Negative: Citizenship Desegregation

By “Coach Vance” Trefethen

***The United States Federal Government should significantly reform its policies regarding convicted prisoners under federal jurisdiction***

Case Summary: The federal government segregates a large percentage of non-citizen federal prisoners in somewhere between 10 to 13 (different sources have different numbers) prisons exclusively for non-citizens. The non-citizens’ prisons lack the rehab programs, halfway houses and early-release opportunities that are granted to “regular” federal prisoners. Note: This is NOT about immigration detention (which would be untopical, since immigrant detainees are not convicted of anything). This is about foreign citizens (mostly Mexicans) who have been convicted of federal crimes. Understand: Some of them were convicted of federal crimes involving entering the country illegally. They are convicted of a crime, they are not detainees awaiting an immigration hearing, so they are subject to this resolution. Most of them are in for drug offenses.
 AFF plan will desegregate the non-citizens and mix them into the other prisons with citizen prisoners, probably on the grounds that the non-citizens are suffering from not having access to the rehab, early-release, training and other programs available in the regular prisons.
 Oddly enough, this very question was adjudicated in a lawsuit in 2012 (Gallegos-Hernandez versus United States). Gallegos was a Mexican citizen in federal prison and segregated in a non-citizen facility. He was denied programs and opportunities given to citizens in other federal prisons. He sued the federal government arguing this was unjust. The federal district court and the 5th Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that in fact federal prisoners do not have a “right” to any programs, so it is not a violation of anyone’s rights to not give them anything. The 5th Circuit Court in essence heard all the arguments in this debate round and voted Negative.
 The NEG position: All the federal government owes its prisoners is to not violate the 8th Amendment (no cruel and unusual punishment) and keep them secure. Anything else is completely discretionary and there’s no reason US taxpayers owe convicted criminal foreign citizens any rehab programs or early release.
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Negative: Case Title

OPENING QUOTES / NEG PHILOSOPHY

 A higher judging panel has heard the arguments and voted Negative

Our esteemed judge(s) is/are wonderful and intelligent and we respect them highly. But a higher judging audience, a 3-member panel of the federal 5th Circuit Court of Appeals, actually heard a case in 2012 in which the very same issues of this debate round were debated there. A Mexican citizen in a segregated non-citizen federal prison filed a federal lawsuit claimed it was unjust that he was denied the same programs and benefits as citizens were getting in other federal prisons. The case was Gallagos versus United States and we’re going to be reading some evidence from that case because the 3 judges voted unanimously Negative and denied his claims. They’re a lot more knowledgeable about constitutional law and the rights of prisoners than any of us in this room, and we will show you today why you should listen to those judges and join them in a Negative ballot.

INHERENCY

1. A/T “Private prisons”

**[Some of the segregated non-citizen prisons are run by private contracting companies, not the BOP directly, and AFF may claim that’s a bad thing. If they do…]**

Status Quo solves: Biden ordered an end to privately operated federal prisons in January 2021

Morgan Simon 2021 (journalist) 27 Jan 2021 “What Does Biden's "Ban" On Private Prisons Really Mean?” <https://www.forbes.com/sites/morgansimon/2021/01/27/what-does-bidens-ban-on-private-prisons-really-mean/> (accessed 5 Nov 2021)

The core of the order is one sentence: “The Attorney General shall not renew Department of Justice contracts with privately operated criminal detention facilities, as consistent with applicable law.”  This statement has the power to eventually cut off as much as 23% and 22% of [GEO Group and CoreCivic’s revenue](https://www.motherjones.com/crime-justice/2021/01/biden-order-justice-department-private-prisons/)s respectively, by ending its contacts with the Bureau of Prisons and Marshals Service.

HARMS / SIGNIFICANCE

1. Prison segregation isn’t bad

Prisoners aren’t entitled to all the same constitutional rights as free citizens. And the risk to their lives outweighs any constitutional concerns

Clarence Thomas 2005 (Justice of the US Supreme Court) dissent in the case of Johnson v. California 543 US 499 23 Feb 2005 <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/543/499/> (accessed 4 Nov 2021)

The Constitution has always demanded less within the prison walls. Time and again, even when faced with constitutional rights no less “fundamental” than the right to be free from state-sponsored racial discrimination, we have deferred to the reasonable judgments of officials experienced in running this Nation’s prisons. There is good reason for such deference in this case. California oversees roughly 160,000 inmates, in prisons that have been a breeding ground for some of the most violent prison gangs in America—all of them organized along racial lines. In that atmosphere, California racially segregates a portion of its inmates, in a part of its prisons, for brief periods of up to 60 days, until the State can arrange permanent housing. The majority is concerned with sparing inmates the indignity and stigma of racial discrimination. Ante, at 6–7. California is concerned with their safety and saving their lives.

