**Part One-Links**

**A.** Although the affirmative sympathizes with the victim’s plight, in narrowing the debate to how *victims* can overcome the oppression of intimate relationship violence they construct domestic violence as a private problem, and ignore the social and cultural problems that lie at the root of spousal aggression. Berns[[1]](#footnote-1): “**An individual frame of responsibility focus[es] primarily on** the victim. A prevalent question in these articles is **"Why** do **battered women remain in the abusive relationship? "**In these articles, the victim may not always be blamed explicitly for the violence or for staying in the relationship. Indeed, many articles focus on the victim in a sympathetic manner, such as by giving her credit for leaving the abusive relation- ship, changing her behavior, or seeking counseling. However, **the focus-and thus the responsibility-remains on the victim** rather than the batterer. Explanations for why women stay in abusive relationships often mention institutional and social barriers; however, these perspectives still place responsibility on the individual **rather than on society or specific institutions. There is no advice on how society can change to help the victim. Rather, the victim must overcome these obstacles.”** *[Specific AC Links to how victim can overcome DV]*

**B.** Describing the victimization of one human being by their intimate partner as “domestic violence” entrenches the notion that intimate relationship violence is a private matter restricted to the confines of the household or family unit. Holmes[[2]](#footnote-2) explains: “**A central tenet of the dominant Western feminist discourse about violence against women is that intimate relationship violence is hidden through the construct of privacy of the domestic sphere of the heterosexual home. The term ‘domestic violence’** (although not universallyapplied) also **conveys the idea that****intimate relationship****violence occurs in private in the home.”** *[Additional AC Links to definition of DV]*

**C.** The affirmative strategy of pigeonholing the resolutional conflict to the actions of a discrete and singular victim and a similarly atomic abuser engenders a discussion of domestic violence devoid of social context or reference to the institutions and cultural practices that define and reproduce that violence. *[Specific AC Links to AC’s conception of ethical subject/victim]*

**Part Two-Impacts**

**A.** The affirmative’s portrayal of domestic violence as a private matter shrouds the real problem at stake. An authentic reckoning with the ethical conflict over victims who kill must start with the recognition that domestic violence is rooted in the deep-structures of heteronormative male dominance that characterize many social norms. Randall[[3]](#footnote-3):

“At the micro level, **men's violence against women in intimate relationships expresses the greater social power and control** they wield; powerwhich isalso **structured and entrenched at the macro-level of social relations**,in terms of their overrepresentation in most positions of power and authority, including in the economic and political spheres. **Gendered violence** is a phenomenon that **emerges from and reinforces women's subordinate status in society.** This has been recognized by the Supreme Court of Canada in cases including R. v. Seaboyer, Janzen v. Platy Enterprises,[n21](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.baylor.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1328774944666&returnToKey=20_T13893748061&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633797.1588560307" \l "n21) and R. v. Osolin.[n22](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.baylor.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1328774944666&returnToKey=20_T13893748061&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.633797.1588560307" \l "n22) As Justice L'Heureux-Dube remarked in Seaboyer, "perhapsmore than any other crime; **the fear and constant reality of** sexual **assault affects how women conduct their lives and** how they **define their relationship with** the larger **society.**” Yet the concepts "power and control" can nevertheless run the risk of being understood in overly individualized terms if they are not linked to an analysis of the social relations of gender, specifically of the ways in which this **violence expresses** the **imbalances of power embedded in** those **social relations of inequality.** While attention to the factors which make some men act out violence towards women while others do not is of crucial importance, the larger point I am making here is that **the problem of men's violence against women** is too pervasive to be understood as a pathology of a few individual men. Instead, it **must be analyzed within the context of the larger patterns of presumed male entitlement, authority, and power.”**

It is impossible to understand intimate violence absent the social context that defines and sustains it; gender inequality in the workplace and cultural norms like “women should be caretakers” are part and parcel of any definition of domestic violence. Thus, the affirmative’s representation of domestic violence as a private problem destroys debaters and the judge's ability to properly frame and understand the issue of domestic violence by omitting to account for the social patterns and institutions that create the conditions for domestic violence. Resolution of this representational issue is a prerequisite to engaging in any meaningful argumentation. Crawford[[4]](#footnote-4):

