

New LD Aff

New LD Aff..... 1
1AC..... 3
1AC..... 4
1AC..... 5
1AC..... 6
1AC..... 7
1AC..... 8
*****2AR Args*****..... 9
At: No ! (Genocide)..... 10
AT: No ! (Eugenics)..... 11
*****2AR Advantage Ad On *****..... 12
Voting Rights..... 13
*****INH*****..... 14
AT: No Inh. 15
AT: Homeless don't need MHS..... 16
*****AT: NEG*****..... 17
AT: Free PO Boxes..... 18
AT: Coercion..... 19
AT: Kritiks—Permutation Solvency..... 20
AT: Kritiks—Permutation Solvency..... 21
AT: Law Kritik—AT: Must Focus on Root Cause..... 22
AT: Disadvantages—Social Justice K of War Impacts..... 23
AT: Disadvantages—Social Justice K of War Impacts..... 24
AT: Disadvantages..... 25
AT: Disadvantages..... 26
AT: Disadvantages..... 27
AT: Economy Disadvantage..... 28
AT: Politics..... 29
AT: Politics..... 30
Misc—K of “The Homeless”..... 31
*****Tix*****..... 32
No Link..... 33
A2: Winners Win (Ornstein only)..... 34
A2: Winners Win..... 35
AT: Winners Lose..... 36
AT: Gop Backlash..... 38
*****Spending*****..... 39
1AR Answers (1/3)..... 40
1AR Answers (2/3)..... 41
1AR Answers (3/3)..... 42
AT: Non-Unique..... 43
Economy resilient..... 44
Economy resilient..... 45
AT: china money in us econ..... 47
Economic decline solves warming (Impact Turn)..... 48
*****Counter plans*****..... 49
1AR 50 states answers (1/4)..... 50
1AR 50 states answers (2/4)..... 51
1AR 50 states answers (3/4)..... 53
1AR 50 states answers (4/4)..... 54
1AR Housing Subsidies CP (1/2)..... 56
1AR Housing Subsidies CP (2/2)..... 57

SDSU NFA-LD	2010-2011
Fear the Beard	Homeless AFF
1AR Counterplans to Solve Homelessness(1/2)	58
1AR Counterplans to Solve Homelessness (2/2).....	59
AT: 50 STATES CP	60
AT: States CP.....	61
AT: States CP.....	62
AT: States CP.....	63
AT: States CP.....	64
AT: States CP.....	65
AT: States CP.....	66
AT: Private Actor CP	67
*****Spec*****	69
AT: A(gent) Spec (camp version)	70
AT: O(ver) Spec	71
AT: U(nder) Spec	72
*****Topicality*****	73
AT: CMI	74
AT: MHS	75
AT: Reform – End Abuses.....	76
AT: Provision.....	77
AT: Substantially – any def	78
AT: You are losing T from the 1AC.....	79
*****Warming Impact Turns*****	81
A2: Warming- Offense- Food Prices	82
A2: Warming- Offense- Food Prices → Economy.....	83
A2: Warming- Offense- Food Security	84
A2: Warming- Offense- Food Security Extra Impacts.....	85
A2: Warming- Offense- Food Stress Scenario	86

1AC

Contention One: Inclusive Exclusion

Status quo approaches to homelessness attempt to combat the social problems of poverty through criminal sanctions, trying to expel those without homes from membership in our political communities by denying them eligibility for social services.

Jonathan L. **Hafetz**; March, **2003**; J.D., Yale Law School, 1999; M. Phil., Oxford University, 1992; B.A., Amherst College, 1990. The Author was formerly a staff attorney at The Partnership for the Homeless in New York City; 2003 Fordham University School of Law Fordham Urban Law Journal; 30 Fordham Urb. L.J. 1215, Homeless Legal Advocacy: New Challenges And Directions For The Future, Lexis-Nexis.

If early efforts to establish an affirmative right to shelter reflect the expansive hopes of advocates, subsequent challenges to attempts to criminalize behavior associated with homeless people suggest a defensive response to an angry backlash. 140

Local governments have turned increasingly to law enforcement and the criminal justice system to address homelessness, rather than addressing the underlying problems, such as the lack of affordable housing or social services. 141 **This shift reflects decreased sympathy for homeless people generally and outright hostility towards more visible activities like aggressive panhandling and sleeping in public parks.** The reliance on law enforcement as a substitute for social welfare and housing policy 142 is more prevalent in those localities that do not provide sufficient shelter space for their homeless population, 143 though it also exists in localities where there is a right to shelter. 144 Attempts to regulate the movement and behavior of the poor through threat of imprisonment have a long history. The Elizabethan Poor Law of 1601, which dramatically influenced social welfare policy in America, authorized the imprisonment of able- [*1236] bodied adults who refused to work. 145 During the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, police in American cities relied on vagrancy and loitering statutes to help ensure that homeless people remained in skid row areas. These practices were eventually limited by Supreme Court decisions invalidating local vagrancy 146 and loitering 147 statutes. **The most recent wave of anti-homeless criminal sanctions, however, seeks to return to an approach of combating the social problems of poverty through criminal sanctions and to increase the discretion given to local law enforcement** officials while trying to avoid potential constitutional problems of vagueness and overbreadth. 148 Cities claim they are merely protecting residents against crime, controlling threats to public health and sanitation, and trying to attract business and tourism. 149 New York City and San Francisco - **municipalities with disproportionately large homeless populations - have lately taken particularly tough stances, seeking to rid their streets of homeless people through aggressive enforcement of "quality of life" measures.** 150 Some localities, however, have pursued more constructive alternatives that seek to facilitate the intervention of social service providers on behalf of homeless people, rather than simply sweeping them from public view. 151

1AC

Contention Two: Exclusion

Denying mail service to those experiencing homelessness isolates and excludes them from the American citizenry.

Brown, et al, National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty, 02

(Caroline M., Thomas W. Beimers, Maria Foscarinis, Pallavi Rai, Jeremy Rosen; IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT CARL A. CURRIER, et al., v. WILLIAM J. HENDERSON, Postmaster General of the United States, et al.; No. 02-035232; On Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington; July 10, 2002; pg. 5-7; http://www.nlchp.org/view_report.cfm?id=73)

A. The Postal Service Has Historically Met Its Legal Obligation To Provide Universal Mail Service. The statutory mandate obligating the Postal Service to deliver mail to all communities is rooted in a rich and proud history. **The mails have traditionally served to bind together all Americans, and the goal of universal mail service sought to ensure that Americans from all areas and backgrounds would be a part of the national identity and dialogue.** Before the advent of the telegraph, the telephone, the railroad, or the automobile, mail helped to unite the nation. *See* Wayne E. Fuller, *The American Mail: Enlarger of the Common Life* 81 (1972). **Postal service “made the national government visible to every man, woman, and child in the nation.”** *id.* at 84, and the mails provided many early Americans with their only contact with the national government. *Id.* As the Civil War threatened to split the nation apart, the Post Office began carrying daily mail to the West, which one congressman claimed would “bind the Pacific States more closely to the Union . . . than any bands of either iron or gold.” *Id.* at 100. And when the Post Office began offering rural free delivery of mail in 1896, “perhaps nothing the national government had done through the long years following Appomattox did as much to unite the North and South, heal old wounds, and strengthen the bond of the union between the two sections.” *Id.* at 105-06. **To enable the Postal Service to satisfy its mission of universal service, in 1845 Congress officially granted the Postal Service a monopoly over the transportation of letters in the United States.** *See Air Courier Conference of Am. v. American Postal Workers Union*, 498 U.S. 517, 519 (1991). Congress unanimously agreed that it was “the duty of the Government to serve outlying, frontier areas, even if it meant doing so at below cost.” *Id.* at 527; George L. Priest, *The History of the Postal Monopoly in the United States*, 18 J.L. & Econ. 33, 65 (1975). The postal monopoly, which is still in place today, ensured that private companies would not offer cheaper services on low-cost routes while leaving high-cost routes to the Postal Service and thus preventing it from providing affordable service to patrons in all areas. *See Air Courier*, 498 U.S. at 527-28. **As the Supreme Court has stated, the postal monopoly “exists to ensure that postal services will be provided to the citizenry at large.”** *Id.* at 528. **Today, as in the past, mail service is an essential means of uniting Americans and binding them together as a nation.** Congress has repeatedly emphasized the importance of universal mail service in the Postal Service’s mission. In the nineteenth century, the Post Office strived to provide mail delivery to rural or frontier dwellers who were geographically isolated from the rest of the country. **In today’s world, the Americans who are at the greatest risk of isolation are not those who live in remote locations but rather those who live in poverty and homelessness that separates them from their fellow citizens.**

1AC

The homeless are dehumanized, excluded, making the conditions for genocide possible. This exclusion must be fought in every instance.

Anawim Christian Community, coalition to end homelessness, 2009

(“how the homeless are dehumanized” <http://www.nowheretolayhishead.org/howarethehomelessdehumanized.html>)

How are the Homeless Dehumanized? Almost **every person who is homeless goes through a process of dehumanization. Here are some of the ways** homeless people are dehumanized in many cities in the U.S. **Segregated The homeless** become homeless because they **are separated from their family and friends, not allowed space in their social network to live.** For some, this is because they are doing or have done things that were unacceptable for their community, for others it is because they have received all the help their social community feel they deserve to have, while for others it is because they have no social network at all. Whatever the case, the homeless person begins their time on the street alone, separated from the people they are familiar with. This segregation continues as the homeless are assumed to be a “class apart.” This assumption soon becomes truth as those on the street, getting their clothes and food from the same places, often begin to look like each other. For many people, although there is a homeless “look” about them, many never make connections with others on the street. Although there are some homeless communities, for the most part each person on the street is separated from everyone else, alone and lonely. **Fear** **The majority culture fear the homeless because of their differences.** First of all, almost all of the homeless come from the lower classes, which have different cultural standards and mores than the middle class—the ruling culture. Also, since **most people don’t understand how people become homeless or why some remain on the street, there is a distinct otherness about the homeless. A lack of understanding** of a social group almost always **creates social fear and disgust** of the other group. **Illegal to be Poor They are automatically criminals in most towns and cities in the U.S. which have anti-camping ordinances.** Although homelessness is almost always an unwanted tragedy by those who experience it, most cities and towns, by having this ordinance, makes it illegal to have this tragedy occur to one. There are certain **types of poverty** which will **cause one to be treated as a criminal, of which homelessness is one. The Criminal Label** Because it is illegal to be without a house, **the police feel the social obligation to treat the homeless as criminals. It is assumed,** wrongly, that **the homeless,** especially the chronic homeless, **are hotbeds of criminal activity,** and so **every homeless person is checked by local police.** Because they are assumed to be criminals, it is made clear to them that **police service is not for them because they are not** really a **part of the community.** Thus they are denied community security. At times the homeless, because they are already labeled as criminals, feel that they have the right to act as low-level criminals. They might drink in public, jaywalk, participate in low-level drug trade or steal items from stores to sell. **Attacked by Police** Also, because of the assumption of wrongdoing, the police at rare times, especially in certain communities, feel it necessary to be brutal. **The homeless are excluded from public areas where they did no criminal activity,** verbally abused by the police, beat up by the police and attacked by police dogs. While these instances are relatively rare compared to the number of times the homeless are stopped by the police, these incidents cause each encounter between a homeless person and a police officer to be tinged with fear. **Community Self-maligned** **Because it is assumed by the majority culture that all homeless are criminals,** low-lives and screwups, almost **every homeless person comes into the homeless community assuming that of their fellows.** They will assume that every homeless person is a thief, drug user, alcoholic and lazy until they are proven otherwise. Thus, even when one interviews the homeless about their street community, they will degrade them all, except for the few that they personally know. **Refused a Place to Sleep** The homeless, **because they have broken a camping ordinance** (because they have no way of obtaining an apartment), **they are denied the right to sleep on public property** or (in some cities) on private property, even if they have permission. This means that **they are** often **awakened in the middle of the night, roused out of bed and told to move all of their possessions** out of whatever space they are in within a given period of time, often an hour. Depending on where the homeless person is, this may happen as little as every two years, or as frequently as once a week. **Property stolen legally** Because they are camping illegally, the property of the homeless is also at risk to be stolen or damaged by public servants.

[CONTINUED]

1AC

[CONTINUED]

Police officers, park workers, other government crews and also other homeless tear up tents, steal sleeping bags, throw away clothes, steal money and take and sell precious metals. Denied food In some cities, **it is illegal to serve the homeless a free meal. The fines are steep to those churches or organizations who take the moral high ground and serve the homeless despite the ban.** Even in cities in which meals are available, most homeless only eat one meal a day, because of the difficulty of getting across town from one meal to another, and to prevent themselves from having to stand in long lines more than once a day. **Denied bathrooms Because the homeless are assumed to have a higher level of drug use, they are,** as a group, **denied access to bathrooms.** Most homeless train themselves to need to go to the bathroom once or twice a day. **Denied proper health care** Almost all emergency rooms are required by law to meet the desperate needs of those who come for treatment, especially life-threatening emergencies. However, many **doctors and nurses, when they see** a patient has been treated for drug-related issues or when they see **a patient is homeless, they will do the least amount of work possible and send the patient away as quickly as possible.** Some emergency rooms only see a homeless patient after all the other patients have gone home. Even if a hospital provides adequate medical care, if a homeless person's care is severe, **the hospital will send the patient "home" to a shelter or to the street, with inadequate healing time,** thus **causing secondary infections,** a recurrence of the condition **and sometimes** even **death.** **Existence denied Many communities deny that there are any homeless among them at all. If a group tries to assist the homeless in a community, the mayor or police chief may deny that any homeless exist in their community, despite them sending police officers to roust the homeless out of their camps.** Bill O'Reilly infamously denied the existence of homeless veterans, despite some living only blocks away from his studio. **Verbally abused** Any homeless person trying to catch up on their lack of sleep the night before or asking for money for food will at times be maligned and abused by some. They **are abused by those who feel that the very act of being asked for assistance is an affront to them and** also, at times, by **police officers.** They are sometimes just told to "get a job", but often they are invited to participate in more colorful activity. **Attacked** The homeless are under constant danger of attack. **The police are** not with them, but **against them.** A routine police sweep, to "move the homeless on," might turn violent where **the homeless person might be electrocuted with a tazer, attacked by a dog, or just beat up. Some young people, feeling their community's wrath against the homeless, feel that they have the right to beat up homeless people, burn them or even murder them. These are the conditions the Jews and Gypsies had to live under before the holocaust really got underway.** The Tutsis in the early stages of the Rwandan holocaust faced some of these conditions, such as being forced to move out of their homes, living under fear of attack and being declared illegal as a group. Those who are tortured for terrorist activity face many of the same problems—lack of sleep, lack of food, inadequate health care, fear of attack at any time of the day or night. **Many groups' existence have been denied to deny them adequate protection when a genocide occurs.** What have the homeless done to warrant such ill treatment? None of the stereotypes of the homeless hold up under scrutiny (see "Myths of the Homeless"). Are the homeless maligned, mistreated and refused protection to them that they are not wanted? That communication has been clearly received. But I also wonder, **given the pattern of dehumanization before any genocide,** should the U.S. become more of a society of fear than it already is, **how long will it be until the homeless are locked in camps and allowed to die of the sickness that comes of having inadequate food and bathroom facilities?** What is the next stage in the dehumanization of the homeless? The only way the state of the homeless will get better is if we all become concerned. And being concerned can only come about when we know those who are suffering.

1AC

Contention Three: Plan

Thus I advocate that the Congress will pass, President Obama will sign, and the Courts will uphold a law to remove address eligibility requirements for mental health services which preclude individuals with chronic mental illnesses.

Funding, enforcement, and questions of procedure through normal means: I reserve the right to clarify.

1AC

Observation Four: Solvency

Removing eligibility restrictions is key to allowing the homeless to participate in the public sphere regardless of their productive capacities—our legal advocacy is an essential starting point. Our call for legal advocacy to remove eligibility restrictions is key to include homeless people in society.

Jonathan L. Hafetz; March, 2003; J.D., Yale Law School, 1999; M. Phil., Oxford University, 1992; B.A., Amherst College, 1990. The Author was formerly a staff attorney at The Partnership for the Homeless in New York City; 2003 Fordham University School of Law Fordham Urban Law Journal; 30 Fordham Urb. L.J. 1215, Homeless Legal Advocacy: New Challenges And Directions For The Future, Lexis-Nexis.

Because **federal welfare programs have traditionally been limited** to families with children, **single adults have been forced to rely on state general assistance programs that provide significantly lower benefit rates**, if they exist at all. **Single adults still make up a majority of the homeless population**, though the proportion of families with children has been rising steadily. 233 Many homeless single adults suffer from mental illness. For this population, it is important, where possible, to obtain benefits under the SSI program, 234 the federal means-tested program for low-income persons who are elderly (sixty-five and older), blind, or disabled. 235 Indeed, [*1251] for non-elderly, mentally ill single adults - who are ineligible for TANF funds and unable to work - accessing SSI represents perhaps the best chance to gain the financial means to escape homelessness. Many homeless people meet the Social Security disability standard 236 because they have chronic health problems, which being homeless often exacerbates. 237 Yet, **many eligible homeless people are not receiving SSI benefits**, 238 as the Social Security Administration ("SSA") itself has recognized. 239 **The problem may partly be explained by the lack of information about SSI, the lack of assistance in filing for benefits, and the length and complexity of the application process itself.** 240 **The SSA, however, has made some attempt to increase outreach efforts aimed at homeless people.** 241 **Given the often inappropriate denial of disability claims by homeless people,** 242 **and the high rates of reversal at the administrative hearing level where such denials are challenged,** 243 **legal advocacy can make a significant difference.** 244 This is particularly true for individuals who suffer from alcohol or substance abuse in light of a 1997 change to eligibility criteria that prevents receipt of SSI benefits if drug or alcohol "is a contributing factor material to [*1252] the determination of disability," 245 and thus face greater difficulty establishing disability. **Further advocacy is also needed around regulations that directly impact homeless people, such as those governing residence in public institutions** such as homeless shelters, jails, and hospitals. 246 **Regulations preclude receipt of SSI benefits by individuals who remain in public homeless shelters for six months within a nine-month period.** 247 Even though the regulations require that an individual remain in the shelter for the entire month for that month to count in terms of the restriction, 248 SSA often incorrectly counts months against recipients in which they were absent for part of that month. Also, SSI benefits are suspended when an individual enters other public institutions, such as jails. Under the pre-release program, individuals in such public institutions may either file new SSI applications or seek to reactivate previously open cases prior to their release so that, if approved, they will receive benefits upon release. 249 Many public institutions, however, have not complied with the pre-release program. 250 **While SSI benefit rates may, in many cases, still be insufficient for homeless people to obtain permanent housing at market rates,** 251 **they provide a critical source of income**, particularly for single adults 252 who must otherwise rely solely on meager state general assistance funds to survive. Indeed, obtaining SSI benefits may open the door to new housing opportunities, including subsidized housing programs run by not-for-profit organizations in the community.

SDSU NFA-LD
Fear the Beard

2010-2011
Homeless AFF

*******2AR Args*******

At: No ! (Genocide)

Dehumanization justifies genocide.