2. Prison officials know better than we do

Prison officials are the best qualified to determine how to house prisoners

Clarence Thomas 2005 (Justice of the USSupreme Court) dissent in the case of Johnson v. California 543 US 499 23 Feb 2005 <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/543/499/> (accessed 4 Nov 2021)

Well before Turner, this Court recognized that experienced prison administrators, and not judges, are in the best position to supervise the daily operations of prisons across this country. See, e.g., Jones v. North Carolina Prisoners’ Labor Union, Inc., [433 U. S. 119](https://supreme.justia.com/us/433/119/index.html), 125 (1977) (courts must give “appropriate deference to the decisions of prison administrators”); Procunier, supra, at 405 (“[C]ourts are ill equipped to deal with the increasingly urgent problems of prison administration and reform”). Turner made clear that a deferential standard of review would apply across-the-board to inmates’ constitutional challenges to prison policies.

3. Good reasons for denial of programs in the non-citizen prison

Good reason for denial of rehab programs: Non-citizens are a flight risk

5th Circuit Court of Appeals 2012. (unanimous opinion of the 3-judge panel of a federal appeals court) GALLEGOS–HERNANDEZ, v. United States 18 July 2012 688 F.3d 190 (5th Cir. 2012) <https://casetext.com/case/gallegoshernandez-v-united-states> (accessed 4 Nov 2012) (Gallegos was a Mexican citizen in federal prison who filed a lawsuit in federal court challenging the different treatment – fewer programs and lack of early release opportunities – that applied to non-citizens. He lost the case.)

Gallegos has filed a habeas petition under [28 U.S.C. § 2241](https://casetext.com/statute/united-states-code/title-28-judiciary-and-judicial-procedure/part-vi-particular-proceedings/chapter-153-habeas-corpus/section-2241-power-to-grant-writ), asserting that the BOP improperly denied him benefits and opportunities made available under [18 U.S.C. §§ 3621](https://casetext.com/statute/united-states-code/title-18-crimes-and-criminal-procedure/part-ii-criminal-procedure/chapter-229-postsentence-administration/subchapter-c-imprisonment/section-3621-imprisonment-of-a-convicted-person) and 3624 on the basis that he is not a U.S. citizen. Sections 3621 and 3624 involve drug treatment and other rehabilitation programs, which, if completed, offer prisoners potential reductions in sentence up to 12 months. Placement in community-based reentry facilities (i.e., halfway houses) is a component of these programs. [28 C.F.R. § 550.53(a)(1)](https://casetext.com/regulation/code-of-federal-regulations/title-28-judicial-administration/chapter-v-bureau-of-prisons-department-of-justice/subchapter-c-institutional-management/part-550-drug-programs/subpart-f-drug-abuse-treatment-program/55053-residential-drug-abuse-treatment-program-rdap)–(3). The BOP has, however, exercised its discretion to exclude ICE detainees from eligibility for early release and participation in the community-based treatment programs because of the flight risk associated with such prisoners.

Different treatment of non-citizens justified by flight risk, and there’s no “rights” violation

5th Circuit Court of Appeals 2012. (unanimous opinion of the 3-judge panel of a federal appeals court) GALLEGOS–HERNANDEZ, v. United States 18 July 2012 688 F.3d 190 (5th Cir. 2012) <https://casetext.com/case/gallegoshernandez-v-united-states> (accessed 4 Nov 2012) (brackets, parentheses and ellipses in original)

Nor does this claim involve a fundamental right. See Wottlin v. Fleming, [136 F.3d 1032, 1036–37](https://casetext.com/case/wottlin-v-fleming#p1036) (5th Cir.1998); see also Torres v. Chapman, [359 Fed.Appx. 459, 462](https://casetext.com/case/torres-v-chapman-2#p462) (5th Cir.2009) (“Our precedent establishes that the ... opportunity to obtain a reduced sentence [under [§ 3621](https://casetext.com/statute/united-states-code/title-18-crimes-and-criminal-procedure/part-ii-criminal-procedure/chapter-229-postsentence-administration/subchapter-c-imprisonment/section-3621-imprisonment-of-a-convicted-person)] is not a fundamental right.”). Applying rational-basis review, our court has previously held that the determination that ICE detainees are ineligible to participate in prerelease halfway house confinement is rationally related to preventing those detainees from fleeing during the community-based portion of those programs.