Coherent arguments **are unlikely to take place** **unless** and until **actors,** at least on some level, **agree on what they are arguing about.** The at least temporary **resolution of meta-arguments- regarding** the nature of the good (the content of prescriptive norms); what is out there, the way we know the world, how we decide between competing beliefs (ontology and epistemology); and the nature of the situation at hand**(the proper frame or representation**)- must occur before specific arguments that could lead to decision and action may take place. Meta-arguments over epistemology and ontology, relatively rare, occur in instances where there is a fundamental clash between belief systems and not simply a debate within a belief system. Such arguments over the nature of the world and how we come to know it are particularly rare in politics though they are more frequent in religion and science. Meta-arguments over the “good” are contests over what it is good and right to do, and even how we know the good and the right. They are about the nature of the good, specifically, defining the qualities of “good” so that we know good when we see it and do it. Ethical arguments are about how to do good in a particular situation. More common are meta-arguments over representations or frames- about how we out to understand a particular situation. Sometimes actors agree on how they see a situation. More often there are different possible interpretations. Thomas Homer-Dixon and Roger karapin suggest, “Argument and debate occur when people try to gain acceptance for their interpretation of the world”. For example, “is the war defensive or aggressive?”. Defining and controlling representations and images, or the frame, affects whether one thinks there is an issue at stake and whether a particular argument applies to the case. An actor fighting a defensive war is within international law; an aggressor may legitimately be subject to sanctions. Framing and reframing involve mimesis or putting forward representations of what is going on. In mimetic meta-arguments, actors who are struggling to characterize or frame the situation to accomplish their ends by drawing vivid pictures of the “reality”through exaggeration, analogy, or differentiation.Representations of a situation do not re-produce accurately so much as they creatively re-present situations in a way that makes sense. “mimesis is a metaphoric or ‘iconic argumentation of the real.’ Imitating not the effectivity of events but their logical structure and meaning.”Certain features are emphasized and others de-emphasized or completely ignored as their situation is recharacterized or reframed. **Representation** thus becomes [is] a “constraint on reasoning in that it limits understanding to a specific organization of conceptual knowledge.” **The dominant representation delimits which arguments will be considered legitimate, framing how actors see possibilities**. As Roxanne Doty argues, “the possibility of practices presupposes the ability of an agent to imagine certain courses of action. Certain background meanings, kinds of social actors and relationships, must already be in place.” If, as Donald Sylvan and Stuart Thorson argue, “politics involves the selective privileging of representations, “it may not matter whether one representation or another is true or not. Emphasizing whether frames articulate accurate or inaccurate perceptions misses the rhetorical import of representation- how frames affect what is seen or not seen, and subsequent choices.Meta-arguments over representation are thus crucial elements of political argumentbecause an actor’s arguments about what to do will be more persuasive if their characterization or framing of the situation holds sway**.** But, as Rodger Payne suggests, “No frame is an omnipotent persuasive tool that can be decisively wielded by norm entrepreneurs without serious political wrangling.” Hence framing is a meta-argument.

Since the AC’s flawed representation of domestic violence makes an accurate discussion of the resolution impossible in this particular round, the only recourse is to vote negative in an effort to bring the true nature of domestic violence to light.

**B.** Conceiving of domestic violence as part of the private sphere, or an abnormality far removed from “normal society,” creates a self-fulfilling prophecy whereby the public sphere disengages itself from problem and refuses to take steps towards eliminating the conditions that allow for brutal domestic victimization. Maddox[[5]](#footnote-5):

**If domestic violence were viewed as an individual issue, rather than a social problem, the general public may think that it cannot affect them because it is not their problem.** Researchers have found many distinctions between domestic violence being viewed as an individual or public problem leading to the conclusion that **if the public does not view the issue as their own then they are less likely to actively pursue resolution of the issue (**Bullock, 2007; Consalvo, 1998).Bullock (2007) found that the victim and perpetrator were described as being very different from the rest of society, which would indicate that the domestic violence is their individual problem and not society’s. Consalvo (1998) also found that **the way that the victim and perpetrator of domestic violence** were **[are] portrayed, would lead you to believe that they are not “normal” and as such the violence is something with which the rest of “normal” society should not be concerned with.”**

Thus, the recognition that domestic violence is a public problem is a pre-requisite to authentically confronting the issue. Moreover, the AC turns itself by retrenching the private view of domestic violence; regardless of what ethical system you adopt, in order to affirm the AC’s ethic must be able to condemn domestic violence, and since the aff entrenches the problem it seeks to remedy the aff world is comparatively worse than the negative world.

**C.** The affirmative’s claim that killing an aggressor empowers a victim creates a ruse that individual actions can sufficiently combat the social inequality at the heart of male aggression. And, conceptualizing domestic violence as a private issue perpetuates the patriarchal mindset that sustains domestic violence in the first place. Schneider[[6]](#footnote-6):

**By seeing woman- abuse as "private," we affirm it as a problem that is individual,** that only involves a particular male-female relationship, and **for which there is no social responsibility to remedy. Each of us needs to** deny **[understand] the seriousness** and pervasiveness **of battering, but more significantly, the interconnectedness of battering with** so **many other aspects of family life and gender relations.** Instead of focusing on the batterer, **we focus on the battered woman, scrutinize her conduct, examine her pathology and blame her for not leaving the relationship**, in order to maintain that denial **and refuse to confront the issues of power. Focusing on the woman**, not the man, **perpetuates the power of patriarchy**. Denial supports **and** legitimates this power; **the concept of privacy is** a **[the] key [to]** aspect of **this denial.**

Reinforcing the notion that public and private spheres are conceptually distinct legitimates the Western tradition whereby “a man’s house is his castle” at the expense of female victims. Decker[[7]](#footnote-7): **“In domestic violence, the** legal **mechanism that** preserves such **[enables] domination is** not the fictive consent of the rape scheme but **the proliferation of the private sphere. The private sphere is "man's sovereign castle, where** most women remain for a lifetime, where **women are mostly to be battered and sexually assaulted, and where they have no recourse because the private, by definition, is inviolable and recourse means intervention.** t]he law of privacy treats **the private sphere** as **[is] a sphere of personal freedom**. **for men,** it is. **[But] for women, the private is the** distinctive **sphere of intimate violation and abuse, neither free nor** particularly **personal.”**

