First off – Prison DA

Women who kill their abusers go to prison for a long time. **Lowry 11**[[1]](#footnote-1)

But while I might cheer on the fictional Janice Soprano as she murders the fictional Richie Aprile, I would never advocate for women who have been abused to take such action in real life. There are obvious moral reasons for this, but there are practical reasons as well. After shooting Richie, Janice called her mob boss brother Tony Soprano to take care of cleaning up the mess and disposing of the body. And so Janice experienced no consequences from the murder except for her own grief. Not so for real-life victims of domestic violence who murder their abusers. The **[a] study** "Convicted Survivors: The Imprisonment of Battered Women Who Kill" by Elizabeth Ann Dermody Leonard **demonstrates that 95.4 percent of battered women who kill their abusers are convicted of either first or second-degree murder and sentenced to lengthy prison terms.** Nearly all abused inmates will be released back into their communities without needed support.

Prison outweighs domestic violence for two reasons:

1. **Magnitude** – women in prison have fewer liberties and are confined for a longer amount of time.

2. **Reversibility** – abuse victims can rectify abuse through alternate means later on, but there is no way to solve a life sentence in prison.

Prison turns the case. Women are abused worse in prison and have no recourse.

**Lind 2k**[[2]](#footnote-2)

As Owen notes, **Human Rights Watch** recently **focused on the sexual abuse of women in prison.** Reviewing the evidence in an array of states, the organization **[It] reported that** "our findings indicate that being a woman in U.S. state prisons can be a terrifying experience." **For all too many women in US prisons**, Human Rights Watch concluded, **there is *no* escape from one's abuser. There are ineffectual grievance procedures,** there is **a lack of employee accountability, and** there is **little to no public concern about the problem.**

Second Off – Cap K

Focusing on specific types of oppression, such as discrimination, obscures the underlying problem of capitalism.

**Zizek 99**[[3]](#footnote-3)

The big news of today’s post-political age of the ‘end of ideology’ is thus the radical depoliticization of the sphere of the economy: **the way the economy functions** (the need to cut social welfare, etc.) **is accepted as** a simple insight into **the objective state of things. However, as long as this** fundamental **depoliticization** of the economic sphere **is accepted,** all the talk about **active citizenship**, about public discussion leading to responsible collective decisions, and so on, **will remain limited to the ‘cultural’ issues of religious, sexual, [and] ethnic** and other way-of-life **differences, without** actually **encroaching upon the level at which long-term decisions** that affect us all **are made.** In short, the only way effectively to bring about a society in which risky long-term decisions would ensue from public debate involving all concerned is some kind of radical limitation of Capital’s freedom, the subordinated of the process of production to social control – the radical *repoliticization of the economy*. That is to say: if the problem with today’s post-politics (‘administration of social affairs’) is that it increasingly undermines the possibility of a proper political act, this undermining is directly due to the depoliticization of economics, to the common acceptance of Capital and market mechanisms as neutral tools/ procedures to be exploited. We can now see why today’s post-politics cannot attain the properly political dimension of universality; because it silently precludes the sphere of economy from politicization. The domain of global capitalist market relations in the Other Scene of the so-called repoliticization of civil society advocated by the partisans of ‘identity politics’ and other postmodern forms of politicization: all the talk about **new forms of politics** bursting out all over, **focused on particular issues** (**[such as] gay rights, ecology, [and] ethnic minorities…**), all this incessant activity of fluid, shifting identities, of **build**ing **multiple *ad hoc* coalitions**, and so on, has something inauthentic about it, and ultimately resembles the obsessional neurotic who talks all the time and is otherwise frantically active precisely in order to **ensur[ing] that** something – **what *really matters*** – **will *not* be disturbed**, that it will remain immobilized. **So, instead of celebrating** the **new freedoms** and responsibilities brought about by the ‘second modernity’, **it is much more crucial to focus on what *remains the same*** in this global fluidity and reflexivity, on what serves as the very motor of this fluidity: **the inexorable logic of Capital.** The spectral presence of Capital is the figure of the big Other which not only remains operative when all the traditional embodiments of the symbolic big Other disintegrate, but even directly causes this disintegration: far from being confronted with the abyss of their freedom – that is, laden with the burden of responsibility that cannot be alleviated by the helping hand of Tradition or Nature – today’s subject is perhaps more than ever caught in an inexorable compulsion that effectively runs his life.

