Negative: Moms Relocation

By “Coach Vance” Trefethen

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

Case Summary: The AFF plan requires federal prisoners who are mothers to be located at the nearest federal prison to where their children are located to increase in-person visitation. May be called the “Moms Act” by some debaters. NEG position: Status Quo is already doing all it can. The biggest barrier is that there just aren’t many federal women’s prisons, so it’s impossible to put most women anywhere near their children. And that’s probably a good thing, because moms who are felons are a bad influence on their kids. The kids are better off NOT being around such models of parenting. And most of them end up in foster care or adoption anyway, so they’ll be moved to another city right after mom gets transferred near the city where they were living.
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Negative: Moms Relocation

TOPICALITY

1. No significant reform

Definition of significant

Merriam Webster Online Dictionary copyright 2021. https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/significant

of a noticeably or measurably large amount

Affirmative burden: Prove the size of the reform

Affirmative needs to produce numbers showing how many women prisoners would be transferred after their plan takes effect, compared to the total number of women prisoners. That’s the size of the reform. If it’s 1%, the plan is not a substantial reform. If it’s 100%, then maybe it is substantial. Maybe most federal women prisoners are already as close as they can get to their children based on the location of federal prisons. It’s their burden to prove it, and until they do, their plan isn’t affirming the resolution.

Impact: No one affirming the resolution means Negative ballot.

If no one in the room is advocating significant reform, then there’s no Affirmative team in this debate. If no one affirms the resolution, then no matter who wins the round, you should vote Negative.

INHERENCY

1. Can’t do any better than Status Quo is doing on women’s placement

Status Quo policy already requires women be placed close to children. But distances can’t get any shorter because there aren’t many federal women’s prisons

US Commission on Civil Rights 2020. (an independent, bipartisan agency established by Congress in 1957) Women in Prison: Seeking Justice Behind Bars Briefing Report Before The United States Commission on Civil Rights Held in Washington, D.C. Briefing Report February 2020 <https://www.usccr.gov/files/pubs/2020/02-26-Women-in-Prison.pdf> (accessed 4 Dec 2021)

In addition, BOP’s Female Offender Manual states that the location of female inmates’ children and families should be considered and discussed when deciding where to place women in federal custody. However, placing women in prison near their families is challenging given the limited number of women’s facilities. In fact, more than 25 percent of women in federal prisons are housed in facilities further than 500 miles from their legal residence. By way of comparison, a recent study that analyzed data for the Survey of Inmates in State Correctional Facilities found that only 10 percent of people in state prisons lived over 500 miles from their homes. The issue of prison placement and distance from families therefore impacts women inmates significantly more than men inmates, if for no other reason than that there are fewer facilities in which to house incarcerated women, which increases their likelihood of distance from home.

Best we can do is put women in halfway houses close to families at the end of their sentence, and we’re already doing that

US Commission on Civil Rights 2020. (an independent, bipartisan agency established by Congress in 1957) Women in Prison: Seeking Justice Behind Bars Briefing Report Before The United States Commission on Civil Rights Held in Washington, D.C. Briefing Report February 2020 <https://www.usccr.gov/files/pubs/2020/02-26-Women-in-Prison.pdf> (accessed 4 Dec 2021) (brackets in original)

At the Commission’s February briefing, BOP’s representative Dr. Alix McLearen stated that:  
there’s 29 [women’s] facilities and I don’t think that we’re here to suggest that we build more prisons, but that means that just by math, if you’re spreading those across the country, there may not be a facility right near somebody’s home. [P]art of our process towards re-entry is the residential re-entry center, or what you might think of as a halfway house. We call them RRCs and those are the facilities that are community-based that somebody transitions into on their way out of the system where they can continue to do programs. And we have more than 200 of those facilities so it’s much more likely that somebody would be placed in their local community or very close to their local community at that end part [of their sentence] before they are completely released from the system.

HARMS / SIGNIFICANCE

1. Women already get special treatment just for having children

Women federal prisoners get lighter sentences than men, due to judges perceiving their responsibility for child care

UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION 2004. “FIFTEEN YEARS OF GUIDELINES SENTENCING An Assessment of How Well the Federal Criminal Justice System is Achieving the Goals of Sentencing Reform” Nov 2004 <https://www.ojp.gov/pdffiles1/Digitization/208044NCJRS.pdf> (accessed 4 Dec 2021)

Whether these patterns of more lenient sentencing for women reflect unwarranted disparities or legitimate sentencing considerations that happen to disproportionately benefit women has been the subject of lively debate. Analyses of data and case law have suggested that judges' paternalistic attitudes toward women might hold women to be more vulnerable and sympathetic and less responsible than men (Nagel & Johnson, 1994; Segal, 2000; Schazenbach, 2004). Differences may arise from enduring attitudes that hold women more responsible for child care. Part of the more lenient treatment may arise, however, from differences between the genders that are relevant to sentencing but not well captured by the available data. Several commentators have noted that women offenders are often among the least culpable members of criminal conspiracies, yet are subject to lengthy sentences due to the conduct of their accomplices, on whom they may be emotionally or financially dependent (Demleitner, 1995).

