

Debating the 2009-10 Resolution: Federal Action to Extend Social Services to the Poor

by
Stefan Bauschard

The United States federal government should substantially increase social services for persons living in poverty in the United States.

The topic area advertised for vote, and the area paper from which this resolution grew, was articulated as “poverty.” If you talk to debaters and coaches about the upcoming 2009-10 topic, they will almost invariably refer to it as the “poverty topic.”

Nonetheless, what the resolution really focuses on is the desirability of expanding “social services” to assist those who live in poverty, *not on solving poverty*, though that may be one advantage to expanding such services. This essential question of the merits of expanding “social services” is arguably the core question of the resolution, and it is certainly one of two: Should the federal government be involved in efforts to reduce poverty; Should the federal government expand social services?

This essay will proceed through a basic semantic analysis of the resolution and then turn to a basic analysis of some of the key arguments that are likely to drive debates, with a focus toward directing debaters toward the most useful arguments.

A Basic Semantic Analysis of the Resolution

Federal government. The actor in the resolution is the “federal government.” The likely central dispute in any topicality debate on this term will be whether or not that actor includes only the central government and its branches

(executive, legislative, and judicial) that operate out of Washington, D.C., or whether that actor also includes the state governments, as the state governments are part of the federal system. Some definitions point to the central authority in Washington (1-2) and others (3-5) include the state governments.

Upon consultation with a variety of dictionaries, it does not seem that the capitalization, or lack thereof, of the term has any significance, at least in terms of establishing what set of actors that the term refers to. The framers chose not to capitalize the term “federal government” because there is no such thing as “the Federal Government” – it is not a proper noun.

It will be important on the negative for you to win that the “federal government” refers to the central government in Washington, D.C. This will be important not only to win links to generic disadvantages such as politics and federalism, but also to be able to defend the competitiveness of the states counterplan. Negatives should not have any difficulty doing this, as this is how the term “federal government” has traditionally been understood in debate. Also, the presence of the term “the” emphasizes a referent to specific government (6-7), strengthening the negative’s argument.

On a related note, negative teams may also occasionally try

to catch affirmatives off guard with atypical definitions of federal government, particularly ones involving foreign governments. For example, some teams have argued, “the federal government is the central government of Brazil.” Hopefully, the presence of the term “United States” in the resolution should also suffice in distinguishing which federal government is the agent of the resolution. There are, however, some definitions that refer to the “United States of Brazil.”

Should. The term “should” in the resolution is typically interpreted to mean “ought” – expressing “obligation, duty, propriety, or desirability” (8-9). Generally, it really does not have any significance in most topicality debates. It exists primarily to provide a contextual basis for fiat the affirmative is arguing that the plan *should* be done, not necessarily, that it *would* be done.

It can also be argued that “should” is the past tense of “shall,” essentially meaning that the federal government should have supported social service programs in the past. Crafty negatives have tried to hold affirmatives to this interpretation in the past (no pun intended), but it is an argument that is difficult to win. I only mention it here in order to help affirmative teams avoid being caught off guard.

Substantially. In the resolution, “substantially” is an adverb modifying the word “increase.” The

“increase” in “social services” must be by a “substantial” amount.

It is difficult for the negative to use the term “substantially” to limit much affirmative action because there are no precise and generally agreed on definition of the term. Dr. Rich Edwards, the author of the yearly FORENSICS QUARTERLY, explained three years ago that the “legal encyclopedia *Words and Phrases* presents more than 500 pages of fine-print definitions of this term.” He explains the origin of such different definitions:

The context for these definitions should be understood: each one involves the judgment of a court in a particular case concerning what the word meant in the context of that case. It is natural that debaters will try to make use of these legal definitions, but it must always be done with a key question in mind: “Is the context for this court case similar to the way that the word ‘substantially’ is used in the debate resolution?” There is, for example, a major difference in the meaning of the word “substantially” in the phrase “substantially all” from the resolutive phrase of “substantially increase.” Many of these definitions warn that the word is not a term of precision. In *State v. Rose* the court held that “the term ‘substantially’ is relative and must be considered within the context of the particular fact situation; in essence, it means less than totally or the whole, but more than imaginary” (*Words and Phrases*, Vol. 40, 1995, p. 458).

Often, negatives will read definitions of “substantial” that claim “substantial is “X percentage” and that since the affirmative fails to meet “X percentage” they are not topical. The problem with this interpretation is that these interpretations are

arbitrary and in different contexts.

Although tying the affirmative down to a specific number may be difficult, there are various definitions of the word substantially that may be helpful to the negative without being unrealistic for the affirmative. Certainly, most judges will be persuaded that a “substantial increase” is at least a 5% increase. If the increase the affirmative argues for is not at least 5%, the negative will have a strong topicality argument.

There are two additional topicality arguments related to the term “substantial.” First, the negative can argue that the affirmative’s plan has to be “permanent.” In *Fisher v. Fisher* ruled that “to establish ‘substantial change’ in former spouse’s circumstances, as would warrant modification of child support awarded pursuant to dissolution judgment, change must be significant, material, involuntary and permanent in nature” (*Words & Phrases*, Vol. 40, 2001, p. 632). Second, the negative can argue that the affirmative cannot put a “material qualification” on the increase in social services; the affirmative cannot limit or condition in any way the increase in social services.

Increase. “Increase” is generally defined as to “become greater or larger” (11). So, after the plan there needs to be more social services for persons living in poverty than there are now. The one major controversy related to the term “increase” is whether or not the social service has to be “pre-existing.” The “pre-existing” argument that the negative will make is that in order for a social service to be increased it has to already exist. Some services may not exist previous to the affirmative plan, and the negative may argue that is not an increase. This is a weak argument because adding a new social services will increase the total number of social services available.

Social Services. According to

the American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language (14), “social services” are “organized efforts to advance human welfare.” This is obviously a very broad definition, but the negative will struggle to limit what the affirmative can define as a social service. Examples of social services include drug rehabilitation, disaster relief, food pantries, after school programs (15), free school lunches (16), day care, health education, meal programs (17), unemployment benefits (18), immigration assistance, English classes (19), foster care, adoption, prevention of child abuse, emergency shelter, group homes, case management, treatment of developmentally disabled children (20), subsidized housing (21), mental health care, education and job training, computer access, (22), drug rehabilitation (23), prisons (24), domestic violence prevention (25), transportation assistance (26), health and education programs (27), Medicaid (28), public hospitals, telecommunications, and efforts to improve the roads and clean the water supply (29). I’m certain that this list is not exhaustive will and grow substantially before institutes finish this summer.

Persons. The word “person” is somewhat ambiguous term. If you were to approach 100 people walking down the street and ask them what a person is, I suspect 40 would point you to another “human being,” (30), 50 would run away from you because they will think you are a loon, five (lawyers) will point to a corporation that is visible from the street, and another five (philosophers) will throw up their hands in despair.

The reason for the difference is that I think it is fair to say that most people understand a “person” to be another human being. Nonetheless, legally corporations and other entities have the same legal obligations and responsibilities, making them

“persons” at least within some areas of the law. Philosophers have argued over the criteria for what constitutes a “person” for hundreds of years.

Philosophical disputes over the definition of “person” usually arise within the context of the animal rights debate. Some of my debaters have already suggested that we simply say animals are people and provide social services to animals. We may be able to claim an advantage from preventing certain animals from living in poverty, but more importantly we could argue that we support animal rights by defining the animals as persons

This “animal rights” approach to the topic will inevitably be tried. Negatives attack it by arguing that a definition of a “person” as a human is the only one that should be accepted by the judge. Negatives can also attack this interpretation by having a general strategy that argues that animal rights shouldn’t be protected by defining them as humans – that that reduces them to people rather than celebrating them for what they are. Strong negative teams should have both arguments ready to go.

Despite the potential breadth of the term “person,” the term was successfully limited to a “human being” on the 2005-6 national service topic. I suspect that is how it will be interpreted in 2009-10 as well.

In poverty. Since, there are many different ways to define “poverty,” there will likely be some significant debate next year over what it means to live “in poverty.”

First, poverty can be defined in economic terms. The most common means is to use a federally established minimum income standard and to calculate whether or not a family’s income meets that federal standard. If the income does not meet that standard, the person is considered to be “living in poverty.” (31). For example, if you were a single parent with three children and

earned \$19, 874 in 2005, you were considered poor. If you earned, \$19, 875 you were not considered poor (Shipler, p. 14).

Second, poverty can be defined more descriptively. At least one definition claims that poverty is “a state resulting from a lack of sufficient income that leaves affected persons without basic needs such as food, water, shelter, clothing, or emotional or physical health (Hunsaker, p. 631). Other definitions suggest that poverty is more than a lack of material necessities (32), suggesting that “it includes the inability to achieve a health, innovative life, have a positive self-image, and benefit from the respect of others” (Ibid, p. 631).

Given the precision and predictability (it is the federal government’s standard) of the first definition, it is likely the interpretation that most debaters will be able to win should control the debates. Negatives, however, should be prepared for broader and more ambiguous definitions of the term, especially since federal definition is widely criticized (33) from many perspectives (liberals arguing it is too narrow, conservatives arguing it is too broad, critical scholars arguing it ignores many factors (34)).

Semantic Conclusions. Based on common understandings of the terms of the resolution, and popular ways that those terms have been previously “interpreted,” it is reasonable to predict that topical affirmative advocacy will include having the central government in Washington, D.C. take action to substantially expand the provision of the type of social services described above to persons living in poverty, as defined, most likely, by the federal poverty standard. With this understanding in mind, I will now examine some of the core topic arguments.

Affirmative Case Ground

As discussed, the core affirmative ground focuses on expanding social services to persons living in poverty. There are three overlapping categories of cases that expand such services – a basic expansion, expansion to specific groups, and removal of federal restrictions on the provision of such services. Some of the categories offer more strategic cases than others.