**Impact (1/2)**

Capitalism precludes ethics by reducing decision-making to economic calculation.

**Morgareidge 98**[[4]](#footnote-4)

To show why this is the case, let me turn to capital's greatest critic, Karl Marx. **Under capitalism**, Marx writes, **everything** in nature and everything that human beings are and can do **becomes an object: a resource for**, or an obstacle to, **the expansion of production**, the development of technology, the growth of markets, and the circulation of money. For those who manage and live from capital, **nothing has value of its own. Mountain streams, clean air, human lives -- all mean nothing in themselves, but are valuable only** if they can be used **to turn a profit.** If capital looks at (not into) the human face, it sees there only eyes through which brand names and advertising can enter and mouths that can demand and consume food, drink, and tobacco products. If human faces express needs, then either products can be manufactured to meet, or seem to meet, those needs, or else, if the needs are incompatible with the growth of capital, then the faces expressing them must be unrepresented or silenced. Obviously what capitalist enterprises do have consequences for the well being of human beings and the planet we live on. Capital profits from the production of food, shelter, and all the necessities of life. The production of all these things uses human lives in the shape of labor, as well as the resources of the earth. If we care about life, if we see our obligations in each others faces, then we have to want all the things capital does to be governed by that care, to be directed by the ethical concern for life. But feeding people is not the aim of the food industry, or shelter the purpose of the housing industry. In medicine, making profits is becoming a more important goal than caring for sick people. As capitalist enterprises these activities aim single-mindedly at the accumulation of capital, and such purposes as caring for the sick or feeding the hungry becomes a mere means to an end, an instrument of corporate growth.

Therefore **ethics**, the overriding commitment to meeting human need, **is left out of deliberations about what the heavyweight institutions of our society are going to do.** Moral convictions are expressed in churches, in living rooms, in letters to the editor, sometimes even by politicians and widely read commentators, but almost always with an attitude of resignation to the inevitable. People no longer say, "You can't stop progress," but only because they have learned not to call economic growth progress. They still think they can't stop it. And they are right -- as long as the production of all our needs and the organization of our labor is carried out under private ownership. Only a minority ("idealists") can take seriously a way of thinking that counts for nothing in real world decision making. Only when the end of capitalism is on the table will ethics have a seat at the table.

Corporate control of the environment means that capitalism ensures extinction

**Zizek 99**[[5]](#footnote-5)

This already brings us to the second aspect of our critical distance towards risk society theory: the way it approaches the reality of capitalism. Is it not that, on closer examination, its notion of 'risk' indicates a narrow and precisely defined domain in which risks are generated: the domain of the uncontrolled use of science and technology in the conditions of capitalism? The paradigmatic case of 'risk', which is not simply one among many out risk 'as such', is that of a new scientific-technological invention put to use by a private corporation without proper public democratic debate and control, then generating the spectre of unforeseen cata­strophic long-term consequences. However, is not this kind of risk rooted in the fact that **the logic of** market and **profitability is driving privately owned corporations to pursue their course** and use scientific and techno­logical innovations (or simply expand their production) **without actually taking account of the long-term effects of such activity on the environ­ment, as well as the health of humankind itself**?

Thus - despite all the talk about a 'second modernity' which compels us to leave the old ideological dilemmas of Left and Right, of capitalism versus socialism, and so on, behind - is not the conclusion to be drawn that in the present global situation, in which **private corporations outside public political control are making decisions which can affect** us all, even up to **our chances of survival,** the only solution lies in a kind of direct socialization of the productive process - in moving towards a society in which global decisions about the fundamental orientation of how to develop and use productive capacities at the disposal of society would somehow be made by the entire collective of the people affected by such decisions? Theorists of the risk society often evoke the need to counteract reign of the 'depoliticized' global market with a move towards radical repoliticization, which will take crucial decisions away from state planners and experts and put them into the hands of the individuals and groups concerned themselves (through the revitalization of active citizenship, broad public debate, and so on) - however, they stop short of putting in question the very basics of the anonymous logic of market relations and global capitalism, which imposes itself today more and more as the 'neutral' Real accepted by all parties and, as such, more and more depoliticized. 34

