**Strategy and RFD:**

*I read the Pell Grants Plan, with a few things switched up for Matt. Matt read an otherization bad framework, an unconditional delay CP, a politics DA, a lot of defense on the naval advantage, and a four-point util dump. The 1ar went for Bostrom, systemic impacts of crime as a risk to prefer aff on time frame, a temporal perm on the CP, a lot of link defense on the disad, and an impact turn to econ collapse. The 2n was arguments why Bostrom didn’t function, extension of the otherization framework, a lot of arguments on the competition of the CP, answering link defense, and an argument or two on the impact turn. The 2ar was basically the same as the 1ar, except more time allocated to the perm and the impact turn, less to Bostrom and the links on the DA. Martin Sigalow voted for Matt off the risk of extinction on the DA, since the impact turn didn’t link to the DA and didn’t link to extinction. His paradigm was that perms are a test of competition and not an advocacy, so me winning the perm on the CP didn’t get rid of the DA.*

The Online Etymology Dictionary[[1]](#footnote--1) says

**[The main modern use of ought is]** As an auxiliary verb **expressing** duty or **obligation** ~~(~~c.1175, the main modern use), it represents the past subjunctive.

Because common usage is what gives words meaning, I value **obligations.** The resolution questions the obligations of the USFG **(A)** only the USFG has power over the criminal justice system **(B)** key to debatability, whether a policy or mindset, our debate is moot if we use an actor who can’t influence the res and **(C)** “ought” always refers to an action, even when used as “ought to be.” **Prichard 12**[[2]](#footnote-0)

But this argument, if it is to restore the sense of obligation to act, must presuppose an intermediate link, viz., the further thesis that what is good ought to be. The necessity of this link is obvious. An "ought," if it is to be derived at all, can only be derived from another "ought." Moreover this link tacitly presupposes another, viz., that **the apprehension that something good, *which is not an action,* ought to be involves** just **the feeling of** imperativeness or **obligation which is to be aroused *by the thought of the action*** which will originate it. Otherwise the argument will not lead us to feel the obligation to produce it by the action. And, surely, both this link and its implication are false.[1](http://www.ditext.com/prichard/mistake.html#1) **The word "ought" refers to** actions and to **actions alone**. The proper language is never "So and so ought to be," but "I ought to do so and so." **Even if we** are sometimes moved to **say** that the world or something in it is not what **it ought to be**, what **we really mean** is **that** God or **some human** being **has not made some thing what he ought to have made it.** And it is merely stating another side of this fact to urge that **we can only feel the** imperativeness upon us **[obligation] of something which is in our power**; for it is actions and **actions alone** which, directly at least, **are** **in our power.**

And, governments are obligated to maximize observable ends since they only know generalities **Goodin 90**[[3]](#footnote-1)

My larger argument turns on the proposition that there is something special about the situation of public officials that makes utilitarianism more probable for them than private individuals. Before proceeding with the large argument, I must therefore say what it is that makes it so special about public officials and their situations that make it both more necessary and more desirable for them to adopt a more credible form of utilitarianism. Consider, first, the argument from necessity. Public officials are obliged to make their choices under uncertainty , and uncertainty of a very special sort at that. All choices – public and private alike – are made under some degree of uncertainty, of course. But in the nature of things, private individuals will usually have more complete information on the peculiarities of their own circumstances and on the ramifications that alternative possible choices might have for them. Public officials, in contrast, are relatively poorly informed as to the effects that their choices will have on individuals, one by one. What they typically do know are generalities: averages and aggregates. They know what will happen most often to most people as a result of their various possible choices, but that is all. That is enough to allow public policy-makers to use the utilitarian calculus – assuming they want to use it at all – to chose general rules or conduct.

And, the government is responsible for every outcome. **Sunstein** and **Vermuele[[4]](#footnote-2)**

In our view, any effort to distinguish between acts and omissions goes wrong by overlooking the distinctive features of government as a moral agent. If correct, this point has broad implications for criminal and civil law. Whatever the general status of the act/omission distinction as a matter of moral philosophy**,** the [act/omission] distinction is least impressive when applied to government, because the most plausible underlying considerations do not apply to official actors The most fundamental point is that, unlike individuals, **governments always** and necessarily **face a choice between** or among possible **policies for regulating** third **parties. The [act/omission] distinction** between acts and omissions may not be intelligible in this context, and even if it is, the distinction **does not make a morally relevant difference.** Most generally**, [the] government** is in the business of creating permissions and prohibitions. When it explicitly or implicitly authorizes private action, it **is not omitting to do anything or refusing to act.**

This means **(1)** Because the government is complicit with every action it takes or refuses to take it must always act to ensure the best consequences and **(2)** moral claims don’t apply to the government.