Different immigration status justifies different treatment of non-citizens, and it’s not based on discriminatory intent

5th Circuit Court of Appeals 2012. (unanimous opinion of the 3-judge panel of a federal appeals court) GALLEGOS–HERNANDEZ, v. United States 18 July 2012 688 F.3d 190 (5th Cir. 2012) <https://casetext.com/case/gallegoshernandez-v-united-states> (accessed 4 Nov 2012)

As other circuits have recognized, alien prisoners with ICE detainers, such as Gallegos, cannot show that exclusion from rehabilitation programs, or from halfway house placement, establishes that alien prisoners, as an identifiable group, are being treated differently from other similarly situated prisoners who are not aliens. See McLean v. Crabtree, [173 F.3d 1176, 1185](https://casetext.com/case/mclean-v-crabtree#p1185) (9th Cir.1999). This is true because, on its face, the statute and regulations classify prisoners—not as aliens and non-aliens—but as those who have ICE detainers against them and those who do not. Id. Gallegos points to no evidence that the exclusion is motivated by discriminatory intent against aliens. Instead, Gallegos has only shown that the BOP regulations require “prisoners with detainers being treated differently from prisoners without detainers.”

4. Prisoners don’t have a “right” to the things they’re not getting in the non-citizens prison

Prisoners don’t have a right to go to a particular prison or to prison programs or early release

5th Circuit Court of Appeals 2012. (unanimous opinion of the 3-judge panel of a federal appeals court) GALLEGOS–HERNANDEZ, v. United States 18 July 2012 688 F.3d 190 (5th Cir. 2012) <https://casetext.com/case/gallegoshernandez-v-united-states> (accessed 4 Nov 2012)

Gallegos is housed in a facility that segregates alien inmates from citizen inmates.Where he is housed, drug-rehabilitation and other related programs that could lead to early release are not available. The denial of these benefits is the basis of Gallegos's due-process claims. The district court, however, concluded he had no liberty interest in a particular facility or in early release.

 Federal prisoners don’t have a “right” to benefits, programs and opportunities

5th Circuit Court of Appeals 2012. (unanimous opinion of the 3-judge panel of a federal appeals court) GALLEGOS–HERNANDEZ, v. United States 18 July 2012 688 F.3d 190 (5th Cir. 2012) <https://casetext.com/case/gallegoshernandez-v-united-states> (accessed 4 Nov 2012) (brackets and parentheses in original)

Section 3624(c) provides that the BOP “shall, to the extent practicable” afford prisoners an opportunity to prepare for reentry to the community. Gallegos seizes on the word “shall” as creating a liberty interest in these programs and opportunities. Our court, however, explained in Richardson v. Joslin, [501 F.3d 415](https://casetext.com/case/richardson-v-joslin-3) (5th Cir.2007), that “[t]he hallmark of a statute that has not created a liberty interest is discretion,” and “[w]here the statute grants the prison administration discretion, the government has conferred no right on the inmate.” Id. at 419 (emphasis added). As evidenced by the phrase “to the extent practicable” and the employment of “individual basis” review of eligibility provided in the regulations, the BOP has discretion whether to grant the benefits. See [28 C.F.R. § 570.22](https://casetext.com/regulation/code-of-federal-regulations/title-28-judicial-administration/chapter-v-bureau-of-prisons-department-of-justice/subchapter-d-community-programs-and-release/part-570-community-programs/subpart-b-pre-release-community-confinement/57022-designation). Consequently, there is no right conferred here.

