# Space Witches CP

I agree with their fwk questioning masc concepts is good

Cornell defines Private entity: (A) In general Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, the term “private entity” means any person or private group, organization, proprietorship, partnership, trust, cooperative, corporation, or other commercial or nonprofit entity, including an officer, employee, or agent thereof.

*Definition: Private entity from 6 USC § 1501(15)(A)*. (n.d.). LII / Legal Information Institute. Retrieved January 21, 2022, from https://www.law.cornell.edu/definitions/uscode.php?width=840&height=800&iframe=true&def\_id=6-USC-625312480-168358316&term\_occur=999&term\_src=title:6:chapter:6:subchapter:I:section:1501

Allow space to act as an utopian future for witches. A place to explore and create instead of viewing space through the perspective of the rich white man.

Thaddeus-Johns 21, J. (2021, November 24). Space pagans and smartphone witches: Where tech meets mysticism. *The New York Times*. https://www.nytimes.com/2021/11/24/arts/design/technoshamanism-hmkv-germany.html

Treister’s neat, colorful works on paper feature flying saucers and stars laid out in a kabbalah tree-of-life diagram, and blueprints for imagined scientific systems and extraterrestrial architecture. As billionaires like Elon Musk and Jeff Bezos look to outer space as the next frontier for human expansion, Treister has imagined a utopian alternative: space exploration as a process in which rituals and visions play as much of a role as solar power and artificial intelligence. Many esoteric practices connect communities to a higher power, Arns said, which is why outer space features in so many contemporary artists’ explorations of spirituality. “It’s making a link between the microcosm and macrocosm,” she added, creating “an idea of a world that doesn’t only include the Earth.”

The counter plan is Space Witches. Witches as individuals as a private entity should be allowed to appropriate space. We appropriate the stars, the moon, and the solar system to create an all inclusive and future orientated horizon. This space exists outside the realm of the normative and on a fluid plane of shape shifting and creation. Space will act as a haven for witches. The affirmative rejects going to space because of the confines of the rich white man. Instead of being concerned with the money and actions of them let us freely explore. As long as they frame disclourse in the debate space as hetronormative we can never have any real change, the conversation needs to completely shit to enhjoying space. The neg solves for the harms of the afff by doing this and allowing witches in for different purposes of appropriating space that don’t perpetuate the harms of the aff.

Also their case is non-unique, the harms still continue on earth no matter what, redefining space doesn’t solve for oppersion or pain like allowing witches in space will.

#### **No solvency - Notions of one feminist project are universalizing and defeat the goals of diverse schools of feminist thought**

**Zalewski**, Head of the School of Social Science at Aberdeen University, **03** (Marysia, “’Women’s Troubles’ Again In IR”, Gender and International Relations, International Studies Review 5, 2003 JSTOR)//AS

We know **feminism is really feminisms. Its boundaries**, such as they exist, **are supple and pliant; its remit unbounded**. Yet, two conjoined practices endure within IR: one involves the restriction of feminism’s possibilities; the other relates to its necessary abandonment. Put another way, **despite the widespread acknowledgment of feminism’s unbridled diversity, the aspiration to confine it within distinct and ‘‘proper’’ parameters appears irresistible**, **evoking the ensuing logical affirmation that feminism is ultimately futile**. **Despite the lively controversy within feminism** regarding its relationship to and with ‘‘woman,’’ as Helen Kinsella notes in this forum, it is this category that draws the disciplinary attention of those who crave feminism’s containment. **Feminism becomes, simply, about wome**n. As Charli Carpenter (2002:159) comments, ‘‘**feminist approaches, even though rich, diverse, and a much needed critique- , are substantively narrow as their emphasis is women**.’’ **Similar references to ‘‘the’’ feminist project** (Carpenter, this forum), or feminism’s ‘‘focus on women’’ (Carver, this forum), **or that ‘‘feminism is an on-going political project about gender oppression’’** (Carver, this forum**) reinforce the vision of feminism’s limitations.**

**Even the most inclusive feminist theories are constrained by their female focus—dooms alt to failure**

**Jones**, political scientist, writer, and photojournalist based at the [University of British Columbia Okanagan](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/University_of_British_Columbia_Okanagan), **96** (Adam, “Does 'Gender' Make the World Go Round? Feminist Critiques of International Relations”, Review of International Studies 22:4, October 1996, JSTOR)//AS