Maiese, philosophy graduate student, University of Colorado, 2003

[Michelle, Research Staff, Conflict Research Consortium, <http://www.intractableconflict.org/m/dehumanization.jsp>

Dehumanization is a psychological process whereby opponents view each other as less than human and thus not deserving of moral consideration. Jews in the eyes of Nazis and Tutsis in the eyes of Hutus (in the Rwandan genocide) **are but two examples. Protracted conflict strains relationships and makes it difficult for parties to recognize that they are part of a shared human community. Such conditions often lead to feelings of intense hatred and alienation among conflicting parties. The more severe the conflict, the more the psychological distance between groups will widen. Eventually, this can result in moral exclusion. Those excluded are typically viewed as inferior, evil, or criminal.** We typically think that all people have some basic human rights that should not be violated. Innocent people should not be murdered, raped, or tortured. Rather, international law suggests that they should be treated justly and fairly, with dignity and respect. They deserve to have their basic needs met, and to have some freedom to make autonomous decisions. In times of war, parties must take care to protect the lives of innocent civilians on the opposing side. Even those guilty of breaking the law should receive a fair trial, and should not be subject to any sort of cruel or unusual punishment. However, **for individuals viewed as outside the scope of morality and justice, "the concepts of deserving basic needs and fair treatment do not apply and can seem irrelevant." Any harm that befalls such individuals seems warranted, and perhaps even morally justified. Those excluded from the scope of morality are typically perceived as psychologically distant, expendable, and deserving of treatment that would not be acceptable for those included in one's moral community.** Common criteria for exclusion include ideology, skin color, and cognitive capacity. **We typically dehumanize those whom we perceive as a threat to our well-being or values. Psychologically, it is necessary to categorize one's enemy as sub-human in order to legitimize increased violence or justify the violation of basic human rights. Moral exclusion reduces restraints against harming or exploiting certain groups of people. In severe cases, dehumanization makes the violation of generally accepted norms of behavior regarding one's fellow man seem reasonable, or even necessary.**

AT: No ! (Eugenics)

Failure to provide mental health care spurs Social Darwinist movements that lead to violent eugenics

Dr. Cosman 2001, Ph.D., Esq. (Madeleine Pelner Attorney and president of Medical Equity, Inc) Issues in Law & Medicine Summer, 17
Issues L. & Med. 3

AHSA's ideas are detrimental to the mental health of the nation. That failed legislation and its rejuvenations in current law are dangerous disservices to mental health law and the mental health of Americans. **Mentally ill people are particularly vulnerable in cost versus benefit analysis.** If by national policy of cost reduction we refuse treatment and by threat of criminal penalties we forbid citizens or their families to buy care privately, which already is the law under *HIPAA* and the *Balanced Budget Act's* section 4507, then two rational prescriptions for those not mentally fit thus unfit for medical care are neglect and death. I am confident that there is better way to handle refractory mental impairments, honoring American individuality, integrity, and autonomy. Compassion can be combined with fiscal responsibility, allowing the mentally impaired to live. My proposed solution is the subject of my next essay. The purpose of this essay is to sound the alarm that malevolent medical reform in the Clinton Health Plan called *American Health Security Act* of 1993 is flourishing today in medical law. **Horrors of the Progressivist eugenics of the 1920s and 1930s then paired in medicine with a perversion of Darwinism are again possible in our current American medical-legal context which honors integrity to the medical program while violating integrity of the patient,** and which respects medical cost while disrespectful of physician and patient choice even if and when patient or family will pay for excellent care. Under *AHSA's* legislative progeny, patients are collectivized and physicians are criminalized. **Utilitarianism literally is deadly. "Medically necessary" means whatever government or insurance will pay for. Psychiatric diseases only minimally responsive to treatment and chronic serious mental illness will not be treated. If limited American money, medicine, and time are invested only in inevitable medical [*34] success, then America's medicine by its medical law will be Medical Darwinism encouraging survival of the fittest by requiring extinction of the unfit.**

Eugenics risks total human species loss

Gleen **McGee 1997**, Senior Fellow @ the Center for Bioethics and Professor of Bioethics @ the University of Pennsylvania, The Hastings Center Report, 3/13

There is plenty, though, **to be frightened about when conversation turns to eugenics. The fear is not of genetic control but of socially prescribed blueprints of perfection, enforced by intolerant scientists-cumbureaucrats.** We have seen the results in our own century, and can at least glean from the misadventures chronicled by Daniel Kevles and others that **a scientifically styled "perfect society," stratified by genes, makes little sense in a world where genetic variability turns out to be a virtue--and in which specialization and rigidity spell extinction.** There are also plenty of practical examples of the danger of replacing parental responsibility with overarching social control.[6]

SDSU NFA-LD
Fear the Beard

2010-2011
Homeless AFF

*******2AR Advantage Ad On *******

Voting Rights

A) Without mailboxes homeless people cannot vote which makes true democracy impossible

National Coalition the Homeless, 2009

(You don't need a home to vote 2009 pg 5

http://www.nationalhomeless.org/projects/vote/Manual_2010.pdf)

Equal access to the right to vote is a crucial part of maintaining a true democracy. Voting allows people to play a part in deciding the direction of their communities by voicing their opinion on issues that are important and relevant to their lives. Each election, low income and homeless individuals vote at a lower rate than people with higher incomes, despite the fact that many policy decisions directly impact people who are economically disadvantaged.

Currently, issues such as raising the minimum wage and funding certain social welfare and housing programs are being debated in the U.S.

Congress and in communities around the country. In order for **our government to truly represent the people, citizens must vote-- especially those who are economically disadvantaged. For years, homeless citizens have had obstacles to registering. In the 1984 case Pitts v. Black, 608 F.Supp. 696 (S.D.N.Y. 1984), a federal court in New York explicitly found that homeless persons could not be denied the right to vote just because they did not live in a traditional residence. Courts deciding subsequent cases from around the country came to similar conclusions.** Although it has been established that homeless individuals do not need to live in a traditional residence to register to vote, other obstacles remain. Today, many homeless and low income individuals may not have the appropriate identification documents required by some states to register or to vote. Furthermore, many individuals who are experiencing homelessness may lack the resources to educate themselves about candidates or may not be able to get to the polls on Election Day.

B) Extinction

Diamond 95

(Larry, Senior Fellow – Hoover Institution, Promoting Democracy in the 1990s, December, <http://wwics.si.edu/subsites/ccpdc/pubs/di/1.htm>)

OTHER THREATS This hardly exhausts the lists of threats to our security and well-being in the coming years and decades. In the former Yugoslavia nationalist aggression tears at the stability of Europe and could easily spread. The flow of illegal drugs intensifies through increasingly powerful international crime syndicates that have made common cause with authoritarian regimes and have utterly corrupted the institutions of tenuous, democratic ones. **Nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons continue to proliferate. The very source of life on Earth, the global ecosystem, appears increasingly endangered.** Most of **these** new and unconventional **threats** to security **are associated with** or aggravated by the weakness or **absence of democracy, with its provisions for** legality, **accountability**, popular sovereignty, **and openness**. LESSONS OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY The experience of this century offers important lessons. **Countries that govern themselves in a truly democratic fashion do not go to war with one another.** They do not aggress against their neighbors to aggrandize themselves or glorify their leaders. Democratic governments do not ethnically "cleanse" their own populations, and they are much less likely to face ethnic insurgency. Democracies do not sponsor terrorism against one another. **They do not build weapons of mass destruction to use on or to threaten one another. Democratic countries** form more reliable, open, and enduring trading partnerships. In the long run they offer better and more stable climates for investment. They **are more environmentally responsible because they** must **answer** to **their own citizens**, who organize to protest the destruction of their environments. They are better bets to honor international treaties since they value legal obligations and because their openness makes it much more difficult to breach agreements in secret. Precisely because, within their own borders, they respect competition, civil liberties, property rights, and the rule of law, democracies are the only reliable foundation on which a new world order of international security and prosperity can be built.

SDSU NFA-LD
Fear the Beard

2010-2011
Homeless AFF

*******INH*******

AT: No Inh.

Eligibility requirements for welfare benefits exclude the homeless because their lack of a permanent residence precludes them from meeting standards for confirming their qualifications—a stable address has become the bright line for who gets to count as a citizen.

Susan D. **Bennett** June, **1995**, ("No Relief But Upon the Terms of Coming into the House," - Controlled Spaces, Invisible Disentitlements, and Homelessness in an Urban Shelter System <http://www.lexisnexis.com:80/us/Inacademic/search/journalssubmitForm.do> Professor of Law and Director of the Public Interest Law Clinic of the Washington College of Law of the American University)

The practice of churning explains why **homeless persons are underrepresented among the ranks of benefits holders, despite their indisputable financial eligibility.** ⁿ⁹³ **Homelessness increases the impact of churning practices simply because rootless families cannot keep, or never receive notice of, the multiple appointments demanded for confirmation of eligibility.** ⁿ⁹⁴ **When homeless recipients fail to meet these administrative burdens, workers churn them off the benefit rolls. One unusually detailed study tracking the experiences of homeless recipients of nonemergency public assistance in New York City found that over seventy-five percent of the clients studied had their benefits terminated within six months of first receiving them.** ⁿ⁹⁵ **The study blamed this high incidence of churning on the recipient's difficulty in receiving or responding to the many notices of required recertification appointments that welfare offices in New York regularly mail to all recipients.** ⁿ⁹⁶ The study also [*2182] noted that **fewer than half of the individuals in its sample succeeded in opening a public benefits case.** ⁿ⁹⁷ **The formal system of protections for welfare applicants and recipients offers little to redress the invisible injuries inflicted in the preapplication "twilight zone."** In the AFDC program, the statute requires the state to provide a fair hearing if a "claim for aid" is "denied or not acted upon with reasonable promptness." ⁿ⁹⁸ Regulations obligate the state to inform "[e]very applicant or recipient" of the right to a hearing and the rights associated with it, "at the time of application and at the time of any action affecting his claim." ⁿ⁹⁹ **Where the unit of grievance is "the claim," and the triggering mechanism for complaint is the "time of application," needy persons who never reach the formal application stage are denied formal redress. The concrete harm of disenfranchisement can be measured in benefits lost.** However, **the** unquantifiable, and perhaps **greater, harm is a dampening of the spirit, a lowering of expectations of any kind of fair treatment or favorable result from a bureaucratic system.** Lipsky describes this effect as a residuum of "disenfranchisement." ⁿ¹⁰⁰ **It is this reduction in poor persons' expectations, as much as the reduction of services, that makes disenfranchisement tactics effective.**

AT: Homeless don't need MHS

Homeless People suffer mental and physical health problems at drastically worse rates than the rest of the population

Shelton et al, 2009 Lecturer @ School of Psychology, Cardiff University,
(Katherine, Pamela, Adrian, Marianne, Psychiatr Serv 60:465-472, April 2009 doi: 10.1176 /appi.ps.60.4.465 Risk Factors for Homelessness: Evidence From a Population-Based Study)

The physical and mental health of people who are homeless is considerably worse than that of the general population (5,6,7). **The prevalence of mental disorders is** three to four times **higher** among the homeless population, **with rates of affective and anxiety disorders and drug and alcohol abuse** particularly elevated (8,9,10,11,12). **Rates of DSM diagnoses among the homeless are almost double** those among persons who have never been homeless, whereas the rate of alcohol use disorder co-occurring with one or more psychiatric disorders has been identified as five times greater (13). Homelessness is **also associated with a high risk of suicide attempts** (14). Previous research has shown that so-called biographical risk factors are important to understanding the pathways into homelessness (8,15). Specifically, a disproportionate number of **homeless people report experiences of** childhood adversity, including **poor relationships with parents, neglect, physical and sexual abuse**, and being forced or placed out of the home (15,16,17). One study indicated that up to **50% of homeless** and runaway adolescents **may have experienced physical** abuse; almost one-third reported **sexual abuse** (18). **These experiences may contribute to the risk of mental health problems both concurrently and later in life** (19,20,21).

Homeless commit suicide at five times the rate of the rest of the population

Fitzpatrick 2007 professor of sociology @University of Arkansas - KEVIN M. Just Thinking about It Social Capital and Suicide Ideation among Homeless Persons, 2007, pg 751

Homelessness is an undesirable life circumstance associated with negative life events and significant distress. Homeless persons, however, generally have limited personal and social assets available to address these challenging events and circumstances. Consequently, depressive symptomatology is prevalent among the homeless, with estimates ranging as high as 80 percent suffering the symptoms of clinical depression (Fitzpatrick & LaGory, 2000; LaGory, Ritchey, & Mullis, 1990; Ritchey, LaGory, Fitzpatrick, & Mullis, 1990). **The very high prevalence rates of depression coupled with the depressing circumstances of homelessness itself, suggest the inappropriateness of designating this as mental illness and medicalizing the condition.** Some of the symptoms of depression (difficulty sleeping, problems eating, difficulty with others) may actually reflect the physical circumstances of homelessness itself. Indeed the association between homelessness and depression can better be viewed as evidence of the psychological suffering normally associated with the homeless condition. In short, **it is not surprising that homeless persons are depressed; it is after all a depressing condition.** The depths of this suffering, however, have had only minor attention in the empirical literature on homelessness. In particular, almost no information exists on suicide ideation and its etiology among the homeless, yet such data provide a reliable barometer of the level of felt distress, its potential consequences, as well as the resources necessary to alleviate it (Schutt, Meschede, & Rierdan, 1994). **Data over the last decade suggest that about 3 percent of the US population aged 18 to 54 report suicide ideation annually. The few studies that report ideation among the homeless indicate rates that are at least four to five times greater than the general population** (Rossi, 1989; Schutt et al., 1994). Suicide ideation represents a heightened state of emotional distress; one that better assesses a homeless individual's degree of maladjustment to their precarious situation. While depression can in fact be a normal **response to a particularly dehumanizing experience, suicide ideation is the result of feelings of hopelessness and despondency, an emotional reaction highly indicative of pathology.**

SDSU NFA-LD
Fear the Beard

2010-2011
Homeless AFF

*******AT: NEG*******

AT: Free PO Boxes

The Postal Service violates equal protection because they provide no fee post office boxes for some people but not for the homeless

Girard and Trupin, 30 year worker comp / disability lawyer in, 2001

(David, and Casey Trupin, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE CARL A. CURRIER, *et al.*, v. WILLIAM J. HENDERSON, Postmaster General of the United States, *et al.*; No. C01-0156; PLAINTIFFS' MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF THEIR MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION; August 31, 2001;
<http://www.povertylaw.org/poverty-law-library/case/55300/55359/55359d.rtf>)

Although required by its own regulations to do so, the Postal Service does not provide no-fee post office boxes to all eligible customers. Instead it refuses to provide them to the homeless in violation of the Equal Protection component of the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution and the anti-discrimination requirements of 39 U.S.C. § 403(c).²³ a. Equal Protection **Equal Protection requires the uniform treatment of persons standing in the same relation to the governmental action questioned or challenged.** Reynolds v. Sims, 377 U.S. 533, 84 S.Ct. 1362 (1964). The Equal Protection clause does not forbid classification; it simply keeps governmental decision-makers from treating persons differently if they are alike in all relevant respects. Nordlinger v. Hahn, 505 U.S. 1, 10, 112 S.Ct. 2326, 2331 (1992). **Equal protection analysis requires strict scrutiny of a legislative or administrative classification when the classification impermissibly interferes with the exercise of the fundamental rights such as rights guaranteed by the First Amendment or operates to a particular disadvantage of a suspect class.** Massachusetts Board of Retirement v. Murgia, 427 U.S. 307, 96 S.Ct. 2562 (1976). **Under strict scrutiny Equal Protection analysis, such classifications can only be justified by a compelling governmental interest.** San Antonio Independent School District v. Rodriguez, 411 U.S. 1, 33-34, 93 S.Ct. 1278, 1296-97 (1973); United States v. Johnson, 40 F.3d 436, 439 n.1 (D.C. Cir. 1994).²⁴ Postal customers have both a statutory and a constitutional right to receive mail. See U.S. Const. amend. I; 39 U.S.C. §§ 101(A) and 403(a) and (b).

AT: Coercion

1) Turn: the senders have already paid the government for the mail delivery. The Government is breaking its side of the contract by denying service.

David Girard, Attorney for Seattle Housing and Resource Effort, 2005

(Petition For Writ Of Certiorari To The United States Supreme Court, No. 04-1115, February 15, westlaw) pg. 9

The Postal Service only delivers mail in four ways: 1) individual home delivery; 2) delivery to a set of mail boxes such as in an apartment building lobby or at a mobile *16 home park (another form of home delivery); 3) delivery to post office boxes located in a post office; and 4) general delivery.

Homeless people, by definition, cannot get mail delivered to them at their homes. In addition, the Postal Service will not allow a homeless customer to obtain a post office box without a fee even though that exact service is provided to other customers who are ineligible for carrier delivery. Id. at 722. The Plaintiffs therefore seek access to any kind of effective and free mail delivery, be it post office boxes, general delivery or any other appropriate means of delivery.[FN16] **Plaintiffs merely seek access to the individual pieces of mail that others have paid the defendant to deliver to them. It is inconsequential how that delivery takes place, as long as delivery in fact takes place.**

2) Turn: Plan is a prerequisite for all other rights

David Girard, Attorney for Seattle Housing and Resource Effort, 2005

(Petition For Writ Of Certiorari To The United States Supreme Court, No. 04-1115, February 15, westlaw) pg. 15

Access to mail services is a bedrock constitutionally- guaranteed right of all Americans. It is the conduit by which citizens correspond between themselves and with their government. Denial of access to this system severely threatens an individual's ability to exercise other constitutionally protected freedoms. Without mail, a person may be unable to receive voter registration materials, information from the courts, or information regarding government benefits to which the person is entitled. **Mail provides a vital connection** for many people to family and friends **which cannot be replicated by any other means of communication. Because of their limited access to other means of communication, homeless people feel the denial of mail *29 especially acutely.** As the GAO recently reported to Congress, **because homeless people are "more likely to lack a reliable mailing address" they are often hindered from getting assistance in** mainstream employment, **housing and financial assistance programs.**[FN25] **Homeless individuals depend on mail service as the exclusive means by which they can be contacted by employers, doctors, attorneys, and loved ones. Without access to postal services a homeless person may be unable to vote, to maintain family contacts and to participate in society in general. The harm homeless people suffer due to the deprivation of mail service is unique and significant.**

AT: Kritiks—Permutation Solvency

Permutation solves—only interrogation of both identity politics and pragmatic action can breakdown the root cause of homelessness

Leonard C. **Feldman**, 2004 (Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Oregon. BA at Yale University, PhD at the University of Washington with research interests in contemporary the politics and law of necessity, Giorgio Agamben, Hannah Arendt, the politics of homelessness and public space, and the role of the state in constituting identities. “Citizens Without Shelter” Cornell Press 2004, p. 5)

If ameliorative and punitive approaches both reinforce the separation of the homeless population from a normative public of home dwelling citizens and if punitive policies are justified by neoconservatives as an element of compassionate aid, **then one must pause before simply reasserting the desirability of compassionate policies over and against a punitive approach.** As the left critique of welfare makes clear, **one should not assume that whatever is not explicitly punitive (emergency shelters, drug treatment programs, etc. is an ideologically distinct alternative** to be bolstered and shielded from critical examination.²⁴ **Yet it is also a mistake simply to dismiss compassion and welfare efforts as nothing more than punitive, disciplinary social control measures in disguise.** Although sympathetic to this critique, I believe it moves too quickly toward finding a hidden unity of the two approaches **Explaining such unity in terms of an economic functionality** (the requirements of urban reinvestment, the needs of capitalism), **or a cultural logic** (the ever present dynamic of identity /difference) **leaves unanswered the question of why the homeless need to be contained, enclosed, disciplined, or excluded.** Furthermore, it fails to appreciate that whatever similar goals may orient welfare and punishment, and however much neoconservatives may try to justify punishment as a form of welfare, there are real ideological differences. **In other words, both the differences between sanctuary and discipline and the underlying logics that connect them need to be examined.**

AT: Kritiks—Permutation Solvency

Perm- we must work both inside and outside the system to make any true change.

Sanford F. **Schram 2006** (Welfare Discipline: Discourse, Governance, and Globalization
<http://www.questia.com/read/113460889?title=Welfare%20Discipline%3a%20%20Discourse%2c%20Governance%2c%20and%20Globalization>
Teaches social theory and social policy in the Graduate School of Social Work and Social Research at Bryn Mawr P. 179)

A politics of loving therefore actually values the role of conflict and antagonism. Antagonism need not involve violence and need not insist on only working for a total overhaul of the existing judicial order. Instead, **we must learn to work both within and outside the system simultaneously. This means pushing for more legal right to entitlements even as we work within the system to make it more likely to allow for acts of compassion that compensate people right now within a system of entitlements that leaves them unable to meet their basic needs. We must work to make incremental reforms possible now in the short run even as we work to produce structural reforms in the long run.** While the continuing struggle for a basic income for all is imperative, this needs to be supplemented with building in more compassionate and more generous assistance to those who are currently excluded from the entitlement system. This would be a politics of compassion worth fighting for.

Such a politics of compassion would work within liberal institutions to humanize them while at the same time plotting to transform them beyond the limits of liberal capitalism. It would practice harm reduction, offering aid without passing judgment, working to incrementally make things better for people even as it planned to overcome the systemic sources that marginalized and oppressed those who did not conform to the standards of deservingness in a society that insisted on particularly narrow understanding of who was a personally responsible, self-sufficient member of that society. This politics of compassion would not be anything like the compassionate conservatism that has been promoted in recent years. **It would not be a compassion that can be used to rationalize the substitution of entitlement rights with the disciplinary practices of the new forms of governance that work through civil society to regiment people into the emerging social order.** It would instead be a politics that recaptures compassion from those who seek to exploit it to justify painting the welfare state as cold, heartless, uncaring, and not worth fighting for. It would do that in the name of rebuilding the welfare state. And in an era of globalization, this is the most urgent task.

AT: Law Kritik—AT: Must Focus on Root Cause

Governmental action must be taken to address the root cause of homelessness instead of inefficient quick fixes.

Jonathan L. **Hafetz**; March, **2003**; J.D., Yale Law School, 1999; M. Phil., Oxford University, 1992; B.A., Amherst College, 1990. The Author was formerly a staff attorney at The Partnership for the Homeless in New York City; 2003 Fordham University School of Law Fordham Urban Law Journal; 30 Fordham Urb. L.J. 1215, Homeless Legal Advocacy: New Challenges And Directions For The Future, Lexis-Nexis.