**Impact (2/2)**

The kritik turns the case – Capitalism is the root cause of modern discrimination

**Zizek 08**[[6]](#footnote-6)

But **we are not dealing** here only **with good old racism.** Something more is at stake: a fundamental feature of our emerging “global” society. On 11 September 2001 the Twin Towers were hit. Twelve years earlier, on 9 November 1989, the Berlin Wall fell. That date heralded the “happy ‘9os,” the Francis Fukuyama dream of the “end of history” —the belief that liberal democracy had, in principle, won; that the search was over; that the advent of a global, liberal world community lurked just around the corner; that the obstacles to this ultra-Hollywood happy ending were merely empirical and contingent (local pockets of resistance where the leaders did not yet grasp that their time was up). In contrast, 9/11 is the main symbol of the end of the Clintonite happy ‘9os. This is the era in which **new walls emerge everywhere, between Israel and the West Bank, around the European Union, on the U.S.—Mexico border.** The rise of the populist New Right is just the most prominent example of the urge to raise new walls. A couple of years ago, an ominous decision of the European Union passed almost unnoticed: the plan to establish an all-European border police force to secure the isolation of Union territory and thus to prevent the influx of immigrants. *This* is the truth of globalisation: the construction of new walls safeguarding prosperous Europe from the immigrant flood. One is tempted to resuscitate here the old Marxist “humanist” opposition of “relations between things” and “relations between persons”: in the much-celebrated free circulation opened up by global capitalism, it is “things” (commodities) which freely circulate, while the circulation of “persons” is more and more controlled. We are not dealing now with “globalisation” as an unfinished project but with a true “dialectics of globalisation”: the **segregation** of the people ***is* the reality of economic globalisation. This new racism of the developed is** in a way **much more brutal than the previous ones: its implicit legitimisation is neither** naturalist (the **“natural” superiority** of the developed West) **nor any** longer culturalist (we in the West also want to preserve our **cultural identity**), **but unabashed economic egotism. The** fundamental **divide is one between those included in the sphere of** (relative) **economic prosperity and those excluded from it.**

**Alternative**

The alternative is to completely withdraw from the logic of capital – this is essential to destroy the fetishism that allows capital to survive

**Johnston 04**[[7]](#footnote-7)

Perhaps the absence of a detailed political roadmap in Zizek's recent writings isn't a major shortcoming. Maybe, at least for the time being, **the most important task is simply the negativity of the critical struggle**, the effort **to cure** an intellectual constipation resulting from **capitalist ideology and thereby** to truly **open up the space for imagining** authentic **alternatives** to the prevailing state of the situation. Another definition of materialism offered by Zizek is that it amounts to accepting the internal inherence of what fantasmatically appears as an external deadlock or hindrance (Zizek, 2001d, pp 22-23) (with fantasy itself being defined as the false externalization of something within the subject, namely, the illusory projection of an inner obstacle, Zizek, 2000a, p 16). From this perspective, seeing through ideological fantasies by **learning** how **to think again outside the confines of current restrictions has**, in and of itself, **the potential to operate as a** form of real **revolutionary practice** (rather than remaining merely an instance of negative/critical intellectual reflection). Why is this the case? Recalling the analysis of commodity fetishism, the social efficacy of money as the universal medium of exchange (and the entire political economy grounded upon it) ultimately relies upon nothing more than a kind of "magic," that is, the belief in money's social efficacy by those using it in the processes of exchange. **Since the value of currency is**, at bottom, **reducible to the belief that it has the value attributed to it** (and that everyone believes that everyone else believes this as well), **derailing capitalism** by destroying its essential financial substance **is**, in a certain respect, **as easy as dissolving the mere belief in** this substance's **[money’s] power**s. **The "external" obstacle of the capitalist system exists** exclusively on the condition that **[because] subjects**, whether consciously or unconsciously, **"internally" believe in it.**

**AT AC**

The most comprehensive and recent studies conclude that domestic violence is mutual.

