1) The disad: The witch and the universe. **Courtney Weber** writes:

**“I don’t recall if the moon was full**, a quarter, or a sliver, **but** I remember that **something** **on that dark**, sticky **night felt different.** It was as though **the moon looked right at me,** perhaps as if it had been waiting for me. **I raised my wine to the moon** and said, “Okay, I’m; yours.” It’s the simple moments that really change us. I didn’t know it then, but **I was meeting Hekate - the goddess of the crossroads, of the moon**, of ghosts and crops, **and of Witches.** **In the** nearly **twenty years since that** unassuming but **powerful night, I’ve honored Hekate** in rituals both intimate and packed. I’ve sought her to bless deceased loved ones, and sung her songs when euthanizing beloved pets. **I prayed to her in the thin hours of the morning** when our new, frightened puppy howled. **I have** ordained two priestesses dedicated to this strange and wonderful goddess, and have **witnessed how she** has **transformed** their **lives**. **She is** known as **a goddess of death**, one who guards souls in the underworld, whose symbols include the black dog, the whip, and the dagger. She is known as **the keeper of the crossroads, a goddess who helps those experiencing transition.** She is called the key holder or torchbearer , the one who opens doors and reveals secrets, **a goddess of the cosmos who holds mysteries beyond our** modern **understanding.** She is associated with the depths of the sea, **the stars of the night, and the fertile earth.”**

Weber, Courtney. *Hekate: Goddess of Witches.* Weiser Books, 2021.

Witches don’t critique, they create. The witch’s stance isn’t to point out that it’s bad for men to try to mine asteroids; the witch doesn’t concern herself/theirself with the petty material goals of old white industrialists. The witch takes ownership of space and partnership with space; Hekate is the goddess of witches and the Goddess of the cosmos. Some billionaire who wants to mine gold on an asteroid has no idea what it means to appropriate space - to become a part of the infinite. That is the mind-space of the witch, and it rejects this affirmative.

2) Thus the counteradvocacy: Space is for witches. We appropriate the sun, the moon, the stars and planets, and the earth. They are the basis of our divine interaction, of our transformation, of our connection to each other and to the Goddess of Witches. This is the soul of transformation.

Affirming and rejecting our connection to space because we’re concerned with what rich white men will waste their time and money on contradicts the role of the ballot. The witch transcends economic concerns: the witch holds, occupies, and is one with the cosmos.

The mutability and infinitude of space is the representation of the witch’s power to transform; to transcend binaries. The aff by rejecting the appropriation of space out of concern for what the rich men will do is re-inscribing those binaries: is allowing herself/theriself to be shaped and controlled by the rich men and their projects.

Perms can’t function because the advocacy is literally mutually exclusive.

**The aff’s performance re-entrenches the capitalist system – focus on individualism reinforces fake radicalism where people use creative works to feel radical while failing to enact material change.**

**Dean 12** *The Communist Horizon*. Jodi Dean. 2012. AQ. Accessed 06/28/19.  I can give you the PDF.

The boundaries to what can be thought as politics in certain segments of the post-structuralist and anarchist Left only benefit capital. Some activists and **theorists think** that **micropolitical activities**, whether practices of self-cultivation or individual consumer choices, **are more important** loci of action **than large-scale** organized **movement**-an assumption which **adds to** the **difficulty of building** new types of organizations because it makes thinking in terms of **collectivity** rarer, harder, and seemingly less "fresh." Similarly, some **activists** and theorists **treat** aesthetic objects and **creative works as displaying** a political **potentiality** missing from classes, parties, and unions. This **aesthetic focus disconnects politics from** the **organized stmggle of working people**, **making politics into what spectators see. Artistic prod ucts**, whether actual commodities or commodified experiences, thereby **buttress capital as they circulate** political **affects while displacing political struggles from** the **streets to** the **galleries**. **Spectators** can **pay** (or donate) **to feel radical without having to get** their **hands dirty.** The **dominant class retains** its **position** and the contradiction between this class and the rest of us doesn't make itself felt as such. The **celebration of momentary actions** and singular happenings-the playful dismption, the temporarily controversial film or novel-works the same way. Some on the anarchist and post-stmcturalist Left treat these flickers as the only proper instances of a contemporary left politics. A pointless action involving the momentary expenditure of enormous effort-the a11istic equivalent of the 5k and lOk runs to fight cancer, that is to say, to increase awareness of cancer without actually doing much else-the **singular happening disconnects task from goal**. Any "sense" it makes, any meaning or relevance it has, is up to the spectator (perhaps with a bit of guidance from curators and theorists). Occupation contrasts sharply with the singular hap pening. Even as specific occupations emerge from below rather than through a coordinated strategy, their common form-including its images, slogans, terms, and practices-links them together in a mass struggle. The power of the return of communism stands or falls on its capacity to inspire large-scale organized collective struggle toward a goal. For over thirty years, the **Left** has eschewed such a goal, **accep**ting instead liberal notions **that goals are strictly individual** life style **choices** or social-democratic claims that history already solved basic problems of distribution with the compromise of regulated markets and welfare states a solution the Right rejected and capitalism destroyed. The **Left failed to defend** a **vision of** a **better world,** an egalitruian world of common production by and for the collective people. Instead, **it accommodated capital, succumbing to** the lmes of **individualism**, consumer ism, competition, and privilege, and proceeding as if there really were no alternative to states that rule in the interests of mru·kets.