The standard is **Maximizing Expected Lives of US Citizens.**

There are three more independent warrants:

1. Ends-based theories are the best theoretically because they force Topic Education – We have to use empirics and analytics to evaluate the consequences our actions have on the real world, which forces us to research the effects of actions and how those effects will come about, thus learning more about the topic. Education is the terminal impact of debate and the only reason why debate gets school funding, so always prefer the most educational value criterion on a theoretical level.

2. Value is contingent upon experiencing that value, which means all moral theories reduce to ends. **Harris**

I believe that we will increasingly understand good and evil, right and wrong, in scientific terms, because moral concerns translate into *facts* about how our thoughts and behaviors affect the well-being of conscious creatures like ourselves. If there are facts to be known about the well-being of such creatures—and there are—then there must be right and wrong answers to moral questions. Students of philosophy will notice that this commits me to some form of moral realism (viz. moral claims can really be true or false) and some form of consequentialism (viz. the rightness of an act depends on how it impacts the well-being of conscious creatures). While moral realism and consequentialism have both come under pressure in philosophical circles, they have the virtue of corresponding to many of our intuitions about how the world works. Here is my (consequentialist) starting point: **all questions of value** (right and wrong, good and evil, etc.) **depend upon the possibility of experiencing such value**. **Without** potential **consequences at the level of experience**—happiness, suffering, joy, despair, etc. —**all talk of value is empty.** Therefore, **to say that an act is moral**ly necessary, or evil, or blameless, **is to make** (tacit) **claims about its consequences in the lives of** conscious **creatures** (whether actual or potential).I am unaware of any interesting exception to this rule. Needless to say, if one is worried about pleasing God or His angels, this assumes that such invisible entities are conscious (in some sense) and cognizant of human behavior. It also generally assumes that it is possible to suffer their wrath or enjoy their approval, either in this world or the world to come. Even within religion, therefore, consequences and conscious states remain the foundation of all values.

Puts his theory in the double bind, either (a) we experience it and it reduces to consequences, or (b) we don’t experience it and it has no effect on us.

3. Maximizing life comes prior to any other ethical evaluation. **Rasmussen**[[5]](#footnote-3)

In so far as one chooses, regardless of the choice, one must choose (value) man's life. **It makes no sense to value some X without also valuing that which makes the valuing of X possible** ~: notice that this is different from saying "that which makes X possible"). If one lets X be equivalent to "death" or "the greatest happiness for the greatest number," one is able to have such a valuation only because of the precondition of being a living being. **Given that life is a necessary condition for valuation, there is no other way we can value something without also** (implicitly at least) **valuing [life].**that which makes valuation possible.

**The plan text is**: The United States Federal Government will allow prisoners in the United States criminal justice system to receive Pell Grants by repealing Section 20411 of the VCCLEA.

Current laws don’t matter because affirming means amending the laws to make the aff world consistent with them.

**Contention 1** is crime

Providing Pell Grants to prisoners solves crime, here’s the inherency, topicality, and solvency. **Buzzini 09**[[6]](#footnote-4)

It’s no secret that the education system in the United States is in shambles – and not just for inmates. Students aren’t receiving a proper education, which encourages the nation’s youth to get involved in gangs, drugs, and violence. Many inmates can’t even read well, ranking in at “maybe a seventh-grade level”. Were it possible for inmates to receive an education while serving time (a GED if an equivalent has not yet been attained, followed by a post-secondary degree) they would have a much greater chance of escaping the clutches of poverty and their ties to illegal activity when they are released back into society. This must have been the line of thinking that inspired the inception of the first post-secondary correctional education program, which began in 1953 at the University of Southern Illinois in Menard. Such a program must have been a bit ahead of its time, because by 1965 only 11 more post-secondary correctional education programs appeared. 1965 was a landmark year for PSCE because it marked the first time that inmates were eligible to receive Pell Grants to fund their college aspirations. Thanks to the availability of federal funding, programs began popping up nationwide. In 1973 there were 182 programs; by 1982 there were 350. Programs reached their peak when, in the early 1990s, there were a total of 772 on-site college programs in 1,287 prisons. The majority of inmates covered their costs with the aid of the Pell Grant. However, **in 1994**, **thanks to the** prevailing “**tough on crime**” **attitude** of the time**, inmates were no longer eligible to receive federal aid in the form of Pell grants.** While peak enrollment in PSCE programs totaled at 12 percent of inmate populations, the so-called “deteriorated state” counted less than 4 percent.