Federal prisoners don’t have a right to any early release program

5th Circuit Court of Appeals 2012. (unanimous opinion of the 3-judge panel of a federal appeals court) GALLEGOS–HERNANDEZ, v. United States 18 July 2012 688 F.3d 190 (5th Cir. 2012) <https://casetext.com/case/gallegoshernandez-v-united-states> (accessed 4 Nov 2012) (brackets and parentheses in original; Gallegos is the Mexican citizen in the segregated federal prison who argued he should have the same early release program as citizens get in other prisons.)

Section 3621 provides that the BOP “shall” provide residential substance abuse treatment to prisoners with treatable addictions and shall offer early release as a potential incentive to complete the program. See§ 3621(b) and (e)(2)(B). But this statute does not create a liberty interest in early release. As we have explained in Rublee, [160 F.3d at 216](https://casetext.com/case/rublee-v-fleming#p216), § 3621(e)(2)(B) affords the BOP discretion in deciding whether to allow early release. Id. at 217. Because neither statute creates a liberty interest in the benefits Gallegos claims, his due-process claims fail.

No big deal: Lots of citizen prisoners are also denied rehab and early release programs too

5th Circuit Court of Appeals 2012. (unanimous opinion of the 3-judge panel of a federal appeals court) GALLEGOS–HERNANDEZ, v. United States 18 July 2012 688 F.3d 190 (5th Cir. 2012) <https://casetext.com/case/gallegoshernandez-v-united-states> (accessed 4 Nov 2012)

The Third Circuit also supports this reasoning as it found identical claims—ICE detainees seeking to participate in rehabilitative and early-release programs excluded solely on the basis of their having ICE detainers lodged against them—without merit because the class of ineligible prisoners included non-aliens as well as aliens. Adams v. Apker, 148 Fed.Appx. 93, 95–96 (3d Cir.2005); see also [28 C.F.R. § 550.55(b)](https://casetext.com/regulation/code-of-federal-regulations/title-28-judicial-administration/chapter-v-bureau-of-prisons-department-of-justice/subchapter-c-institutional-management/part-550-drug-programs/subpart-f-drug-abuse-treatment-program/55055-eligibility-for-early-release) (listing inmates not eligible for early release); P.S. 7310.04, pp. 10–11 (listing inmates not ordinarily eligible for halfway house placement).

SOLVENCY

1. Deportation. There’s no benefit giving rehab/training or other programs to non-citizens who are going to be deported.

We don’t get productive members of society, even if rehab programs worked, because these guys are going to be deported

Emma Kaufman 2019 (Bigelow Fellow and Lecturer in Law, University of Chicago Law School) March 2019 SEGREGATION BY CITIZENSHIP , Harvard Law Review prisonershttps://harvardlawreview.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/1379-1444\_Online.pdf (accessed 5 Nov 2021)

Penal institutions are often overlooked in immigration scholarship, which tends to emphasize cooperation between ICE agents and police. Yet prisons were the primary site of enforcement when the pace of deportations began to rise in the 1980s. Three decades later, prison-based enforcement initiatives account for nearly half of all “immigrant apprehensions,” more than most other immigration-enforcement programs combined.

Criminal aliens will be deported

Emma Kaufman 2019 (Bigelow Fellow and Lecturer in Law, University of Chicago Law School) March 2019 SEGREGATION BY CITIZENSHIP , Harvard Law Review prisonershttps://harvardlawreview.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/1379-1444\_Online.pdf (accessed 5 Nov 2021)

Congress encouraged this development with the passage of two laws, the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (IRCA) and the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988. IRCA, which introduced employer sanctions into immigration law, also included a brief provision requiring the Attorney General to “begin any deportation proceeding as expeditiously as possible” after a noncitizen is convicted of a deportable offense.

Just about every crime makes non-citizens eligible for deportation

Emma Kaufman 2019 (Bigelow Fellow and Lecturer in Law, University of Chicago Law School) March 2019 SEGREGATION BY CITIZENSHIP , Harvard Law Review prisonershttps://harvardlawreview.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/1379-1444\_Online.pdf (accessed 5 Nov 2021) (brackets added)

In April 1996, AEDPA [Anti-terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act] made more than ten new crimes “aggravated felonies.” § 440(e), 110 Stat. at 1277–78. Six months later, IIRIRA [Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act] expanded the term “aggravated felony” and amended existing immigration laws to subject noncitizens convicted of firearm offenses and almost all drug offenses to deportation. See Pub. L. No. 104-208, § 321, 110 Stat. 3009-627 to -628. As a result, conviction for any misdemeanor or felony controlled substance offense other than a single conviction for simple possession of thirty grams or less of marijuana renders a noncitizen eligible for deportation.