Instead of exposing the notion of the private sphere as oppressive when approaching the issue of domestic violence, the affirmative omits to discuss, and thus shrouds this structural violence. By obscuring the social institutions that reinforce a status quo of domestic violence, the affirmative’s ethical gesture with regards to the permissibility of a deadly response is meaningless. But more importantly, the AC’s ethical construction is irrevocably tainted by its tunnel-vision. Your role as an educator is to hold the affirmative accountable for the real world implications of their advocacy. Debate should teach students to criticize and firmly oppose such oppressive constructions. Giroux[[8]](#footnote-8):

**“At the heart of such [a] public space**s **is a formative culture that creates citizens who are critical thinkers capable of "putting existing institutions into question so that democracy again becomes society's movement** that is to say, a new type of regime in the full sense of the term." **Young people need to be educated both as a condition of autonomy and** for the sustainability of **democratization** as an ongoing movement. **Not only does a substantive democracy demand citizens capable of** self- and **social criticism, but** it **also**, once again, requires **a critical formative culture in which people are provided with the knowledge and skills to be able to participate in such a society**.”

Thus, bind the affirmative to their advocacy and vote negative to endorse and reinforce the critical stance that is crucial to combating oppression.

**Part Three-Alternative**

The alternative is to recognize that domestic violence is not a private problem, but rather the domain of the public sphere; and to understand that domestic violence is both structured and conditioned by social norms. In addition to embracing the ethical and political ramifications of this paradigm shift in the context of this round, and substantively negating, my alternative suggests that the judge both *can* and *should* use your ballot to explode the public/private binary and signify that your decision is not an artificially neutral evaluation of debate cases so abstracted and tied to convoluted ethical frameworks that they destroy the possibility of a genuine and personal discussion of domestic violence, but rather a personal, public, and political endorsement of the principle that domestic violence is inextricably tied to the community it occurs in, and that a community effort is crucial to combating domestic violence. The ballot is uniquely situated in that it allows for the possibility of exactly this sort of political expression. Voting affirmative is a very *literal* concession that domestic violence belongs in the private sphere, that it is “their problem,” in that it tacitly confirms that Lincoln-Douglas debate is insulated from reality. However, circling “negative” on your ballot at minimum signifies to the people in this room that you have made the political decision to shift domestic violence to the public sphere and acknowledge the value of my discourse. Kulynych[[9]](#footnote-9) explains:

**A performative concept of participation as resistance explodes the distinction between public and private**, between the political and the apolitical.As Foucault explains, what was formerly considered apolitical, or social rather than political, is revealed as the foundation of technologies of state control.Contests over identity and everyday social life are not merely additions to the realm of the political, but actually create the very character ofthose things traditionally considered **[the] political**. The state itself **is “super-structural in relation to** a whole series of **power networks that invest the body.**, sexuality, the family, kinship, knowledge, technology and so forth.” Thus it is **Contestations at the micro-level, over the intricacies of everyday life,** that **provide** the raw material for global domination, and **the key to disrupting** global strategies of **domination.**

When we look at the success of **citizen initiatives** from a performative perspective, we look precisely at **[are] those moments of defiance and disruption that bring the invisible and unimaginable into view.** Although citizens were minimally successful in influencing or controlling the out come of the policy debate and experienced a considerable lack of autonomy in their coercion into the technical debate, the goal-oriented debate within the energy commissions could be seen as a defiant moment of performative politics. The existence of a goal-oriented debate within a technically dominated arena defied the normalizing separation between expert policymakers and consuming citizens. **Citizens momentarily recreate**d **themselves as policymakers in a system that define[s]**d **citizens out of the policy process, thereby refusing their construction as passive clients.**

“Casting your ballot” negative in recognition of my advocacy is an active political resistance through which you can both literally and symbolically destroy the public/private dichotomy with regards to domestic violence. Thus, I urge you to negate.

CX Link strategy:

Q: If another actor can take action against the abuser, would it still be permissible for the victim to take action against the abuser?

A: Yes (They will of course say yes because they think you are trying to set up a CP with an “if alts exist, then victim-action is not permissible FW”)

Q: Why?

A: Because…the victim still has a relationship to the abuser. Because the victim has a responsibility to protect her own life. Because the victim can’t know others will act, etc.

Q: Okay, so the theory of the AC is not affected by the effectiveness of other actors – i.e. you believe that the permissibility of deliberate killing is justified because of the relationship between abuser and victim?

A: Yes.

AT-Perm

1. Links section proves the Ks exclusivity

2. Can’t acknowledge it after the AC. Articulating the AC such that it doesn’t reinforce the private sphere in the AR is tantamount to saying a racial slur 50 times in the AC and then pretending like it never happened in the next speech; it is absurd.
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