SOLVENCY

1. Need new prisons. A lot of them.

Big reason why women are located some distance from children: Because there are fewer women’s prisons

Dr. Susan Hatters Friedman, Dr. Aimee Kaempf and Dr. Sarah Kauffman 2020 (Dr. Friedman is the Phillip Resnick Professor of Forensic Psychiatry, Professor of Reproductive Biology and Pediatrics, Adjunct Professor of Law, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland and Honorary Associate Professor of Psychological Medicine, Univ of Auckland, New Zealand. Dr. Kaempf is Associate Professor of Clinical Psychiatry, University of Arizona College of Medicine. Dr. Kauffman is Women's Mental Health Fellow, Columbia University Medical Center, New York city) Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law Online May 2020 “The Realities of Pregnancy and Mothering While Incarcerated” <http://jaapl.org/content/early/2020/05/13/JAAPL.003924-20> (accessed 3 Dec 2021)

Many barriers for visitation of incarcerated mothers exist, including that, because there are fewer women's prisons, there are greater distances between mothers and children. This article reviews data about pregnancy and motherhood in corrections, and it discusses the international state of mother-baby units, with implications for U.S. corrections.

Scarcity of women’s prisons is why women can’t be closer to children (so judges compensate by giving shorter sentences)

UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION 2004. “FIFTEEN YEARS OF GUIDELINES SENTENCING An Assessment of How Well the Federal Criminal Justice System is Achieving the Goals of Sentencing Reform” Nov 2004 <https://www.ojp.gov/pdffiles1/Digitization/208044NCJRS.pdf> (accessed 4 Dec 2021)

Judges may seek to mitigate the effects of strict application of the guidelines rules based on female offenders sometimes being dominated by more culpable male accomplices. There is also reason for judges to believe that women are more instrumental in raising their children than their male counterparts (Wald, 1995; Raeder, 1993), and may suffer more from imprisonment than do men due to greater separation from their families caused by the relative scarcity of prisons for women (Seldin, 1995).

Big sections of the US don’t even have any federal women’s prisons

US Commission on Civil Rights 2020. (an independent, bipartisan agency established by Congress in 1957) Women in Prison: Seeking Justice Behind Bars Briefing Report Before The United States Commission on Civil Rights Held in Washington, D.C. Briefing Report February 2020 <https://www.usccr.gov/files/pubs/2020/02-26-Women-in-Prison.pdf> (accessed 4 Dec 2021)

As mentioned above, BOP houses female federal inmates in one of their 29 facilities, which means that there is an average of fewer than one women’s federal facility per state. Women’s facilities are especially lacking in the Northwestern and Central parts of the United States (see Figure 9).

Impact: No new prisons = no solvency

Since the AFF plan contains no budget to build new women’s prisons, you can never solve for putting women close to children. You’d have to build dozens of new prisons spread out geographically all over the country, including Alaska, Hawaii, all the territories, etc.

2. In-person visits not beneficial to children

Dallaire Study: In-person child-parent visits can be worse for children than letters and phone calls

Prof. Julie Poehlmann-Tynan 2015 (Professor of Human Ecology at the University of Wisconsin–Madison) Focus Vol. 32, No. 2, Fall/Winter 2015–16 “Children’s contact with incarcerated parents” <https://www.irp.wisc.edu/publications/focus/pdfs/foc322c.pdf> (accessed 4 Dec 2021)

Dallaire and colleagues found that the relationship between parent-child contact and child behavior problems varied as a function of type of contact, which is not surprising since children’s experiences of in-person barrier visits vastly differ from their experiences talking with a parent on the telephone or reading and writing letters. The researchers found that for children who had more frequent barrier visits with their jailed mothers, problems such as anxiety, withdrawal, or depression were reported more often. In contrast, frequent letter writing and telephone contact were associated with fewer behavior problems. These results suggest that inperson visits with their mother behind a Plexiglas barrier may make it harder for children to maintain their own, gentler version of reality about their incarcerated parent. Such visits may generate strong negative emotions that are less likely to arise, and easier to assuage, when communication with their mother takes place in the comfort of their own home.