There is myriad statistical data to show that education programs inside prisons aid in actual rehabilitation and do reduce recidivism rates. But these facts were glossed over as politicians wowed their constituents with their tough policies regarding crime. However, they didn’t bother to mention to their constituents that “Massachusetts, Maryland, and New York are among the **states** [that **reported**] **reductions in recidivism** **of** as high as **15**.5 **percent for inmates who participated in education programs**.” That 15.5 percent reduction means 15.5 percent of inmates were *actually* rehabilitated, as opposed to merely punished, during their time on the inside. The numbers are even more impressive on the national scale, as “inmates with at least two years of college had a 10 percent re-arrest rate; the national average is 60 percent”. That means **50 percent less people went back to prison,** simply **because they completed some form of higher education.** It is for reasons such as this that “critics lament the loss [of Pell Grants] as short sighted in light of studies documenting lower recidivism and misconduct rates among inmates who pursue post-secondary education.” It truly is a serious loss, for **the depletion of funding via Pell Grants** for PSCE **has resulted in a devastating loss of programs nationwide**, despite such programs’ ability to reduce recidivism and markedly rehabilitate many inmates who participate. Should the Pell Grant be re-instated, corrections in American would likely see a much-needed turn for the better.

Even if statistics are wrong, the margin-of-error is so wide that there is no risk that I don’t garner a significant reduction in crime.

Aff gets RVIs on I meets and counter-interps because the 1AR timeskew means I can’t cover theory and still have a fair shot on substance and no risk theory would give neg a free source of no risk offense which allows him to moot the AC, exploding his ground and destroying mine.

**Contention 2** is Naval Power

The manufacturing industry is in decline now due to lack of skilled workers. Increase in community college or vocational training would solve. **Weiss ‘13**[[7]](#footnote-5)

In his **State of the Union** Address on Tuesday, President Obama highlighted several manufacturing initiatives and **touted the growth** **of** 500,000 **manufacturing jobs** over the past three years, **but warned about the** major **skills gap in the industry**:

*“None of it will matter unless we also equip our citizens with the skills and training to fill those jobs…let’s also make sure that a high school diploma puts our kids on a path to a good job. Right now, countries like Germany focus on graduating their high school students with the equivalent of a technical degree from one of our community colleges, so those German kids, they’re ready for a job when they graduate high school.”*

**A new survey** of 199 metalworking manufacturers published by [One Voice](http://www.metalworkingadvocate.org/), the joint federal advocacy program of the National Tooling and Machining Association (NTMA) and the Precision Metalforming Association (PMA), underscores the severity of the skilled worker shortage in the U.S.

In fact, the survey **showed that while 69% of surveyed manufacturers currently have job openings** and many anticipate workforce and sales increases this year, **91% of these** metalworking **manufacturers struggle to find qualified employees.**

The manufacturers, who averaged 77 employees in 2012 (compared to 69 employees in 2011), supply components, tools and other products and services to the agriculture, aerospace, appliance, automotive, defense, electronics, energy, medical, transportation and other industries.

New worker recruitment is crucial to avoid a net shortage of skilled manufacturing workers in the coming years. One of the challenges is that many **students** today **don’t realize there are advanced educational and training programs** and good-paying career opportunities **available in the trades**.

**To** address the challenge of **recruit**ing **qualified employees**, **respondents reported** their use of several different tactics such as working directly with high schools, community **colleges or vocational institutions** and using industry-training centers.

And, shipbuilding industry is on the brink of collapse now – boost in manufacturing is key to prevent collapse. **Motorship 13**[[8]](#footnote-6)

**Shipbuilding did not enjoy the best of years in 2012.** Although on the surface things seem satisfactory, with many yards reporting that production is still high and order books are full, the realisation that **far less healthy times are just around the corner**.

As an industry, shipbuilding, although moving in cycles, tends to be less extreme in the ups and downs than many other sectors, and to follow trends rather than initiate them. **A boom in manufacturing means more ships are required, to take raw materials to where they are needed, then to transport the finished goods to where they are sold.** As demand reduces, as it is bound to do in times of global recession, demand for ships dries up – but because of long lead times, typically around three years from initial order to delivery – the supply of ships steadily continues for some time ahead.