Basic expansion of social services. The type of affirmative case is simply one that has the federal government directly increase, most likely through funding, the expansion of social services, such as child care and school lunch programs, to persons living in poverty. Specific affirmative cases include child care support; nutrition programs, programs to provide support to the homeless, programs to improve parenting, expansion of Head Start, educational programs for parents, programs to reduce teen pregnancy, home visitation programs to reduce child abuse, foster care reforms, lead paint removal, the expansion and reform of food stamps, job creation programs, legal assistance, public housing, the provision of health care, and education services. I will now examine the these affirmative cases in more detail.

In order for single parents living in poverty to work (as required as a condition of the receipt of welfare payments), they must be able to find work. In order to find work, however, they need to find child care, which is often hard to find and difficult for low-income parents to afford (Forman, 2007). Single parents who are unable to find appropriate child care are often forced to forgo work, risking the elimination of welfare payments or placing their children in sub-standard care that threatens their long-term development (and further impoverishment) (Neuman, 2009). Government support for the

provision of high quality care can support working parents and help to reduce the risks of this vicious cycle reoccurring (Duncan, 2009; Neuman, 2009). This can be accomplished by expanding the child care subsidy (Crone, 2007; Polakow, 2007) and/or the child care tax exemption (Kennedy, 2008).

Impoverished children (and adults) are often hungry and lacking in appropriation nutrition. Even those who have enough to eat often do not receive adequate nutrition, threatening brain development, leaving them mentally impaired for life (Chilton, 2007). A poor diet also results in obesity (American Dietetic Association, 2007). A strong case can be made to expand nutrition programs, particularly in places where it is easy to reach children, such as schools.

Homeless youth often suffer from severe mental and physical development challenges (Berg, 2007). The Federal Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (RHYA) was established to help deliver such services and it would be expanded (National Council Network for Youth). Loza (2007) argues for expanding social services to the rural homeless. The National Alliance to End Homelessness (2008) argues for expanding housing vouchers. Johnston (2001) argues for focusing on the housing needs of the veteran poor.

Since family poverty is usually correlated with domestic violence, particularly spousal and child abuse, interventions to support mental health counseling and reduce child abuse are important (Child Welfare League of America, 2007). For a comprehensive discussion of the value of early home visitation programs, see the hearing on the EDUCATION BEGINS AT HOME ACT (2008, <http://edlabor.house.gov/hearings/2008/06/hr-2343-education-begins-at-ho.shtml>)

One particular problem the poor face is exposure to lead paint (Outterson, 2007). Many poor individuals live in sub-standard housing that continues to contain a lot of lead paint. Lead paint can lead to stunted development, including learning disabilities. Many poor individuals lack the resources to remove lead paint from the homes or to find other places to live. Financial support for lead paint removal under the Residential Lead-Based Paint Hazard Reduction Act could be expanded to support the removal of lead based paint. Lead paint victims could also be given standing to sue (Outterson, 2007).

One particular problem for single parent families is that the former spouse or boyfriend – usually the father – fails to pay court-ordered child support. Lindsay (2009) and Steib (2008) suggest increasing enforcement of child support payments in order to reduce poverty in single parent homes.

Impoverished families that lack well-educated parents are likely to stay in poverty because the parents are unlikely to be able to obtain jobs that pay high enough wages to enable the parents to move out of poverty. Affirmatives that offer to expand educational opportunities for the poor include allowing education to count as work under welfare reform (Furstenberg, 2008) and expanding Pell Grants (Holzer, 2007 and Newman, 2007).

As discussed in some other sections of this essay, there are many limits to current food stamp programs, but one solution is to simply expand the monetary value of the stamps so that individuals who already receive the stamps can purchase more food and more nutritious food (Chilton, 2007). Berg (2008) recommends expanding school breakfast and lunch programs.

Many poor individuals lack

necessary resources to obtain necessary legal assistance to deal with their legal issues, including potential eviction, discrimination, and police brutality. Without legal assistance, it is difficult for people living in poverty to protect their rights. Given this, a strong case can be made to increase legal assistance to the poor (Wallace, 2008).

One barrier to the poor escaping poverty is the fact that poverty is very concentrated, particularly in urban and rural areas. This concentration of poverty makes it difficult for the poor to obtain needed services and to establish contacts with individuals who can help them climb out of poverty. The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has started a program --- HOPE VI – that is aimed at encouraging middle class individuals to move into cities and to support the movement of poor to the suburbs. This program could be expanded (Curley, 2007).

Increasing access to higher education can improve the employment prospects of impoverished individuals, but so can on the job training programs, many of which are sponsored by the federal government (Lang, 2007). A strong case can be made to expand these programs (Holzer 2007; Lang, 2007; Stricker, 2007).

When girls become pregnant as teenagers, it substantially increases the risk that they will become impoverished (Klein, 2007), a problem that continues to grow. Status quo programs have put a lot of emphasis on abstinence programs, programs that many scholars contend will fail (Steib, 2008), and some such as Klein argue that we should re-focus our efforts on traditional sex education programs. There have been many successful models (Sawhill, 2007).

Providing health care to the

poor is almost a topic unto itself (“health care reform” was chosen second behind “poverty” in the 2009-10 topic voting). And, the issue of health care reform goes well beyond the poor, as there are many who live well above the poverty line and lack access to affordable health care. But despite the fact that health care debates move beyond providing care to the poor, there are many strong cases to expand the provision of health care to persons living in poverty.

There are a few basic problems the poor face as a result of a lack of access to health care. First, many poor individuals lack access to any care at all, creating life-threatening conditions. In the U.S., health care is generally provided through employer-based plans, and most of the poor either do not have employers or do not have good enough jobs to enable them to qualify for such plans (Feder, 2007). Second, even when the poor have access to care, they often lack access to preventive care, causing conditions to grow worse and requiring more costly treatment when they are finally able to access care. Third, when the poor are treated they are often treated in emergency rooms (Warden, 2007). Emergency rooms are only required to stabilize the patient, not treat the condition, resulting in return visits and higher health care costs (Choudhury 2007).

Some advocates (Kinney (2007), Daniels (2008), and Sandhu (2007) suggest a “right to health care” be established. There are some obvious topicality issues with this – it is not in of itself a social service and it would apply to more people than the poor – but it would result in the delivery of more social services to those living in poverty.

There are more topical proposals in the health care area, however. Lefkowitz (2007) and

Sered (2007) advocate expanding the number of community health care centers in poor areas.

Others advocate a specific focus on improving dental/oral health. Many poor people never receive any appropriate dental care, and more and more research is pointing to the importance of dental health to overall health.

One way that the poor, particularly the children of the poor and the poor who have disabilities, do receive care is through Medicaid, a federally and state funded program that provides health care for the needy. One problem with Medicaid is that services are generally rendered in institutionalized settings, increasing costs and lowering the quality of care (Thomas, 2008). Baldwin (2008) recommends the passage of the Community Choice Act of 2007 as a means of decentralizing care in community settings, increasing both access to care and the quality of care. There is also a strong case to be made for the simply expansion of Medicaid services because current resources do not permit adequate care (Geyman, 2008).

Another category of affirmatives that could be its own topic (it was in 1999) is improving education/ education reforms. Like health care, many of the proposals, such as removing standardized testing and No Child Left Behind (NCLB), are focused beyond how to help those in poverty to the question of how to improve education generally. There are, however, proposals to expand funding for high poverty schools (Corwin, 2007; Weiner, 2007) that may be topical.

One education affirmative that is probably topical is the expansion of Head Start programs for vulnerable youth. Head Start is an early childhood learning program that provides learning opportunities

for kids of the pre-school age to help make up for deficient backgrounds.

There are some strong affirmative cases in this area that requiring pushing the breadth of the definition of “social services,” but probably still qualify. One of the most significant is asset development. Assets are anything of material value that are owned by individuals. Since impoverished Americans own few, if any, assets, it is difficult for them to use assets to leverage future loans and/or to establish financial stability.

The government does a lot to help middle class and wealthy Americans build assets. Americans who buy homes are able to deduct up to \$1 million in interest on mortgage payments and up to another \$100,000 in interest on home equity loans. Individuals who sell their own homes also do not have to pay the capital gains tax on homes that they sell, enabling them to escape this tax on any profit that they make from the sale of their home. This not only makes it possible for them to develop assets, but since schools are primarily financed by property taxes, it enables them to send their own children to schools that are driven by higher property values, magnifying the impact of wealth gaps.

Kramer (2009) & Reid (2008) argue that the government should help impoverished individuals develop assets by providing savings matching grants that individuals can use to purchase homes and/or start their own businesses. Other parts of the program include assisting individuals with starting their own bank accounts. Collectively, asset development plans are referred to as IDAs – Individual Development Accounts. Some asset development programs have been tried on a limited basis and have proven successful.

Other proposals include providing a tax credit for savings for

individuals making up to \$75,000 (New America Foundation, 2007), establishing savings accounts with modest deposits for all persons born in the U.S., establishing additional tax credits for individuals who deposit their Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) refund into a savings plan, such as an Individual Retirement Account (IRA) or a 529 College Savings Account.

One specific form of asset development is support for microfinance. Microfinance provides capital for microenterprises – small businesses with five or fewer employees that require \$35,000 or less in financing to get started. For more on microfinance, see Klein (2008), Jurik (2008), and Dion (2008). Related proposals include a guaranteed minimum income (Crone, 2007; Kennedy, 2008), an increase in the Earned Income Tax credit (Billitteri, 2009), changing the tax structure so the rich pay more and the poor pay less (Crone, 2007), and raising the federal minimum wage.