**Capitalism is a system engendering massive violence and inevitable extinction – the foundational task is to find a way out – the Role of the Ballot is to endorse the best organizational tactics.**

**Badiou ‘18**

[Alain, former chair of philosophy at the Ecole Normale Superiure, professor of philosophy at The European Graduate School. Translated by David Broder. 07/30/2018. “The Neolithic, Capitalism, and Communism,” <https://www.versobooks.com/blogs/3948-the-neolithic-capitalism-and-communism>] pat

Today, it has become commonplace to predict the end of the human race such as we know it. There are various reasons for such forecasts. According to a messianic kind of environmentalism, the excessive predations of a beastly humanity will soon bring about the end of life on Earth. Meanwhile, those who instead point to runaway technological advances prophesy, indiscriminately, the automation of all work by robots, grand developments in computing, automatically-generated art, plastic-coated killers, and the dangers of a super-human intelligence.

Suddenly, we see the emergence of threatening categories like transhumanism and the post-human — or, their mirror image, a return to our animal state — depending on whether one prophesies on the basis of technological innovation or laments all the attacks on Mother Nature.

For me, all such prophesies are just so much ideological noise, intended to obscure the real peril that humanity is today exposed to: that is to say, **the impasse that globalised capitalism is leading us into**. In fact, it is this form of society — and it alone — which permits the destructive exploitation of natural resources, precisely because it connects this exploitation to the boundless quest for private profit. The fact that so many species are endangered, that climate change cannot be controlled, that water is becoming like some rare treasure, is all a by-product of the merciless competition among billionaire predators. There is no other reason for the fact that scientific innovation is subject to the question of what technologies can sell, in an anarchic selection mechanism.

Environmentalist preaching does sometimes use persuasive descriptions of what is going on — despite the exaggerations typical of the prophet. But most of the time this becomes mere propaganda, useful for those states who want to show their friendly face. Just as it is for the multinationals who would have us believe — to the greater benefit of their balance sheets — in the noble, fraternal, natural purity of the commodities they are trafficking.

The fetishism of technology, and the unbroken series of "revolutions" in this domain — of which the "digital revolution" is the most in vogue — has constantly spread the beliefs both that this will take us to the paradise of a world without work — with robots to serve us, and us left to idle — and then, on the other hand, that digital "thought" will crush the human intellect. Today there is not one magazine that does not inform its astonished readers of the imminent "victory" of artificial over natural intelligence. But in most cases neither "nature" nor the "artificial" are properly or clearly defined.

Since the origins of philosophy, the question of the real scope of the word "nature" has been constantly posed. "Nature" could mean the romantic reverie of evening sunsets, the atomic materialism of Lucretius (De natura rerum), the inner being of things, Spinoza’s Totality (Deus sive Natura), the objective underside of all culture, rural and peasant surroundings as counterposed to the suspicious artificiality of the towns ("the earth does not lie," as Marshal Pétain put it), biology as distinct from physics, cosmology as compared to the tiny location that is our planet, the invariance of centuries as compared to the frenzy of innovation, natural sexuality as compared to perversion… I am afraid that today "nature" most of all refers to the calm of the villa and the garden, the charm wild animals have for tourists, and the beach or the mountains where we can spend a nice summer. Who, then, can imagine man responsible for nature, when thus far he has just been a thinking flea on a secondary planet in an average solar system at the edge of one banal galaxy?

Since its origins philosophy has also devoted a great deal of thought to Technology, or the Arts. The Greeks meditated on the dialectic of Techne and Physis — a dialectic within which they situated the human animal. They laid the ground for this animal to be seen as "a reed, the weakest of nature, but … a thinking reed." For Pascal, this meant that humanity was stronger than Nature and closer to God. A long time ago, they saw that the animal capable of mathematics would do great things to the order of materiality.