This is exactly the situation facing most fleets today. **Shipowners** find they **have surplus** **capacity**, **and as ships** **ordered** during and at the tail end of the period of high demand **are delivered, the surplus increases.** Many owners are having to decide whether to keep ships running despite charter rates that barely, if at all, cover costs, or to lay up ships and cancel orders. Layup, even though ships are not being used, incurs continuing cost, and most newbuilding contracts include substantial penalties for cancellation. So it is difficult to make the maths add up – and in the absence of returns on investment, financiers turn away from shipping as a worthwhile home for their money.

The situation is not helped by sharply rising operating costs, not just in terms of fuel, but in meeting increasingly strict regulations.

One equation that does have a solution is that with surplus capacity, orders for new ships will all but dry up – and this is what is happening. **Once the present spate of orders is fulfilled, shipyards face a bleak future.**

And, shipbuilding sector is key to naval power – every increase is important.

**NLUS 12**[[9]](#footnote-7)

**The A**merican **M**aritime **I**ndustry also **contributes to our national defense by sustaining the shipbuilding** and repair **sector** of our national defense industrial base upon which our standing as a seapower is based. **History has proven that without** a **strong** **maritime infrastructure**—shipyards, suppliers, and seafarers—**no country can hope to build and support a Navy of sufficient size and capability** to protect its interests on a global basis. Both our commercial and naval **fleets rely on U.S. shipyards** and their numerous industrial vendors **for building and repairs**. The U.S. commercial shipbuilding and repair industry also impacts our national economy by adding billions of dollars to U.S. economic output annually. In 2004, there were 89 shipyards in the major shipbuilding and repair base of the United States, defined by the Maritime Administration as including those shipyards capable of building, repairing, or providing topside repairs for ships 122 meters (400 feet) in length and over. This includes six large shipyards that build large ships for the U.S. Navy. Based on U.S. Coast Guard vessel registration data for 2008, in that year U.S. shipyards delivered 13 large deep-draft vessels including naval ships, merchant ships, and drilling rigs; 58 offshore service vessels; 142 tugs and towboats, 51 passenger vessels greater than 50 feet in length; 9 commercial fishing vessels; 240 other self- propelled vessels; 23 mega-yachts; 10 oceangoing barges; and 224 tank barges under 5,000 GT. 11 Since the mid 1990’s, the industry has been experiencing a period of modernization and renewal that is largely market-driven, backed by long-term customer commitments. Over the six-year period from 2000-05, a total of $2.336 billion was invested in the industry, while in 2006, capital investments in the U.S. shipbuilding and repair industry amounted to $270 million.12 The state of the industrial base that services this nation’s Sea Services is of great concern to the U.S. Navy. **Even a modest increase in** oceangoing commercial **shipbuilding would give a substantial boost to our shipyards and marine vendors**. Shipyard facilities at the larger shipyards in the United States are capable of constructing merchant ships as well as warships, but often cannot match the output of shipyards in Europe and Asia. On the other hand, **U.S. yards construct and equip the best** war**ships**, aircraft carriers and submarines **in the world**. **They are unmatched** in capability, **but must maintain that lead.**

And, naval power ensures global peace and solves great power nuclear war, speed and versatility makes it uniquely key to solve.