Related to the problem of asset development is asset depletion. In order to qualify for programs such as SSI – Supplemental Security Income -- or Medicaid, recipients often have to first spend-down the value of their assets, depleting their life savings. While this is not as consequential for individuals at the end of life who often must deplete their assets before relying on programs like Medicaid to cover the cost of nursing home care, it is destructive to individuals who must rely on such programs mid-life in order to deal with unfortunate circumstances that they may find themselves in (New American Foundation, 2007). In order to qualify, they have to spend-down their assets, depleting savings that they may need for another 20-30 years. And, it obviously operates to discourage savings since strong retirement savings make it

impossible for those individuals to access these programs (Retirement Security Project, 2008).

One particular problem that asset depletion manifests itself in is in the area of food stamp delivery. As explained by Berg (2008), in order to qualify for food stamps, households cannot have more than \$2,000 in countable resources, \$3,000 if the household is disabled. This discourages savings because it encourages families to have \$2,000 in countable savings, they simply spend them so that they can become eligible for the food stamps. O'Brien (2007) argues for a relaxation of asset limits for food stamp utilization.

Another structural issue related to confronting housing is the contemporary housing crisis. In relation to poverty, this manifests itself in two ways. First, it is not economical for the poor to purchase houses not only because they have difficulties accumulating assets but also because their income is so low that the tax credit has almost no value. Second, many poor Americans who own homes are currently being foreclosed on because they cannot make the payments on their own homes. Proposals that expand assets, and new programs that help prevent the poor from being foreclosed on, may go a long way toward alleviating the housing crisis.

There are other economic development programs that are certainly social services, though they are likely to be social services for everyone, not just the poor. An example of this type of program is expanding public transportation infrastructure (Blackwell, 2007; Crone, 2007). Mass transit affirmatives have been popular on past topics, so if affirmatives can find a way to defend these cases against topicality attacks, they will be run frequently.

It is possible that any of these proposals, or a more general proposal that targeted the delivery of social services for minorities, to function as a reparation for historical injustices against minorities, particularly blacks. For a comprehensive discussion of the merits of reparations, see REDRESS FOR HISTORICAL INJUSTICES IN THE UNITED STATES: ON REPARATIONS FOR SLAVERY, JIM CROW AND THEIR LEGACIES (2007).

Proposals for basic social services are easy to find and very simple to understand. These affirmatives will improve the quality of life for persons living in poverty and hopefully reduce the likelihood that they will remain in poverty. One big factor that the affirmative will need to be able to account for is that many of these proposals are targeted toward people who can be broadly defined as living “in poverty,” or even who have the potential to end-up in poverty (through, for example, asset depletion), and not just for persons living in poverty.

Affirmatives that choose cases in these areas do need to be prepared for an “increase” topicality argument. First, removing a restriction is not a direct increase. Second, and more importantly, removing the restriction may not increase the total availability of social service supports that are available since those that meet the conditions may already be exhausting the available budgeted resources.

Targeting of social services to specific groups. Cases in this category will target social services to particular groups of poor persons rather than all people living in poverty. More specifically, these cases are likely to offer social services to individuals where the federal government has the responsibility to/most directly can provide the social services, for such

as to members of the military, those in federal detention/federal prisons, those living on Indian reservations, those living in poverty in the New Orleans area, immigrants who are often unable to access Medicaid resources, and victims of sex trafficking (Hsu, 2007). At least these first three cases will enable the affirmative to claim a strong justification for federal action.

Affirmative cases to expand social services to members of the military living in poverty are likely to be some of the most popular cases next year. These cases are strategic because the states counterplan will not be particularly effective against them, and because they allow the affirmative to access a big impact – military readiness – that they can weigh against the disadvantages.

One significant problem facing the military is that many of the soldiers who served/are serving in Iraq and Afghanistan have developed Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD). Sufferers of PTSD are vulnerable to commit acts of violence against their families and communities when they are at home and are less effective warfighters when stationed abroad. Eibner (2008) makes a strong case for an increase in the provision of mental health PTSD services for members of the military.

In a hearing on PROMOTING INMATE REHABILITATION AND SUCCESSFUL RELEASE PLANNING (http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=110_house_hearings&docid=f:39480.pdf), a number of panelists testified that if prisoners do not receive appropriate social services necessary for rehabilitation that they will recidivate, substantially increasing crime. Others (Conyers, 2007) and LoBuglio (2007) argue that these services need to continue after offenders are released.

In a hearing on the INDIAN HEALTH CARE IMPROVEMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 2007 (http://energycommerce.house.gov/cmte_mtgs/110-he-hrg.060707.Indian.Hcare.shtml), panelists testified about the importance of efforts to improve health care services for Native Americans, both on reservations and in urban areas where many Natives Americans reside. There are also proposals to strengthen the Indian Health Services specifically. Some advocates place a particular emphasis on expanding mental health care for Native Americans.

Removal of federal limits on social services. There are many examples of federal limits on the provision of social services. Many affirmatives this year will argue for a removal of these limits, arguing that the social services that would flow are good and that the limit itself is inherently bad. There are limits that can be removed at least in the areas of abortion, welfare, and food stamps.

As per the Hyde Amendment, the federal government currently prohibits federal funding for abortion. Affirmatives could remove this limit, arguing it is important for the federal government to fund abortions, not only to reduce poverty, but also to protect abortion rights.

There are many examples in the area of welfare reform. As part of the Personal Work and Responsibility Act (PWORA), the federal government established many conditions on the receipt of welfare. These include a requirement that the recipient work, that the recipient does not have additional children while on welfare, that the recipient make efforts to disclose the identity of the father and find the father, as well as some additional conditions. Removing the restrictions

would increase the number of social services provided, reducing poverty and its effects. Affirmatives will also be able to claim advantages from the harms of the conditions – such as the biopolitical control of the recipients that results from the government controlling their childbearing decisions.

Another interesting area where one could relax restrictions is in the area of food stamps. Getting access to food stamps is incredibly complicated, and the bureaucracy deters many people from even applying (Berg 2008). Removing the asset limits on food stamps (previously discussed) and reducing the bureaucracy are probably good means to expand access to this social service. Bolling (2007) recommends allowing people to apply for food stamps online.

Asset test limits that were discussed above could also be placed in this “removal of federal limits” category. For example, affirmatives that remove the asset limits would make it easier for individuals who have assets to access the social services at issue.

Strategic thoughts on the categories. One of most effective arguments that the negative has on this topic is the states counterplan. For the last thirty years, this has been a very effective negative strategy, and affirmative teams that want to win will need to choose affirmative cases that can defeat this counterplan.

The cases in the first category – those that generally increase social services -- introduce the most breadth to the topic – a myriad of social services that the federal government could provide. The number of affirmative cases in this area, however, is substantially (if not entirely) reduced by the need for the affirmative to justify federal action as opposed to state action (either in the form of a justification argument or in

the form of a states counterplan), and it will be difficult for affirmatives in this category to provide strong justifications for federal action. Really the only plausible justification for federal action in this category is that “federal leadership” is necessary, but those arguments have really not been winners in modern debate. Negatives are usually able to convince judges that any marginal benefit to federal action vis-à-vis the states is easily outweighed by the disadvantages (usually politics and/or spending).

The second category of cases presents a greater opportunity for the affirmative to argue that federal action is necessary to solve. Clearly, the states cannot, for example, provide social services to those in federal prisons. They could, perhaps, provide social services to members of the military living in poverty, but they could not necessarily provide those services “on base” or “on location.” Many of these cases enable the affirmative to make strong solvency deficit arguments against the states counterplan.

The third category of affirmatives appears to provide a lot of leverage against the states counterplan: If federal law limits the distribution of funds, it seems that it is important to remove the federal law in order to solve. While this is an intuitive claim, one weakness of these affirmatives is that in most instances the federal law does not prohibit the use of *all* funds for social services such as abortion, but only *federal funds*. The negative can still counterplan to have the states expand their own public funding for abortion and have the states use their own financial resources to for welfare without the federal conditions. Changing the federal policy is one way to solve, but it is probably not *necessary*. Affirmatives would still need to prove that federal action and/or leadership in these areas is

necessary. And they can argue that the existence of the restriction is inherently bad, independent of the fact that it blocks the flow of social services to the poor. For example, the affirmative could argue that the welfare conditions are biopolitical and need to be removed.

Affirmative Advantage Ground

There are three categories of advantages on the 2009-10 resolution. The first category stems from actions to reduce poverty.

Poverty. The most predictable advantage on the topic is poverty. Many, though not all (the resolution does not require that the affirmative reduce poverty) affirmative cases will claim to reduce poverty and the harms that result from poverty. Harms that result from poverty include:

- Sickness and death – The poor do not have adequate diets, they often end up hungry (Berg, 2008) and homeless, and they do not have access to appropriate health care. This often results in death (Fiscella, 2007).
- Disease. Those living in poverty are less likely to be treated for diseases, increasing the risk that diseases will spread.
- Childhood poverty – The children of poor parents (those in poor families) are poor themselves. Lacking appropriate opportunities (an appropriate education, appropriate living conditions, necessary social contacts), many of these individuals grow up to be poor themselves, creating a “cycle of poverty” (Pearce, 2007).
- Domestic violence. Poor families experience higher rates of spousal and child abuse. Poverty is often correlated with increased rates of mental illness and substance abuse, leaving parents less capable of handling

life’s difficulties and leading to abuse (Child Welfare League of America, 2007).

- Crime. Those living in poverty are more likely to commit crimes in order to obtain the goods necessary to support living. Children living in poverty are more likely to be delinquent.
- Racism. Members of minority classes often constitute many of the poor, so arguably the failure to act to reduce poverty is racist.

Ethics & Social Justice. It is arguably unethical for a society to let a large number (or any) of its members to live in poverty. Many affirmative teams are likely to take a strong ethical stance against allowing poverty to continue.

A failure to reduce poverty can also have larger consequences:

Soft Power. Our ability to make friends and influence others is known as soft power. The fact that the U.S. is the richest nation on earth yet still has the highest rate of poverty for any industrialized country undermines our global credibility, threatening our soft power and overall leadership.