**Straus 2012** writes[[8]](#footnote-8)

Graham-Kevan’s paper fully documents overwhelming evidence that the “patriarchal dominance” theory of partner violence (PV from here on) explains only a small part of PV. Moreover, more such evidence is rapidly emerging. To take just one recent example, **analyses of data from 32 nations** in the International Dating Violence Study (Straus, 2007) Straus and International Dating Violence Research Consortium 2004) **found** about **equal perpetration rates and a predominance of mutual violence in all 32 samples, including non-western nations.**

Studies prove that women do not act on the motive of self-defense.

**Straus 2012** writes[[9]](#footnote-9)

The widely acclaimed and influential World Health Organization report on domestic violence (Krug et al. 2002) reports that “Where violence by women occurs it is more likely to be in the form of self defense. (32, 37, 38).” This is selective citation because almost **all studies that have compared men and women find about equal rates of self-defense.** Perhaps even worse, **none of the three [widely acclaimed] studies** cited **provide evidence supporting [self-defense]** the quoted sentence. Study #32 (**Saunders** 1986) **shows that** 31% of minor violence and **39% of severe [violence] was in self defense, i.e., about two-thirds of female** perpetrated PV **[violence] was not in self defense.** Study #37 (**DeKeseredy** et al. 1997) **found that only 7% of women said their violence was in self defense.** Study #38 (Johnson and Ferraro 2000) is a review paper that has no original data. It cites #32 and #37, neither of which supports the claim.

AT Public Private Dichotomy

**The term domestic violence entrenches the private sphere while obscuring the nature of domestic violence.**

**Krishnadas, 2007:**

(Krishnadas, Jane. "Relocating The Master's Domain: Social And Legal Locations Of Gender From Post-Disaster To Everyday Life." *Social & Legal Studies* 16.1 (2007): 131-147. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 27 Apr. 2012. PhD. from Keele University. Lecturer at the School of Law at Keele University.)

In legal terms **domestic violence is a term for** a **located violence**; **a violence that takes place within the home.** The very fact **that ‘domestic violence’ warrants a separate term indicates** **a qualification of violence attributed to the ‘private’ domain, distinguishing it from violence in the public sphere.** **Feminist scholars have advocated the ‘public nature of private violence’** (Fineman and Mykitiuk, 1994), **in order to ensure that ‘domestic violence’ is not isolated, ghettoized or trivialized from the public domain and that it is recognized on the public agenda.** In the situation of Latur to understand how the ‘domestic’ nature of violence implicates the public, it is important to consider how the public sphere constructed the domestic and the violence within it. The boundaries of the World Bank and state policy and the women’s private rights remained uncertain in the private sphere of litigation. Three years into the reconstruction process, domestic violence was prevalent in one of the four homes that I visited (Krishnadas, 2004). The changing public environment had led to a closing-in of the private sphere. This closure of the private sphere marks comparative responses in colonial, and post-colonial histories, whereby ‘the need to fight against the “modernisation” of the inner sphere, the home, legitimated various forms of violence against women’ (Bannerji, 2000: 917). In Latur, examples of ‘domestic’ violence were experienced in the form of marital violence, dowry violence, and child marriages, which in some cases had the fatal consequence of maternal or foetal morbidity. **Though the violence was experienced in the home, the conditions or causes of such violence could be related both to the larger** reconstruction **process in which women were located**, and the kin groups which resisted this process. In Gubal village, Sara delivered a stillborn child due to the desperate living conditions throughout pregnancy. On the child’s death, she said, ‘I had married because my parents wanted me out of the situation in my village, yet the town was much worse . . . we must tell the other girls’ (Krishnadas, 2004: 225). Hence, **though the location of the violence may be termed ‘domestic’, the violence may be attributed within the broader sphere** of the relocation policy, for which a similar trajectory has been evident from post-disaster to development reconstruction processes (Wilson et al., 1998; Upadhyay, 2001).