Yet, it is unfair to blame advocates for misdirecting efforts away from long-term solutions. Indeed, **leading homeless civil rights groups themselves recognize that anti-criminalization lawsuits, while invaluable, do not create affordable housing or accessible services.** 170 **Litigation is initiated in response to the real and immediate needs of homeless clients and to the government's failure to implement and sustain an effective anti-poverty policy.** When a homeless person is arrested for sleeping on a park bench, her **lawyer's first response is not to address the underlying causes of homelessness,** but to respond to a concrete injustice. Indeed, prohibitions on **begging or sleeping in the park** do not threaten some abstract notion of liberty, but rather **strike at the ability of men and women to survive.** 171 [*1240] In short, **litigation has played an important part in challenging aggressive, anti-homeless law enforcement policies.** Decisions like Pottinger have helped overcome - or at least mitigate the effects of - attempts to use criminal law to deny society's poorest and most vulnerable members the basic means of survival. 172 Legal advocacy also has fostered effective organizing approaches, raising awareness of and sympathy for homeless people (and helping mobilize public sentiment against anti-homeless ordinances). 173 While such **litigation** may establish only negative rights, 174 it **has helped lead some governments to initiate programs designed to assist homeless people.** 175 Thus, while resisting attempts to criminalize homelessness represents an integral part of homeless legal advocacy, **it must be part of a broader strategy that attempts to address homelessness' root causes.** The following Part outlines some elements of this broader strategy.

AT: Disadvantages—Social Justice K of War Impacts

Their disad reinscribes the logic of neoliberalism by sidelining social justice out of fear– makes war inevitable

Henry A. **Giroux 2005** (The Terror of Neoliberalism: Rethinking the Significance of Cultural Politics
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/25115243.pdf> Henry A. Giroux holds the Global TV Network Chair in Communications at McMaster in Hp.13-14)

We live at a time when the conflation of private interests, empire building, and evangelical fundamentalism brings into question the very nature, if not the existence, of the democratic process. Under the reign of neoliberalism, capital and wealth have been largely distributed upwards, while civic virtue has been undermined by a slavish celebration of the free market as the model for organizing all facets of everyday life (Henwood 2003). Political culture has been increasingly depoliticized as collective life is organized around the modalities of privatization, deregulation, and commercialization. **When the alleged champions of neoliberalism invoke politics, they substitute "ideological certainty for reasonable doubt,"** and deplete "the national reserves of political intelligence" just as they endorse "the illusion that the future can be bought instead of earned" (Lapham 2004a, 9,11). **Under attack is the social contract with its emphasis on enlarging the public good and expanding social provisions such as access to adequate health care, housing, employment, public transportation, and education which provided both a safety net and a set of conditions upon which democracy could be experienced and critical citizenship engaged. Politics has been further depoliticized by a policy of anti-terrorism practiced by the Bush administration that mimics the very terrorism it wishes to eliminate.** Not only does a policy of all **embracing anti-terrorism exhausts itself in a discourse of moral absolutes and public acts of denunciation that remove politics from the realm of state power, it also strips community of democratic values** by defining it almost exclusively through attempts to stamp out what Michael Leeden, a former counter-terror expert in the Reagan administration, calls "corrupt habits of mind that are still lingering around, somewhere"(qtd. in Valentine 2001, para.33). **The appeal to moral absolutes and the constant mobilization of emergency time coded as a culture of fear configures politics in religious terms, hiding its entanglement with particular ideologies and diverse relations of power. Politics becomes empty as it is reduced to following orders, shaming those who make power accountable, and shutting down legitimate modes of dissent** (Giroux 2004). **The militarizing of public space at home contributes to the narrowing of community,** the increasing suppression of dissent, and as Anthony Lewis argues, **a growing escalation of concentrated, unaccountable political power that threatens the very foundation of democracy in the United States** (2002, A15). **Authoritarianism marches forward just as political culture is being replaced with a notion of national security based on fear, surveillance, and control rather than a vibrant culture of shared responsibility and critical questioning. Militarization is no longer simply the driving force of foreign policy, it has become a defining principle for social changes at home.** Catherine Lutz captures the multiple registers and complex processes of militarization that has extensively shaped social life during the 20th century. She is worth quoting at length: By militarization, I mean ... an intensification of the labor and resources allocated to military purposes, including the shaping of other institutions in synchrony with military goals. **Militarization is simultaneously a discursive process, involving a shift in general societal beliefs and values in ways necessary to legitimate the use of force, the organization of large standing armies and their leaders, and the higher taxes or tribute used to pay for them.** Militarization is intimately connected not only to the obvious increase in the size of armies and resurgence of militant nationalisms and militant fundamentalisms but also to the less visible deformation of human potentials into the hierarchies of race, class, gender, and sexuality, and to the shaping of national histories in ways that glorify and legitimate military action. (Lutz 2002, 723) Lutz's definition of militarization is inclusive, attentive to its discursive, ideological, and material relations of power in the service of war and violence.

[CONTINUED]

AT: Disadvantages—Social Justice K of War Impacts

[CONTINUED]

But **militarization is also a powerful cultural politics that works its way through everyday life spawning particular notions of masculinity, sanctioning war as a spectacle, and fear as a central formative component in mobilizing an affective investment in militarization.** In other words, **the politics of militarization, with its emphasis on "social processes in which society organizes itself for the production of violence or the threat thereof"** (Kraska 1999,208), **has produced a pervasive culture of militarization,** which as Kevin Baker insists, "inject[s] a constant military presence in our lives"(2003, 40). **As the culture of profit and militarization dominate or seek to eliminate democratic public spheres, self-reflection and collective empowerment are reduced to self-promotion and self-interest, legitimated by a new and ruthless social Darwinism played out nightly on network television as a metaphor for the "naturalness" of downsizing, the celebration of hyper-masculinity, and the promotion of a war of all against all over even the most limited notions of solidarity and collective struggle** (Bourdieu 1998).

AT: Disadvantages

The language of their disad is productive of the type of social relations which ensure the marginalization and ultimate elimination of those not considered to be valuable and productive citizens.

Gerald **Daly** 1998 (Professor in the faculty of environmental studies at York University, Canada. Worked with housing agencies and non-profit groups and has published widely on housing, homelessness, and comparative planning. "Homelessness and the Street" in Nicholas Fyfe's book "Images of the Street" p. 125)

The desire for self-protection and its corollary, the need to exclude the odious 'other', is expressed in law, in social relations, in architecture, planning and urban design, and in language. Language is instrumental in the social construction of reality. Language is political. It is revealing of how we look at social, economic and political issues; and the ways we use language serve to convey society's messages of power, influence and authority. Homeless individuals may be silenced by such power relationships and associated control mechanisms. These processes serve not only to define social order and to set the political agenda, but also to marginalize, to devalue, and to hold at arm's length. In social, economic and political discourse the life stories of homeless people habitually are devalued, shunted aside or unconsciously limited. Social service and health professionals, sympathetic bureaucrats and politicians, as well as many representatives of voluntary agencies, all involved in dealing with homelessness, also have constructed an image of the homeless individual — a patronizing view of one who needs them to speak for him, to design his programmes, to assist him continuously, as if he were unable to help himself. A formerly homeless man in Oregon observed ruefully that 'too often people experiencing homelessness and poverty are given programmes rather than given the opportunity to design the programmes' (Daly, 1996: 250). In recent times, however, homeless individuals have begun to wrest control of the agenda that governs their lives. In Figure 8.3, occupants of Bed and Breakfasts in Bayswater, London, demonstrate against homelessness, the conditions in temporary accommodation, and the inadequacies of the state response to these problems.

AT: Disadvantages

It is the logic of their DA which perpetuates the invisibility of the homeless, sacrificing them for an poorly conceived greater good—our entire 1AC is a straight turn to their method of decision calculus.

Daly, Gerald. Professor in the faculty of Environmental Studies at York University, Canada. He has worked with housing agencies and non-profit groups and has published widely on housing, homelessness and comparative planning. Author of *Homeless: Policies, strategies and Lives on the Streets*. 19**96**. Pg 9-10.

To the extent that it is visible and audible, **the agenda of the political debate is set by public officials and experts** (academics, consultants, and representatives of voluntary agencies), **while typically excluding the presumed beneficiaries.** Because they lack a collective voice and are not organized, **individuals on the street are represented by proxies whose interests may be self-serving. These relationships may constitute a control system based on a charity model and on naive assumptions about the need to dictate terms to the recipient population.** A self-perpetuating network, characterized by common interests, mutual dependencies and benefits, it has fashioned a web of interdependent communities based on self-interest. It includes government agencies and bureaucrats, not-for-profit and voluntary organizations, professional care-givers and shelter operators. **While most are well-intentioned they, nevertheless, are motivated by a desire to exercise power and a need for control:** the power of the purse strings, the ability to set policy, to allocate resources, to plan and design programs, **to decide who will be helped and who will not, to determine whose interests will be represented, and to sanction or condemn certain practices, values, or beliefs.**

A separate, but related sphere includes **the business community** and the larger public, **whose views on homelessness** and charity help to **define or constrain the roles of government** and the voluntary sector and to determine the nature of opportunity/exploitation affecting the prospects of homeless individuals. **Economic interests employ the language of competitiveness, laissez-faire, and the free market to describe their preference for a "level playing field."** This field, however, **is readily accessible only to members of the team. For others,** who do not enjoy the advantages and resources of team members, **the field is strewn with barriers and obstacles. The participants in this debate represent two dissimilar cultures, based on unequal power relationships with discordant values, beliefs, and languages.** By describing how their worlds intersect I will try to clarify the nature of the bureaucratic and institutional contexts in which policy is formed and the arenas in which political and power dynamics play themselves out. Context is centrally important. It shapes the terms and tone of the debate over homelessness and helps to define the issues. It determines what gets discussed in the public domain as well as what gets suppressed or excluded from the agenda.

AT: Disadvantages

Focusing on the impacts of the DA reverts to crisis based politics which undermines systemic impacts.

Cuomo 1996 (Chris, Cuomo is a Professor of Philosophy and Women's Studies, and Director of the Institute for Women's Studies at the University of Georgia, "War Is Not Just an Event: Reflections on the Significance of Everyday Violence" p. 31)

For any feminism that aims to resist oppression and create alternative social and political options, **crisis-based ethics and politics are problematic because they distract attention from the need for sustained resistance to the enmeshed, omnipresent systems of domination and oppression that so often function as givens in most people's lives.** Neglecting the omnipresence of militarism allows the false belief that the absence of declared armed conflicts is peace, the polar opposite of war. It is particularly easy for those whose lives are shaped by the safety of privilege, and who do not regularly encounter the realities of militarism, to maintain this false belief. **The belief that militarism is an ethical, political concern only regarding armed conflict, creates forms of resistance to militarism that are merely exercises in crisis control. Antiwar resistance is then mobilized when the "real" violence finally occurs, or when the stability of privilege is directly threatened, and at that point it is difficult not to respond in ways that make resisters drop all other political priorities. Crisis-driven attention to declarations of war might actually keep resisters complacent about and complicitous in the general presence of global militarism.** Seeing war as necessarily embedded in constant military presence draws attention to the fact that horrific, state-sponsored violence is happening nearly all over, all of the time, and that it is perpetrated by military institutions and other militaristic agents of the state. **Moving away from crisis-driven politics and ontologies concerning war and military violence also enables consideration of relationships among seemingly disparate phenomena, and therefore can shape more nuanced theoretical and practical forms of resistance.** For example, investigating the ways in which war is part of a presence allows consideration of the relationships among the events of war and the following: how militarism is a foundational trope in the social and political imagination; how the pervasive presence and symbolism of soldiers/warriors/patriots shape meanings of gender; the ways in which threats of state-sponsored violence are a sometimes invisible/sometimes bold agent of racism, nationalism, and corporate interests; the fact that vast numbers of communities, cities, and nations are currently in the midst of excruciatingly violent circumstances. **It also provides a lens for considering the relationships among the various kinds of violence that get labeled "war."** Given current American obsessions with nationalism, guns, and militias, and growing hunger for the death penalty, prisons, and a more powerful police state, one cannot underestimate the need for philosophical and political attention to connections among phenomena like the "war on drugs," the "war on crime," and other state-funded militaristic campaigns.

AT: Economy Disadvantage

The disad's privileging of economic calculation precludes forming ethical relations with Others—this dualistic thinking guarantees inevitable environmental and social crises which make their impacts inevitable—only voting affirmative can solve.

Chris **Cuomo** 2003 (Associate Professor of Philosophy and Women's Studies at the University of Cincinnati, current Visiting Fellow at Cornell University Society for Humanities and author of numerous feminist theory texts. "Review: Environmental Culture: The Ecological Crisis of Reason" <http://ndpr.nd.edu/review.cfm?id=1059>)

Readers of Val Plumwood's *Feminism and the Mastery of Nature* (Routledge 1993) will find that the bulk of *Environmental Culture* consists of a more nuanced and thorough presentation of the critical arguments found in that earlier work. Plumwood's basic position is that the ecological crises we currently face are the result of arrogant cultures (based in arrogant philosophical views) that deny the fact that humans are dependent on nature, men are dependent on women, and those with economic and decision-making power are dependent on disempowerment of others. Cultures built on the legacies of Platonic dualism (which posits reason as separate from and superior to nature, or matter) and empiricism (which admits that nature is relevant to knowledge, but debases it nonetheless) fail to acknowledge the existence and importance of "the Other"—nature, women, indigenous people, and anyone identified with the less powerful side of the reason/matter dualism. They therefore allow for and encourage mindsets and practices that harm those "others" on which the privileged at the center of reality depend.

For Plumwood, arrogance is philosophically deep. It is enabled by metaphysics that describe ultimate being as that which is the absolute opposite of nature or matter. It is bolstered by epistemologies that take knowledge to be rightly dominating, disembodied, and singular in form. It is justified by ethics that see detached autonomy as a moral goal and that consider humans the paradigm of moral considerability. It is encouraged by political systems where privileged elites are able to maintain severe remoteness from the social and ecological consequences of their decisions. And it is presupposed by science that is driven by the dictates of economic rationalism and that interprets "impartiality" as "for sale to the highest bidder."

AT: Politics

Do not be beholden to political expediency—it is type of decision-making which attempts to eradicate the homeless in order to curry political favor—only voting aff can stop this cycle of exclusionary violence.

Randall **Amster 03**, Professor of Peace Studies at Prescott College in northern Arizona, holds a J.D. from Brooklyn Law School and a Ph.D. in Justice Studies from Arizona State University. Co-editor of *Lives in the Balance: Perspectives on Global Injustice and Inequality* (Brill 1997), Published recent articles in *Social Justice*, *Peace Review*, and *Contemporary Justice Review*. Author of *Patterns of Exclusion: Sanitizing Space, Criminalizing Homelessness*. March 22, 2003. http://goliath.ecnext.com/coms2/gi_0199-3159714/Patterns-of-exclusion-sanitizing-space.html

In political terms, the pervasiveness of the disease image in connection with the homeless serves simultaneously to empower officials and merchants to assume the mantle of speaking for "the community" in devising and implementing schemes to remove the perceived threat, and to disempower the homeless from having effective domains of self-presentation and resistance. As Wright (1997: 39) concludes, "living with 'spoiled identities,' **the very poor are categorized, inspected, dissected, and rendered mute in the public discourse about their future by those who have the power to enforce [such] categorical distinctions.**" Tempe's "Piper" (interview, 2000), a 20-year-old self-described "gutter punk," waxes philosophically about the whole state of affairs: "They think their lives would be so much better if they didn't have to see the 'slime' and the 'scum' that lives on the street, but you know what? This is fucking real life, this is here, a diverse amount of things--in this world you never know what you're gonna see, so why try to hide it? Their kids are gonna find out about it anyway." Lyn Lofland (1998: 190) also notes this eventual permeation of homeless identity, despite attempts at regulation: "**If regulation alone could achieve the purification of the public realm, we would all currently live in a world from which ... the homeless ... had completely disappeared.**" Nonetheless, despite their lack of full realization in the **present**, it is apparent, as Ferrell (2001: 175) explains, that such **efforts "promote a type of spatial cleansing whereby unwanted populations are removed, by the force of law and money, from particular locations and situations. But this spatial cleansing is at the same time a cultural cleansing; as economic, political, and legal authorities work to recapture and redesign the public spaces of the city, they work to control public identity and public perception as well,** to remove from new spaces of consumption and development images of alternative identity."⁸

AT: Politics

Their refusal to confront vested political interests creates serial policy failure

SANFORD E **SCHRAM** 1993 (Department of Political Science, Macalester College, St. Paul, MN 55105 and LaFollette Institute of Public Affairs, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI 53706. Postmodern policy analysis: Discourse and identity in welfare policy <http://www.springerlink.com/content/13427712m43r7411/fulltext.pdf> p. 253)

A postmodern orientation allows for the possibility that welfare policy discourse and the practices of the welfare state are actually constitutive forces, contributing to the conditions of poverty which are supposedly addressed by such public policies. Stone (1988) argues that implied policy solutions animate policy discourse and unavoidably get insinuated into the representation of policy problems. Edelman (1988) emphasizes the political limitations which constrain the state so that the policy solutions that prefigure the political representations of problems are necessarily self-serving and politically conservative. He argues **that the state has a vested interest in ensuring its own legitimacy and therefore cannot actually solve its problems by attacking their systemic causes. Necessarily committed to not rocking the political boat, it must content itself with managing problems and keeping them within politically acceptable limits. The net result is policy which cannot eliminate problems, but is instead partly a contributor to their perpetuation. Policy, therefore, as an ensemble of discursive practices, does not just create its own politics and does not just become its own cause, but contributes to making up the reality it confronts.**

Misc—K of “The Homeless”

Calling homeless persons “the homeless” creates an us/them distinction that facilitates their marginalization – the impact is the aff

Daly, Gerald. Professor in the faculty of Environmental Studies at York University, Canada. He has worked with housing agencies and non-profit groups and has published widely on housing, homelessness and comparative planning. Author of *Homeless: Policies, strategies and Lives on the Streets*. 19**96**. Pg 8.

Researchers are now beginning to address the way society categorizes and responds to homeless individuals. Rather than talk about homeless people as being "disaffiliated," some suggest that it is more appropriate to examine the notion of dissociation as it is applied to **homeless people**, victims of disasters, and poor inner city residents. These individuals **are consigned to the periphery of public consciousness because by failing to conform they violate social norms and offend public sensibilities. We deal with them by dissociation, distancing ourselves to minimize or displace feelings of resentment, fear, contempt, guilt, shame, or conflict. In doing so a cycle of disinterest and disaffection is generated, allowing us to shun collective responsibility. We compartmentalize and place barriers between "us" and "them."** We tend to see some things and to ignore others. **As a dehumanizing process, the extent of this dualistic dissociation is manifest in the terminology used to describe homeless individuals. Common use of the term "the homeless" instead of "homeless persons" or "people without houses" facilitates the distancing process. "They" become an amorphous, remote, alien mass lacking individuality or even humanity. A sense of community is lost. Definitions and descriptions of "the homeless" expose our personal values and beliefs, especially when homelessness is characterized by what it is not.** Our egos yearn "to be free of complexity and of change, of relation, and of needing to know the irksome other" (Keller 1986: 174).

SDSU NFA-LD
Fear the Beard

2010-2011
Homeless AFF

*******Tix*******

No Link

Plan doesn't link to politics – it'll be spun

Giamo and Grunberg 1992 (Benedict and Jeffrey, Giamo is a Professor of American Studies at the University of Notre Dame. Grunberg is a Professor of Clinical Psychology at Columbia University. "Beyond Homelessness: Frames of Reference" p. 165)

Well, earlier I gave you an example of a piece of social distress: in effect, the way the members of Congress, although they were not the perpetrators as it were, created the means to produce the problem of this tremendous amount of money that the American public is going to have to pay off. And they did it in a way that I think outrages most people. They are saying that we have to pay a bunch of hoodlums who went into the saving and loan business knowing full well that there was no risk because they were setting it up to get bailed out by the government. They walked out the back door with the money, and now we're going to have to give the people back the money who were insured by the government. That's institutionalizing distress financially, socially, ana politically, and to the point of absurdity and to the point where it could break the backs of the social structures and the people who hold them up. That's the meaning of social distress.

A2: Winners Win (Ornstein only)

1. Non unique – Obama perceived as a winner now –

Only a risk the plan hurts him. Obama's approval rating is higher than Clinton, so Congress is much more likely to go along with him now.

2. Wrong Context – Ornstein doesn't apply – Ornstein assumes context unique to Clinton – he was in serious political decline – meaning a victory would make him a winner – the same doesn't apply to Obama

Ornstein, American Enterprise Institute fellow and political analyst, 1993

(Norman J., Roll Call, "Clinton Can Still Emerge a Winner; Here's What to Do", May 27, p. Online)

The President needs a victory, and badly, to stop the hemorrhaging and prevent the press from hyping every embarrassing miscue in the White House as proof-positive of the President's weakness. The stakes in the next few weeks could not be higher.

3. Win doesn't overwhelm the link –

Obama still has to spend political capital to get the win, ensuring he has net less capital to pass _____

4. No link – Ornstein assumes particular context – 16 years ago – he assumes Clinton's 2nd 100 days, and economic policy

Ornstein, American Enterprise Institute fellow and political analyst, 1993

(Norman J., Roll Call, "Clinton Can Still Emerge a Winner; Here's What to Do", May 27, p. Online)

The first 100 days of the Clinton presidency set in place an initial impression and a tone. Now, in the second 100 days, the real heavy lifting takes place. The next three weeks are a critical time for Bill Clinton. He will either emerge as a winner on his economic plan, crossing over the hurdles in the House and Senate, or he will set in place an image of a president too weak, inexperienced, and egotistical to overcome the forces of gridlock in Washington. If he emerges as a winner, he will be in a position to move, albeit in increments, in other areas that are important to him, like health care, welfare reform, and national service. If his economic plan gets eviscerated or wholly transformed by Congress, he will spend much of his time ahead simply trying to overcome an image of weakness and ineptitude that will feed on itself.