Economy. I think a lot of teams will try to tie the consequences of poverty – decay of the inner cities, the collapse of affordable housing – to the larger economy. Economic collapse in the U.S. can have domestic and global implications.

Class inequality/riots. There is more and more evidence that growing inequality in America is contributing to “class warfare” and some speculate that the outbreak of rioting is possible.

The second category of advantages stems from changing federal policies that may be contributing to poverty and/or undermining efforts to distribute social services.

Violations of the constitution. As discussed, limits on the use of federal funds for abortion services may be unconstitutional. Other policies that limit the distribution of social services are also likely to be challenged on constitutional grounds. Violations of the Constitution can be argued generally, but also specifically (as in the case of a denial of abortion rights – as violations of privacy).

Positive rights. Violations of the constitution are generally referred to as violations of negative rights – when the government violates your right to be free from something – such as when it violates your privacy. Scholars such as Frank Michelman and Robin West argue that the Constitution should be interpreted to involve more than the protection of negative rights, but should also involve the protection of positive rights – the right to something, such as health care or a basic standard of living.

Racism. In addition to arguing that the failure to address poverty has racist effects, one can also argue that the current policies themselves are also racist. For example, the failure to aid the poorest victims of hurricane Katrina may be driven by racism – institutional and/or attitudinal racism. Others argue that current policies that do nothing to protect the poor from having their homes foreclosed on are racist (ENDING POVERTY IN AMERICA, p. 143).

Biopolitical control. As discussed in the section on welfare reform, many federal restrictions on the provision of social services constitute a form of biopolitical control over the recipients.

A third category of advantages stems from providing social services to particular groups.

Military readiness. Providing mental health counseling for this in the military might both increase retention in the military and keep

soldiers more mentally prepared for combat, boosting readiness.

Trust doctrine. As a result of the appropriation of native land through various treaties in the 1800s, many argue that the U.S. has a “trust doctrine” responsibility to meet the needs of Native Americans. If impoverished Native Americans are in need of social services, the U.S. arguably has a responsibility to provide them as part of its trust doctrine.

Prisoner rights. Prisoners are entitled to certain basic social services, such as health care, in prison. To the extent that the provision of such services are currently inadequate, boosting them could improve the rights of prisoners.

Negative Advantage Ground

Negative arguments against the core affirmative advantage – poverty – are difficult to come by. Poverty is certainly increasing in the United States, and many of the impacts are difficult to contest. Negatives, however, can make a few arguments to minimize the significance of the advantage. First, many people living in poverty simply do not die from poverty. There simply is a minimal impact to poverty (at least in debate terms). Second, there are many programs at the state and local level, including those operated by private actors such as churches and other charities, that protect against the most deleterious impacts of poverty – homelessness and death.

Furthermore, basic utilitarianism arguments – a defense of the idea that we should act to promote the greatest good for the greatest number -- can be advanced against the claim that we have a moral obligation to solve poverty. There are also arguments that challenge the notion that it is the responsibility of the government to help the poor, including the common Objectivism argument that claims that it is not the responsibility of

the government to provide social services to the poor. In fact, the argument goes even farther to claim that it is immoral to support the redistribution of wealth from the rich to the poor.

The soft power advantage has been debated for years. Popular answers to the advantage include arguments about the many other policies that threaten U.S. leadership. General arguments about the negative effects of U.S. leadership and hegemony can also be advanced. Negatives may also wish to counterplan to boost U.S. soft power by changing other policies.

The economy advantage can easily be challenged with evidence that indicates that there are many other factors responsible for the current economic decline. Also, boosting the economy could trigger inflation, threatening long-term economic growth.

The advantages, while strong, can be substantially mitigated with reasonable negative arguments.

Negative Case Ground

Negative case arguments will certainly vary from case-to-case, but I think that there are certain categories of general arguments that negatives can prepare against any affirmative. First, negatives can argue that social services are generally ineffective – that they are poorly delivered, that people do not respond appropriately, that they are not sustained, and that they empirically don’t have much success. Second, negatives can argue that the federal government is particularly poor at delivering social services. This particular case argument dovetails well with a states counterplan because it undermines any solvency deficit to the counterplan that the affirmative may try to win.

Negative Disadvantage Ground

There are some strong

disadvantages against expanding social services.

Presidential politics. There is really no political support to significantly expand social services. If Obama pushed the expansion of social services, this would arguably undermine his ability to push other agenda items such as the Law of the Sea Treaty (LOST). The magnitude of the politics impacts (nuclear war, economic collapse, “extinction”) are likely to outweigh most case advantages. If the negative wins any disadvantage with an economy impact, they can prove that the plan will result in a radical increase in poverty.

Spending. Given the fact that the federal government is currently spending trillions of dollars, it will probably be difficult to construct a unique spending disadvantage. There are, however, two potential arguments. First, once the federal government is done with its bailouts, it is likely that many commentators will argue that we simply cannot spend anymore without breaking the bank. Affirmatives could be this bank-breaker. Second, negatives can argue that since Congress will not support increased spending, new spending for social services will force trade-offs in the budget and that these trade-offs are undesirable.

Federalism. The Tenth Amendment to the Constitution states that powers not explicitly given to the federal government are reserved for the states. Included in the powers explicitly given to the federal government are the powers to raise and coin money, the power to spend that money, the power to regulate foreign and interstate commerce, and the power to provide for the defense of the United States. Generally speaking, the states are responsible for policy action on domestic issues, including education, welfare, health, and criminal justice where the Constitution does not

provide authorization for the federal government to act – all of these being in the area of social services. The purpose of federalism, striking a balance between the powers of the state and the federal government, is to ensure that one branch of government, particularly the federal government, does not obtain too much power. Negatives can argue that by expanding the role of the federal government in social services, the affirmative disrupts this delicate federal-state balance, risking tyranny and resulting in other countries that may model U.S. constitutionalism abandoning federalism as well.

All three of these disadvantages are excellent net-benefits to the states counterplan because they are all contingent on federal action being bad, whereas the counterplan advocates state action.

Volunteerism. A strong general argument can be made that when social services are organized and provided for by the government, it undermines a volunteer ethic and reduces the actual personal value and civic nature of the service.

Inflation. Substantially boosting economic activity may increase inflation, undermining the economy in the long-term.

Immigration Bad. This disadvantage argues that expanding social services will attract more illegal immigrants to the U.S., increasing the problems associated with high levels of immigration.

Dependency. Expanding social services can make individuals more dependent on those services, increasing poverty over the long-term.

If the affirmative uses the Supreme Court as the agent of action (this will be discussed in the next section), there are a number of disadvantages to such action.

Hollow Hope. The foundation of the Hollow Hope Disadvantage is a book by Gerald Rosenberg

called HOLLOW HOPE: CAN THE COURTS BRING ABOUT SOCIAL CHANGE? Rosenberg largely answers this question in the negative, claiming that the courts are ineffective at producing social change. He articulates three general constraints that the court operates under that inhibit it:

1. Limited opportunities for rulings. Since constitutional rights are generally limited and do not specifically address many contemporary issues (such as welfare), the courts are generally barred from, and cannot credibly rule on, important issues of social reform.

2. Lack of judicial independence. The judiciary is not independent enough from the other branches of government to lead their own charge for social change.

3. Implementation. Courts lack the requisite tools to implement any socially progressive policies that they may develop.

In addition to these defensive arguments against the ability of the courts to produce social change, Rosenberg also identifies a number of reasons why court action may actually undermine the prospects for social reform. The critical argument he makes that sets-up the disadvantage is that when the courts make liberal decisions they tend to attract subsequent litigants, particularly group litigants, who are hoping the courts will also make decisions favorable to their cause. Rosenberg cites examples of environmental groups who turned to the courts after the courts made environmentally-friendly decisions, of pro-choice activists who turned to the Supreme Court after its decision in ROE v. WADE, and a number of others. Rosenberg argues that this is problematic because the rarely support additional protections for these groups. Instead, these groups just burn limited economic and personnel resources and

consequently undermine the ability of these groups to obtain progressive social change.

Supreme Court Legitimacy.

The opposite of Hollow Hope, this disadvantage argues that controversial court decisions will undermine the legitimacy of the Supreme Court and the rule of law.

Judicial activism. Judicial activism or judicial policymaking are terms describing the process by which judges use their interpretive power broadly to discover “new rights” and limit the authority of elected legislatures. During the 1950’s and 1960’s, the Warren Court used the concept of substantive due process to discover new rights deserving federal protection even if state majorities, expressing their will through elected legislatures, did not want those rights protected. The right to desegregated educational facilities was one of many rights that the Warren Court created using the vague notion of substantive due process. Kline (1999) explains:

A judicial activist is, simply put, a judge who exceeds the proper limits of his or her authority and usurps the authority delegated to another branch (or institution) of government. In its most basic sense, activism is when judges make law instead of apply it (Kline, p. 689).

Generally, activism is opposed by many schools of judicial restraint. Judicial restraintists believe that unelected justices of the Supreme Court damage the democratic process when they discover new rights, under the definition of substantive due process that the majorities in society do not support. Restraintists believe that judges ought to limit their power to strike down legislation in circumstances where very clear provisions of the Constitution have been compromised. Creation and recognition of new rights, they argue, should be done through

the constitutional amendment process. Activists of the Warren Court believed that the Fourteenth Amendment gave them the authority to explore new meanings of substantive law. Today, negatives may argue that reading rights into the constitution that are not explicitly there, such as abortion rights, increases judicial activism.

Separation of Powers. The government has three distinct branches – the executive, the legislature, and the judicial (the courts). The purpose of the legislature is to draft the laws, the purpose of courts is to interpret them, and the purpose of the executive is to enforce them. The framers argued that if each of these branches were strong that they would be able to check the relative power of each other and prevent tyranny. The Separation of Powers disadvantage argues that if the action of one of the branches usurps the legitimate authority of either of the other branches of government, the separation of powers is violated and that there is an increased risk of tyranny, largely due to the concentration of power in one particular branch.