**I have suggested that the most important, and surely a lasting, contribution of  feminist critiques has been to add a gender dimension to analyses of international  relations. Few scholars will be able, in future, to analyze international divisions of  labour, or peace movements, or (pace Enloe) the activities of international diplo  mats, without attending to feminist perspectives on all these phenomena.  But feminists' success in exploring the gender variable remains, at this point,  mixed. And until feminist frameworks are expanded and to some extent reworked, it  is hard to see how a persuasive theory or account of the gendering of international  relations can be constructed.  Feminist attempts to incorporate a gender variable into IR analysis are con  strained by the basic feminist methodology and all feminists' normative commit  ments. A genuinely 'feminist approach' by definition 'must take women's lives as the  epistemological starting point'.53 And a defining element of feminist approaches, as  noted earlier, is a social project aimed at ameliorating women's structured lack of  privilege and emancipating them as a gender-class.  The result is a defacto equating of gender primarily with females/femininity. It is,  in its way, a new logocentrism, whereby (elite) male actions and (hegemonic) mas  culinity are drawn into the narrative mainly as independent variables explaining'gender' oppression. Even those works that have adopted the most inclusive  approach to gender, such as Peterson and Runyan's Global Gender Issues, betray this  leaning. Peterson and Runyan do acknowledge that 'our attention to gender . . .  tends to underplay the considerable differences among men and among women', and  note that 'it is not only females but males as well who suffer from rigid gender  roles'.54 For the most part in their analysis, though, 'gender issues' are presented as  coequal with women's issues. The plight of embodied women is front and centre  throughout, while theattention paid to the male/masculine realm amounts to little  more than lip-service.**

#### **The Aff attaches meaning to the ballot and creates an optimistic relationship to the object. This produces a cruel fantasy of solvency around a meaningless paper.**

**Berlant, U-Chicago, “Cruel Optimism” 11:**

**(Berlant, Lauren. University of Chicago. “Cruel Optimism” Duke University Press. 2011. Pgs. 2)**

**Whatever the experience of optimism is in particular, then,** **the affective structure of** **an** **optimistic attachment involves a** **sustaining inclination to return to the scene of** **fantasy that enables you to expect** **that this time, nearness to this thing will help you or a world to become different in just the right way.** **But, again,** **optimism is cruel when the object/scene** **that ignites a sense of possibility actually makes it impossible to attain** **the expansive transformation** **for which a person or a people risks striving;** **and doubly, it is** **cruel insofar as the very pleasures of being inside a relation having become sustaining** **regardless of the content of the relation,** **such that a person or a world finds itself bound to a situation of profound threat that is, at the same time,** **profoundly confirming.**

#### **The Aff presents their communication in this room hoping that we can collectively create a better world. This produces a relation of cruel optimism with the political.**

**Berlant, U-Chicago, “Cruel Optimism” 11:**

**(Berlant, Lauren. University of Chicago. “Cruel Optimism” Duke University Press. 2011. Pgs. 226-227)**

**Public spheres are always affect worlds, worlds to which people are bound, when they are, by affective projections of a constantly negotiated common interestedness. But an intimate public is more specific. In an intimate public one senses that** **matters of survival are at stake and** **that** **collective meditation through narration and audition might provide some routes out of** **the impasse and the struggle of** **the present, or at least some sense that there would be recognition were the participants in the room together.** **An intimate public promises the sense of being held in its penumbra. You do not need to audition for membership in it. Minimally, you need just to perform audition, to listen and to be interested in the scene’s visceral impact. You might have been drawn to it because of a curiosity about something minor, unassociated with catastrophe, like knitting or collecting something, or having a certain kind of sexuality, only after which it become a community of support, offering tones of suffering, humor, and cheerleading. Perhaps an illness led to seeking out a community of survival tacticians. In either case, any person can contribute to an intimate public a personal story about not being defeated by what is overwhelming. More likely, though, participants take things in and sometimes circulate what they hear, captioning them with opinion or wonder. But they do not have to do anything to belong. They can be passive and lurk, deciding when to appear and disappear, and consider the freedom to come and go the exercise of sovereign freedom.**