5. Theory incoherent –

Ornstein says you have to be aggressive and give in at the same time. It's impossible to do both.

6. Only a risk of a turn – there is no positive spillover –

The politicians who lose as a result of the plan will harden their positions, making them less likely to cooperate with Obama on _____

7. Ornstein doesn't assume forcing massively unpopular items, like the plan, down Congress's throats

Ornstein, American Enterprise Institute fellow and political analyst, 1993

(Norman J., Roll Call, "Clinton Can Still Emerge a Winner; Here's What to Do", May 27, p. Online)

Winning in this regard does not mean forcing sweeping proposals, in toto, down the throats of lawmakers. It means compromising, cutting back, and ceding ground to build majorities, but doing so in ways that make it clear that you are in control.

A2: Winners Win

Cult of personality will hurt Obama – overexposure hurts political power

Noonan, Wall Street Journal columnist & former Reagan speechwriter, -9

(Peggy, “Look at the time”, 1-30 <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB123326587231330357.html>, accessed 2-1-9)

A final point: **In the time since his inauguration, Mr. Obama has been on every screen in the country, TV and computer, every day. He is never not on the screen.** I know what his people are thinking: Put his image on the age. Imprint the era with his face. But **it's already reaching saturation point.** **When the office is omnipresent, it is demystified. Constant exposure deflates the presidency, subtly robbing it of power and making it more common. I keep the television on a lot, and somewhere in the 1990s I realized that Bill Clinton was never not in my living room. He was always strolling onto the stage, pointing at things, laughing, talking. This is what the Obama people are doing, having the boss hog the screen. They should relax. The race is long.** As a matter of fact, they should focus on that: The race is long. Run seriously.

AT: Winners Lose

Losers don't necessarily lose- can still get big agenda items after a loss

Weisberg 2005 (Jacob Weisberg, Editor, "Bush's First Defeat: The president has lost on Social Security. How will he handle it?" Slate, March 31, 2005, <http://www.slate.com/id/2115141/>)

This means that Bush is about to suffer—and is actually in the midst of **suffering—his first major political defeat**. After passing all his most important first-term domestic priorities (a tax cut, an education-reform bill, domestic security legislation, another tax cut), Bush faces a second term that is beginning with a gigantic rebuke: A Congress solidly controlled by his own party is repudiating his top goal. It's precisely what happened to Bill Clinton, when Congress rejected his health-care reform proposal in 1993. As **the Clinton example shows, such a setback doesn't doom an administration. But how Bush handles the defeat is likely to be a decisive factor in determining whether he accomplishes any of the other big-ticket items on his agenda.**

****Winners win – winning on controversial issues is key to Obama's agenda**

Jonathan Singer, JD candidate at Berkeley and editor of MyDD, 3-3-09,

<http://www.mydd.com/story/2009/3/3/191825/0428>

Peter Hart gets at a key point. **Some believe that political capital is finite**, that it can be used up. To an extent that's true. **But it's** important to note, too, that political capital **can be regenerated** -- and, specifically, that **when a President expends a great deal of capital on a measure that was difficult to enact and then succeeds, he can build up more capital.** Indeed, that appears to be what is happening with Barack **Obama**, who **went to the mat to pass** the **stimulus** package out of the gate, **got it passed despite near-unanimous opposition of the Republicans** on Capitol Hill, **and is being rewarded** by the American public as a result. Take a look at the numbers. President Obama now has a 68 percent favorable rating in the NBC-WSJ poll, his highest ever showing in the survey. Nearly half of those surveyed (47 percent) view him very positively. Obama's Democratic Party earns a respectable 49 percent favorable rating. The Republican Party, however, is in the toilet, with its worst ever showing in the history of the NBC-WSJ poll, 26 percent favorable. On the question of blame for the partisanship in Washington, 56 percent place the onus on the Bush administration and another 41 percent place it on Congressional Republicans. Yet just 24 percent blame Congressional Democrats, and a mere 11 percent blame the Obama administration. So at this point, **with** President **Obama** seemingly **benefiting from his ambitious actions and the Republicans sinking** further and further **as a result of their** knee-jerked **opposition** to that agenda, **there appears to be no reason not to push forward on anything** from universal healthcare to energy reform to ending the war in Iraq.

Winners win – one victory builds the habit for future wins

Norman Ornstein, Roll Call, May 27, 1993

2. **Winning comes to those who look like winners.** This only sounds redundant or cliché-ish. If power is the ability to make people do something they otherwise would not do, **real power is having people do things they otherwise wouldn't do** without anybody making them - when they act in anticipation of what they think somebody would want them to do. **If a president develops a reputation as a winner**, somebody who will pull out victories in Congress **even when** he is **behind, somebody who can say, "Do this!" and have it done**, then Members of **Congress will behave accordingly.** **They will want to cut their deals with the president early, getting on the winning team** when it looks the best and means the most. **They will avoid cutting deals with the opposition.** Stories that show **weakness**, indecisiveness, or incompetence in the White House - and there are always lots of them - **will go unreported** or will be played down because they will be seen as the exception that proves the rule of strength and competence. But the converse is also, painfully, true. **If a president develops a reputation for being** weak or for being **a loser** - somebody who says, "Do this!" and nothing happens, who is ignored or spurned by other interests in the political process - he **will suffer death by a thousand cuts.** Lawmakers will delay jumping on his bandwagon, holding off as long as possible until they see which side will win. Stories about incompetence, arrogance, or failure will be reported always, and given prominence, because they prove the point.

SDSU NFA-LD

Fear the Beard

Capital can't be saved. Obama needs to spend it now or lose it forever

Lincoln **Mitchell**, Assistant Professor of Politics at Columbia University

The Huffington Post, 18 June **2009**

Political capital is not, however, like money, it cannot be saved up interminably while its owner waits for the right moment to spend it. Political capital has a shelf life, and often not a very long one. If it is not used relatively quickly, it dissipates and becomes useless to its owner. This is the moment in which Obama, who has spent the first

few months of his presidency diligently accumulating political capital, now finds himself.

The next few months will be a key time for Obama. If Obama does not spend this political capital during the next months, it will likely be gone by the New Year anyway.

2010-2011

Homeless AFF

AT: Gop Backlash

GOP's knee-jerk oppositional politics won't work – it will only bolster Obama

Zelizer, Princeton University Woodrow Wilson School history and public affairs professor,

9 (Julian E., CNN.com, "Commentary: Why GOP can't say 'whatever it is, we're against it'", 1-27
<http://www.cnn.com/2009/POLITICS/01/27/zelizer.republicans/index.html>, accessed 1-30-9)

One of the best Marx Brothers movies, "Horse Feathers," played in movie theaters at the height of the Great Depression in 1932. In the film, the comedian Groucho Marx played the new president of Huxley College. Quincy Adams Wagstaff. During one of the most memorable scenes, Groucho introduces himself to faculty and students by singing about his philosophy of governance: "Your proposition may be good/But let's have one thing understood/ Whatever it is, I'm against it!/And even when you've changed it or condensed it, I'm against it/ I'm opposed to it/On general principle. I'm opposed to it." If Republicans want to rebuild their party after the calamity of 2008, the party leadership needs to avoid the Quincy Adams Wagstaff approach to politics. When Obama proposed his economic recovery bill last week, the first words to come out of House Minority Leader's John Boehner's mouth sounded a bit like Wagstaff. With the economy imploding and the international economic crisis worsening, Boehner said: "Right now, given the concerns that we have over the size of the package and all of the spending in this package, we don't think it's going to work. And so if it's the plan that I see today, put me down in the 'no' column." Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell has been more restrained in his response, leaving open the door to compromise. If Boehner is simply acting as Dr. No to get a better deal, Republicans can come out of the negotiations over the economic recovery bill as partners, planting the seeds for a new Republican approach toward dealing with economic matters. But **if Boehner's plan is for his party to act as an oppositional force -- trying to block, delay and prevent legislative action -- then the GOP could find itself in big trouble. If the Republicans don't agree with Obama's approach, given the severity of the crisis, they need to offer an alternative rather than just sitting still.** To be sure, there is the possibility that if the economy continues to deteriorate after a bill has passed and the public loses faith in Obama, the House GOP could reap the benefit from their opposition. They could say "we told you so." But even that would be a high-risk maneuver, particularly given the state of public opinion about the Republican Party. **Even if a bill passes and the economy continues to struggle, voters would be looking at a Republican Party that didn't have anything better to offer. The public likes hard-working politicians. President Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal ideas didn't always work -- some like the National Recovery Act were downright failures -- but voters valued a president who tried to offer arguments about how to end the crisis and who rolled up his sleeves to make the nation better.**

*******Spending*******

1AR Answers (1/3)

1 – Non-Unique: Arguments of overwhelming cost and demand are unfounded. The Postal Service has historically spent millions of dollars to stop inequitable treatment of customers.

Girard and Trupin, 30 year worker comp / disability lawyer in, 2001

(David, and Casey Trupin, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE CARL A. CURRIER, et al., v. WILLIAM J. HENDERSON, Postmaster General of the United States, et al.; No. C01-0156; PLAINTIFFS' MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF THEIR MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION; August 31, 2001; <http://www.povertylaw.org/poverty-law-library/case/55300/55359/55359d.rtf>)

The Postal Service will not be "overwhelmed" by the demands of the homeless for no-fee post office boxes. Most homeless applicants will be placed on waiting lists for such boxes just like other similarly situated customers and will receive general delivery in the meantime. the same remedy and cost suggested by the Postal Service below for Currier in lieu of providing him with a no-fee post office box. Moreover, **the cost of providing the homeless with no-fee post office boxes is not a compelling governmental interest that would justify the Postal Service's discriminatory treatment of the homeless.** As the court in *Greenberg v. Bolger*, 497 F. Supp. 756 (E.D.N.Y. 1980) held, **the preservation of scarce financial resources is not a sufficient rationale for a Postal Service regulation that infringes on First Amendment rights. A long line of cases have affirmed that, when a constitutional right is involved, the government cannot apportion its services, especially when that apportionment is based on the history or ability of an individual to financially contribute.** See, e.g. *Shapiro*, 89 S. Ct. at 1330. (a state may not protect the public fisc by drawing an invidious distinction between classes of its citizens). **In 1998 the Postal Service was ready, willing and able to assume a cost of \$8 to \$13 million to stop its "inequitable treatment" of some customers who were eligible for no-fee post office boxes. The cost of providing such boxes in 1998 was not viewed by the Postal Service as a compelling enough justification to support its "inequitable treatment" of some customers who were then ineligible for carrier delivery service. Likewise, such costs are not compelling governmental interests here. The Postal Service may choose to not provide no-fee boxes to any customers, even those ineligible for carrier delivery services.⁴⁹[49] But once it has chosen to provide such boxes to all customers ineligible for carrier delivery services it cannot invidiously discriminate in the provision of such boxes between similarly situated customers even though it may cost the Postal Service more to extend the service to the homeless. See *Shapiro*, 89 S. Ct. at 1330.**

2 – Turn: Criminalization only exacerbates the economic downturn because of the funding required to sweep the streets.

Maria **Foscarinis et al; A.B. 1977**, Barnard College; M.A. 1978, J.D. 1981, Columbia University; 1999 *Georgetown Journal on Poverty Law & Policy* 6 Geo. J. Poverty Law & Pol'y 145FEATURE: Out of Sight -- Out of Mind?: The Continuing Trend Toward the Criminalization of Homelessness; Lexis-Nexis

Advocates of criminalization also cite the need to preserve the economic vitality of urban business districts and the promotion of tourism as justifications for anti-homeless policies. They **claim that the presence of homeless people sleeping, sitting, or begging will deter customers from patronizing local businesses and will decrease tourism, ultimately causing businesses to leave the area and resulting in urban decay.** 48 **However**, homelessness is not the cause of such economic decline; rather, such downturns are due to more complex economic factors. 49 In fact, **homelessness is more likely a result of such economic declines than a cause of them.** 50 On a larger scale, **criminalization is unlikely to solve these largely economic problems.** In the absence of alternatives, homeless people forced to move from one area will simply move into another, while the underlying economic issues are ignored.

Addressing these concerns through the criminal justice system rather than providing housing and services not only fails to provide any long-term benefits for homeless people, or to create lasting solutions to conflicts over the use of public spaces, but it **is also likely to cost significantly more than implementing constructive alternatives. The costs of police time and resources used in detaining individuals is likely to be much higher than the combined cost of providing basic shelter and necessary services.** In 1993, the average cost of detaining one person for one day in jail in the U.S. was over \$ 40, excluding the police resources utilized in the arrest process. 51 According to HUD figures obtained in an evaluation of its Supportive Housing Demonstration Program, the cost of providing transitional housing, which includes not only housing and food but also transportation and counseling services was approximately \$ 30.90 per person per day. 52

1AR Answers (2/3)

3 – TURN: IN TIMES OF ECONOMIC DOWNTURN, GOVERNMENT SPENDING INCREASES GROWTH

Calbreath '09, Union-Tribune Staff Writer February 1, 2009 David Calbreath, "Government spending is tool to revive the economy" The Union-Tribune is a California-based newspaper reporting on national and local issues. The newspaper has won numerous awards over the years, including four Pulitzer Prizes. <http://www3.signonsandiego.com/stories/2009/feb/01/1b1dean185149-government-spending-tool-revive-econ/>

As politicians on Capitol Hill debate how much money to pour into the latest stimulus package, they may take heart from the findings of

a recent study from the University of California San Diego, which **suggests that government spending programs can be very useful in revitalizing the economy.** In a year-old study now being updated to

reflect the ongoing economic crisis, UCSD economist Valerie Ramey took a look at government spending programs from the

Eisenhower era through the Sept. 11 terrorist attacks. Her conclusion: **For every \$1 the government spent, it**

generated an average of \$1.40 in economic growth. "Raising spending stimulates the

economy." Ramey said. "On average, **government spending raises the gross domestic product**

and raises employment, although it sometimes leads to a small decrease in consumer spending, as consumers find

themselves in competition with the government." Over the past two months, **the stimulus package** – created to revive an

economy laid low by the mortgage crisis – has evolved from a near-record \$700 billion proposal to a leviathan between \$819 billion and

\$888 billion, depending on whether you're looking at the House or Senate version. Many economists say even that will not be enough to

revive the economy. As originally envisioned, the package was aimed at infrastructure construction and bolstering state and local

budgets, with the goal of creating or preserving 3 million jobs through 2011. That continues to be the core of the bill, but now embedded

within in its 647 pages are proposals to devote millions of dollars to funding the National Endowment for the Arts, revamping the

Department of Commerce headquarters, rebuilding restrooms in national parks and buying new computers for government agencies,

among other things. Although critics describe some of those proposals as "pork" projects, supporters of the bill say they **will create**

jobs and stir economic growth, which is the point of the bill. To assuage some critics – and to fulfill Obama's

campaign promises – the bill also includes \$275 billion in tax cuts, including reductions to the alternative minimum tax, income taxes

and corporate taxes. But several studies last week agreed with Ramey's findings at UCSD: **In times like these, the most**

important step the government can take is to spend. "A massive hole in demand is

emerging as consumers, businesses, and state and local governments are forced to cut back," said Nigel Gault, chief U.S.

economist at IHT Global Insight, an economic analysis firm in Massachusetts. **The federal government is the only**

entity that can fill that gap, either by spending itself or by providing the financing for spending in the rest of the

economy." In a report last week, Gault compared the benefits of three elements of the stimulus proposal: tax cuts, infrastructure

spending and transfers of federal funds to state and local governments. Gault found that the most effective use of the money would be

spending on infrastructure projects, generating \$1.70 in economic activity for every \$1 spent. "This should not be surprising, since the

spending creates GDP both directly, by putting idle resources to work, and indirectly,

since those businesses and workers **receiving extra income will then be able to spend more.**" he

said. Transfers to state and local governments would generate \$1.40 for every \$1 spent, he said, partly by **preventing further**

job losses.

1AR Answers (3/3)

4 – Turn: **HELP FOR LOW-INCOME FAMILIES STIMULATES THE ECONOMY**

Kathryn **Baer '09**, a consultant in policy communications. "Benefits Will Jump Start Economic Recovery" January 29, 2009
<http://povertyandpolicy.wordpress.com/2009/01/29/benefits-will-jump-start-economic-recovery/>

The Coalition on Human Needs has done us all a great service. It **has issued a summary of the provisions in the House economic recovery package that will benefit low-income**

people and others at immediate risk of hardship. Anyone who's tried to read the legislation—or even the Appropriations Committee's summary—knows how useful this is. CHN also identifies shortcomings in the package, including the short shrift given to affordable housing. No funding for additional housing vouchers, despite the rising tide of homelessness. No funding to support the construction of new affordable housing, despite the job creation potential. To me, these are glaring gaps. However, CHN's

most important message is **that the provisions targeted to low-income people and laid-off**

workers will do more than alleviate hardship. Combined with proposed increases for K-12 education

programs, **they will save or create nearly two million jobs. This is because they will**

quickly put money into the hands of people who will spend it to meet their needs. Mark

Zandi, chief economist for Moody's Economy.com has translated this obvious truth into dollars and cents. He says, for example, that a

\$1.00 increase in food stamps will generate an estimated \$1.73 in near-term economic growth. **The Economic Policy**

Institute has crunched the numbers another way. Its analysis for CHN **shows that the food stamp provisions**

in the House package will save or create about 185,000 jobs. Think grocery store clerks, drivers for

distribution companies, workers in food processing plants, etc. Experts, including Zandi and the Congressional Budget Office, say that tax cuts are a less effective economic stimulus. CBO is particularly unenthusiastic about reductions in the corporate tax rate. As it says,

businesses will not spend more money on labor or produce more just because they have more after-tax income. **They need**

increased consumer demand. And that's what the proposed food stamps increase and

other measures targeted to low-income people will deliver. Nevertheless, Congressional Republicans

want less spending and more tax relief in the economic recovery package. And on the House side, they clearly won't budge. Not a single

Republican voted in favor of the package the House passed yesterday. Now, there's a reasonable argument to be made for paring down

the spending part to focus it more on jump starting the economy and perhaps also for expanding the tax part. But substituting tax relief

for the major measures CHN endorses should be a non-starter. Fortunately, it looks as if it will be.

AT: Non-Unique

The Postal Service is NOT designed to make a profit precisely so that it can afford everyone the opportunity to receive mail.

David Girard, Attorney for Seattle Housing and Resource Effort, 2005 (Petition For Writ Of Certiorari To The United States Supreme Court, No. 04-1115, February 15, westlaw) pg. 14
Third, as stated above in the introduction, the Postal Service's Constitutional and statutory obligation to provide universal mail delivery to all Americans trumps all of these considerations. **The most important difference is that [the Postal Service] does not seek profits, but only to break even,** 39 U.S.C. § 3621, **which is consistent with its public character.** It also has broader obligations, including the provision of universal mail delivery, the provision of free mail delivery to the certain classes of persons, §§ 3201-3405, and, most recently, increased public responsibilities related to national security. Flamingo, supra, 540 U.S. at 747 (emphasis added); see also, Air Courier Conference v. American Postal Workers Union, 498 U.S. 517, 527 (1991) (Postal Service has "responsibility to provide service to all communities at a uniform rate ..."). **This obligation to provide mail delivery services to all Americans outweighs the Postal Service's business considerations.** Milner v. Bolger, 546 F. Supp. 375, 379 (E.D. Cal. 1982). **In fact, in other instances the Post Office itself has recognized this basic obligation. In 1998 the Postal Service was ready, willing and able to assume a cost of \$8 to \$13 million to stop its "inequitable treatment" of some customers who were eligible for no-fee post office boxes. There, it greatly expanded the definition of who was eligible for no-fee post office boxes to include people who lived within a quarter-mile of the local post office.** App. 151. **The cost of providing such boxes in 1998 was not viewed by the Postal Service as a significant enough justification to support its "inequitable treatment" of some customers who were then *27 ineligible for carrier delivery service. Likewise, such costs are not significant governmental interests here.**

Economy resilient

No Impact: EMPIRICISM PROVES THAT ECONOMIC SHOCKS WON'T CAUSE DEPRESSION OR WAR, US ECONOMY IS RESILIENT

Los Angeles Times February 9, 2003 Sunday

Still, Gross's hand-wringing about "hegemonic decay" is terribly overstated. It ignores, after all, a fundamental lesson of history: **The U.S. economy is remarkably resilient.** Indeed, what Gross is ignoring is that **America has faced tough times before -- and has successfully worked through them,** only to emerge stronger. In the 1960s, President **Johnson tried to fight the war in Vietnam without raising taxes, and** that stretched the economy. **The result was the runaway inflation** of the 1970s and a crisis in the dollar that forced President Nixon to cut the greenback loose from the gold standard. **Still, the U.S. economy bounced back, enjoying strong growth through** much of **the 1980s.** In 1981, President **Reagan increased the defense budget and cut taxes** at the same time. **The** eventual **result** was swelling budget deficits, which raised interest rates and **undermined the financial markets.** **But once again, the problems were dealt with, and the nation moved on,** spurred by great technological advances.