Court clog. This disadvantage argues that providing new foundations for rights encourages increased litigation in the courts. Expanding litigation reduces the amount of time courts have to decide all cases, threatening justice.

Court capital. The court capital disadvantage is largely a creation of the debate community – a permutation of the court legitimacy and political capital disadvantages. The basic argument is that court infighting over the new case the affirmative has the Court decide, and a loss of public support due to the (potential) unpopular nature of the decision, means that the court will not have the political strength to rule in a particular way on an

upcoming decision. The impact to the disadvantage stems from the consequence of failing to rule in that particular way in the other decision.

Negative Counterplan Ground

There are a number of strong negative counterplans, most of which simply change the agent of action.

States counterplan. The states counterplan argues that the fifty states, rather than the federal government, should adopt the non-federal mandates of the plan. Since the states ordinarily implement social service programs, it will be difficult for affirmatives to generate significant solvency deficits against this counterplan

It is worth noting that there is a controversy related to the theoretical legitimacy of the states counterplan: Is it fair for the negative to “fiat” that the 50 states all simultaneously adopt the mandates of the affirmative plan, minus the federal action? An article on the theoretical legitimacy of the states counterplan by University of Kentucky debate coach Roger Solt can be found at <http://groups.wfu.edu/debate/MiscSites/DRGArticles/Solt1999Education.htm> and a recent discussion of the counterplan’s theoretical legitimacy by leading high school and college debate coaches can be found here <http://www.ndtceda.com/pipermail/edebate/2009-April/078259.html> (Note: Click on “Next message: Re-thinking the states counterplan” to continue following the discussion).

Lopez counterplan. The Lopez counterplan has the Supreme Court “extend the Lopez decision” and rule that the counterplan is unconstitutional because it is inconsistent with the Lopez decision precedent that supposedly opposes federal action. The counterplan then has the states implement the mandates of the plan. Teams running the counterplan will argue that the counterplan is mutually exclusive

with the plan because the counterplan strips the authority of the federal government to do the plan and that this stripping of authority is net beneficial because it sends a strong pro federalism signal.

State Courts/Constitutions Counterplan. This counterplan has all of the state legislatures pass a constitutional amendment to their state constitutions to ensure that the rights are protected (e.g., abortion rights or positive rights to a life without poverty). The negative can easily win that the state courts will enforce these provisions, as the state courts have been very active in securing progressive rights. There is also very strong evidence that claims that when the state courts and the federal courts afford identical rights participation (the permutation), that undermines the independence of the state courts. In addition to presidential politics and general federalism net benefits, the affirmative could also claim a state constitutionalism net benefit. The negative could claim that while the counterplan enhances the role of state constitutionalism/state courts, the plan undermines them. The negative can also use the Hollow Hope disadvantage as a net benefit, claiming that social movements are more likely to succeed if they are drawn to the state courts than if they are drawn to the federal courts and subsequently repulsed.

Courts/Congress/Executive counterplan. If the affirmative uses the Court as its agent of action, the negative can use the Congress and read court disadvantages as net-benefits. Similarly, if the affirmative uses the Congress or the Executive, the negative can pick the Court and read the politics disadvantage as a net-benefit.

Affirmatives that use the courts (they usually use the Supreme Court) as an actor have not been specifically

discussed in the Affirmative Case Ground section. The reason that this was not discussed is that it is conceptually possible for the affirmative to use the courts to remove barriers to, or require increases in, social services as long as they have some justification for court action. The most obvious example is the protection of abortion rights, where the affirmative could have the courts rule that the right to public funding for abortion is constitutionally protected.

Constitutional amendment. This counterplan will be popular against cases that protect rights to social services through court action, particularly Supreme Court action. The counterplan has the Congress directly amend the Constitution, using the court disadvantages to argue that the counterplan is net-beneficial.

Private actors. Rather than rely on the government to deliver social services, the case can be made for private actors, such as churches and other non-profits.

Natives pic. This counterplan argues that the plan should not apply to Indians/Native Americans because involving natives threatens Native sovereignty.

Exclude "poverty." If the plan includes either the term "poverty" or the term "the poor," the negative can counterplan to provide the services to everyone (or anyone who may qualify through some other standard) and kritik the concept of/idea of term "poverty."

Cash assistance. This counterplan argues that rather than expanding social services cash assistance should be given directly to the poor. Net-benefits to this counterplan include avoiding any kritik or disadvantage that has a social service specific link. This counterplan focuses the debate on the desirability of providing social

services rather than just solving poverty, fundamentally addressing the question of whether or not social services should be expanded.

Income tax reform. One way to reduce poverty without expanding social services is to radically restructure income taxes to make the tax structure more progressive: Requiring the rich to pay substantially more and having the poor pay substantially less. Net-benefits to this counterplan also include all of the reasons why social services are bad.

Although these last two counterplans have not been discussed extensively, they are important strategic weapons that force the affirmative to justify why social services need to be expanded, not just why poverty needs to be reduced and/or why the plan action should be targeted toward the poor.

Negative Kritik Ground

Almost every kritik works on almost every topic. Here I will discuss what are likely to be some of the most common and effective kritiks on the 2009-10 resolution.

Capitalism. This kritik argues that poverty can never be solved until the capitalist economic system is eliminated. Furthermore, the kritik argues that efforts to provide social services only mask the harms and perpetuate the system. The evidence for this kritik is good, and it may be the most popular kritik in 2009-10.

Coercion/Libertarianism. The exact opposite of the capitalism kritik this argument contends that it is immoral to redistribute any wealth – that a person's earnings are his or her property and they government doesn't have the right to take that property for the purpose of income redistribution.

Statism. This kritik argues that the plan would strengthen the position of the state and that state

power is bad – it leads to war, genocide, and aggression.

Biopower. Biopower refers to the ability of the government to regulate and observe the day to day life of the population. Foucault refers to it as “regulation of population...,” consisting of “comprehensive measures, statistical assessments, and interventions aimed at the entire social body or at groups taken as a whole” (Foucault, 1978, 145-6). Specifically, this includes measures to protect the public from threats, such as environmental threats and security threats, and to collect information on the population. It also includes efforts to *manage* the population in order to facilitate the proper functioning of the state and the economy. Efforts to regulate the population in order to protect them from security threats fit this definition. Foucault argues that biopower is bad because once the state starts to intervene in the management of the population the state becomes intertwined with it and is able to press the population into its own service, either directly or indirectly. Foucault argues that this contemporary acceptance of biopower is what is responsible for making wars more deadly in this century than ever because now wars are waged not only in the names of populations but with and through those populations. The power to protect the populations, he argues, is the same power to annihilate them.

Net-Widening. Perhaps the original kritik (though it was originally presented as a disadvantage), net-widening argues that expanding social services sucks those who receives the services into a complex net work of government programs that ends up functioning as

a means of social control. This is a very strategic kritik for the negative to develop because if they can find ways to solve the affirmative without increasing social services, this will function as an excellent net-benefit.

Kritik of “poverty.” There is a strong kritik of the idea of “poverty.” The kritik has two manifestations. First, it is bad to argue that there is a class of “poor” people – it stigmatizes them and treats them as a group that is inferior to others, as people who are “impoverished.” Second, it is generally bad to categorize people. This is an excellent net-benefit to a counterplan that makes social services generally available, not just to the poor.

Conclusion

The affirmative enjoys two strategic advantages on the 2009-10 topic. First, the problem of poverty is growing and extending social services is likely to accrue many advantages beyond the reduction of poverty. Second, the category of “social services” is very large, giving the affirmative many different plans to choose from.

Despite the affirmative’s strength in the harms areas and the plan breadth, the negative most likely still has the strategic advantage. Affirmatives will have to defend federal action vis-à-vis strong state counterplans, defend a focus on delivering social services to the “poor,” and defend that social service approaches are superior to policies like expanded cash assistance and tax reform. And even if they are able to defeat these counterplans, they still need to outweigh strong disadvantages, such as politics, inflation, and many of the court arguments. Plus they will have to

defeat some very powerful kritiks. Even though affirmatives have many cases to choose from, they will struggle to find affirmatives that can defeat these negative strategies.

Negative teams need to begin preparing for their 2009-10 debates by developing a states counterplan, a politics disadvantage, a kritik of the term “poverty,” and a cash assistance counterplan or tax reform counterplans with kritiks of social services, particularly net-widening. These strategies, especially if combined with a general capitalism kritik, a reasonable topicality file, some basic advantage defense, and an angle against affirmatives that can be done through the courts (probably best served with a constitutional amendment counterplan and a court capital disadvantage) will enable the negative to win many debates.

So, despite the widespread (and growing) problem of poverty in the U.S., it is the negative that will enter the debate with a strategic advantage. Affirmative teams that wish to overcome this strategic advantage need to develop cases that have a strong justification for federal action, defend the need for social services against cash assistance, can conceptually defend targeting services toward the “poor,” has an advantage that outweighs many disadvantages, and meets the expected interpretation of the terms of the resolution discussed in the topicality section. This is no simple task, but it where affirmatives must focus their energies as they develop their affirmative cases over the summer. At least the affirmative has one thing going for them – many programs can be defined as “social services,” allowing them to have many different cases to choose from.

Referenced Definitions

1 - PRINCETON UNIVERSITY WORDNET, 1997, p. <http://www.dictionary.com/search?q=federal%20government>. federal government. n: a government with strong central powers.