It’s capitalism, not patriarchy, that is the true root cause. 4 reasons:

1. **Gender-focus can’t explain why 90% of men aren’t batterers. Tracy 07** [“Patriarchy and Domestic Violence: Challenging Common Misconceptions,” Steven Tracy, professor of theology and ethics at Phoenix Seminary. *JETS* 50/3 (September 2007) 573–94]

While feminist research has greatly advanced our understanding of domestic violence by highlighting the broad social context in which abuse often occurs and the manner in which patriarchy has historically spawned violence against women, it does not explain the whole story. The feminist explanation for domestic violence gives many helpful insights, but is reductionistic as the complete and final explanation for abuse against women.29 For example, many have noted the fallacy of attributing all contemporary abuse to patriarchy by raising an obvious question: **If patriarchy is the ultimate basis for** all **violence against women,** then **why is it that on an annual basis 90% of** all **North American men do not abuse women?** [D. G. Dutton, *The Domestic Assault of Women* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1995) 7–11; D. G. Dutton, *The Batterer: A Psychological Profile* (New York: Basic Books, 1995) 70–71.] In other words, **why does the virus of patriarchy lead only 10% of men to batter women each year? Furthermore,** the feminist hypothesis does not take into account the changing social climate. While the feminist model has been critical in explaining violence against women, particularly in cultures in which women truly have no power and experience global inequity, **women in the western world have far more power than they did a few decades ago, suggesting that there are other factors at play.**

2. **Studies prove patriarchy is not the root cause of domestic abuse. Tracy 07** [“Patriarchy and Domestic Violence: Challenging Common Misconceptions,” Steven Tracy, professor of theology and ethics at Phoenix Seminary. *JETS* 50/3 (September 2007) 573–94]

Perhaps the most powerful refutation of the feminist thesis that patriarchy is the underlying cause of all abuse of women is the consensus of several studies in the past decade which assess religion, gender views, and domestic violence. While relatively few studies have been conducted which specifically assess the relationship between religion, patriarchal beliefs, and abuse, most of the studies that have been conducted do not support the global feminist hypothesis. For instance, **a comprehensive meta-analysis** of various studies **showed that adult male batterers could not be differentiated from non-abusive men on the sole basis of** traditional (**patriarchal**) gender **attitudes.**41 **Early** population studies did find that the least egalitarian states had the highest rates of violence,42 and a few **studies** that gave very extreme definitions of patriarchy **found higher abuse rates among patriarchal men.**43 **But** several **recent studies are more nuanced in their assessment of** religion, **patriarchy, and abuse.** These studies do find a link between conservative religion and domestic violence, but it is not the simple causal relationship the feminist model would predict. Rather, there is an inverse relationship between church attendance and domestic violence. Conservative Protestant men who attend church regularly are found to be the least likely group to engage in domestic violence, though conservative Protestant men who are irregular church attendees are the most likely to batter their wives.44 **Thus current research disproves the feminist hypothesis that patriarchy is the single underlying cause of all abuse against women**, though it strongly suggests that patriarchy plays some role in domestic violence.

3. Capitalism creates the family units responsible for domestic violence. **Cotter 02**  (Jennifer, Red Critique, September/October, “War and Domestic Violence” [http://www.redcritiq...ticviolence.htm](http://www.redcritique.org/SeptOct02/waranddomesticviolence.htm), accessed 7-11-09, PAK)

CAP K link: the rhetoric and logic of solving for domestic violence is inherently capitalist as it enframes the issue as one of private property. This also proves that you cant solve for DV in a capitalist system, so any risk of stopping cap means you vote neg bc it precludes the aff, Cotter

War and **domestic violence**, to be clear, are **[is a] matters of class:** the social relations of production based on private ownership of the means of production. The wars in Central Asia and the Middle East are imperialist wars on behalf of U.S. capital, which is trying to gain a monopoly over the production of the total, global surplus-labor. In order to stave off declining rates of profit brought on by overproduction, U.S. monopoly capital—specifically oil cartels and their financiers—are compelled to seek out new conditions of production (a concentration of ownership of means of production, raw materials, and access to cheap labor) through the building of a Central Asian oil pipeline, gaining access to Iraqi oilfields, and access to new reserves of labor-power in Central Asia and the Middle East from which to extract surplus-labor. War, in short, has become historically necessary for U.S. capital if it is going to stave off a decline in profit. As Lenin argued, war is a historical necessity under capitalism in its imperialist phase. It is the outcome of the intense concentration of production (of multiple industries) into the hands of a few, the domination of monopolies over global production, a resulting crisis of overproduction, and the subsequent need under capitalism for competing imperialist interests to re-divide ownership of production in the world, often requiring violent force (war), in an attempt to raise the rate of profit (*Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism*). Far from helping to "liberate women" the imperialist wars sharpen class antagonisms, preserve private property relations, and intensify the violent effects of private property on women "abroad" and "at home", including domestic violence. The crisis of profit that develops as a result of **the concentration of capital into fewer hands**, **requires the increased exploitation of workers** in production (through access to new reserves of cheap labor and increased appropriation of their surplus-labor). Moreover, **this, in turn,** requires the use of existing capital to put the conditions in place to make this possible (e.g., through shifting capital into the military and warfare). The concentration of wealth into fewer hands and the resulting crisis of profit **leads to** increased **impoverishment** of workers, **which sharpens workers' dependence on the privatized family of capitalism as an economic unit of survival.** At the same time, the family—the relations of reproduction—cannot themselves stave off the crisis of profit in production, which requires seeking out new sources of production and surplus-labor extraction. Both the economic contradictions of the privatized family (that is, that the family cannot resolve the crisis of profitability in production and the increased impoverishment of workers) and **the ideology of the privatized family** of capitalism, which **puts forward a possessive individualism, especially an ideology of "ownership" of women by men, support[ing] conditions of domestic violence** against women.