Economy resilient

THE US ECONOMY HAS THE ABILITY TO RESPOND TO ANY CHALLENGE

Bonvillian '04 is Legislative Director and Chief Counsel to Sen. Joseph Lieberman of Connecticut. Fall 2004 William B. Bonvillian, "Meeting the New Challenge to U.S. Economic Competitiveness" <http://www.issues.org/21.1/bonvillian.html>

In the 1980s, **when the United States faced significant competitive challenges from Japan and Germany, U.S. industry, labor, and government** worked out a series of competitiveness policies and approaches that **helped pave the way for the nation's revitalized economic leadership** in the 1990s. In the mid-1980s President Reagan appointed Hewlett Packard president John Young to head a bipartisan competitiveness commission, which recommended a practical policy approach designed to defuse ideological squabbling. Although many of its recommendations were enacted slowly or not at all, the commission created a new focus on public-private partnerships, on R&D investments (especially in IT), and on successful competition in trade rather than protectionism. This became the generally accepted response and provided the building blocks for the 1990s boom. The Young Commission was followed by Congress's Competitiveness Policy Council through 1997. These efforts were successful in redefining the economic debate in part because they built on the experiences, well-remembered at the time, of industry and government collaboration that was so successful in World War II and in responding to Sputnik. Those are much more distant memories in this new century, but we should revisit the Young Commission model. The private sector Council on Competitiveness, originally led by Young, has assembled a group of leading industry, labor, and academic leaders to prepare a National Innovation Initiative, which could provide a blueprint for action. Legislation has been introduced in the Senate to establish a new bipartisan competitiveness commission that would have the prestige and leverage to stimulate government action. **The U.S. economy is the most flexible and resilient in the world. The country possesses a highly talented workforce, powerful and efficient capital markets, the strongest R&D system, and the energy of entrepreneurs and many dynamic companies.** That by itself will not guarantee success in a changing economy, but **it gives the country the wherewithal to adapt to an evolving world.** Challenges to U.S. dominance are visible everywhere. Strong economic growth is vital to the U.S. national mission, and innovation is the key to that growth. The United States needs to fashion a new competitiveness agenda designed to speed the velocity of innovation to meet the great challenges of the new century. Once that agenda has been crafted, the nation must find the political will to implement it.

No Impact: THE ECONOMY ALWAYS REBOUNDS

Wilder '08 Rebecca, a staff writer for News & Economics, which analyzes of global economic and financial conditions with a focus on the U.S. "The U.S. economy is efficient and resilient" November 7, 2008 <http://www.newsneconomics.com/2008/11/us-economy-is-efficient-and-resilient.html>

Yesterday the Bureau of Labor Statistics released its measure of nonfarm productivity. **U.S. productivity slowed to a 2.0% annual pace, but** relative to the U.K. and Germany, **the silver lining shows the innate resilience of the U.S. economy. Once the U.S. economy emerges from the recession, productivity will propel economic growth forward.** Nonfarm productivity measures output per man-hour worked for all U.S. production sectors except farming. Productivity is a very good estimate of how efficient is the U.S. workforce in the utilization of all technologies and resources available to it, including capital, production capacity, materials, energy, management structures, available technologies, and the characteristics of the workforce. Here's is Bloomberg's take on the productivity reading: "U.S. worker efficiency rose in the third quarter at a slower pace than in the previous three months as the economy slumped, a sign employment may take a bigger hit." Here is my take on the productivity reading: Businesses are squeezed from slackening demand and are efficiently cutting their labor force. Furthermore, those workers that remain employed are receiving increased compensation under the rising costs of living, but the higher compensation does not fully offset the rise in prices over the year. In my opinion, this reading illustrates the U.S. economy's ability to remain productive during a recession. And **although the labor force suffers now, it pays off over the long run with stronger productivity and growth going forward.** Productivity falls during recessions; current productivity growth, 2.0%, is consistent with the lowest reading in the 2001 recession, but 1.4% above the lowest reading in the 1990-1991 recession (0.6%). Productivity and growth are highly correlated and once productivity picks up, growth will too. The chart plots annual productivity growth from the first quarter of 1991 to the third quarter of 2008 for the U.S. and similarly developed economies, the U.K. and Germany. Spanning 2000-2008, average productivity growth for the U.S., the U.K., and Germany was 2.5%, 1.8%, and 3.6%, respectively. (See this post for a short description of the German labor force; the labor force has become highly productive partially due to a structural shift in 2006). **The U.S. economy remains resilient, producing just 0.5% below its 8-year average,** while the U.K. and Germany are producing 1.7% and 4.8% below their averages. **The U.S. is more efficient, and cuts back on its labor force in order to maintain efficiency gains.** On the other hand, the U.K. and Germany cling to their labor force, which tends to hurt the aggregate economy in the short term. However, one cannot discount the impacts of a quickly deteriorating labor market on the welfare of the workforce, and so all I can say here is that **the U.S. remains more productively resilient, providing a bigger boost when it turns around.** It is likely that U.S. productivity will decelerate for the next

SDSU NFA-LD
Fear the Beard

2010-2011
Homeless AFF

two quarters, but with spare capacity building, firms will pick up the slack in the labor force when stronger demand for goods and services emerges. Productivity **growth will kick in, and quickly at that.**

AT: china money in us econ

THERE IS NO ALTERNATIVE TO THE DOLLAR; CHINA'S NEVER GOING TO STOP BUYING, EVEN IF FISCAL DISCIPLINE IS NOT REFORMED: THREE REASONS

Keiko **Ujikane and Jason Clenfield '09** are Asian finance reporters for Bloomberg. 6/23 "Moody's Says World Has 'No Credible Alternative' to U.S. Dollar." Bloomberg, 23 June 2009. <http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=20601087&sid=aGlxDL7cVZY>

The fiscal health of the world's largest economy has come under scrutiny by its creditors as bailouts and stimulus plans swell a budget deficit forecast to soar to a record \$1.85 trillion this year. China and Russia, the largest and third- largest foreign holders of the debt, have said

they may diversify some of their reserves. **Even if the U.S.'s ratio of debt to gross domestic product were to exceed 100 percent, more than double the current level, the country's rating would still be secure as long as borrowing costs stay low, Cailleteau said. Moody's estimates the ratio will rise to 59.9 percent this year from 40.8 percent.** "In the U.S., interest rates are low because the debt is issued in its own currency and the currency happens to be the international reserve currency," he said.

Yields on benchmark 10-year Treasuries have risen to 3.63 percent since touching a record low 2.04 percent in December. They rose to their highest level since October this month after Alexei Ulyukayev, first deputy chairman of Russia's central bank, said on June 10 his country may switch some of its Treasury holdings to International Monetary Fund bonds. **China, which in March called for the U.S. to guarantee the safety of China's assets, is still buying Treasuries. Premier Wen Jiabao's government has increased its holdings of the securities by almost a quarter to \$763.5 billion since the onset of the global credit crisis in**

September, according to U.S. Treasury data. "The question you have to ask is: What does it mean to be a safe haven in the end?"

Cailleteau said. **The test is that when you have a big problem, either in the economy or if you have the threat of a war, where do you think people are going to put their money?"** Policy makers have indicated there is no replacement for the dollar.

Russian Finance Minister Alexei Kudrin said on June 13 that "it's too early to speak of an alternative." Japanese Finance Minister Kaoru Yosano, whose government is the largest holder of Treasuries after China, this month said the dollar should remain the world's reserve currency. **U.S. President Barack Obama has said that it is important his nation**

maintains fiscal discipline to ensure investors keep buying Treasuries. He plans to cut the deficit by half before the end of his first term. **Even if he's wrong, even if he's too optimistic, that**

doesn't necessarily meant we'll have to act," Cailleteau said. **The U.S. started the crisis in pretty good shape in terms of government finances."**

Economic decline solves warming (Impact Turn)

ECONOMIC CRISIS SLOWS GLOBAL WARMING

Watson, '09 USA Today staff writer April 9, 2009 Traci Watson, "Bad economy helps cut CO2 emissions"
http://www.usatoday.com/weather/climate/globalwarming/2009-04-08-climate_N.htm

The **worldwide economic slowdown is having an unexpected positive impact in the fight against global warming: Emissions of carbon dioxide are falling**, records collected by governments show. From the United States to Europe to China, the **global economic crisis** has forced offices to close and factories to cut back. That **means less use of fossil fuels such as coal to make energy**. Fossil-fuel burning, which creates carbon dioxide, is the primary human contributor to global warming. **A recession-driven drop in emissions "is good for the environment"**, says Emilie Mazzacurati of Point Carbon, an energy research company. "In the long term, that's not how we want to reduce emissions." As carbon dioxide builds in the atmosphere, it traps heat and warms the Earth. The result: melting glaciers, rising seas and fiercer droughts. The lower emissions are caused partly by milder weather -- which means less energy is needed for cooling and heating -- and by policies that promote energy efficiency, but experts agree that economic problems play a role. The emission decreases are unusual and in some cases unprecedented: Carbon dioxide from U.S. power plants fell roughly 3% from 2007 to 2008, according to preliminary data from the Environmental Protection Agency analyzed by the Environmental Integrity Project. That's the biggest drop since 1995-96, the first two consecutive years for which data are publicly available. Carbon dioxide from industrial facilities in 27 European nations in 2008 plummeted 6%, according to Point Carbon's analysis of data published last week by the European Commission. Electricity production by Chinese power plants has fallen almost every month since September compared with the same months a year earlier, says Richard Morse, a Stanford University researcher. A drop in power generation translates to a drop in carbon-dioxide output. These are the first such drops in Chinese power production since the Chinese economic boom in the 1990s. European nations face a 2012 deadline to cut their emissions under the Kyoto Protocol, a global-warming treaty. **The recession could make it easier for countries to meet their goals**, says David Doniger of the Natural Resources Defense Council, an environmental group, but "I wouldn't recommend recession **as a way to deal with this problem**." Some experts fear lower emissions may make companies and governments less likely to spend money to cut carbon output. "There's a risk that it will push back needed investment into ... cleaner production," Mazzacurati says.

SDSU NFA-LD
Fear the Beard

2010-2011
Homeless AFF

*******Counter plans*******

1AR 50 states answers (1/4)

1 – No solvency: Only federal legislation prevents identity-based discrimination – state action doesn't spillover

Boyer, Kate (**2002**, Department of Science and Technology Studies, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute Reform and Resistance: A Consideration of Space, Scale and Strategy in Legal Challenges to Welfare Reform, <http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/fulltext/118562122/PDFSTART>, P. 5)

I argue that **as social policy has re-scaled, so have the means for resisting its more oppressive aspects**. As the cases considered here suggest, legal advocates are working at multiple scales at once to challenge welfare reform. On the one hand devolution has increased attention to the local level, and we find a variety of legal challenges working within the new devolved policy scale. On the other hand, however, **legal advocates have also experimented with scaling up to national-level laws, in particular** by invoking Civil Rights legislation passed in the 1960s **to guard against identity-based discrimination in the operation of government programs**. In so doing, **advocates are seeking to “re-scale responsibility”** from that of single mothers to **submit to wage labor in order to survive, to the government’s responsibility to protect its citizens against identity-based discrimination**. After providing a brief overview of the policy changes activated by welfare reform, I examine the scale politics of legal challenges to this policy through a selection of cases heard in New York City between the late 1990s and early 2000. **I suggest that while cases based on local law demonstrate creativity in the face of a constrained policy context, the effects of such cases are limited by municipal and state juridical boundaries**. Although more difficult to mount, **cases based on national-level Civil Rights legislation offer the potential for more far-reaching effects**.

2 – No Solvency: States cant expand social services – don't have the money

Monica **Fennell**, Fordham University School of Law journal writer, **1993** (Fordham University School of Law Journal, fall 1993, 21 Fordham Urb., L.J. 127, “why the homeless need food stamp advocacy and how to pay for it”, LexisNexis Academic page 9)

A. Targeting the Homeless **Because state budgets for social services are being cut, using federal money to create a hybrid homeless assistance/food stamp program could be popular with states** and non-profit groups alike. n141 The program could be run by a non-profit group, and **state food stamp offices could contract out to these groups to provide outreach and advocacy. n142** **The best way to get federal money is to design a food stamp outreach and advocacy program that is specifically tailored to the homeless**. A program tailored to the homeless is likely to get preference in obtaining the fifty percent matching funds for food stamp outreach and advocacy - despite the USDA's limited interpretations - as well as funds under the McKinney Act or the Food Stamp Act's demonstration projects. n143

3 – Turn: States abuse power given to them by the federal government, over restricting social service access.

Lisa R. **Metsch and** Harold A. **Pollack**; Welfare Reform and Substance Abuse; The Milbank Quarterly, Vol. 83, No. 1 (**2005**), pp. 65-100; Blackwell Publishing on behalf of Milbank Memorial Fund

PRWORA converted the financing of public aid from an entitlement to a system of block grants that shifts many financial incentives and risks from the federal government to the 50 states and, in many cases, ultimately to the recipients themselves. **TANF block grants accord states broad discretion to determine who is eligible for TANF and for how long**. **States are given broad discretion to sanction recipients who do not comply with program rules** (Edelman 1997). **As long as the states comply with due process requirements, they are free to impose a wide range of penalties, ranging from small and temporary benefit reductions to the removal of recipient families from the TANF rolls. Such sanctions are widely applied**. A study by the General Accounting Office found that the benefits of an average of 113,000 families per month (4.5% of TANF recipients) were reduced because of sanctions. Equally significant, in 1999 seven states reported that sanctions accounted for at least 20 percent of their case closures (Goldberg and Schott 2000; Pavetti and Bloom 2001).

1AR 50 states answers (2/4)

4: Solvency Deficit/Turn- the 50 states are less than the USFG so my impacts affect protectorates and Indigenous populations. There are strategically trying to exclude homeless American Indians from gaining access to MHS extending the American Genocide.

5 – No Solvency: the 50 states cannot change policy for federal Social Services since it is a federal agency out of the control of the 50 states.

6 – Perm: Congress will pass, President Obama will sign, and the Courts will uphold a law to remove eligibility requirements for social services which preclude homeless people with chronic mental illness from accessing those mental health services and _____ CP Text Here _____.

7 – Perm – do both: Do the plan and all the non competitive parts of the CP.

8 – Evaluate the Perms: If I win either perm the CP no longer becomes a competitive reason to vote for the negative. This means that the CP just goes away.

9 – Presumption flips Aff: When the Neg runs a CP presumption flips aff so you now vote for the aff by default if you don't know who to vote for.

10 – The DA:

A. Uniqueness – States are dealing with massive budget deficits in the status quo as revenue sources dry up - leaving spending cuts as the only option

Nicholas Johnson et al, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, July 15, 2010 [Nicholas Johnson is Director of the CBPP's State Fiscal Project and holds a graduate degree from Duke's Terry Sanford Institute of Public Policy. Elizabeth McNichol is a CBPP Senior Fellow specializing in state fiscal issues. Phil Oliff is a Policy Analyst with the State Fiscal Project. "Recession Continues to Batter State Budgets; State Responses Could Slow Recovery." <http://www.cbpp.org/cms/?fa=view&id=711>] Garcia NM

States' fiscal conditions remain extremely weak this year – fiscal year 2011 – even as the economy appears to be moving in the direction of recovery. Indeed, historical experience and current economic projections suggest 2011 will be worse than 2010 by the time the year ends due to declining federal assistance. Taking all these factors into account, it is reasonable to expect that **for 2011, shortfalls are likely to exceed \$140 billion**

after taking into account approximately \$40 billion in federal Recovery Act dollars that are likely to remain available for fiscal year 2011. Once employment is growing again, state budget problems will diminish but it is likely that states will face shortfalls of at least \$120 billion in fiscal 2012. This means that states will close shortfalls of some \$260 billion for fiscal years 2011 and 2012 combined. Figure 2 shows the budget shortfalls that states faced and will face after taking into account the federal recovery act dollars. The recession caused a state fiscal crisis of unprecedented severity. Figure 3 compares the size and duration of the shortfalls that occurred in the recession of the first part of this decade to shortfalls reported to date this time. In the early 2000s, as in the early 1990s and early 1980s, state fiscal problems lasted for several years after the recession ended. The same will undoubtedly be the case this time, since the current recession is more severe — deeper and longer — than the last one, and state fiscal problems have proven to be worse and are likely to remain so. Unemployment, which peaked after the last recession at 6.3 percent, has already hit 10 percent, and many economists expect it to remain at high levels throughout 2010 and beyond. Continued high unemployment will keep state income tax receipts at low levels and increase demand for Medicaid and other essential services that states provide. High unemployment and economic uncertainty, combined with households' diminished wealth due to fallen property values, will continue to depress consumption, thus sales tax receipts also will remain low. These factors suggest that state budget gaps will continue to be significantly larger than in the last recession, and last longer. Estimates from the states, although incomplete, are consistent with this outlook. Table 1 lists the shortfalls that states dealt with when adopting budgets for 2011. A total of 46 states addressed shortfalls for fiscal year 2011. This total includes at least 34 of the states that prepare budgets annually and recently addressed deficits for fiscal year 2011. In addition, 11 states that operate on a two-year budget cycle (known as a biennial budget) adopted budgets a year ago that addressed shortfalls for 2011 totaling at least \$25 billion. In total, fiscal year 2011 gaps — which have been addressed in most states — total \$121 billion or 19 percent of budgets. In addition, at least 39 states have looked ahead to fiscal year 2012 and anticipate shortfalls totaling \$102 billion. (See Table 2.) It is reasonable to expect that it will grow during the course of the fiscal year if revenues again come in under expectations or spending reductions yield less savings than anticipated. TABLE 1: These current year shortfalls are in addition to the gaps states closed when adopting their fiscal year 2010 budgets and the mid-year gaps that developed after these budgets were adopted. Table 3 combines the mid-year gaps with the gaps that were addressed when states wrote their 2010 budgets. In total, 48 states have addressed shortfalls in their budgets for fiscal year 2010, totaling \$192 billion or 29 percent of state budgets — the largest gaps on record. (Table 4 of this paper shows the 2009 budget gaps that were addressed, and Table 5 lists the sources of these shortfall estimates for each state.) TABLE 2: Of course, a

faster-than-expected recovery could reduce the size of future shortfalls. But **several factors could make it particularly difficult**

for states to recover from the current fiscal situation. Housing markets might be slow to fully recover; their decline already has depressed consumption and sales tax revenue as people

refrain from buying furniture, appliances, construction materials, and the like. **This also would depress property tax revenues,** increasing the likelihood that local governments will look to states to help address the squeeze on local and education budgets.

And as the employment situation continues to be weak, **income tax revenues will continue to lag** and there will be further downward pressure on sales tax revenues as consumers are reluctant or unable to spend. Some states have not been affected by the economic downturn, but the number is dwindling. Mineral-rich states — such as New Mexico, Alaska, and Montana — saw revenue growth in the beginning of the recession as a result of high oil prices. More recently, however, the decline in oil prices has affected revenues in these states. The economies of a handful of other states have so far been less affected by the national economic problems. Only two states, Montana and North Dakota, have not reported budget shortfalls, but the recession has dampened those states' surpluses, which were largely mineral-driven as well. Two other states — Alaska and Arkansas — faced shortfalls in fiscal year 2010 but are not now projecting gaps for fiscal year 2011. The Consequences of Shortfalls In states facing budget gaps, the consequences are severe in many cases — for residents as well as the economy. To date, budget difficulties have led at least 45 states to reduce services to their residents, including some of their most vulnerable families and individuals. Over 30 states have raised taxes to at least some degree, in some cases quite significantly. **If revenue declines persist as expected in many states, additional spending and service cuts are likely. Budget cuts**

SDSU NFA-LD
Fear the Beard

2010-2011
Homeless AFF

often are more severe later in a state fiscal crisis, after largely depleted reserves are no longer an option for closing deficits.