- 2** - WEBSTER'S NEW INTERNATIONAL DICTIONARY UNABRIDGED, 1976, p. 833. Of or relating to the central government of a nation, having the character of a federation as distinguished from the governments of the constituent units (as states or provinces).
- 3** - PRINCETON UNIVERSITY WORDNET, 1997, p. <http://www.dictionary.com/search?q=United%20States>. United States. n 1: there are 50 states in the United States [syn: United States, United States of America, America, US, U.S., USA, U.S.A.] 2: the executive and legislative and judicial branches of the federal government of the US [syn: United States government, United States, U.S. government, U.S.].
- 4** - BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY, 1969, p. 461. The government of a community of independent and sovereign states, united by compact.
- 5** - BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY, 1990, p. 611. The system of government administered in a nation formed by the union or confederation of several independent states.
- 6** - MERRIAM-WEBSTER COLLEGIATE DICTIONARY ONLINE, 2002, p. <http://www.webster.com/cgi-bin/dictionary>. 1a—used as a function word to indicate that a following noun or noun equivalent is definite or has been previously specified by context or by circumstance <put the cat out>.
- 7** - MERRIAM-WEBSTER COLLEGIATE DICTIONARY ONLINE, 2002, p. <http://www.webster.com/cgi-bin/dictionary>. 1b—used as a function word to indicate that a following noun or noun equivalent is a unique or a particular member of its class <the President> <the Lord>.
- 8** - WEBSTER'S NEW WORLD COLLEGE DICTIONARY THIRD EDITION, 1996, p. 1242. Should. 2. used to express obligation, duty, propriety, or desirability [you should ask first, the plants should be watered weekly].
- 9** - MERRIAM-WEBSTER COLLEGIATE DICTIONARY ONLINE, 2002, p. <http://www.webster.com/cgi-bin/dictionary>. 2. used in auxiliary function to express obligation, propriety, or expediency <'tis commanded I should do so—Shakespeare> <this is as it should be – H.L. Savage> <you should brush your teeth after each meal>.
- 11**- CORPUS JURIS SECUNDUM, 1944, p. 545
Increase. In General: A word in common use and variously used and therefore of doubtful and equivocal import. It is derived from “cresco”, to grow and implies the existence of something made, the subject of the increase, etc.
- 12**- PRINCETON WORDNET, p. <http://www.google.com/search?hl=en&q=define%3A+number> accessed May 27, 2006 the property possessed by a sum or total or indefinite quantity of units or individuals; “he had a number of chores to do”; “the number of parameters is small”; “the figure was about a thousand”
- 14** - AMERICAN HERITAGE DICTIONARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE, 08. www.thefreedictionary.com. Social service: Organized efforts to advance human welfare; social work.
- 15** - Boone County Community Services Advisory Commission (Boone County, NC), SOCIAL SERVICES FUNDING POLICY, Dec. 07. from www.gocolumbiamo.com. Social services are those services provided to individuals or families experiencing difficulty in meeting their basic human needs: physical survival (i.e. food, shelter, and clothing); adequate preparation for and help in sustaining gainful employment (i.e. employment and training programs, child care, and transportation); assistance in addressing conditions related to mental health and substance abuse, especially in times of personal or family crises (rehabilitation and counseling); prevention services for at-risk children and youth (education, enrichment, and opportunity); services specifically for seniors and/or disabled residents (i.e. in-home services, adult day care, and care coordination); and help in gaining access to available appropriate services (i.e. transportation and information & referral services).
- 16**-Christopher Leonesio, (Managing Editor), AMERICAN HERITAGE HIGH SCHOOL DICTIONARY, 4th Ed., 2007, 1314. *Social Services: A service, such as free school lunches, provided by a government for its disadvantaged citizens.
- 17**- BUSINESS DICTIONARY.COM, 07. www.businessdictionary.com. Social Services: Benefits and facilities such as education, food subsidies, health care, and subsidized housing provided by a government to improve the life and living conditions of the children, disabled, the elderly, and the poor in the national community.
- 18**- BUSINESS WIRE, Dec. 16, 2008. In addition, the center is poised to act as a national model for the next generation of senior services. “This facility will transform the traditional senior center into a 21st century hub for innovative services that help seniors living at or near poverty prolong their independence, enhance their quality of life and promote their overall health,” said Paul Downey, president and CEO of Senior Community Centers. “In addition to providing nutritious meals - the cornerstone of its services - the new center will offer an array of health and social services, including health and wellness check-ups, mental health care, education and job training, computers access, inter-generational activities, and socialization benefits. Most notably, the center will utilize wireless health technology

to help improve the overall health and wellness of our seniors,” said Gary West.

19 - BALTIMORE SUN, Sept. 30, 2008, 12A. In 1963, [Dionicio] Morales created the Mexican American Opportunity Foundation to provide social services such as job training and child care. Today, the foundation serves more than 100,000 people, most of them of low or moderate income, with a range of social services, including immigration assistance and English classes.

20 - Betsy Williams, (Staff), SARASOTA HERALD-TRIBUNE, Aug. 17, 2007, C4. The Children’s Home Society is the oldest Florida-based nonprofit provider of family services. Founded in 1902, CHS now has 14 divisions providing a wide array of social services that include foster care, adoption, prevention of child abuse, emergency shelter, group homes, case management, treatment for developmentally disabled children and more.

21 - BUSINESS WIRE, Aug. 25, 2008. Through the program, the HCHA secures down-payment assistance and a significant portion of closing costs, in addition to a broad spectrum of social services, including caseworker assistance to help guide prospective homebuyers through the process of finding a realtor and a mortgage company willing to work with a non-traditional buyer. The program ensures success by requiring families to go through post-purchase counseling, credit counseling and other services.

22 - BUSINESS WIRE, Dec. 16, 2008. In addition, the center is poised to act as a national model for the next generation of senior services. “This facility will transform the traditional senior center into a 21st century hub for innovative services that help seniors living at or near poverty prolong their independence, enhance their quality of life and promote their overall health,” said Paul Downey, president and CEO of Senior Community Centers. “In addition to providing nutritious meals - the cornerstone of its services - the new center will offer an array of health and social services, including health and wellness check-ups, mental health care, education and job training, computers access, inter-generational activities, and socialization benefits. Most notably, the center will utilize wireless health technology to help improve the overall health and wellness of our seniors,” said Gary West.

23 - Harvy Lipman, (Staff), THE BERGEN COUNTY (NJ) RECORD, Dec. 2, 2008, B2. The Salvation Army provides a range of social services, including food pantries, drug rehabilitation and disaster relief.

24 - LANCASTER (PA) NEW ERA, Mar. 8, 2007, A6. We pay far less in taxes to educate a poor child than to try to remediate or incarcerate him/her later as an adult. Social services, including prisons, are paid for in taxes at the county and state level; thus, reducing such costs should be the concern of taxpayers everywhere. “School-funding system Karl E. Moyer Lancaster Township”

25 - Norman Daniels, (Prof., Ethics, Harvard School of Public Health), JUST HEALTH: MEETING HEALTH NEEDS FAIRLY, 2008, 43. The promotion of healthy lifestyles requires appropriate and effective education, as well as the right incentives and disincentives. Measures to protect against domestic and other kinds of violence fall in to this category as well as into the broader category of the social determinants of health. The nonmedical personal and social support services can also comprise broad features of the legal structure that aim to include people with disabilities in the mainstream of productive, cooperative activity.

26 - PR NEWSWIRE, Nov. 24, 2008. Miriam’s Kitchen offers a hot, nutritious breakfast every weekday morning to individuals who are homeless in Washington, DC. In addition to breakfast, guests are invited to receive a wide range of social services, including mental health, medical, and substance abuse services, assistance finding adequate shelter and permanent housing, connection to employment, and help meeting other immediate needs such as clothing, toiletries, transportation, and haircuts. By creating an atmosphere of hospitality where guests can choose how they receive support,

27 - STATES NEWS SERVICE, Feb. 15, 2008. The government’s emphasis on reorienting the budget toward improving social services including health and education programs can also help both to reduce disparities and rebalance growth.

28 - STATES NEWS SERVICE, July 31, 2008. Congresswoman Rosa L. DeLauro (CT-3) issued the following statement after the U.S. Department of Agriculture announcement urging Indiana to suspend its effort to privatize its social services, including food stamps and Medicaid.

29 - UNESCO, GLOSSARY OF TERMS, 2008. www.unesco.org. Social Services: Services generally provided by the government that help improve people’s standard of living; examples are public hospitals and clinics, good roads, clean water supply, garbage collection, electricity, and telecommunications.

30 - Christine Lindberg, (Editor), OXFORD COLLEGE DICTIONARY, 2nd Ed., 2007, 1023. Person: A human being regarded as an individual.

31 - Cherry Lei Hunsaker, (Journalist), CLASS IN AMERICA: AN ENCYCLOPEDIA, Vol. 2, 2007, 631. There are

many methods to measure poverty. The most common method in the United States is to calculate a federally established threshold and compare income with this threshold. When a family's income fails to meet the federally established standard, the family is considered to be in poverty.

32 - Cherry Lei Hunsaker, (Journalist), *CLASS IN AMERICA: AN ENCYCLOPEDIA*, Vol. 2, 2007, 631-632. Income poverty is not the only dimension of poverty that concerns the United States. Life is not valued only in material terms, and hence, poverty is not isolated to economic measures only. Poverty includes more than solely a lack of material goods; it includes the inability to achieve a healthy, innovative life, have a positive self-image, and benefit from the respect of others. Because of these emotional needs, other indices were created to measure additional aspects of poverty. One of the alternate poverty measurements includes the physical quality of life index (PQLI), which takes into consideration life expectancy, infant mortality, and literacy to evaluate the quality of life. The human development index (HDI) is a supplementary method used to determine poverty. It uses calculations based on life expectancy, education, and gross domestic product. To further break down aspects of poverty, the gender development index (GDI) and the gender empowerment measure (GEM) are used. These look at the gender analysis of poverty.