**Indeed, in liberal societies, freedom includes freedom from the obligation to pay attention to much, whether personal or political- no-one is obliged to be conscious or socially active in their modes and scenes of belonging. For many this means that political attention is usually something delegated and** **politics is** **something overheard,** **encountered indirectly and unsystematically, through** **a kind of** **communication** **more akin to gossip than to cultivated rationality. But there is nothing fundamentally passive or superficial in overhearing the political. What hits a person encountering the dissemination of news about power has nothing to do with how thorough or cultivated their knowledge is or how they integrate the impact into living.** **Amidst all the chaos, crisis, and injustice in front of us, the desire for alternative filters that produce the sense- of not the scene-** **of a more livable and intimate sociality is another name for the desire for the political.**

**This is why** **an intimate attachment to the political can amount to a relation of cruel optimism.** **I have argued throughout this book that an optimistic attachment is cruel when** **the object/scene** **of desire is itself an obstacle** **to fulfilling the very wants that bring people to it: but is life-organizing status can trump interfering with the damage it provokes. It may be a relation of cruel optimism, when,** **despite an awareness that the normative political sphere appears as a shrunken, broken, or distant place of activity among elites, members of the body politic return** **periodically to its recommitment ceremonies and scenes. Voting is one thing; collective caring, listening, and scanning the airwaves, are others. All of** **these modes of orientation and having a feeling about it** **confirm our attachment to the system and thereby confirm the stem and** **the legitimacy of the** **affects that make one feel bound to it,** **even if the manifest content of the binding has the negative force of cynicism or** **the dark attenuation of political depression.**

#### **First, Solvency Takeout: cruel optimism solidifies relations of oppression. This passivity cannot solve.**

**Berlant, U-Chicago, “Cruel Optimism” 11:**

**(Berlant, Lauren. University of Chicago. “Cruel Optimism” Duke University Press. 2011. Pgs. 43)**

**This means that the object of cruel optimism here appears as the thing within any object to which one passes one’s fantasy of sovereignty for safe-keeping. In cruel optimism the subject or community turns its treasured attachments into safety-deposit objects** **that make it possible to bear sovereignty through its distribution, the energy of feeling relational, general, reciprocal, and accumulative. In circulation** **one becomes happy** **in an ordinary, often lovely, way, because the weight of being in the world is** **being** **distributed** **into space, time, noise, and other beings. When one’s sovereignty is delivered back into one’s hands, though, its formerly distributed weight becomes apparent, and the subject becomes stilled in a perverse mimesis of its enormity. In a relation of cruel optimism our activity is revealed as a vehicle for attaining** **a kind of** **passivity, as evidence of the desire to find forms in relation to which we can sustain a coasting sentience, in response to being too alive.**

#### **Second, Case TURN: Cruel Optimism reproduces normativity and causes further repetitions of oppression. This locks us into a relation of living death.**

**Berlant, U-Chicago, “Cruel Optimism” 11:**

**(Berlant, Lauren. University of Chicago. “Cruel Optimism” Duke University Press. 2011. Pgs. 180)**

**The desire for a less-bad life involves finding resting places; the reproduction of normativity occurs when rest is imagined nostalgically- that is, in the places where rest is supposed to have happened, a fantasy masquerading as screen memory or paramnesia. One might read these repetitions as nostalgia for nostalgia, a kind of desperate regression toward the desire to soon experience an imaginary security one knows without having ever had, and fair enough; but normativity where there is no foundation for the expectation of it beyond a lasting fantasy can also be read as a form of bargaining with what is overwhelming about the present, a bargaining against the fall between the cracks, the living death of repetition that’s just one step above the fall into death by drowning or by hitting the concrete at full speed. It’s a mode of living-on with the dread of an eternal present that gets drowned out by the noise of promised normativity’s soothing bustle. This is an empirical question as well as a theoretical one, but one of the empirical questions is about the transmission, content, form, and force of fantasy. For in order for normative conservatism to take[s] hold in fantasy, or in order for fantasy to join ideology, somewhere in there the children learn to fantasize that the bad life that threatens impossibility or death could be the good life that must materialize from all this labor. The intensity of the need to feel normal is created by economic conditions of nonreciprocity that are mimetically reproduced in households that try to maintain the affective forms of middle-class exchange while having an entirely different context of anxiety and economy to manage. What is it in the relation of fantasy to the everyday that enjambs the children in shaky fidelity to a practice of intimacy whose manifestation in their own lives could easily have produced their rejection of it?**