4. Only capitalism explains why women endure the abuse. Focusing on patriarchy misses the point and only further links into the K. **Cotter 02**  (Jennifer, Red Critique, September/October, “War and Domestic Violence” [http://www.redcritiq...ticviolence.htm](http://www.redcritique.org/SeptOct02/waranddomesticviolence.htm), accessed 7-11-09, PAK)

What actually lies behind these contradictions are historical conditions of necessity in capitalism: the fact that, on the one hand, **economic compulsion** brought on by exploitation in production **drives women** to continue **to rely on the privatized family even though it is a site of violence and abuse** and, on the other hand, the military is itself necessary under capitalism in order to defend private property relations, and specifically the interests of monopoly capitalists, that economically compel workers to rely on the privatized family to begin with. These contradictions are symptomatic of the failure to resolve domestic violence by means of rearranging the social relations of reproduction. Negotiation with the "state" for more resources to help crisis manage the privatized family does not address the root issue of domestic violence. **What is needed is freedom from** necessity brought on by **exploitation.** This is **because domestic violence is a problem that stems from** contradictions in **production, which cannot be resolved through the** social **relations of reproduction. Domestic violence is enabled by the privatized family which itself is a historical necessity *under capitalism*:** workers are economically compelled to rely on it as an economic unit owing to their increasing impoverishment in the social relations of production (the more they produce, the more capital gets concentrated into fewer hands), at the same time they provide a valuable service for capital by absorbing the burden of reproducing labor-power. The contradictions of the family under capitalism, therefore, lead to greater economic and social contradictions for workers, not fewer. **Fundamental changes in the relations of reproduction require changes in the relations of production**. This is further seen in the fact that, although capital historically necessitates the subordination of relations of reproduction to private ownership of the means of production in order to offset the cost to capital of reproducing labor-power, this use of "cost effective" measures (what Lenin called "clipping coupons") to reserve more of the existing surplus-labor for profit does not stop the crisis in production and the decline in the rate of profit. It reduces the drain on profit, but does not itself resolve the over all decline in the rate of profit. This requires access to new reserves of labor-power from which to extract surplus-labor (through exploitation)—thus reproducing the economic conditions of private property and their ideological effects that enable domestic violence against women.

Legal system isn’t patriarchal now. Studies show -- domestic violence courts account for the nature of domestic violence.

Andrew Klein 2009 of the U.S. Department of Justice[[10]](#footnote-10)

A 2004 study found 160 jurisdictions across the country with specialized domestic violence courts. The majority of these courts had the following traits in common: (1) effective management of domestic violence cases, coordinating all of the cases involving the relevant parties and integrating requisite information for the court; (2) specialized intake and court staffing for domestic violence cases; (3) improved victim access, expedited hearings, and assistance for victims by court staff, often assisted by related specialized, vertical domestic violence prosecution units; (4) court processes to ensure victims' safety (e.g., court metal detectors, separate waiting rooms, specialized orders and victim referrals; (5) increased court monitoring and enforcement of batterer compliance with court orders, often exercised by specialized probation supervision units; (6) consideration of any children involved in the domestic violence; and (7) enhanced domestic violence training for judges.
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