33 - Sheila D. Collins, (Prof., Social Policy, William Patterson U.), *ENCYCLOPEDIA OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS*, VOL. 2, 2008, 699. Critics of the U.S. poverty index point to numerous flaws in its formulation. For one thing, the ratio of expenditures on food compared with other consumption items has changed over time. For example, families now spend more of their income on housing than on food, and more women are in the workforce, requiring greater expenditures for child care. Second, the formula does not recognize changes in regional living standards. Third, it does not take into account changes in household configuration—for example, the growth of single-parent and non-family households—and finally differences in out-of-pocket health care costs borne by different population segments

34 - Robert E. Weir, (Prof., Commonwealth College), *CLASS IN AMERICA: AN ENCYCLOPEDIA*, Vol. 2, 2007, 635. The poverty line refers to the measurement tool by which official poverty is determined in the United States. Like all poverty calculations, it is controversial. Conservatives charge that the method of calculation overstates poverty because it does not account for a person's material possessions or nonmonetary transfers such as food stamps, subsidized housing, or heating assistance. Liberals counter that the line is calculated by outdated methods and that the floor is set at an unrealistically low figure. Analysts of all sorts note that any specific and absolute cutoff is arbitrary and makes sense only in bureaucratic logic. By current federal standards, however, a family of four is considered poor if its income falls below \$19,307 per annum.

Bibliography

General Poverty

-Periodicals

CHILD POVERTY IN AMERICA TODAY.

-Books, Hearings, & Online Reports

Billitteri, Thomas. (2009). *URBAN ISSUES*, 4th edition, p. 1-22.

Blackwell, Angela; Child Welfare League of America. (2007). *ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AND POVERTY IN AMERICA*. Hearing. <http://fdsys.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CHRG-110hhr11035776/html/CHRG-110hhr11035776.htm>

Collins, Sheila. (2008). *ENCYCLOPEDIA OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS*.

Conlin, Michelle; McDermott, James. (2008). *POVERTY: OPPOSING VIEWPOINTS*.

Crone, James. (2007). *HOW WE CAN SOLVE OUR SOCIAL PROBLEMS*.

Dion, Robin; Woodworth, Warner. (2008). *HANDBOOK OF FAMILIES & POVERTY*.

Doak, Melissa. (2008). *SOCIAL WELFARE: FIGHTING POVERTY AND HOMELESSNESS*.

Duncan, Greg. (2007). *HIGHER GROUND: NEW HOPE FOR THE WORKING POOR AND THEIR CHILDREN*.

Eitzen, Stanley. *SOLUTIONS TO SOCIAL PROBLEMS: LESSONS FROM STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS*

Ford, Jean Otto. (2008). RURAL CRIME AND POVERTY: VIOLENCE, DRUGS, AND OTHER ISSUES.

Gilbert, Geoffrey. (2008). RICH AND POOR IN AMERICA: A REFERENCE HANDBOOK.

Gilderbloom, John. (2008). INVISIBLE CITY: POVERTY, HOUSING AND NEW URBANISM.

Hearing. (2007). ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AND POVERTY IN AMERICA. http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=110_house_hearings&docid=f:35776.pdf

Hearing. (2007). MEASURING POVERTY IN AMERICA. <http://waysandmeans.house.gov/hearings.asp?formmode=detail&hearing=581>

Kennedy, Joseph. (2008). ENDING POVERTY: CHANGING BEHAVIOR, GUARANTEEING INCOME, AND REFORMING GOVERNMENT.

Lang, Kevin. (2007). POVERTY AND DISCRIMINATION

Lei, Cherry. (2007). CLASS IN AMERICA: AN INTRODUCTION.

McDermott, James. (2008). DYNAMICS OF SOCIAL WELFARE POLICY: RIGHT VERSUS LEFT.

Forman, Jonathan; New America Foundation; Sawhill, Isabel. (2007). PROPOSALS FOR REDUCING POVERTY. Hearing. <http://waysandmeans.house.gov/hearings.asp?formmode=view&id=6797>

Retirement Security Project. (2008). REMOVING BARRIERS TO RETIREMENT SAVING IN MEDICAID AND SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME.

Seccombe, Karen. (2007). FAMILIES IN POVERTY.

Newman, Katerine; Sherridan, Michael; Klein, Joyce; Jurik, Nancy. (2008). WELFARE.

Shipler, David; Holzer, David. (2007). ENDING POVERTY IN AMERICA: HOW TO RESTORE THE AMERICAN DREAM.

Stricker, Frank. (2007). WHY AMERICA LOST THE WAR ON POVERTY – AND HOW TO WIN IT.

Travis, Jeremy. (2007). ON YOUR OWN WITHOUT A NET: THE TRANSITION TO ADULTHOOD FOR VULNERABLE POPULATIONS.

Weir, Robert. (2007). CLASS IN AMERICA: AN ENCYCLOPEDIA.

Abortion

Friedman Goldstein, Leslie. (1980). A Critique of the Abortion Funding Decisions: On Private Rights in the Public Sector. HASTINGS CONSTITUTIONAL LAW QUARTERLY, v. 8, p. 313-ff.

McDonagh, Eileen. (1999). My Body, My Consent: Securing the Constitutional Right to Abortion Funding. ALBANY LAW REVIEW, p. 1-ff

Asset Development

Assets Corporation for Enterprise Development. (2008). ASSETS AND OPPORTUNITY: NET WORTH, WEALTH INEQUALITY AND HOME OWNERSHIP DURING THE BUBBLE YEARS. http://www.cfed.org/specialreport/a_o_special_report.pdf

Beverly, Sondra. (2008). DETERMINANTS OF ASSET BUILDING. <http://www.urban.org/publications/411650.html>

Kramer, Reid. (2009). ASSET BUILDING PROGRAM: RENTAL ASSISTANCE ASSET ACCOUNTS. http://www.newamerica.net/files/Rental%20Assistance%20Asset%20Accounts_0.pdf

Miller, Rae Ann. (2007). INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT ACCOUNTS AND BANKS. http://www.fdic.gov/bank/analytical/quarterly/2007_vo11/IDAs-and-banks.html

Child Poverty

Curley, Alexandria. CHILD POVERTY IN AMERICA TODAY, v. 4, p. 70-74

Furstenburg, Frank. (2007). DESTINIES OF THE DISADVANTAGED: THE POLITICS OF TEENAGE CHILDBEARING.

Hearing. (2007). DISCONNECTED AND DISADVANTAGED YOUTH. http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=110_house_hearings&docid=f:43759.pdf

Hearing. (2007). EDUCATION BEGINS AT HOME ACT. <http://edlabor.house.gov/hearings/2008/06/hr-2343-education-begins-at-ho.shtml>

Hearing. (2007). HEARING TO ASSESS THE IMPACT OF RECENT CHANGES TO PROGRAMS ASSISTING LOW-INCOME FAMILIES. http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=110_house_hearings&docid=f:40306.pdf

Lindsey, Duncan. (2009). CHILD POVERTY & INEQUALITY: SECURING A BETTER FUTURE FOR AMERICA'S CHILDREN.

Neuman, Susan. (2009). CHANGING THE ODDS FOR CHILDREN AT RISK: SEVEN ESSENTIAL PRINCIPLES OF EDUCATION PROGRAMS THAT BREAK THE CYCLE OF POVERTY.

Pearce, Diana. (2007). CHILD POVERTY IN AMERICA TODAY. Volume 3.

Polakow, Valerie. (2007). WHO CARES FOR OUR CHILDREN? THE CHILD CARE CRISIS IN THE OTHER AMERICA.

Steib, David. (2008). GEORGETOWN JOURNAL OF GENDER AND THE LAW, p. 459-ff.

Education Reform

Corwin, Ronald. (2007). THE SCHOOL CHOICE HOAX: FIXING AMERICA'S SCHOOLS.

Gamoran, Adam. (2007). STANDARDS-BASED REFORM AND THE POVERTY GAP: LESSONS FOR NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND.

Harris, Linda. (2007). DISCONNECTED AND DISADVANTAGED YOUTH.

Hearing. (2008). ESEA REAUTHORIZATION: BOOSTING QUALITY IN THE TEACHING PROFESSION.

Hearing. (2007). NCLB: PREVENTING DROPOUTS AND ENHANCING SCHOOL SAFETY. <http://edlabor.house.gov/hearings/2007/04/nclb-preventing-dropouts-and-e.shtml>

Hearing. (2007). NCLB REAUTHORIZATION: STRATEGIES FOR ATTRACTING, SUPPORTING, AND RETAINING HIGH QUALITY EDUCATORS. <http://fdsys.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CHRG-110shrg154/html/CHRG-110shrg154.htm>

Weaver, Reg. (2007). ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY ACT REAUTHORIZATION: IMPROVING NCLB TO CLOSE THE ACHIEVEMENT GAP.

Wiener, Ross. NORTH CAROLINA LAW REVIEW, June, p. 1320-ff.

Head Start

Hearing. (2007). IMPROVING HEAD START FOR AMERICA'S CHILDREN. <http://bulk.resource.org/gpo.gov/hearings/110h/33396.pdf>

Hearing. (2007). INVESTING IN EARLY EDUCATION: PATHS TO IMPROVING CHILDREN'S SUCCESS. <http://edlabor.house.gov/hearings/2008/01/investing-in-early-education-p.shtml>

Health Care

Almgren, Gunnar. (2007). HEALTH CARE POLITICS, POLICY, AND SERVICES: A SOCIAL JUSTICE ANALYSIS.

Brownlee, Shannon. (2007). OVERTREATED: WHY TOO MUCH MEDICINE IS MAKING US SICKER AND POORER.

Choundhry, Lina. (2007). THE IMPACT OF COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS ON EMERGENCY DEPARTMENT USE. April.

Daniels, Norman. (2008). JUST HEALTH: MEETING HEALTH NEEDS FAIRLY.

Dranove, David. (2008). CODE RED: AN ECONOMIST EXPLAINS HOW TO REVIVE THE HEALTHCARE SYSTEM WITHOUT DESTROYING IT.