**Conway et al 7**[[10]](#footnote-8)

The world economy is tightly interconnected. Over the past four decades, total sea borne trade has more than quadrupled: 90% of world trade and two-thirds of its petroleum are transported by sea. The sea-lanes and supporting shore infrastructure are the lifelines of the modern global economy, visible and vulnerable symbols of the modern distribution system that relies on free transit through increasingly urbanized littoral regions. Expansion of the global system has increased the prosperity of many nations. Yet their continued growth may create increasing competition for resources and capital with other economic powers, transnational corporations and international organizations. Heightened popular expectations and increased competition for resources, coupled with scarcity, may encourage nations to exert wider claims of sovereignty over greater expanses of ocean, waterways, and natural resources—potentially resulting in conflict. Technology is rapidly expanding marine activities such as energy development, resource extraction, and other commercial activity in and under the oceans. Climate change is gradually opening up the waters of the Arctic, not only to new resource development, but also to new shipping routes that may reshape the global transport system. While these developments offer opportunities for growth, they are potential sources of competition and conflict for access and natural resources. Globalization is also shaping human migration patterns, health, education, culture, and the conduct of conflict. Conflicts are increasingly characterized by a hybrid blend of traditional and irregular tactics, decentralized planning and execution, and non-state actors using both simple and sophisticated technologies in innovative ways. Weak or corrupt governments, growing dissatisfaction among the disenfranchised, religious extremism, ethnic nationalism, and changing demographics—often spurred on by the uneven and sometimes unwelcome advances of globalization—exacerbate tensions and are contributors to conflict. Concurrently, a rising number of transnational actors and rogue states, emboldened and enabled with unprecedented access to the global stage, can cause systemic disruptions in an effort to increase their power and influence. Their actions, often designed to purposely incite conflict between other parties, will complicate attempts to defuse and allay regional conflict. **Proliferation of weapons** technology and information **has increased the capacity of** nation-states and transnational **actors** **to challenge maritime access,** evade accountability for attacks, and manipulate public perception. Asymmetric use of technology will pose a range of threats to the United States and its partners. Even more worrisome, the appetite for nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction is growing among nations and non-state antagonists. At the same time, attacks on legal, financial, and cyber systems can be equally, if not more, disruptive than kinetic weapons. **The** vast **majority of the** world’s **population lives within** a few **hundred** **miles of the oceans**. Social instability in increasingly crowded cities, many of which exist in already unstable parts of the world, has the potential to create significant disruptions. The effects of climate change may also amplify human suffering through catastrophic storms, loss of arable lands, and coastal flooding, could lead to loss of life, involuntary migration, social instability, and regional crises. Mass communications will highlight the drama of human suffering, and disadvantaged populations will be ever more painfully aware and less tolerant of their conditions. Extremist ideologies will become increasingly attractive to those in despair and bereft of opportunity. Criminal elements will also exploit this social instability. These conditions combine to create an uncertain future and cause us to think anew about how we view seapower. No one nation has the resources required to provide safety and security throughout the entire maritime domain. Increasingly, governments, non-governmental organizations, international organizations, and the private sector will form partnerships of common interest to counter these emerging threats. This strategy reaffirms the use of seapower to influence actions and activities at sea and ashore. The expeditionary character and versatility of maritime [Navy] forces provide the U.S. the asymmetric advantage of enlarging or contracting its military footprint in areas where access is denied or limited. Permanent or **prolonged** **basing** **of** our **military forces overseas** often **has** unintended economic, **social** or **[and] political** **repercussions**. The sea is a vast maneuver space, where the presence of maritime [flexible] forces [that] can be adjusted as conditions dictate to enable flexible approaches to escalation, de-escalation and deterrence of conflicts. **The speed,** flexibility, agility and scalability **of** maritime **[Navy] forces provide** joint or combined force commanders **a range of options for responding to crises.** Additionally**, integrated** maritime **operations,** either within formal alliance structures (such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization) or more informal arrangements (such as the Global Maritime Partnership initiative), **send powerful messages to would-be aggressors that we will act with others to ensure** collective **security** and prosperity.

*United States seapower will be globally postured to secure our homeland and citizens from direct attack and to advance our interests around the world*. As our security and prosperity are inextricably linked with those of others, U.S. maritime forces will be deployed to protect and sustain the peaceful global system comprised of interdependent networks of trade, finance, information, law, people and governance. We will employ the global reach, persistent presence, and operational flexibility inherent in U.S. seapower to accomplish six key tasks, or *strategic imperatives*. Where tensions are high or where we wish to demonstrate to our friends and allies our commitment to security and stability, U.S. maritime forces will be characterized by regionally concentrated, forward-deployed task forces with the combat power to limit regional conflict, deter major power war, and should deterrence fail, win our Nation’s wars as part of a joint or combined campaign. In addition, persistent, mission-tailored maritime forces will be globally distributed in order to contribute to homeland defense-in-depth, foster and sustain cooperative relationships with an expanding set of international partners, and prevent or mitigate disruptions and crises. Regionally Concentrated, Credible Combat Power Credible combat power will be continuously postured in the Western Pacific and the Arabian Gulf/Indian Ocean to protect our vital interests, assure our friends and allies of our continuing commitment to regional security, and deter and dissuade potential adversaries and peer competitors. This combat power can be selectively and rapidly repositioned to meet contingencies that may arise elsewhere. These forces will be sized and postured to fulfill the following strategic imperatives:

**Limit regional conflict with forward deployed, decisive maritime power.** Today regional conflict has ramifications far beyond the area of conflict. Humanitarian crises, violence spreading across borders, pandemics, and the interruption of vital resources are all possible when regional crises erupt. While this strategy advocates a wide dispersal of networked maritime forces, **we can**no**t be everywhere**, **and** we **can**no**t** act to **mitigate all regional conflict**. Where conflict threatens the global system and our national interests, maritime forces will be ready to respond alongside other elements of national and multi-national power, to give political leaders a range of options for deterrence, escalation and de-escalation. Maritime forces that are persistently present and combat-ready provide the Nation’s primary forcible entry option in an era of declining access, even as they provide the means for this Nation to respond quickly to other crises. Whether over the horizon or powerfully arrayed in plain sight, **maritime forces** can **deter** the ambitions of regional **aggressors**, **assure** friends and **allies**, gain and **maintain** **access**, **and** **protect** our **citizens** while working to sustain the global order. Critical to this notion is the maintenance of a powerful fleet—ships, aircraft, Marine forces, and shore-based fleet activities—capable of selectively controlling the seas, projecting power ashore, and protecting friendly forces and civilian populations from attack.

**[and] Deter major power war**. No other disruption is as potentially disastrous to global stability as war among major powers. Maintenance and extension of this Nation’s comparative seapower advantage is a key [to] component of deterring major power war. While war with another great power strikes many as improbable, the near-certainty of its ruinous effects demands that it be actively deterred using all elements of national power. The expeditionary character of maritime forces—our lethality, global reach, speed, endurance, ability to overcome barriers to access, and operational agility—provide the joint commander with a range of deterrent options. We will pursue an approach to deterrence that includes a credible and scalable ability to retaliate against aggressors conventionally, unconventionally, and with nuclear forces.

Win our Nation’s wars. In times of war, our ability to impose local sea control, overcome challenges to access, force entry, and project and sustain power ashore, makes our maritime forces an indispensable element of the joint or combined force. This expeditionary advantage must be maintained because it provides joint and combined force commanders with freedom of maneuver. Reinforced by a robust sealift capability that can concentrate and sustain forces, sea control and power projection enable extended campaigns ashore.

Extinction precedes ethics. **Bostrom[[11]](#footnote-9)**Our present understanding of axiology might well be confused. **We may not now know**— at least not in concrete detail—**what outcomes [are moral]** would count as a big win for humanity; we might not even yet be able to imagine the best ends of our journey. If we are indeed profoundly uncertain about our ultimate aims, then we should recognize that **there** **is** a great *option* ***value*****in** **preserving**— and ideally improving—**our ability to recognize value and to steer the future [in] accord**ingly. **Ensuring** that there will be **a** **future** version of **humanity** with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely **is** plausibly **the best way available to us to increase the probability that the future will contain** a lot of **value**. To do this, we must prevent any existential catastrophe.

Thus, this means that if another ethic is presented that we default to extinction, which outweighs because it’s the only way to ensure an action has value, making it a prerequisite to moral systems. This does NOT mean extinction comes first under util, if I win util we can still weigh systemic impacts against magnitude impacts.

**Contention 3** is **Solvency**

Pell Grants are uniquely key to solve. The vast majority of education programs for prisoners were cut when they couldn’t receive Pell Grants. **Jails to Jobs 13**[[12]](#footnote-10)

Before 1995, **prisoners had access to Pell Grants**, federal financial aid packages that are awarded to students from low-income families and don’t have to be repaid. **The passage of the 1994** **V**iolent **C**rime **C**ontrol and **L**aw **E**nforcement **A**ct, however, changed all that and **prevented giving Pell Grants to prisoners**.

According to a Quick & the Ed blog article of Nov. 5 by Education Sector Policy Analyst Sarah Rosenberg, **before** 1995 **there were about 350 college programs** for prisoners in the U.S. **In 2005 there were 12.**

Even if there are other grants available, Pell Grants are most important to the existence of post-secondary education programs in prison. **Mentor 04**[[13]](#footnote-11)