1AR 50 states answers (3/4)

B. And, states are cutting mental health funding in order to balance their budgets – the plan reverses these cuts and forces borrowing

Christine Vestal, Stateline Staff Writer, July 19, 2010 [“As economy takes toll, mental health budgets shrink”

<http://www.stateline.org/live/details/story?contentId=499181>] Garcia NM

States have taken the lead role in publicly funded care for the mentally ill, and paid the majority of the expenses. Even through recessions, the states have steadily increased their mental health budgets every year to meet increasing demand. Now, as states face their biggest fiscal challenge in modern history, the trend has reversed. **For the first time in more**

than three decades, mental health funding is declining. The drop-off is translating into a reduction in the number of psychiatric hospital beds, as well as fewer services for mental health emergencies and longer waiting lists for housing for the chronically mentally ill. The cuts

are coming just as some experts say economic pressures are creating an increase in mental illness. Although no national numbers are available, hospital emergency rooms, juvenile courts, child welfare agencies, local jails and homeless shelters are reporting bulges in the number of mentally ill people who end up on their doorsteps after failing to get help elsewhere. In addition, a recent national survey showed that the weak economy is taking a toll on the mental health of Americans, with unemployed people four times as likely as those with jobs to report symptoms of severe

mental illness. **States are chipping away at their already very fragile mental health system.**” says Michael Fitzpatrick, executive director of National Alliance on Mental Illness, which advocates for improved mental health care. “More people will be unable to find even basic services that allow them to stay out of the hospital or involvement with police. It’s a dire situation that we’ve never seen before.” Funding fluctuations Since the 1950s, when states cared for more than 500,000 people in psychiatric hospitals, state mental health programs have included more and more community-based services. Those include a wide array of services, such as suicide prevention and 24-hour crisis centers, treatment for drug and alcohol abuse, housing and work supports, counseling and violence-prevention programs. Although advocates maintain that only half of those in need are receiving public mental health services, states have made progress by serving more people in the community at about half the price of committing them to institutions — and with better outcomes. Today, only 50,000 people reside in state mental hospitals while millions are served on an outpatient basis. Still, states have had to increase their budgets to keep pace with demand. Despite fluctuations in funding for nearly every other social service, state mental health budgets have increased nationally by about 6 percent per year for the past 30 years. Now, for the first time, states are pulling

back mental health spending. **These unprecedented cuts — nearly 4 percent as a national average between 2008 and 2009 — come at a time when other public agencies such as child welfare, law**

enforcement and housing also are experiencing budget cuts and can ill afford to handle the overflow. According to the National

Association of State Mental Health Program Directors, **2010 spending appears to have fallen nearly 5 percent compared to 2009. Early indications are that 2011 mental health budgets may sink by 8 percent or**

more. Exacerbating the mental health budget crisis is uncertainty over whether Congress will decide to extend an increase in the federal match for Medicaid services under the stimulus program, which a majority of states have counted on to stretch their overall health care budgets. In 2008, states spent \$36 billion on mental health services to care for 6.4 million people, about half the number of people advocates say are in need of care. Of the total, about \$17 billion came from Medicaid, the federal-state health care program for the poor, \$500 million came from federal grants and the balance was funded through state general revenues. Not counted in the total is funding from county and local budgets, much of which also sits on the chopping block. Where the cuts are Although a few states have minimized mental health cuts and targeted less essential services, many states are closing psychiatric hospitals, eliminating 24-hour crisis centers and tightening eligibility for subsidized medications and services that affect thousands of adults and children with severe mental illness. Here are some examples of states that have made big cuts:

To fill a \$1 billion hole in its 2011 budget, Arizona slashed this year’s budget for mental health services by \$36 million — a 37 percent

cut. As a result, advocates say 3,800 people who do not qualify for Medicaid are at risk of losing services such as counseling and employment preparation. In addition, more than 12,000 adults and 2,000 children will no longer receive the name-brand medications they take to keep their illnesses in check. Other services such as supportive housing and transportation to doctor’s appointments also will be eliminated. Arizona has been considered a progressive state because it provides the vast majority of mental health services through cost-effective outpatient community programs. By slashing these programs, experts say the state will force more people to use emergency rooms or end up in the criminal justice system, which will cost the state more. In Illinois, where Democratic **Governor Pat Quinn is trying to bridge a \$13**

billion budget gap, a proposed mental-health budget cut of \$91 million was reduced to \$35 million after patients and practitioners protested at the governor’s mansion earlier this month. Even so, advocates say more than 70,000 people, including 4,200 children, are in danger of losing basic community services, which may result in more instances of hospitalization. The cuts come on the heels of a court settlement requiring the state to transfer 4,500 severely mentally disabled patients out of nursing

homes and into community residential facilities following a string of rapes and assaults on elderly residents. Mississippi **has cut its mental health budget by about 8 percent for three consecutive years,** resulting in the closure of a residential mental health facility for adolescents, elimination of

184 beds in one of the state’s biggest psychiatric hospitals and consolidation of six crisis centers with existing community mental health centers. In the fiscal year that started July 1, the state plans to further cut funding to localities for mental health services. Prior to the recession, Mississippi lagged far behind most states in funding community services and housed the highest percentage of people with mental illness in state institutions.

1AR 50 states answers (4/4)

C. Unrestrained borrowing causes states to default on their debt

Steven Malanga, Senior Fellow at the Manhattan Institute, Wall Street Journal, July 31, 2010. ["The Muni Debt Bomb." <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703999304575399591906297262.html>] Garcia NM

Taxpayers are slowly realizing that their states and municipalities face growing costs—above all, debt and pension obligations—that will be hard to reduce. The squeeze is already forcing cities and states to cut basic services, since they can't risk defaulting on their debt. But these politically unpalatable moves are troubling more and more observers of the muni market. Nicole Gelinas has warned in these pages that "once state and local governments have borrowed too much, they may well find a way not to pay their lenders back" (see "Beware the Muni-Bond Bubble," Spring 2010). Similarly, Rick Bookstaber, a senior policy advisor to the Securities and Exchange Commission, shook the market recently by observing that it has all the characteristics in place for a crisis that might unfold like the home-foreclosure mess: a few municipalities could declare bankruptcy, decline to honor their debts, and unleash "a widespread cascade in defaults." If that painful scenario emerges, it will be because we have too long ignored how politicians have become addicted to debt.

D. States defaulting on debt crushes the global economy

Chris Isidore, staff writer, CNN Money December 2009 ["Bernanke's biggest fears." December 3, http://money.cnn.com/2009/12/02/news/economy/bernanke_worries/] Garcia NM

The panic in financial markets due to fears of a possible default by Dubai World last week could be only the first warning signs about fears of default on debt. Many other countries are seen as having debt at risk of default. And here at home, budget crisis in numerous states, most notably California, have raised some worries in the markets as well. A default on public debt would not just be bad news for the citizens of whatever state or nation can't pay it bills. It could ripple through the financial markets, and banks and securities firms around the globe. That would force them to write down the value of much of their holdings by billions again, and causing credit to seize up as badly or worse than it did last fall. Think of the Lehman Brothers bankruptcy on steroids. Wyss said that while he believes a state default will be avoided, the risk of such of event "is significant."

E. That causes arms escalation, famine, ethnic wars, and regional conflicts

Bernardo Lopez, BusinessWorld, September 10, 1998 ["Global recession phase two: Catastrophic." Lexis] Garcia NM

What would it be like if global recession becomes full bloom? The results will be catastrophic. Certainly, global recession will spawn wars of all kinds. Ethnic wars can easily escalate in the grapple for dwindling food stocks as in India-Pakistan-Afghanistan, Yugoslavia, Ethiopia-Eritrea, Indonesia. Regional conflicts in key flashpoints can easily erupt such as in the Middle East, Korea, and Taiwan. In the Philippines, as in some Latin American countries, splintered insurgency forces may take advantage of the economic drought to regroup and reemerge in the countryside. Unemployment worldwide will be in the billions. Famine can be triggered in key Third World nations with India, North Korea, Ethiopia and other African countries as first candidates. Food riots and the breakdown of law and order are possibilities. Unemployment in the US will be the hardest to cope with since it may have very little capability for subsistence economy and its agrarian base is automated and controlled by a few. The riots and looting of stores in New York City in the late '70s because of a state-wide brownout hint of the type of anarchy in the cities. Such looting in this most affluent nation is not impossible. The weapons industry may also grow rapidly because of the ensuing wars. Arms escalation will have Primacy over food production if wars escalate. The US will depend increasingly on weapons exports to nurse its economy back to health. This will further induce wars and conflicts which will aggravate US recession rather than solve it. The US may depend more and more on the use of force and its superiority to get its ways internationally.

1AR Housing Subsidies CP (1/2)

Presidential and Congressional funding for housing subsidies is the only way to solve Houghton, Executive Director of the Supportive Housing Network in New York, 2007

(Ted, "Homelessness: A National Problem", New York Times, July 24)

Mayor Michael R. **Bloomberg deserves much credit for daring to take on homelessness.** Indeed, **he and his appointees have achieved some real successes, like the substantial reduction in the number of single adults sleeping in shelters** each night. **The mayor has made this progress by investing a significant amount of local dollars in prevention, rent subsidies and supportive housing for chronically homeless people (proven solutions long called for by advocates and providers).** **The city has fallen short primarily when trying to combat the enormous challenges** of poverty and high housing costs -- **problems caused in large part by the federal government's 30-year retreat on these issues.** **The mayor can still succeed in his goals, but only if the president and Congress are as serious about ending homelessness as he is.**

Federal funding is necessary to fund community housing and voucher programs

Rice and Sard, Rice is Housing Policy Analyst at the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, Sard is the Director of Housing Policy at the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, 2007

(Douglas and Barbra, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, <http://www.cbpp.org/files/2-1-07hou.pdf>)

For example, the **Chattanooga, Tennessee plan aims to create 1,400 new units of affordable housing over ten years, nearly all of which will require rental assistance. While some new rental assistance will be funded by local sources, the lion's share is expected to come from federal programs — from the Housing Choice Voucher Program,** in particular, as well as the programs authorized under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act of 1987 ("McKinney-Vento"). In addition, a share of the 1,400 new units will consist of new permanent supportive housing for chronically homeless individuals who will need intensive support services if they are to remain stably housed. **The development of these units will require capital investments, and, like most developers of permanent supportive housing,** the City of **Chattanooga will have to rely on** a variety of sources for this capital, including **funding from the federal HOME Investment Partnerships and Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) programs.** The **Chattanooga plan is not unique in its reliance on a wide range of federal low-income housing assistance programs,** and this should come as no surprise. HUD and independent sources such as the Government Accountability Office (GAO) have long acknowledged that community **efforts to address homelessness depend on federal assistance** beyond that provided by the McKinney-Vento homeless assistance programs. Indeed, this was Congress' expectation when the McKinney-Vento 3 programs were launched in 1987 with the dual purpose of alleviating emergency needs and developing and testing new approaches to assisting homeless people more effectively.

1AR Housing Subsidies CP (2/2)

States Cannot Fund Vouchers over the long run – the strain on their budgets will be unsustainable

Rice and Sard, Rice is Housing Policy Analyst at the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, Sard is the Director of Housing Policy at the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, **2007**

(Douglas and Barbra, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, <http://www.cbpp.org/files/2-1-07hous.pdf>)

These **losses are already undermining communities' ability to meet their goals**. For example, as part of its plan to end long-term homelessness by 2010, **the State of Minnesota** and its partners in local government and the private sector **will invest considerable resources to develop and operate 4,000 new units of permanent supportive housing**. Since the Minnesota plan was adopted in 2004, **however, the state has lost more than 700 federal housing vouchers**. Although housing agencies support the plan and have contributed some project-based vouchers, **continued funding shortfalls** and misguided policy changes **have forced housing agencies to cut back on their programs, exacerbating the scarcity of rental assistance available across the state**. **The state has been able to meet the production goals under the plan primarily by making a significant commitment to temporary rental assistance from state sources. Yet unless permanent federal rental assistance is made available, it will be increasingly difficult to maintain progress on implementing the plan.** As temporary rental assistance expires, the units provided under the plan will no longer be affordable to this extremely low income population and they may again confront homelessness.

Government contracts with property owners are expiring -- they no longer have to provide affordable housing and are turning properties into higher rent condos

Otto, Washington Post Staff Writer, 2007

(Mary, "Low-Rent Program Predicts Losses; Rising Land Values Diminish Appeal of Section 8 Contracts" Washington Post, Lexis)

The Washington region stands to lose about 26,000 affordable housing units over the next five years as a number of property owners opt out of a housing program designed to keep rents low. Many **contracts signed under the project-based Section 8 program are expiring**. And with property values having risen dramatically, some **owners are selling their buildings or converting them to condominiums** or upscale rentals. The District lost 312 affordable units, or about 13.7 percent of the eligible properties, between 2001 and 2005, according to a recent report by the U.S. Government Accountability Office. Maryland lost 2,036 units, or about 13.3 percent of its total, and Virginia lost 1,827, or 10.5 percent. And 26,000 additional units in the District, Virginia and Maryland are owned by for-profit landlords whose contracts expire within five years. Housing officials are concerned, especially because the project-based Section 8 program accounts for 22,000 properties and 1.5 million units nationwide. **"We couldn't build them again,"** said Stephanie Killian of the Montgomery County Department of Housing and Community Affairs. A separate Section 8 voucher program provides rent subsidies for another 1.8 million low-income households. **More than three decades ago, the federal government came up with a novel approach to creating affordable housing: guarantee subsidies to property owners who agreed to keep rents low for 20, 30, even 40 years.**

1AR Counterplans to Solve Homelessness(1/2)

Homelessness will never be solved, but social services are vital to reduce the number and improve conditions

LaSalle, WDEF news reporter, 2007

(Reneé, Hamilton County News, http://www.wdef.com/news/a_new_home_for_former_tent_city_resident/10/2007)

For the first time in six years Richard Waldrep has a home to call his own. Waldrep has spent the last several years on the streets, for the last few months he called "Tent City" home. But, now that home has been destroyed. Due to safety concerns and liability issues Norfolk Southern Railroad bulldozed the property leaving Waldrep and almost 30 others to find another place to live. Karen Blevins, Interim Dir. of the Chattanooga Regional Homeless Coalition says, "We have to be able to advocate for them. We have to be able to say 'Look, your community as we know it is gone. Now how can we help you?'" Karen Blevins is serving as director for the Chattanooga Regional Homeless Coalition. She says Waldrep was not alone in his search for place to sleep at night. She says as many as 4,000 people in Chattanooga would call themselves homeless, and without vital social services another 18,000 soon would be. Blevins says, "Homelessness, I think, is just a symptom of much deeper problems." She says homelessness will never be solved but it can be treated. She says, that only comes though a collaborative effort of social services, faith based organizations, and local government. Blevins says, "There is no one entity that can do it alone." Thanks to a partnership between the Homeless Coalition and the Chattanooga Housing Authority Blevins was able to help Waldrep find his new home. She says 14 others from the Tent City site will be placed in public housing and the rest are either in the process of being cleared, or will be helped some other way. As for Waldrep and his new home... Waldrep says, "I like it." Blevins says the process of helping the homeless goes way beyond simply finding them a place to live. She says you also have to give them the tools and the coaching they need to succeed.

Homelessness will never be solved just reduced to a certain degree

Ratu, SVD, 2006

(Nicodemus Lobo, "Street Homeless in Dublin (A Foreign Student's Experience)", <http://www.nilora.com/>)

In relation to street homeless, according to the Shaping the future an action plan for homelessness in Dublin 2001-2003 (Dublin: homeless agency, 2001), in Dublin alone there are 275 people street homeless. It is quite a high figures. Although there are 71 distinct services for homeless people in Dublin (one among them is Ruah), which providing contact, friendship, food, bedding, information, and linkages to other services, the street homeless still exist. There are many reasons why homelessness exist. They are: domestic violence, relationship breakdown, chronic disabilities (mental illness, alcohol dependence), drug dealers/users, family breakdown, shortage in housing available to low income households, poverty, and unemployment. Based on those reasons, it shows us that homelessness is a very complex issue. It is also clear that homelessness cannot be solved by looking at the homeless problem alone but it is important to look at the wider context. I think, as long as unemployment and housing shortage exist, for example, the homeless will always be there. To solve the homeless problem, also means to solve the wider problems in our society. It is very difficult. In my understanding, homelessness will never be solved perfectly but it can be reduced to a certain decree.

Homelessness will never end all way can do is improve conditions – cites a homeless policy specialist

Sharoky And Weiner, Staff Writers, 2008

(Catherine and Jon, "Groups take on issues of homeless Talks focus on outreach, plans", Published: November 19, 2004, Updated: July 2, 2008, <http://www.dailytarheel.com/2.1392/groups-take-on-issues-of-homeless-1.184431>)

"As a culture, we have shown an overreliance on the nonprofit sector to fix this issue," said Martha Are, a homeless policy specialist in the Office of the Secretary at the N.C. Department of Health and Human Services. She said a problem many communities have is a lack of extensive data to track expenditures on the homeless. Are said 80 percent of the homeless population is homeless for less than two months at a time. Another 10 percent stay homeless for up to six months. But Greene and Are both said the main problem is chronic homelessness - the 10 percent to 15 percent of people who remain homeless for more than a year. "This 10 percent of all homeless are consuming more than 50 percent of the available resources," Greene said. Ty Dexter, a resident of the Triangle Residential Options for Substance Abusers program in Durham, was homeless about 15 months ago and was at the roundtable on behalf of the program. Dexter said that while homelessness will never end, society can strive to make improvements. "We have the capacity, we have the wealth, and we have the means." he said. "No matter how much money you throw at it, the thing that will make the difference is the people."

1AR Counterplans to Solve Homelessness (2/2)

Homelessness will never be solved, but services are important

RBA Research Ltd, a full service Social Market Research agency, 2005

(Report from research carried out on behalf of CAMBRIDGE CITY COUNCIL “Cambridge Residents’ Priorities and Budget Consultation Exercise” RBA Research is a full service Social Market Research agency specialising in the Local Government, Health, Education & Training and CSR (Corporate Social Responsibility) sectors. RBA has a reputation for consulting with so-called ‘hard-to-reach’ groups including children and young people, ethnic minorities and socially disadvantaged groups)

The parents are ambivalent about waste services, services for homeless people and conservation services. Whilst **they value waste services because of the importance they attach to having a clean environment**, they argue that recycling should generate income that should allow this service to pay for itself. **The services for homeless people are deemed important but they argue that, no matter how much money is spent, the problem of homelessness will never be solved, so it feels like “pouring money into a black hole”**. There is also heated debate about whether some **people** in housing **need** abuse **the help that they are given** (for example by taking drugs) when they are given a property to live in, thus spoiling the area for their neighbours. The conservation **services**, like planning, **are** not initially understood – particularly **‘promoting more sustainable forms of development’**. Once explained, some participants say that they value nature reserves, but there is ambivalence because they feel that this service duplicates aspects of both the planning service (shouldn’t planning be promoting more sustainable forms of development?) and the environmental health services (isn’t air quality an aspect of conservation?)

It is impossible to solve homelessness so social services are key to assist them

Davis, Executive director of The Northeast Ohio Coalition for the Homeless, 2007

(Brian, “Strategies to End Homelessness by the Coalition for the Homeless”, http://www.neoch.org/strategies_to_end_homelessness.htm)

Every month, government, advocates, landlords, and **social service providers meet to discuss potential troubled housing in the community**. This group needs assistance with coordination, distribution of notes from the meeting, research, and publicity. **The goal is for no further reductions in affordable housing in our community**. Re-Entry for Homeless People: **The Coalition realizes that many people are homeless because of recent involvement with the criminal justice system. This often presents a barrier that is impossible to overcome. This problem is especially acute for those convicted of a sexually-based offense. The Coalition needs some assistance in assuring that the special needs of people re-entering from prison or incarceration are in** front of politicians, the media, and **the social service network**.

AT: 50 STATES CP

Federal government action is key to challenging the politics of exclusion and criminalization—only the plan can send a broad enough signal that we no longer consider the homeless to be second class citizens.

National Coalition for the Homeless 2004 (a national network of Homeless Rights advocates, composed of a 32 member board. "Illegal to be Homeless" <http://www.nationalhomeless.org/publications/crimreport/introduction.html>)

This report, "Illegal to Be Homeless: The Criminalization of Homelessness in the United States," is the third annual report since 2002. **This study documents the widespread trend of violations of the basic human rights of people experiencing homelessness** in 179 communities in 48 states, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia. **Through the passage of possibly unconstitutional laws, the "selective enforcement" of existing laws, arbitrary police practices, and discriminatory public regulations,** people experiencing homelessness face overwhelming hardships in addition to their daily struggle for survival. **Instead of spending precious public resources and funding to address the significant lack of affordable housing** in this country, **local governments** in urban, suburban, and rural areas **divert these funds to local Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) and to policing, which often penalize the very people this money could help.** In addition to continuing the documentation of this trend, this report emphasizes the connections between the creation of a public environment of intolerance and the increasing danger of living on the streets that results from this attitude. This report is an annual summary of continuous investigation with evidence that **criminalization is not only a local issue that is duplicated nationwide, but is also a national concern that demands a federal response.** We have asserted and continue to assert that **a pattern and practice of civil rights violations and unconstitutional behaviors by local government authorities,** including the police and other city agencies, exists in many cities around the country. These practices **exact enormous economic, social, political** and individual **costs and do nothing to prevent and end homelessness** that plagues individuals nationwide.