Are these "robots" which they keep banging on about anything more than calculation in the form of a machine? Digits in motion? We know that they can count quicker than us, but it was we who invented them, precisely in order to fulfil this task. It would be stupid to look at a crane raising a concrete pillar up to some great height, use this to argue that man is incapable of the same feat, and then conclude by saying that some muscular, superhuman giant has emerged… Lightning-quick counting is not the sign of an insuperable "intelligence" either. Technological transhumanism plays the same old tune — an inexhaustible theme of horror and sci-fi movies — of the creator overwhelmed by his own creation. It does so either thrilled about the advent of the superman — something we have been expecting ever since Nietzsche — or fearing him and taking refuge under the skirt of Gaia, Mother Nature.

Let’s put things in a bit more perspective.

For four or five millennia, humanity has been organised by the triad of private property — which concentrates enormous wealth in the hands of very narrow oligarchies; the family, in which fortunes are transmitted via inheritance; and the state, which protects both property and the family by armed force. This triad defined our species’ Neolithic age, and we are still at this point — we could even say, now more than ever. **Capitalism is the contemporary form of the Neolithic**. Its enslavement of technology in the interests of competition, profit and concentrating capital only raises to their fullest extension the monstrous inequalities, the social absurdities, the murderous wars, and the damaging ideologies that have always accompanied the deployment of new technology under the reign of class hierarchy throughout history.

We should be clear that technological inventions were the preliminary conditions of the arrival of the Neolithic age, and by no means its result. If we consider our species’ fate, we see that sedentary agriculture, the domestication of cattle and horses, pottery, bronze, metallic weapons, writing, nationalities, monumental architecture, and the monotheist religions are inventions at least as important as the airplane or the smartphone. Throughout history, whatever has been human has always, by definition, been artificial. If that had not existed, there would not have been Neolithic humanity — the humanity we know — but a permanent close proximity with animal life; something which did indeed exist, in the form of small nomadic groups, for around 200,000 years.

A fearful and obscurantist primitivism has its roots in the fallacious concept of "primitive communism." Today we can see this cult of the ancient societies in which babies, men, women and the elderly supposedly lived in fraternity, without anything artificial, and indeed lived in common with the mice, the frogs, and the bears. Ultimately, all this is nothing but ridiculous reactionary propaganda. For everything suggests that the societies in question were extremely violent. After all, even their most basic survival needs were constantly under threat.

To speak fearfully of the victory of the artificial over the nature, of robot over man, is today an untenable regression, something truly absurd. It is easy enough to answer such fears, such prophesies. For judged by this standard, even a simple axe, or a domesticated horse, not to mention a papyrus covered in symbols, is an exemplary case of the post- or trans-human. Even an abacus allows quicker calculation than the fingers of the human hand.

Today we need neither a return to primitivism, or fear of the "ravages" the advent of technology might bring. Nor is there any use in morbid fascination for the science-fiction of all-conquering robots. **The urgent task we face is the methodical search for a way out of the Neolithic order**. This latter has lasted for millennia, valuing only competition and hierarchy and tolerating the poverty of billions of human beings. It must be surpassed at all cost. Except, that is, the cost of the high-tech wars so well known to the Neolithic age, in the lineage of the wars of 1914-1918 and 1939-1945, with their tens of millions of dead. And this time it could be a lot more.

The problem is not technology, or nature. The problem is how to organise societies at a global scale. We need to posit that a non-Neolithic way of organising society is possible. This means no private ownership of that which ought to be held in common, namely the production of all the necessities of human life. It means no inherited power or concentration of wealth. No separate state to protect oligarchies. No hierarchical division of labour. No nations, and no closed and hostile identities. A collective organisation of everything that is in the collective interest.

All this has a name, indeed a fine one: communism. Capitalism is but the final phase of the restrictions that the Neolithic form of society has imposed on human life. It is the final stage of the Neolithic. Humanity, that fine animal, must make one last push to break out of a condition in which 5,000 years of inventions served a handful of people. For almost two centuries — since Marx, anyway — we have known that we have to begin the new age. An age of technologies incredible for all of us, of tasks distributed equally among all of us, of the sharing of everything, and education that affirms the genius of all. May this new communism everywhere and on every question stand up against the morbid survival of capitalism. This capitalism, this seeming "modernity," represents a Neolithic world that has in fact been going on for five millennia. And that means that it is old — far too old.