2. All rehab programs fail

**Providing non-citizens the same programs citizen prisoners get is useless because there are no rehab programs that actually do any good.**

Every program that’s ever been tried has failed to reduce recidivism

Leonard Adam Sipes, Jr. 2019 (Retired federal senior spokesperson. Thirty-five years of award-winning public relations for national and state criminal justice agencies. Former Senior Specialist for Crime Prevention for the Department of Justice’s clearinghouse. Former Director of Information Services, National Crime Prevention Council. Former Adjunct Associate Professor of criminology and public affairs-Univ. of Maryland) 3 June 2019 Nothing Works For Offender Rehabilitation? <https://www.crimeinamerica.net/nothing-works-for-offender-rehabilitation/> (accessed 9 Sept 2021)

But the issue isn’t the Second Chance Act, it’s EVERY program evaluated by the US Department of Justice and most from other sources. They either don’t reduce recidivism, make things worse or have a marginal impact of less than ten percent. What this means is that when there are reductions in recidivism, over ninety percent of people fail. They are rearrested or reincarcerated. Some multiple times. If over ninety percent of people taking an experimental drug showed no results, the CDC would stop the experiment immediately; continuance would be harmful to society.

Lots of good intentions… but there are zero prison rehab programs that actually make society safer

Leonard Adam Sipes, Jr. 2019 (Retired federal senior spokesperson. Thirty-five years of award-winning public relations for national and state criminal justice agencies. Former Senior Specialist for Crime Prevention for the Department of Justice’s clearinghouse. Former Director of Information Services, National Crime Prevention Council. Former Adjunct Associate Professor of criminology and public affairs-Univ. of Maryland) 3 June 2019 Nothing Works For Offender Rehabilitation? <https://www.crimeinamerica.net/nothing-works-for-offender-rehabilitation/> (accessed 9 Sept 2021)

There are dozens of national criminological or advocacy associations pleading for treatment programs, and I understand why. They are humanistic or religious efforts to assist people. They make prisons safer, saner places. But we have no business suggesting that programs make society safer. Blind advocacy of programs doesn’t help anyone, [Advocacy](https://www.crimeinamerica.net/blind-advocacy-of-offender-rehabilitation-programs-hurts-all/). If not programs, what options do we have? The answer beyond sentencing reform is none.

A/T “Lack of funding is why they don’t work” – Turn: They’re not funded because they don’t work

Leonard Adam Sipes, Jr. 2019 (Retired federal senior spokesperson. Thirty-five years of award-winning public relations for national and state criminal justice agencies. Former Senior Specialist for Crime Prevention for the Department of Justice’s clearinghouse. Former Director of Information Services, National Crime Prevention Council. Former Adjunct Associate Professor of criminology and public affairs-Univ. of Maryland) 3 June 2019 Nothing Works For Offender Rehabilitation? <https://www.crimeinamerica.net/nothing-works-for-offender-rehabilitation/> (accessed 9 Sept 2021)

By the way, why does the data show that programs for offenders are so underfunded? It’s because most who fund them do not believe they work. It’s just that simple.

Employment and education programs won’t solve anything until we solve mental health and drug abuse, and even then they will mostly fail

Leonard Adam Sipes, Jr. 2019 (Retired federal senior spokesperson. Thirty-five years of award-winning public relations for national and state criminal justice agencies. Former Senior Specialist for Crime Prevention for the Department of Justice’s clearinghouse. Former Director of Information Services, National Crime Prevention Council. Former Adjunct Associate Professor of criminology and public affairs-Univ. of Maryland) 3 June 2019 Nothing Works For Offender Rehabilitation? <https://www.crimeinamerica.net/nothing-works-for-offender-rehabilitation/> (accessed 9 Sept 2021)

Offenders, especially those released from prison, carry massive problems that are not going to be amended by employment or educational programs. The President’s The Council of Economic Advisers is probably right, the best hope we have is to address mental health and substance abuse issues and even there, they suggest that the vast majority of offenders are still going to fail.