AT: States CP

The devolution of welfare reform has exacerbated social and economic inequalities – states race to the bottom to deny homeless persons public benefits

Boyer, Kate (2002, Department of Science and Technology Studies, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute Reform and Resistance: A Consideration of Space, Scale and Strategy in Legal Challenges to Welfare Reform, <http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/fulltext/118562122/PDFSTART>, P. 5)

In spite of the benefits devolution might offer as a “laboratory for policy innovation” at the state level, there are concerns about the potential for the downward transfer of decision-making power to intensify inequality of access to opportunity between different places (Cashin 1999; Karger 1991). **Benefit levels vary widely between states, and are not calibrated to cost-of-living differences between states or between different areas within a state. We also find considerable unevenness in what it means to be on welfare from state to state.** As research from the Applied Research Center suggests, as of 2001 **welfare recipients in Minnesota were allowed to earn wages to supplement cash benefits, while clients in California were sanctioned and even imprisoned for doing the same** (Gordon 2001). In this sense **devolution is of a piece with neoliberal policies and practices which work to “fix” disenfranchised peoples in place to their detriment.** According to Andrew Herod and Melissa Wright, such policies: localize poor peoples at a supposed time of growing planetary spatial integration of capital flows, goods and services, information, and wealthy people. Apparently, despite the one-world rhetoric of neoliberalism, some people face tremendous obstacles in linking their worlds and becoming fully-fledged citizens of the “global village” about which we hear so much (Herod and Wright 2002:12) These critiques suggest that **devolution has the potential to exacerbate, rather than redress, gendered, racialized, and place-based disparities in access to social and economic opportunity.**

Only federal legislation prevents identity-based discrimination – state action doesn’t spillover

Boyer, Kate (2002, Department of Science and Technology Studies, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute Reform and Resistance: A Consideration of Space, Scale and Strategy in Legal Challenges to Welfare Reform, <http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/fulltext/118562122/PDFSTART>, P. 5)

I argue that **as social policy has re-scaled, so have the means for resisting its more oppressive aspects.** As the cases considered here suggest, legal advocates are working at multiple scales at once to challenge welfare reform. On the one hand devolution has increased attention to the local level, and we find a variety of legal challenges working within the new devolved policy scale. On the other hand, however, **legal advocates have also experimented with scaling up to national-level laws, in particular** by invoking Civil Rights legislation passed in the 1960s **to guard against identity-based discrimination in the operation of government programs.** In so doing, **advocates are seeking to “re-scale responsibility”** from that of single mothers to submit to wage labor in order to survive, **to the government’s responsibility to protect its citizens against identity-based discrimination.** After providing a brief overview of the policy changes activated by welfare reform, I examine the scale politics of legal challenges to this policy through a selection of cases heard in New York City between the late 1990s and early 2000. **I suggest that while cases based on local law demonstrate creativity in the face of a constrained policy context, the effects of such cases are limited by municipal and state juridical boundaries.** Although more difficult to mount, **cases based on national-level Civil Rights legislation offer the potential for more far-reaching effects.**

AT: States CP

States fail at distributing welfare benefits – only the federal government can effectively implement reform

Evelyn Z. **Brodkin**; Bureaucracy Redux: Management Reformism and the Welfare State; Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory: J-PART, Vol. 17, No. 1 (Jan., **2007**), pp. 1-17; Oxford University Press on behalf of the Public Management Research Association

Although **welfare administration had long been a shared federal-state responsibility, states chafed under the regulatory obligations associated with federal funding of social programs.** Subunits of government began to receive federal approval to experiment with different approaches to welfare delivery, ultimately aimed at moving recipients of public assistance into paid work. These reforms selectively interposed so-called new public management (NPM) techniques (Lynn 1998) into social welfare provision. Consistent with familiar NPM Brodtkin Bureaucracy Redux 5 themes, **state** governors promoting experimentation invoked the promise of flexibility and innovation through devolution.² In the true fashion of a dialectic, the new reformers castigated public **welfare agencies** for bureaucratic standardization, which had been introduced in the previous wave of reform. These agencies now **were caricatured as “eligibility and compliance” systems that “everybody hates”** (Bane and Ellwood 1994, 19). The solution, remarkably, was to bring discretion back in.³ Although the discretionary social work bureaucracy of the 1960s and 1970s remained in disrepute, the ideal of discretion, when reintroduced in the quasi-NPM terms of devolution and flexibility, had great appeal. **The federal government gave states flexibility to experiment** with different approaches to assistance aimed at promoting paid work in lieu of cash aid, including giving agencies more leeway to use discretion to promote work. Overall, experimental welfare-to-work programs operated by state- and county-level governments achieved mixed results (ranging from negative to modestly positive), which could have been used to highlight either the drawbacks or the potential of these strategies. **However, for the most part, the experiments were interpreted as indicating the promise of reconstructing welfare agencies into** quasi-labor market intermediaries (Brodtkin and Kaufman 2000; O’Connor 2001; Rogers-Dillon 2004). They laid the political foundation for **a broader national reform program**, giving states expanded management authority to reorganize their public assistance programs and transform caseworkers into promoters and enforcers of work.

AT: States CP

States cant expand social services – don't have the money

Monica **Fennell**, Fordham University School of Law journal writer, 1993 (Fordham University School of Law Journal, fall 1993, 21 Fordham Urb., L.J. 127, "why the homeless need food stamp advocacy and how to pay for it", LexisNexis Academic page 9)

A. Targeting the Homeless **Because state budgets for social services are being cut, using federal money to create a hybrid homeless assistance/food stamp program could be popular with states** and non-profit groups alike. n141 The program could be run by a non-profit group, and **state food stamp offices could contract out to these groups to provide outreach and advocacy. n142** **The best way to get federal money is to design a food stamp outreach and advocacy program that is specifically tailored to the homeless.** A program tailored to the homeless is likely to get preference in obtaining the fifty percent matching funds for food stamp outreach and advocacy - despite the USDA's limited interpretations - as well as funds under the McKinney Act or the Food Stamp Act's demonstration projects. n143

AT: States CP

Counterplan cant solve the case—not in my backyard.

Giomo and Grunberg 1992 (Benedict and Jeffrey, Giomo is a Professor of American Studies at the University of Notre Dame. Grunberg is a Professor of Clinical Psychology at Columbia University. "Beyond Homelessness: Frames of Reference" p. 99)

We spoke to Herb Pardes about the mental health aspects of homelessness and he was quick to point out that, at the time this social policy was being debated, psychiatrists themselves were divided. **Many didn't think it was a good idea, many did. And Richard Lamb, who recently wrote a piece on deinstitutionalization, blamed the naivete of psychiatrists for their inability to get funding they thought would be there, and for their failure to anticipate and understand the extent to which NIMBY [not in my backyard] would reoccur to frustrate community mental health efforts.** It's kind of surprising to think that there could be such naivete. Was it naivete?

Dumpson: I don't call it naivete. **We don't have the political will to deal with NIMBY today. Just this afternoon the mayor of the City of New York [David Dinkins] talked to a group of us about a health center that needed to be relocated. And the commissioner of health said he was having some problems in finding a location. In fact, he had word from some council members that they didn't want this health center where he was planning to put it. The mayor said that he would like to follow through with the original plan, since the commissioner told him that it was the best place for that health center.** The mayor then went on to say, "I want to tell those council unless they come up with sorr be unpopular, but we aren't policy of this administration."

AT: States CP

State cannot handle the federal responsibility, they only hope for a national reform program.

Evelyn Z. **Brodkin**; Bureaucracy Redux: Management Reformism and the Welfare State; Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory: J-PART, Vol. 17, No. 1 (Jan., **2007**), pp. 1-17; Oxford University Press on behalf of the Public Management Research Association

Although **welfare administration had long been a shared federal-state responsibility, states chafed under the regulatory obligations associated with federal funding of social programs.** Subunits of government began to receive federal approval to experiment with different approaches to welfare delivery, ultimately aimed at moving recipients of public assistance into paid work. These reforms selectively interposed so-called new public management (NPM) techniques (Lynn 1998) into social welfare provision. Consistent with familiar NPM Brodtkin Bureaucracy Redux 5 themes, **state** governors promoting experimentation invoked the promise of flexibility and innovation through devolution.² In the true fashion of a dialectic, the new reformers castigated public **welfare agencies** for bureaucratic standardization, which had been introduced in the previous wave of reform. These agencies now **were caricatured as “eligibility and compliance” systems that “everybody hates”** (Bane and Ellwood 1994, 19). The solution, remarkably, was to bring discretion back in.³ Although the discretionary social work bureaucracy of the 1960s and 1970s remained in disrepute, the ideal of discretion, when reintroduced in the quasi-NPM terms of devolution and flexibility, had great appeal. **The federal government gave states flexibility to experiment** with different approaches to assistance aimed at promoting paid work in lieu of cash aid, including giving agencies more leeway to use discretion to promote work. Overall, experimental welfare-to-work programs operated by state- and county-level governments achieved mixed results (ranging from negative to modestly positive), which could have been used to highlight either the drawbacks or the potential of these strategies. **However, for the most part, the experiments were interpreted as indicating the promise of reconstructing welfare agencies into** quasi-labor market intermediaries (Brodtkin and Kaufman 2000; O’Connor 2001; Rogers-Dillon 2004). They laid the political foundation for **a broader national reform program**, giving states expanded management authority to reorganize their public assistance programs and transform caseworkers into promoters and enforcers of work.

States abuse power given to them by the federal government, over restricting social service access.

Lisa R. **Metsch and** Harold A. **Pollack**; Welfare Reform and Substance Abuse; The Milbank Quarterly, Vol. 83, No. 1 (**2005**), pp. 65-100; Blackwell Publishing on behalf of Milbank Memorial Fund

PRWORA converted the financing of public aid from an entitlement to a system of block grants that shifts many financial incentives and risks from the federal government to the 50 states and, in many cases, ultimately to the recipients themselves. **TANF block grants accord states broad discretion to determine who is eligible for TANF and for how long.**

States are given broad discretion to sanction recipients who do not comply with program rules (Edelman 1997). **As long as the states comply with due process requirements, they are free to impose a wide range of penalties, ranging from small and temporary benefit reductions to the removal of recipient families from the TANF rolls. Such sanctions are widely applied.** A study by the General Accounting Office found that the benefits of an average of 113,000 families per month (4.5% of TANF recipients) were reduced because of sanctions. Equally significant, in 1999 seven states reported that sanctions accounted for at least 20 percent of their case closures (Goldberg and Schott 2000; Pavetti and Bloom 2001).

AT: States CP

Only federal action can solve the issues confronting homeless today-it has the resources to allow real change to occur amidst the foreclosure crisis

National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty 2009 [2/2009 “Without a Just Cause”
http://www.nlchp.org/content/pubs/Without_Just_Cause2.pdf]

As the foreclosure crisis continues and intensifies, more and more renters are being evicted— often without notice. Moreover, as documented in this report, **in the vast majority of states there is little in the law to protect tenants' legitimate interests.** To help stem the rising tide of homelessness nationally, and remedy this injustice, **NLCHP and NLIHC recommend that the federal government take immediate action to protect tenants in foreclosures. Federal action is needed to ensure help nationally, and to bring the resources of the federal government to bear to assist financially strapped states and communities.** However, these recommendations are also applicable at the state level. Fair notice to tenants. Tenants who are current in their rent should not be evicted without notice, as now frequently happens. A minimum of 90 days' notice to tenants should be required. Preserve existing tenancies. With limited exceptions, bona fide tenancies should be protected through the end of the lease term. Exceptions would include instances where the tenancy is not bona fide, or where the purchaser will use the property as a primary residence. Tenancies should be considered bona fide as long as the tenant is not the mortgagor, the lease was the result of an arms length negotiation, and the lease payment is not substantially less than the fair market rent for the property. Tenants living in federally assisted housing should also be protected. When foreclosed properties have tenants who are being assisted with subsidies under the United States Housing Act of 1937, vacating the property for sale purposes should not be considered good cause for breaking the tenants' existing lease. Legal assistance. According to reports from around the country, legal aid offices are being overwhelmed with requests for legal assistance from people facing foreclosure and eviction. Few persons who become homeless as a result appear to have had access to any legal assistance that might have helped them avoid the loss of their home. Further, many legal aid lawyers as well as persons facing loss of their homes are unfamiliar with the law or lack the ability to enforce it. Access to legal assistance can make the difference between maintaining and losing housing, and funding for such legal assistance, including training and information on rights, must be increased.

AT: Private Actor CP

[] The private sector alone cannot solve – federal support is key

Michael Lipsky **Steven** professor of political science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology 1989
[“Nonprofit Organizations, Government, and the Welfare State” <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2151102?seq=1>]

Nonprofit organizations invoke the images of community, voluntarism, civic dependability, and neighbor-helping-neighbor that have always exerted a powerful impression on American public consciousness.¹ However, largely as a result of this expanded role in providing services for government, these images are at variance with the contemporary reality of nonprofit service organizations. Rather than depending mostly on private charity and volunteers, **most nonprofit service organizations depend on government for over half of their revenues; for many small agencies, government support comprises their entire budget.** In contrast to the traditional relationship of two independent sectors, **the new relationship between government and nonprofits amounts to one of mutual dependence that is financial as well as technical; increasingly, the lines between public and private are blurred.** For instance, a recent survey of the Child Welfare League of America concluded that government support comprised, on average, 59 percent of their member agency revenue in 1986.² On the other hand, government relies on nonprofits to provide social services. In 1988, fifteen Massachusetts state agencies were budgeted to spend over \$750 million, about 7 percent of the state budget, to purchase from over 1,200 contractors such services as alcoholism rehabilitation, family crisis intervention, English-as-a-second-language, and daycare. Overall, the state recognizes 200 distinct types of social services in its purchase-of-service system.³ Until recently, **our understanding of the development of the welfare state in advanced industrial countries assumed that the hallmark of a progressive welfare state was a large public sector that relegated the private sector to a small residual role. In this view, the United States with its smaller public sector and larger private nonprofit sector compared unfavorably. The expansion of government contracting with nonprofit agencies calls the prevailing view into question.** In the recent period, **government has used nonprofit agencies to expand the boundaries of the welfare state in the United States in a host of service categories**—from child abuse to domestic violence to homelessness. The result is a welfare state that is more expansive than would be the case if policy makers relied solely on the public sector.

It is also a welfare state that has compromised some of the values that the private voluntary sector contributes to social welfare provision. These values include the variety, independence, and legitimacy of community-based agencies, and the capacity of such agencies to pursue distribution policies that tolerate responsiveness to clients over equity among clients if the two values conflict.

Broadly speaking, we reach the following conclusions about the effects of government spending in nonprofit organizations and public policy. **As government funding of nonprofit organizations grows, the pressures on government officials to maintain accountability over public funds increases** as well. Over time, government officials respond to increased reliance on private agencies by instituting new regulations, changing contract requirements, and increasing administrative oversight. The effect is to shift the organizational norms of nonprofit agencies from their historical emphasis on being responsive to the individual to focusing more on treating all clients alike, an orientation that bears resemblance to that of government service agencies. This shift is particularly noticeable in the areas of staffing, client selection and treatment, and physical plant. Thus, government may require non-profit agencies to hire professional staff as a condition of receiving a contract. Or government may force a contract agency to accept only client referrals from government bureaus, rather than allowing contract agencies to have the flexibility to respond to all clients in need who present themselves to the agency. Government may also require a contract agency to modify its physical plant in order to meet official standards on public safety and health. We will argue that government funding of nonprofit agencies transforms the management of contract agencies and the politics surrounding social service expenditure.

In sum, **government spending of nonprofit agencies should not be viewed simply as "privatization," if this term means reducing or minimizing government involvement in policy matters by turning over responsibility to private agencies and providing them with additional funds.** Rather, the new public-private funding arrangement means increased government intrusion into the affairs of nonprofit agencies, thereby altering the character of social policy and the American welfare state.

*****Spec*****

AT: A(gent) Spec (camp version)

A) I meet their interp

1 - In the 1AC I specify that congress will pass a law, President Obama will sign, and courts will uphold.

2 - CX checks back – if you had a question you should have asked it in CX. I also reserve the right to clarify out of the 1AC so any new clarification is only fair because you didn't ask me.

B) Standards

Ground - Their ground standard is infinitely regressive. Even if they have a limiting definition in the round it does not mean it is the best. The neg can always try to find interps I can't ever meet with any aff meaning I will always lose. This collapses debate because affs who hit this neg strat will stop showing up if we always lose.

Education – I meet their education standard because I spec how they want me to.

C) Voters

1 - T may be a voting issue, but not A-Spec. They have to explain fairness and education don't do the work for them. I reserve the right to answer any new args on fairness/education in the 2AR with new turns.

2 – Theory is a 100% win for the neg, if I am reasonably topical then you should vote aff.

3 – I meet their interp which means I cannot violate it – thus I spec correctly.

4 – Since theory is an instant kill for the aff neg you should default aff on theory questions to ensure fairness in the round.

AT: O(ver) Spec

A) I meet their interpretation

1 - I spec to the res. The USFG doesn't actually do anything, people within the USFG do things so it is understandable that people or agencies are specifically pointed out.

Adrienne Brovero, debate coach at Wake Forest University, 1994 ["Immigration Regulation : Borderline Policies." Wake Forest Debate Site. <http://groups.wfu.edu/debate/MiscSites/DRGArticles/Brovero1994Immigration.htm>] Garcia NM

The problem is not that there is not a plan; this time there is one. The problem is that there is no agent specified. **The federal government does not enact policies, agents or agencies within the federal government enact policies. The agent enacting a policy is a very important aspect** of the policy. For some of the same reasons the affirmative team should specify a plan of action, the affirmative team should specify an agent of action

2 – Their interp is bad – the totality of their interp is infinitely regressive. If I spec'd how they want me to in this shell they would have run Under Spec

B) Counter Interpretation

I can spec however I want.

I meet the counter interp because I spec however I want.

C) Counter Standard

Switch Side debate – every other round you get to make the rules for the round – this time it is my turn, next time in elims it will be your turn.

D) Their standards

Limits – Their limits standard is infinitely regressive. Even if they have the most limiting definition in the round it does not mean it is the best. The neg can always try to find interps I can't ever meet with any aff meaning I will always lose. This collapses debate because affs who hit this neg strat will stop showing up if we always lose.

Ground – My interpretation gives the neg more ground because it shows that I have to remove abuse and injustice both.

E) Voters

1 - T may be a voting issue, but not O-Spec. There is no reason to vote me down for under specifying and they can never give you one besides the tag words "fairness and education".

2 – Theory is a 100% win for the neg, if I am reasonably topical then you should vote aff.

3 – I meet their interp which means I cannot violate it – thus I spec correctly.

4 – Since theory is an instant kill for the aff neg you should default aff on theory questions to ensure fairness in the round.

AT: U(nder) Spec

A) I meet their interpretation

1 – I spec how they want me to. They want me to _____ and I do.

2 - CX checks back – if you had a question you should have asked it in CX. I also reserve the right to clarify out of the 1AC so any new clarification is only fair because you didn't ask me.

3 – Their interp is bad – the totality of their interp is infinitely regressive. If I spec'd how they want me to in this shell they would have run Over Spec

B) Counter Interpretation

I only have to spec to the rez.

I meet the counter interp because normal means is spec'ing to the rez.

C) Counter Standard

Predictability – My interp is the best because it is from the rez. This means that as long as the neg knows the rez I cannot abuse them.

D) Their standards

Limits – Their limits standard is infinitely regressive. Even if they have the most limiting definition in the round it does not mean it is the best. The neg can always try to find interps I can't ever meet with any aff meaning I will always lose. This collapses debate because affs who hit this neg strat will stop showing up if we always lose.

Ground – My interpretation gives the neg more ground because it shows that I have to remove abuse and injustice both.

E) Voters

1 - T may be a voting issue, but not U-Spec. There is no reason to vote me down for under specifying and they can never give you one besides the tag words "fairness and education".

2 – Theory is a 100% win for the neg, if I am reasonably topical then you should vote aff.

3 – I meet their interp which means I cannot violate it – thus I spec correctly.

4 – Since theory is an instant kill for the aff neg you should default aff on theory questions to ensure fairness in the round.

*******Topicality*******

AT: CMI

A) I meet their interpretation.

I affect CMIs and only CMIs because the plan text says that only individuals who have a CMI can skip over the necessity of an address.

Extend the Neg's interp of CMI here – those are the only people who may access the plan text.

B) Their standards

C) Voters

1 - T may be a voting issue, but not in this round. I meet their interpretation which means I am topical under their definitions.

2 – I meet my counter interp showing I am removing unjust restrictions.

3 – T is a 100% win for the neg, if I am reasonably topical then you should vote aff.

4 – Since T is an instant kill for the aff neg you should default aff on theory questions to ensure fairness in the round.

AT: MHS

A) I meet their interpretation.

I affect MHS because _____.

B) Counter Interp

Mental health services prevent and treat mental disorders

the free dictionary '10 [<http://medical-ictionary.thefreedictionary.com/mental+health+service> - Mosby's Medical Dictionary, 8th edition. © 2009, Elsevier. Last accessed 10-31-10]

a group of government, professional, or lay organizations operating at a community, state, national, or international level to aid in the prevention and treatment of mental disorders.

1 - I meet my counter interp because I affect the way that homeless individuals access treatment and prevention for their mental disorders.

C) Counter Standard

Access— my interpretation is the most predictable because everyone has access to dictionary.com through library and school resources so even those who can't afford database definitions can still access the round.

Lit base – Mosby's Medical dictionary is the source for the free dictionary's medical dictionary. You should prefer my definition because it is from the literature base and a solid part of understanding concepts in the mental health field.

D) Their standards

E) Voters

1 - T may be a voting issue, but not in this round. I meet their interpretation which means I am topical under their definitions.

2 – I meet my counter interp showing I am removing unjust restrictions.

3 – T is a 100% win for the neg, if I am reasonably topical then you should vote aff.

4 – Since T is an instant kill for the aff neg you should default aff on theory questions to ensure fairness in the round.