Despite evidence supporting the connection between higher education and lowered recidivism, the U.S. Congress included a provision in the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 that **eliminat[ing]**ed **Pell grants for prisoners**. This law **had a devastating effect on prison education programs**. In 1990, there were 350 higher education programs for inmates. By 1997 only 8 programs remained. Ironically, at the same time as the federal government abolished Pell grants for prisoners, many states were undergoing a dollar-for-dollar tradeoff between corrections and education spending. New York State, for example, steadily increased its Department of Corrections budget by 76% to $761 million. During the same period, the state decreased funding to university systems by 28%, to $615 million. Much of the increase in corrections spending was the result of longer prison terms and the need for increased prison construction. In the 1993–1994 school year, more than 25,000 students in correctional facilities were recipients of Pell grants. Althoughthese **[pell] grants** were not the only source of revenue for these programs, they **provided a predictable flow of money that enabled the continued functioning of classes.** Since there were no replacement funds, **programs were forced to abandon** efforts to provide **college courses in prison [without Pell Grants].**

Education for prisoners is the core of the topic. **Chlup 05**[[14]](#footnote-12)

The amount and type of education offered in corrections seem to change depending on the approach and philosophy to corrections that are dominant at the time. **Historic links between prison reform and corrections education show that when a punitive approach** (“lock them up and throw away the key”) **is ascendant, educational programming is de-emphasized**. Instead inmates may spend 17 hours a day locked in their cells, with one hour a day outside for exercise (Prison Activist Resource Center, retrieved May 16, 2004). At present, this approach is followed by several correctional institutions. **This model differs from** **a rehabilitative approach** **in which sentencing is viewed as** the punishment and **time spent in** correctional institutions focuses on rehabilitation, counseling, overcoming addictions, acquiring vocational skills, and **academic learning**. Earlier reformatory models sought to take a Progressive Era, rehabilitative approach (Gehring, 1995).

**Underview:**

1. If the affirmative reads a plan and discloses the plan text before the round on the NDCA wiki, and the negative reads a counterplan, the negative must disclose that counterplan on the NDCA wiki before the round. Reasons to prefer:
   1. Side bias. The neg can write a 7 minute prep-out to the affirmative plan and explode neg bias, whereas aff is already at a disadvantage because of neg flex and the 7-4 time skew. Especially because this is round 7 of the ToC, I don’t get to negate again to beat this back, so give me leeway. Side bias is the worst violation of fairness, it puts one debater at a structural disadvantage that he can’t beat back.
   2. Reciprocal predictability – There’s no way the aff can predict what the neg is going to read if he doesn’t defend the entire converse of the resolution, whereas the aff allows the neg to predict his arguments by disclosing the plan. Predictability is good so that we can prepare to win, but reciprocity is more key because it ensures equal access to the ballot.
   3. Equal Ground: **First**, neg gets more in-round quantity because the aff is tied to one advocacy while the neg can pick from any number of advocacies. **Second,** neg gets better quality of ground since he can pick out of the undesirable parts of the aff, and because he can choose his advocacy to interact well with the aff advocacy. Equal ground is key to fairness because it forms the arguments we make.

Fairness is a voter people wouldn’t compete if debate was

unfair.

2. The plan is popular, big names are rallying to ask Congress to reverse the ban on pell Grants. **Trounstine 13[[15]](#footnote-13)**

Vivian Nixon, director of the College and Community Fellowship and co-founder of Education from the Inside Out (EIO), said in an interview that this is the year they hope to pass a bill to turn back the repeal of Pells for prisoners. EIO’s position is that **forces such as the economy, [and] prison overcrowding,** and the need to keep people from returning to prison **insist we demand education for all**. **Big powerhouses**—Warren Buffett, George Soros, **the Gates and Ford Foundations**, to name a few—**are providing funds to** help Nixon get the word out and to ultimately **ask Congress to reverse the law [on Pell Grants].**that most people don’t know exists. “But changing federal legislation is a slow, painful process,” Nixon said. “First we’ve had to build a national coalition.” *(Editor’s clarification: Donors are not giving directly to EIO, but foundations are pooling money for a project at the Vera Institute to allow certain states to explore increasing access to higher education.)*  
My evidence is from a few weeks ago, congress has been moving so quickly from issue to issue, so always prefer the most recent.

He may read a Trinick card on politics, but **(A)** the immediate benefits of Pell Grants turn back the link and **(B)** Bill Clinton supports the plan, which would mitigates any potential opposition to the plan.   
3. I will concede reasonable neg interps if they’re read to me in cx. You don’t have to read your interp, but I’m warning you now, you should. This will be offensive in the 1ar if you violate. This meta-theory interp is best for substance education because it tries to avoid abuse and the theory debate.

