Counter-plan text – Resolved: It is morally permissible for victims to use deadly force as a deliberate response to repeated domestic domination.

The counter-plan solves domestic injustice better than the aff. The term domestic violence obscures non-physical forms of abuse and marginalizes women whose abuse isn’t primarily from violence.

**Ashcraft 2000** writes[[1]](#footnote-1)

Instead of effectively challenging the traditional definition of violence, classification of all oppressive behaviors as violent actually accepts the dominant construction that violent behavior is more damaging than nonviolent. Because feminists attempted to frame oppressive behavior and its effects within this dominant paradigm-where violent forms of behavior are always more devastating than nonviolent forms-their only available rhetorical strategy for highlighting the seriousness of these often ignored behaviors was to define them also as violence. However, **when** abuse or **violence [is]** are brandished as **the only acceptable** or the preferred **way**s **to describe** any form of **domestic** **injustice, the terms are** in jeopardy of being **rendered meaningless.** If everything is violence, then nothing is. Thus, **relying** solely **on the term**s **violence** and abuse **make[s] depictions of different levels of domestic** **inequality** nearly **impossible. This**, combined with the use of extreme cases to capture public attention, **has solidified the public perception that domestic** **violence primarily entails physical violence**. As a result, the current discourse leaves the abusive/normal distinction unchallenged, thereby **masking the pervasive nature of domestic inequality.** In addition, **it has silenced many women who experience lesser degrees of domestic injustice. Countless women acknowledge that “something is wrong” with their marriages**, particularly that varying levels of inequality prevail, **but they do not feel comfortable defining the problem as abuse or themselves as battered women.**

Even if I lose the counter-plan, the net benefit still turns the case. However, the term “domestic domination” solves. It recognizes the power relations at the root of the abuse.

**Ashcraft-2** writes[[2]](#footnote-2)

The term **domestic domination incorporates much of what currently is defined as domestic** **violence.** Although, the use of **the term domestic violence has** successfully increased recognition of the seriousness of the nature of the problem, the term also has been coopted by dominant society and has **been used to focus attention only on** the traditionally **violent behaviors** associated with this problem. In so doing, **domestic** **violence is seen** as most violence is traditionally seen-**as the result of excessive anger or** a pathological **inability to deal with** anger, **rage, or jealousy. Such a definition masks the power relations and need for control that**, in fact, determine and **shape the violent behavior. Thus, the new** domain **term, domestic domination,** is intended to **highlight[s] the underlying element of control** present i**n these relationships.**
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