AT: Reform – End Abuses

A) I meet their interpretation

1 - Dictionary.com '10 [<http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/abuse> last accessed 10/30/10]

Abuse is: to treat in a harmful, injurious, or offensive way

Extend Anawim Christian Community '09. This says that homeless individuals are dehumanized and thus are abused. The 1AC removes the clause for this meaning I end abuse.

2 - I also meet their interpretation because I introduce a better procedure.

By removing the need for individuals with a CMI to need a stable address I am introducing a system that is better than the SQO.

B) Counter Interpretation

WordNet [WordNet Search - 3.0 <http://wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn?s=reform> Accessed August 6, 2009. MJS.]
reform (make changes for improvement in order to remove abuse and injustices)

I meet my counter interpretation;

I am removing the abuse and injustices towards the homeless by removing restrictions that are unjust.

C) Counter Standard

Access– my interpretation is the most predictable because everyone has access to dictionary.com through library and school resources so even those who can't afford database definitions can still access the round.

D) Their standards

Limits – Their limits standard is infinitely regressive. Even if they have the most limiting definition in the round it does not mean it is the best. The neg can always try to find interps I can't ever meet with any aff meaning I will always lose. This collapses debate because affs who hit this neg strat will stop showing up if we always lose.

Ground – My interpretation gives the neg more ground because it shows that I have to remove abuse and injustice both.

E) Voters

1 - T may be a voting issue, but not in this round. I meet their interpretation which means I am topical under their definitions.

2 – I meet my counter interp showing I am removing unjust restrictions.

3 – T is a 100% win for the neg, if I am reasonably topical then you should vote aff.

4 – Since T is an instant kill for the neg you should default aff on theory questions to ensure fairness in the round.

AT: Provision

A) I meet their interpretation

B) Counter Interpretation

I meet my counter interpretation;

I am removing the abuse and injustices towards the homeless by removing restrictions that are unjust.

C) Counter Standard

Access— my interpretation is the most predictable because everyone has access to dictionary.com through library and school resources so even those who can't afford database definitions can still access the round.

D) Their standards

Limits – Their limits standard is infinitely regressive. Even if they have the most limiting definition in the round it does not mean it is the best. The neg can always try to find interps I can't ever meet with any aff meaning I will always lose. This collapses debate because affs who hit this neg strat will stop showing up if we always lose.

Ground – My interpretation gives the neg more ground because it shows that I have to remove abuse and injustice both.

E) Voters

1 - T may be a voting issue, but not in this round. I meet their interpretation which means I am topical under their definitions.

2 – I meet my counter interp showing I am removing unjust restrictions.

3 – T is a 100% win for the neg, if I am reasonably topical then you should vote aff.

4 – Since T is an instant kill for the aff neg you should default aff on theory questions to ensure fairness in the round.

AT: Substantially – any def

A) I meet their interpretation.

I am substantial because _____.

B) Counter Interpretation

Words and Phrases, 2 (Words and Phrases Permanent Edition, “Substantially,” Volume 40B, p. 324-330 October 2002, Thomson West)

N.D.III. 2002. Under ADA, “**substantially**” in phrase substantially limits, means considerable, or **to a large degree**.

I meet my counter interpretation because I open access for homeless people have to MHS to a large degree. Before plan no homeless people have access to MHS for CMI – post plan everyone has access which is to a large degree.

C) Counter Standard

Predictability – my interpretation is the most predictable because it is the base understanding to all other definitions that are based on substantially.

D) Their standards

Limits – Their limits standard is infinitely regressive. Even if they have the most limiting definition in the round it does not mean it is the best. The neg can always try to find interps I can’t ever meet with any aff meaning I will always lose. This collapses debate because affs who hit this neg strat will stop showing up if we always lose.

Ground – My interpretation gives the neg more ground because it shows that I have to remove abuse and injustice both.

E) Voters

1 - T may be a voting issue, but not in this round. I meet their interpretation which means I am topical under their definitions.

2 – I meet my counter interp showing I am removing unjust restrictions.

3 – T is a 100% win for the neg, if I am reasonably topical then you should vote aff.

4 – Since T is an instant kill for the aff neg you should default aff on theory questions to ensure fairness in the round.

AT: You are losing T from the 1AC

First – T is bad

Silencing is the most effective form of propaganda. Thus, attempts at avoiding the discussion of homeless or arguments that distract from it is no better than propaganda used to silenced true reformers.

Thomas **Huckin** of the University of Utah **2002** [“Textual silence and the discourse of homelessness”
<http://das.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/13/3/347>]

‘The greatest triumphs of propaganda have been accomplished, not by doing something, but by refraining from doing. Great is truth, but greater still, from a practical standpoint, is silence about truth. By simply not mentioning certain subjects, . . . **propagandists have influenced opinion much more effectively than they could have done by the most eloquent denunciations, the most compelling of logical rebuttals.**’ These comments by Aldous Huxley in his 1946 foreword to Brave New World underscore the power of silence to affect communication. **Traditionally, discourse analysts have tended to ignore such silences, preferring instead to focus on the words, phrases, clauses and other linguistic elements that constitute the surface of text and talk** Brown and Yule’s (1983) definition of discourse analysis is illustrative: ‘We examine how humans use language to communicate and, in particular, how addressers construct linguistic messages for addressees and how addressees work on linguistic messages in order to interpret them’ (1983: ix, emphasis added). Yet **any practicing discourse analyst will readily acknowledge that communication involves more than just the linguistic markers used to encode it – that often what is not said or written can be as important, if not more so, than what is.** As Stuart Hall (1985) has noted, ‘Positively marked terms “signify” because of their position in relation to what is absent, unmarked, the unspoken, the unsayable. Meaning is relational within an ideological system of presences and absences’.

Second – T is racist, sexist, exclusionary, and wrong

A procedural method of policymaking debate posits an ‘ideal speech’ which necessarily excludes other forms of discourse, making any definition of participation that is limited exclusively to regulated political discourse inevitably exclusionary, racist and sexist.

Kulynych, 97 (Jessica, Winthrop U Prof of Polysci, “Performing Politics: Foucault, Habermas, and Postmodern Participation, Polity, Vol. 30, No. 2 (Winter, 1997), 315-346, accessed Jstor)

Certainly, one might suggest that the above cases are really just failures of speech, and, therefore, not a critique of ideal speech as it is formulated by Habermas. Indeed Seyla Benhabib reformulates Habermas's speech act perspective to make it sensitive to the above critique. She argues that feminists concerned with the discourse model of democracy have often confused the historically biased practices of deliberative assemblies with the normative ideal of rational deliberation.²⁶ She suggests that feminists concerned with inequities and imbalances in communication can actually benefit from the Habermasian requirement that all positions and issues be

made " 'public' in the sense of making [them] accessible to debate, reflection, action and moral-political transformation."²⁷ **The "radical proceduralism" of the discourse model makes it ideally suited to identify inequities in communication because it precludes our accepting unexamined and unjustified positions.**²⁸

Even such a sophisticated and sensitive approach to ideal speech as Benhabib's cannot cleanse communicative action of its exclusivity. It is not only that acquiring language is a process of mastering a symbolic heritage that is systematically gendered, but **the entire attempt to set conditions for "ideal speech" is inevitably exclusive. The model of an ideal speech situation establishes a norm of rational interaction that is defined by the very types of interaction it excludes.** The norm of rational

debate favors critical argument and reasoned debate over other forms of communication.²⁹ **Defining ideal speech**

inevitably entails defining unacceptable speech. What has been defined as unacceptable in Habermas's formulation is any speech that is not intended to convey an idea. Speech evocative of identity, culture, or emotion has no necessary place in the ideal speech situation, and hence persons whose speech is richly colored with rhetoric, gesture, humor, spirit, or affectation could be defined as deviant or immature communicators. Therefore, **a definition of citizenship based on**

participation in an ideal form of interaction can easily become a tool for the exclusion of deviant communicators from the category of citizens. This sort of normalization

creates citizens as subjects of rational debate. Correlatively, as Fraser explains, because the communicative action approach is procedural it is particularly unsuited to address issues of speech content.³⁰ Therefore, by definition, it misses the relationship between procedure and content that is at the core of feminist and deconstructive critiques of language. **A procedural**

approach can require that we accommodate all utterances and that we not marginalize speaking subjects. It cannot require that we take seriously or be convinced by the statements of such interlocutors. In other words, a procedural approach does not address the cultural context that makes some statements convincing and others not.

*******Warming Impact Turns*******

A2: Warming- Offense- Food Prices

CO2 increase agricultural production – fertilizes plants, lengthens growing seasons, and increases precipitation – decreasing food prices

Moore 2k

(Thomas Senior Fellow – Hoover Institution/ Stanford University, 9-8-00, <http://www.stanford.edu/~moore/CIEffects.pdf> //e.berggren) ET

In many parts of the world, **warmer weather should mean longer growing seasons. Should the world warm, the hotter climate would enhance evaporation from the seas and lead probably to more precipitation worldwide.** Moreover, **the enrichment of the atmosphere with CO2 would fertilize plants and make for more vigorous growth. Agricultural economists studying the relationship of higher temperatures and additional CO2 to crop yields in Canada, Australia, Japan, northern Russia, Finland, and Iceland found not only that a warmer climate would push up yields but also that the added boost from enriched CO2 fertilization would enhance output by 15 percent** (NCPO 1989). **The United States Department of Agriculture in a cautious report reviewed the likely influence of global warming and concluded that the overall effect on world food production would be slightly positive and that agricultural prices would be likely to decrease.**

Blips in food prices kill billions

Tampa Tribune 96 (*Tampa tribune*, 1-20-1996) ET

On a global scale, **food supplies** - measured by stockpiles of grain - **are not abundant.** In 1995, world production failed to meet demand for the third consecutive year, said Per Pinstrup-Andersen, director of the International Food Policy Research Institute in Washington, D.C. As a result, grain stockpiles fell from an average of 17 percent of annual consumption in 1994-1995 to 13 percent at the end of the 1995-1996 season, he said. That's troubling, Pinstrup-Andersen noted, since 13 percent is well below the 17 percent the United Nations considers essential to provide a margin of safety in world food security. During the food crisis of the early 1970s, world grain stocks were at 15 percent. **"Even if they are merely blips, higher international prices can hurt poor countries that import a significant portion of their food,"** he said. **"Rising prices can also quickly put food out of reach of the 1.1 billion people in the developing world who live on a dollar a day or less."** He also said many people in low-income countries already spend more than half of their income on food.

High food prices kills billions

Brown 97 (Lester- founder of the Worldwatch Institute and founder and president of the Earth Policy Institute, 1997, *State of the World* 1997, p. 43) ET

On the demand side, there will also be adjustments. The **supply and demand of grain always balance** in the marketplace, **even in times of scarcity, but at a much higher price.** The key question is, what will be the social and economic effects of these price rises? Those most affected obviously will be the poorer segments of the world population, specifically the **1.2 billion people who now live on \$1 a day. For these individuals who spend 70 cents of that dollar just for a minimal subsistence-level diet, a doubling of grain prices could quickly become life-threatening.**

A2: Warming- Offense- Food Prices → Economy

High food prices will cause economic instability and state collapse.

CNN 8 [CNN, Apr 14 -8,

<[http://www.cnn.com/2008/WORLD/americas/04/14/world.food.crisis /](http://www.cnn.com/2008/WORLD/americas/04/14/world.food.crisis/)) ET

Riots from Haiti to Bangladesh to Egypt over the soaring costs of basic foods have brought the issue to a boiling point and catapulted it to the forefront of the world's attention, the head of an agency focused on global development said Monday. **This is the world's big story," said Jeffrey Sachs, director of Columbia University's Earth Institute.** "The finance ministers were in shock, almost in panic this weekend," he said on CNN's "American Morning," in a reference to top economic officials who gathered in Washington. "There are riots all over the world in the poor countries ... and, of course, our own poor are feeling it in the United States." World Bank President Robert Zoellick has said **the surging costs could mean "seven lost years" in the fight against worldwide poverty.** "While many are worrying about filling their gas tanks, many others around the world are struggling to fill their stomachs, and it is getting more and more difficult every day," Zoellick said late last week in a speech opening meetings with finance ministers. "The international community must fill the at least \$500 million food gap identified by the U.N.'s World Food Programme to meet emergency needs," he said. "Governments should be able to come up with this assistance and come up with it now." The White House announced Monday evening that an estimated \$200 million in emergency food aid would be made available through the U.S. Agency for International Development. "This additional food aid will address the impact of rising commodity prices on U.S. emergency food aid programs, and be used to meet unanticipated food aid needs in Africa and elsewhere," the White House said in a news release. "In **just two months,**" Zoellick said in his speech, **"rice prices have skyrocketed to near historical levels, rising by around 75 percent globally and more in some markets, with more likely to come.** In Bangladesh, a 2-kilogram bag of rice ... now consumes about half of the daily income of a poor family." The price of wheat has jumped 120 percent in the past year, he said -- meaning that the price of a loaf of bread has more than doubled in places where the poor spend as much as 75 percent of their income on food. **"This is not just about meals forgone today or about increasing social unrest.** This is about lost learning potential for children and adults in the future, stunted intellectual and physical growth," Zoellick said. Dominique Strauss-Kahn, managing director of the International Monetary Fund, also spoke at the joint IMF-World Bank spring meeting. **"If food prices go on as they are today, then the consequences on the population in a large set of countries ... will be terrible,"** he said. He added that **"disruptions may occur in the economic environment ... so that at the end of the day most governments, having done well during the last five or 10 years, will see what they have done totally destroyed, and their legitimacy facing the population destroyed also."**

A2: Warming- Offense- Food Security

And, food security given by Co2 outweighs bad impacts

Wittwer 92 (Sylvan H., Professor of Horticulture at Michigan State University, Fall, Issue 62, Policy Review) ET

For the present, **the direct effects of an increasing atmospheric CO2 on food production and the outputs of rangelands and forests are much more important than any effects thus far manifest for climate. A recent review** of over 1,000 individual experiments with 475 plant crop varieties, published in 342 peer-reviewed scientific journals and authored by 454 scientists in 29 countries, **has shown an average growth enhancement of 52%** with a doubling of the current level of atmospheric carbon dioxide. Yet some scientists, especially those with ecological orientations, take delight in glamorizing, along with a sympathetic press, the few exceptions which, in turn, become widely quoted in the scientific literature. These include tussock arctic tundra; some grasslands where undesirable species may, under restricted conditions, outgrow the more desirable; and in some ecosystems where competition among species may create a lack of balance. (See "Rising Carbon Dioxide Is Great for Plants," CR, December 1992.) Globally, it is estimated the overall **crop productivity has been already increased by 10% because of CO2** and may account for much of what has been attributed to the Green Revolution. Meanwhile, changes in climate in specific fields where crops actually grow and are cultivated remain defiantly uncertain. Conversely, **the effects of an enriched CO2 atmosphere on crop productivity in large measure are positive and leave little doubt as to the benefits for global food security.** With this note, it is a sad commentary that most of the current and modern textbooks on plant nutrition omit, inadvertently or otherwise, any mention of the role of carbon dioxide as a fertilizer or essential nutrient. This was true 35 years ago and remains so to this day. Textbooks still ignore the fact that different levels of CO2 may have pronounced effects on plant growth and may interrelate and complement various levels of other nutrients applied to crops in the rooting media. The complementary effects are also manifest with respect to water requirements and positive interrelations with temperature, light, and other atmospheric constraints. (See - "Environmental 'Science' In The Classroom," CR, April 1997.) Today, in the greenhouses of the Westlands of Holland, where the first use of elevated levels of greenhouse carbon dioxide for enrichment of food crops occurred 40 years ago, there are glass green houses covering over 10,000 hectares. These are all enriched with atmospheric levels of 1,000 ppm of CO2 during daylight hours. This practice is followed during the entire year when crops are produced. Increases of marketable yields of tomatoes, cucumbers, sweet peppers, eggplant, and ornamentals range between 20% to 40% with an annual return of \$3 billion. There is currently a blind spot in the political and informational systems of the world. This is accompanied by a corruption of the underlying biological and physical sciences. **It should be considered good fortune that we are living in a world of gradually increasing levels of atmospheric CO2.** The satellite data on global temperature changes are now in. There has been no appreciable warming. Accordingly, **the rising level of atmospheric CO2 does not make the United States the world's worst polluter. It is the world's greatest benefactor.** Unlike other natural resources (land, water, energy) essential for food production, which are costly and progressively in shorter supply, the rising level of atmospheric CO2, is a universally free premium gaining in magnitude with time on which we can all reckon for the future. The effects of the increasing atmospheric **level of CO2 on photosynthetic capacity** for the enhancement of food production and the output of rangelands and forests, **appear far more important than any detectable change in climate. Elevated levels of atmospheric CO2 also provide a cost-free environment for the conservation of water which is rapidly becoming another of the world's most limiting natural resources, the majority of which is now used for crop irrigation.**

A2: Warming- Offense- Food Security Extra Impacts

Food insecurity causes 18000 deaths a day

Magdoff 8 (Fred, Professor emeritus of plant and soil science @ U of Vermont,⁸ *The World Food Crisis Sources and Solutions, Monthly Review*,<http://www.monthlyreview.org/080501magdoff.php>) ET

Of the more than 6 billion people living in the world today, the United Nations estimates that close to **1 billion suffer from chronic hunger**. But this number, which is only a crude estimate, leaves out those suffering from vitamin and nutrient deficiencies and other forms of malnutrition. **The total number of food insecure people who are malnourished or lacking critical nutrients is probably closer to 3 billion—about half of humanity.** The severity of this situation is made clear by the United Nations estimate of over a year ago that **approximately 18,000 children die daily as a direct or indirect consequence of malnutrition** (Associated Press, February 18, 200

A2: Warming- Offense- Food Stress Scenario

Food shortages coming now

Sydney Morning Herald 8

[Jun 20, "Food shortages curb global appetite for free trade," <http://business.smh.com.au/food-shortages-curb-global-appetite-for-free-trade-20080620-2trb.html>]

Global food prices have spiked 60% since the beginning of 2007, sparking riots in more than 30 countries that depend on imported food, including Cameroon and Egypt. The surge in prices threatens to push the number of malnourished people in the world from 860 million to almost 1 billion, according to the World Food

Programme in Rome. Leaders of developing nations including the Philippines, Gambia and El Salvador now say the only way to nourish their people is to grow more food themselves rather than rely on cheap imports. The backlash may sink global trade talks, reduce the almost \$US1 trillion (\$A1 trillion) in annual food trade and lead to the return of high agricultural tariffs and subsidies around the world.

Co2 good- without it Overpopulation means water and food stress is inevitable- global starvation and war

Center for Science and Public Policy, 6

(Jan 12, http://ff.org/centers/csspp/library/co2weekly/20060112/20060112_02.html) ET

Wallace (2000) illustrates the source and magnitude of the problem by noting that **the projected increase in the number of people** who will join our ranks in the coming half-century (a median best-guess of 3.7 billion) **is more sure of occurring than is any other environmental change** currently underway or looming on the horizon; and these extra people will need a whopping amount of extra food that will take an equally whopping amount of extra water to produce, the problem being that *there is no extra water*. "Over the entire globe," therefore, says Wallace, **"a staggering 67% of the future population of the world may experience some water stress," which translates into food insufficiency; and food insufficiency means malnutrition and, in the most extreme cases, starvation and war.** So what's the solution?

There's only one answer, according to Wallace. We must produce much more food per unit of available water, which leads to the most important question of all. How can it be done? Wallace suggests we must greatly augment water conservation measures wherever possible and implement every conceivable efficiency-enhancing procedure in irrigated and rain fed agriculture. Second, we must do everything we can, as he says, "to fix more carbon per unit of water transpired." That is, **we must strive to dramatically increase plant water use efficiency.** Human ingenuity will surely enable great strides to be made in all of these areas over the coming decades. But will the improvements be large enough? At the present time, no one can answer this question with any confidence. In fact, pessimism permeates most thinking on the subject; for as Wallace correctly reports, "the global scientific community is not currently giving this area sufficient attention." So where is our attention currently focused? Unfortunately, it is focused on reducing anthropogenic CO₂ emissions to the atmosphere, which is truly lamentable; for the **continuation of those emissions is, ironically, our only real hope for averting the near-certain future global food and water shortfalls** that are destined to occur if the Kyoto Protocol Crowd gets its way with the world. But how would allowing anthropogenic CO₂ emissions to take their natural course help to ameliorate future thirst as well as hunger? The answer resides in the fact that **elevated levels of atmospheric CO₂ tend to reduce plant transpiration while simultaneously enhancing plant photosynthesis, which two phenomena acting together enable earth's crops to produce more food per unit of water used in the process. Literally thousands of laboratory and field experiments - and that is no exaggeration - have verified this fact beyond any doubt whatsoever.** Indeed, **this atmospheric CO₂-induced blessing is as sure as death and taxes, and as dependable as a mother's love.** But what do climate-alarmist ideologues do about it? They spurn it. They deny it. They even try to make people believe the opposite (see our Editorial 13 Dec 2000). And they do it to the detriment of all mankind. Aerial fertilization of CO₂ both reduces plant transpiration and increases photosynthesis, making plants more efficient and solving for water wars.