling the #MagicalResistance against the current White House administration. But many actual practitioners of witchcraft weren’t thrilled with the headlines. They say they wouldn’t use their power to bring harm to another person — not even Trump. “There are people who want to bind or hurt or do work to make the injustices stop, and there are others who want to ‘shine the light’ so the person’s acts are exposed,” said Michelle Bowman, a co-organizer of the Women’s Spiritual Leadership Alliance’s [monthly forum](https://www.meetup.com/Conversations-in-Witchcraft/) on witchcraft. A Wiccan since the late ’90s, she also helps organize [Earth Temple](https://www.meetup.com/earthtemple/), an open Wiccan circle in the Denver area. “In Wicca, there’s the idea that actions have reactions. If you cast a binding spell on someone, then you yourself become bound in some way. I’m personally concerned about the cycle of consequences.”

#### Hauntological projects enable colonialism because it mythologizes colonialism and erases historical context. Their inherency argument is about erasure—means we turn the case
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In many ways, the affective domain related to a haunting aura is always implicated in such endeavors, particularly because of the complex colonial legacy still circulating in and between former imperialist centers and their peripheries. There is, on one hand, the imperative of an awareness of histories that have never been recorded, a desire to relate to that which is, and was made, other. Yet, there is also a widespread tendency in such endeavors to create monuments of the colonial, to transform it into a mythical and unproblematic domain, unproblematic precisely because it is always assumed to be so problematic, so utterly disruptive to the way we think of it.13 The hauntings of the colonial examined above include both of these tendencies. They do so because the obsessive desire to relate to the Other, to establish a “relational” form of memory through the image and memory of the colonial Other, often collapses into a type of thought that is ultimately not at all relational or plural and, moreover, hardly seems disruptive