1. Evaluate procedural interps read by neg as a reason to drop the argument if they indict an affirmative interp or practice which will deter neg from running frivolous theory, key to deterring abuse which checks the use of theory so it comes first.

**1AR**

**AT Pell Grants will cost a lot.**

1. The Plan leads to an increase in private donations. **Karpowitz and Kenner 2k**[[16]](#footnote-14)

**This report** **illustrates** the overwhelming consensus among public officials that postsecondary education is the most successful and cost-effective method of preventing crime. As proven by the government studies cited in this memo, the public-safety and economic impact of correctional education is enormous. In **the** past these profoundly **positive effects** were widespread **even though** such **grants** **accounted** **for** roughly **one-half** **of 1% of total Pell investments**.24 The cost-effectiveness of this policy is manifest, and has been detailed in officially recognized cost-benefit analyses. The United States Government should resume its policy of releasing a fraction of Pell Grants to qualified incarcerated Americans. **A [Pell Grant]**n extremely modest public **investment** **would create a massive response from private**, non-profit **educational** **and** **religious** **organizations**. Such a policy would sharply cut rates of recidivism and save the states millions of dollars.

1. Turns this argument back since the plan gets more money and (b) severe mitigation, the grants I endorse cost less than a half of 1% of all Pell Grants.

2. Post-dated evidence shows the aff has bipartisan support.

Richard **Fausset**, [January 28, **2011**](http://articles.latimes.com/2011/jan/28), Los Angeles Times, Conservatives latch onto prison reform, <http://articles.latimes.com/2011/jan/28/nation/la-na-conservative-crime-20110129>

Reporting from Atlanta — Reduced sentences for drug crimes. More **job training** and **rehabilitation programs** for nonviolent offenders. Expanded alternatives to doing hard time. In the not-too-distant past, conservatives might have derided those concepts as mushy-headed liberalism — **the essence of "soft on crime."** Nowadays, these same ideas **are central to a strategy being packaged as "conservative criminal justice reform,"** and have rolled out in right-leaning states around the country in an effort to rein in budget-busting corrections costs. **Encouraged by the recent success of reform efforts in Republican-dominated Texas** — where prison population growth has slowed and crime is down —conservative leaders elsewhere have embraced their own versions of the strategy. South Carolina adopted a similar reform package last year. **Republican governors are backing proposals** in Louisiana and Indiana. The about-face might feel dramatic to those who remember the get-tough policies that many conservatives embraced in the 1980s and '90s: In Texas, Republican Clayton Williams ran his unsuccessful 1990 gubernatorial campaign with a focus on doubling prison space and having first-time drug offenders "bustin' rocks" in military-style prison camps. Now, with most states suffering from nightmare budget crises**, many** conservatives **have acknowledged that hard-line strategies**, while partially contributing to a drop in crime, **have also added to fiscal havoc. Corrections is now the second-fastest growing spending category for states**, behind Medicaid, costing $50 billion annually and accounting for 1 of every 14 discretionary dollars, according to the Pew Center on the States. **That crisis affects both parties, and state Democratic leaders have also been looking for ways to reduce prison populations**. But it is conservatives who have been working most conspicuously to square their new strategies with their philosophical beliefs — and sell them to followers long accustomed to a lock-'em-up message. Much of that work is being done by a new advocacy group called Right on Crime**, which has been endorsed by** conservative luminaries such as former House Speaker **Newt Gingrich,** former Education Secretary William J. Bennett, **and Grover Norquist** of Americans for Tax Reform. The group has identified 21 states engaged in some aspect of what they consider to be conservative reform, including California. On its website, the group concedes that the "incarceration-focused" strategies of old filled jails with nonviolent offenders and bloated prison budgets, while failing to prevent many convicts from returning to crime when they got out. "Maybe we swung that pendulum too far and need to reach a cost-effective middle ground here," said Marc Levin, director of the Center for Effective Justice at the Texas Public Policy Foundation, which launched the advocacy group last month. "We have to distinguish between those we are afraid of and those we are just mad at." The right's embrace of ideas long espoused by nonpartisan and liberal reform groups has its own distinct flavor, focusing on prudent government spending more than social justice, and emphasizing the continuing need to punish serious criminals. Even so, the old-school prison reform activists are happy to have them on board. "Well, when **the left and the right agree**, I like to think that you're on to something," said Tracy Velazquez, executive director of the Justice Policy Institute, a Washington think tank dedicated to "ending society's reliance on incarceration."
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