DISADVANTAGES

1. Racial violence

Inmates and staff agree: segregation reduces prison violence

Elizabeth Ross 2016 (journalist) 27 Apr 2016 “California prisons struggle to adapt to desegregation” <https://theworld.org/stories/california-prisons-struggle-adapt-desegregation> (accessed 4 Nov 2021)

[former California inmate Sam] Lewis told [documentary producer Noel] Schwerin that even if you didn’t arrive in a gang at Soledad, you had no choice with whom to associate with. Schwerin says that the inmates and correctional staff adopted the rules of segregation due to the absence of security and safety. “Individuals on both sides of the bars turns toward the system for order and the maintenance of order,” she says.

Link: The all-foreign prisons are almost uniformly populated by Latino/Mexican prisoners

Emma Kaufman 2019 (Bigelow Fellow and Lecturer in Law, University of Chicago Law School) March 2019 SEGREGATION BY CITIZENSHIP , Harvard Law Review prisonershttps://harvardlawreview.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/1379-1444\_Online.pdf (accessed 5 Nov 2021)



Link: We’re not claiming that Latino prisoners are worse than other ethnic groups.

We’re just arguing that the sudden influx of a single ethnic group into other prisons after their plan takes effect is a recipe for disaster. The same thing would happen with any other ethnic group, as we see in the next..

Link: Greater heterogeneity (mixing of different groups) in prisons leads to more gangs and conflict

**This card is arguing that when you increase the diversity of a prison population, it motivates them to self-segregate into rival groups and form gangs, which then leads to a lot of problems.**

Prof. Derek A. Kreager and Dr. Candace Kruttschnitt 2017 (Kraeger - Professor of Sociology and Criminology, Penn. State Univ. Kruttschnitt – PhD in sociology ) 13 Oct 2017 “INMATE SOCIETY IN THE ERA OF MASS INCARCERATION” <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5846711/> (accessed 5 Nov 2021) (note on author’s intent: The authors are reviewing the literature and studies on prisoners, which is why they are talking about the beliefs of others in this quote. They are citing this as the current findings of published research and do not express disagreement with it in their article.)

[Skarbek (2014)](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5846711/#R109) also discusses the impacts of increased prison racial heterogeneity on inmate social order. Specifically, he argues that greater black and Hispanic prison representation resulted in increased racial segregation and between-race antagonisms. This proposition parallels work in school networks, where more equal representation by race has been associated with heightened levels of intra-school racial segregation ([Moody 2001](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5846711/#R90)). This fractionalization, [Skarbek (2014)](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5846711/#R109) asserts, combined with the rise of prison gangs to create a balkanized social system made up of race-based gangs competing for shares in prison illicit activities, principally the drug trade

Link: California study finds desegregation in prison fails and leads to conflict. Inmates and guards agree it’s better not to push desegregation

Prof. Derek A. Kreager and Dr. Candace Kruttschnitt 2017 (Kraeger - Professor of Sociology and Criminology, Penn. State Univ. Kruttschnitt – PhD in sociology ) 13 Oct 2017 “INMATE SOCIETY IN THE ERA OF MASS INCARCERATION” <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5846711/> (accessed 5 Nov 2021)

[Trammell’s (2012)](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5846711/#R121) interviews with ex-convicts support [Skarbek’s (2014)](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5846711/#R109) description of the prison racial divide, at least within the Californian correctional system. The men in her study described California’s prisons as being highly segregated by race where violent incidents commonly occurred along racial lines despite the fact that the majority of individual inmates also socialized daily with friends from other races. Inmates thus enforced norms of racial segregation and resisted official mandates, such as the Supreme Court decision, to desegregate prisons. Prison authorities, in turn, acquiesced to inmate racial norms in order to maintain system stability (Goodman, 2008).

Impact: Prison race riots cause injury and death. Example: California state prison, where Hispanic inmates were hardest hit

**Sarah Spiegel generally agrees with the Affirmative position, but she admitted in 2007 QUOTE:**

Sarah Spiegel 2007 (J.D. Univ of Calif.-Berkeley Law school) Prison Race Riots – AN Easy Case for Segregation? CALIFORNIA LAW REVIEW Dec 2007 <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20439144> (accessed 4 Nov 2021)



A/T “None of these examples are federal, they’re all from states”

Because we haven’t done the AFF plan yet. We can see what States are doing and learn from it.