**Vote neg to join the party – dual power organizing is the only path to revolutionary change.**

**Escalante ‘18**

[Alyson, philosophy at U of Oregon. 08/24/2018. “Against Electoralism, For Dual Power!” <https://theforgenews.org/2018/08/24/against-electoralism-for-dual-power/>] pat

I am sure that at this point, the opportunists reading this have already begun to type out their typical objection: the world is different than it was in 1917, and the conditions of the United States in no way echo the conditions which enabled the Bolsheviks to achieve revolutionary success.

To this tried and true objection, there is one simple answer: **you are entirely correct, and that is why we need to abandon electoralism and working within the bourgeois state**.

What were the conditions which allowed the Bolsheviks to successfully revolt? The conditions were that of Dual Power. Alongside the capitalist state, there existed a whole set of institutions and councils which met the needs of the workers. The soviets, a parallel socialist government made up of individual councils, successfully took over many governmental responsibilities in some parts of Petrograd. In the radical Viborg district, the Bolshevik controlled soviets provided government services like mail, alongside programs that could meet the needs of workers. When a far right coup was attempted against the provisional government, it was troops loyal to the Bolshevik factions within the soviet who repelled the coup plotters, proving concretely to the workers of Petrograd that the socialists could not only provide for their needs, but also for their defense.

In short: the Bolsheviks recognized that instead of integrating into the bourgeois state, they could operate outside of it to build dual power. They could establish programs of elected representatives who would serve the workers. **They would not bolster the capitalist state in the name of socialism, they would offer an alternative to it**.

And so, when the time came for revolt, the masses were already to loyal to the Bolsheviks. The only party who had never compromised, who had denounced the unpopular imperialist wars, who had rejected the provisional government entirely, was the party who successfully gained the support of the workers.

And so, many of us on the more radical fringes of the socialist movement wonder why it is the the DSA and other socialist opportunists seem to think that we can win by bolstering the capitalist state? We wonder, given this powerful historical precedent, why they devote their energy to getting more Ocasios elected; **what good does one more left democrat who will abandon the workers do for us?**

The answer we receive in return is always the same: we want to win small changes that will make life for the workers easier; we want to protect food stamps and healthcare.

And do this, we reply: what makes you think reformism is the only way to do this. When the bourgeois state in California was happy to let black children go to school unfed, the Black Panthers didn’t rally around democratic candidates, they became militant and fed the children themselves. In the 40s and 50s, socialists in New York saw people going without healthcare and instead of rallying behind democratic candidates, they built the IWO to provide healthcare directly. Both these groups took up our pressing revolutionary task: building dual power.

Imagine if all those hours the DSA poured into electing Ocasio were instead used to feed the people of New York, to provide them with medical care, to ensure their needs were met. Imagine the masses seeing socialism not as a pipe dream we might achieve through electing more imperialists, but as a concrete movement which is currently meeting their needs?

The fact is, we are not nearly ready for revolution. Socialists in the United States have failed to meet the needs of the people, and as long as their only concrete interaction with the masses is handing them a voter registration form, they will continue to fail the people. Our task now is not to elect representatives to advocate for the people; it is much more gruelingly laborious than that. **Our task is to serve the people**. Our task is to build dual power.

The movement to do this is underway. Members of the DSA refoundation caucus have begun to move the left of the DSA in this direct, socialist groups like Philly Socialists have begun to build dual power through GED programs and tenants unions, many branches of the **P**arty For **S**ocialism and **L**iberation have begun to feed the people and provide for their concrete needs, and Red Guard collectives in Los Angeles have built serve the people programs and taken on a stance of militant resistance to gentrification. The movement is growing, its time is coming, and dual power is achievable within our life time.

The opportunists are, in a sense, correct. We are not where we were in 1917, but we can begin to move in that direction and dual power can take us there. In order to achieve dual power we have to recognize that Lenin was right: there will be no socialist gains by working within state institutions designed to crush socialism. Furthermore, we must recognize that the strategies of the electoral opportunists trade off with dual power. Electing candidates drains resources, time, and energy away from actually serving the people.

And so, we should commit to undertake the difficult and dangerous task of building dual power. We must reject opportunism, we must name the democratic party as our enemy, we must rally around power directly in the hands of the socialist movement. We do not have a parallel system of soviets in the United States. We can change that. Someday the cry “all power to the soviets” will be heard again. Lets make it happen.

TURN: **Space’s lack of inhabitants and ecological problems solves the vast majority of their criticism – but it segregates the capitalists from ruining space and generates enough resources to make the planet’s surface into a Communist utopia**