Fiscella, Kevin; Geyman, John; Rowland, Diane. (2008). HEALTH POLICY: CRISIS AND REFORM IN THE U.S. HEALTH CARE DELIVERY SYSTEM

Garson, Arthur. (2007). HEALTH CARE HALF-TRUTHS: TOO MANY MYTHS, NOT ENOUGH REALITY.

Hearing. (2007). EXAMINING INNOVATIVE APPROACHES TO COVERING THE UNINSURED THROUGH EMPLOYER-PROVIDED HEALTH BENEFITS. <http://edlabor.house.gov/hearings/2007/03/examining-innovative-approache.shtml>

Hearing. (2007). HEALTH CARE COVERAGE AND ACCESS: CHALLENGES & OPPORTUNITIES

Hearing. (2007). HEALTH CARE REFORM: RECOMMENDATIONS TO IMPROVE THE COORDINATION OF FEDERAL AND STATE INITIATIVES. <http://edlabor.house.gov/hearings/2007/05/health-care-reform-recommendat.shtml>

Hearing. (2007). WORKING FAMILIES IN FINANCIAL CRISIS: MEDICAL DEBT AND BANKRUPTCY. <http://judiciary.house.gov/hearings/printers/110th/36783.PDF>

Jost, Thomas. (2007). HEALTH CARE AT RISK: A CRITIQUE OF THE CONSUMER-DRIVEN MOVEMENT.

Kinney, Eleanor. (2008). RUTGERS LAW REVIEW, Winter, p. 340-61

Lefkowitz, Bonnie. (2007). COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS: A MOVEMENT AND THE PEOPLE WHO MADE IT HAPPEN.

Longman, Phillip. (2007). BEST CARE ANYWHERE: WHY VA HEALTH CARE IS BETTER THAN YOURS.

Ness, Debra. (2007). HEALTH CARE COVERAGE AND ACCESS: CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES.

Sandhu, Puneet. (2007). CALIFORNIA LAW REVIEW. August, p. 1122-1151.

Sered, Susan. (2007). UNINSURED IN AMERICA: LIFE AND DEATH IN THE LAND OF OPPORTUNITY.

Thomas, Stephanie; Baldwin, Tammy. (2008). HELPING FAMILIES WITH NEEDED CARE: MEDICAID'S CRITICAL ROLE FOR AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES.

Warden, Gail. (2007). EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES AT THE CROSSROADS.

Warden, Gail. (*2007). HOSPITAL-BASED EMERGENCY CARE: AT THE BREAKING POINT.

Zellicoff, Alan. (2008). MORE HARM THAN GOOD.

Hunger

Berg, Joel. (2008). ALL YOU CAN EAT: HOW HUNGRY IS AMERICA?

American Dietetic Association; Chilton, Marianna; Weill, James. (2007). REVIEW OF THE FEDERAL FOOD STAMP PROGRAM AND ITS IMPACT ON CHILDREN'S HEALTH. http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=110_house_hearings&docid=f:36264.pdf

Bolling, Bill; O'Brien, Rourke; Dostis, Robert; Greenstein, Robert. (2007). THE ROLE OF FEDERAL FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS IN FAMILY ECONOMIC SECURITY AND NUTRITION. http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=110_senate_hearings&docid=f:34740.pdf

Center for Pan Asian Community Services. (2007). FIELD HEARING TO EXAMINE FEDERAL FOOD AND NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS. http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=110_senate_hearings&docid=f:35048.pdf

Wine, Mark. (2008). CLOSING THE FOOD GAP: RESETTING THE TABLE IN THE LAND OF PLENTY.

Homelessness

Cunningham, Mary. (2008). HOMELESSNESS IN AMERICA: SOLUTIONS TO HOMELESSNESS.

Doak, Melissa. (2007). SOCIAL WELFARE: FIGHTING POVERTY AND HOMELESSNESS.

Berg, Steven. (2007). RUNAWAY, HOMELESS, AND MISSING CHILDREN: PERSPECTIVES ON HELPING THE NATION'S VULNERABLE YOUTH.

Johnston, (2007). AFFORDABLE HOUSING NEEDS OF AMERICA'S LOW-INCOME VETERANS.

National Alliance to End Homelessness. (2008). HOMELESSNESS IN AMERICA: FACES OF HOMELESS. Volume 1.

National Network for Youth. (2007). REAUTHORIZATION OF THE MCKINNEY-VENTO HOMELESS ASSISTANCE ACT, PART II. Hearing.

Immigration

Hearing. (2007). COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM: IMPACT OF IMMIGRATION ON STATES AND LOCALITIES. http://judiciary.house.gov/hearings/May2007/hear_051707_2.html

Indian health Care

Hearing. INDIAN HEALTH. August 15, 2007.

Hearing. INDIAN HEALTH CARE IMPROVEMENT. March 8, 2007. http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=110_house_hearings&docid=f:42712.pdf

Katrina

Berube, Alan. (2005). KATRINA'S WINDOW: CONFRONTING CONCENTRATED POVERTY ACROSS AMERICA. http://www.brookings.edu/metro/pubs/20051012_concentratedpoverty.pdf.

Brinkley, Douglas. (2006). THE GREAT DELUGE: HURRICANE KATRINA, NEW ORLEANS, AND THE MISSISSIPPI GULF COAST.

Hearing. (2007). POST KATRINA HEALTH CARE: CONTINUING CONCERNS AND IMMEDIATE NEEDS IN THE NEW ORLEANS REGION. http://energycommerce.house.gov/cmte_mtgs/110-oi_hrg.031307.katrina_health_care.shtml

Lead Paint

Outterson, Sara. (2007). WILLIAM & MARY LAW REVIEW, Spring, p. 830-856.

Legal Assistance

Wallace, Jo-Ann. (2008). CLOSING THE JUSTICE GAP: PROVIDING CIVIL LEGAL ASSISTANCE TO LOW-INCOME AMERICANS. http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=110_senate_hearings&docid=f:45653.pdf

Military

Eibner, Christine. (2008). INVISIBLE WOUNDS OF WAR. http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2008/RAND_MG720.pdf

Positive Rights

Bandes,, Susan. (1990). The Negative Constitution: A Critique. MICHIGAN LAW REVIEW, v. 88, p. 2271

Black, Charles. (1986), Further Reflections on the Constitutional Justice of Livelihood, COLUMBIA LAW REVIEW, p. 1103-ff.

Kreimer, Seth. (1984). Allocational Sanctions: The Problem of Negative Rights in a Positive State. UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA LAW REVIEW. V. 132, p. 1351-78

Michelman, Frank. (1977). States' Rights and States' Roles: Permutations of "Sovereignty" in National League of Cities v. Usery, YALE LAW JOURNAL, v. 85, p. 1165-ff

Michelman, Frank. (1979) Welfare Rights in a Constitutional Democracy. WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY LAW QUARTERLY, p. 65-ff.

"Poverty" Kritik

Brodkin, Evalyn. (1993). The Making of an Enemy: How Welfare Policies Construct the Poor. LAW & SOCIAL INQUIRY, v. 18, p. 647-ff.

Ross, Thomas. (1991). The Rhetoric of Poverty: Their Immorality, Our Helplessness, GEORGETOWN LAW JOURNAL, v. 79 p. 1499-ff

Prison Reform

Hearing. (2007). PROBLEMS WITH IMMIGRATION DETAINEE MEDICAL CARE <http://judiciary.house.gov/hearings/printers/110th/42722.PDF>

Hearing. (2007). PROMOTING INMATE REHABILITATION AND SUCCESSFUL RELEASE PLANNING. http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=110_house_hearings&docid=f:39480.pdf

Hearing. (2007). SECOND CHANCE ACT OF 2007. <http://judiciary.house.gov/hearings/printers/110th/39480.PDF>

May, David. (2008). CORRECTIONS AND THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM.

Reparations

Saito, Natsu. (2003) Beyond Reparations: Accommodating Wrongs or Honoring Resistance?, 1 HASTINGS RACE & POVERTY LAW JOURNAL, p. 27-ff.

Sex Trafficking

Hsu, Kevin. (2007). GEORGETOWN JOURNAL ON POVERTY LAW & POLICY. Fall, p. 400-ff.

Social Justice

Miller, David. (1999). PRINCIPALS OF SOCIAL JUSTICE.

States Counterplan

Cimini, Christine. (2002). Welfare Entitlements in the Era of Devolution. GEORGETOWN JOURNAL ON POVERT & LAW, p. 89-ff.

State Constitutions

Crave, William. (1998). Constitutional Protections for the Poor, TEMPLE LAW REVIEW, v. 71, p. 141-ff.

Hershkoff, Helen. (1998). Welfare Devolution and State Constitutions. FORDHAM LAW REVIEW, v. 4, p. 1403-ff.

Kaufman, Rise. (1997). The Cultural Meaning of the “Welfare Queen”: Using State Constitutions to Challenge Child Exclusion Provisions. NEW YORK UNIVERSITY REVIEW OF LAW & SOCIAL CHANGE, v. 23, p. 301-ff.

Teen Pregnancy

Furstenberg, Frank. (2007). DESTINIES OF THE DISADVANTAGED: THE POLITICS OF TEENAGE CHILDBEARING.

Mendez Cassell, Carol. (2007). ENDING POVERTY IN AMERICA: HOW TO RESTORE THE AMERICAN DREAM.

Steib, David. (2008). GEORGETOWN JOURNAL OF GENDER AND THE LAW, p. 378-462.

Veterans

Longman, Philip. (2007). BEST CARE ANYWHERE: WHY VA HEALTHCARE IS BETTER THAN YOURS.

Welfare Reform

Hearing. (2007). CHALLENGES FACING THE CHILD WELFARE SYSTEM. http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=110_house_hearings&docid=f:43094.pdf

Shaw, Greg. (2007). THE WELFARE DEBATE.

(Stefan Bauschard is the President & Co-Founder of Planet Debate, Director of Debate for the Lakeland School District (NY), and an assistant debate coach for Harvard Debate.)