McClure Study: More contact with prison mothers produced higher anxiety and depression among the children

Prof. Julie Poehlmann-Tynan 2015 (Professor of Human Ecology at the University of Wisconsin–Madison) Focus Vol. 32, No. 2, Fall/Winter 2015–16 “Children’s contact with incarcerated parents” <https://www.irp.wisc.edu/publications/focus/pdfs/foc322c.pdf> (accessed 4 Dec 2021)

McClure and colleagues used longitudinal data on contact and maternal adjustment at three time points, including after the mother’s release from prison. Following families during the reunification period is a rarity in the literature focusing on parental incarceration, and an important step in documenting the longer-term implications of parent-child contact for maternal and family functioning. The researchers found positive outcomes for mothers who had more contact with their children, including lower recidivism rates six months after release from prison. However, more contact through visits, phone calls, or both, was also associated with higher rates of symptoms reflecting anxiety and depression among children. Longer periods of incarceration, and thus more limited contact between mother and child, were associated with children’s difficulty regulating their emotions, poorer social skills, and behavior problems. These negative effects for children suggest the need for careful consideration by both families and corrections systems of whether and how children should have contact with their incarcerated parents.

3. Missing behavioral skills programs [not in AFF Plan]

McClure Study: Prisons need behavioral and cognitive skill programs for Moms to make child interaction beneficial

Prof. Julie Poehlmann-Tynan 2015 (Professor of Human Ecology at the University of Wisconsin–Madison) Focus Vol. 32, No. 2, Fall/Winter 2015–16 “Children’s contact with incarcerated parents” <https://www.irp.wisc.edu/publications/focus/pdfs/foc322c.pdf> (accessed 4 Dec 2021)

The findings by McClure and colleagues on mother-child contact during and after incarceration are in line with past findings, and support the idea that corrections facilities should identify ways to facilitate positive parent-child contact. There is an accruing literature on how this might be done but the field is still in its infancy. To date, what appears to be most promising for incarcerated parents is helping them develop specific cognitive and behavioral skills relevant to emotional regulation and positive parent-child interactions, both inside and outside of the corrections setting. In addition, the findings presented by McClure and colleagues suggest that more generalized stress management programs for incarcerated parents could have positive effects on inmate health and functioning, and result in more successful adjustment to life after incarceration. This may be particularly true for parents with longer sentences, although this requires further study for incarcerated fathers.

4. More study needed

Rigorous, focused research is needed on children of incarcerated parents, and existing federal research isn’t good enough

Prof. Julie Poehlmann-Tynan 2015 (Professor of Human Ecology at the University of Wisconsin–Madison) Focus Vol. 32, No. 2, Fall/Winter 2015–16 “Children’s contact with incarcerated parents” <https://www.irp.wisc.edu/publications/focus/pdfs/foc322c.pdf> (accessed 4 Dec 2021)

Rigorous, focused, practical research is also needed on children of incarcerated parents and their families. A key question is how to accomplish such research when funding is tight and such a research agenda does not fit neatly into any one federal agency’s domain. In recognition of this fact, the federal government has assembled an interagency working subgroup on children with incarcerated parents, which comprises diverse departments including the Federal Bureau of Prisons, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the Department of Health and Human Services, and disseminates information on the topic. However, even when there is a match between a research agenda and interested agencies, much of the available funding goes to programs rather than research, with programs often requiring only a minimal evaluation component.

5. Won’t survive constitutional challenge

Special rights for women in prison but not men will be voided by courts for violating the Constitution

US Commission on Civil Rights 2020. (an independent, bipartisan agency established by Congress in 1957) Women in Prison: Seeking Justice Behind Bars Briefing Report Before The United States Commission on Civil Rights Held in Washington, D.C. Briefing Report February 2020 <https://www.usccr.gov/files/pubs/2020/02-26-Women-in-Prison.pdf> (accessed 4 Dec 2021)

This report studies the civil rights of women in the United States prison system. The Constitution and federal statutes require that men and women in prison receive equal treatment.

6. Kids are gone. They’re taken away by the Adoption & Safe Families Act

Doesn’t matter where mom is located: The Adoption & Safe Families Act terminates parental rights and moves kids away to foster care or adoption in another city while mom is in prison

US Commission on Civil Rights 2020. (an independent, bipartisan agency established by Congress in 1957) Women in Prison: Seeking Justice Behind Bars Briefing Report Before The US Commission on Civil Rights. Briefing Report February 2020 <https://www.usccr.gov/files/pubs/2020/02-26-Women-in-Prison.pdf> (accessed 4 Dec 2021)

In addition, the aforementioned Bureau of Justice Statistics report demonstrates that when compared to men, incarcerated women who were the primary caretaker prior to incarceration were almost 5 times more likely to have their children be placed in foster care or state agency care (see Table 6) and were likely to have their parental rights taken away more often. When a child goes into the foster care system, the child not only risks multiple placements with various families; each time, the child may live in a new community, attend a new school, and possibly lose contact with parents who are incarcerated. In addition, under the federal Adoption and Safe Families Act, termination of parental rights is possible for parents of a minor child who spends 15 out of the past 22 months in foster care. Adoption, after a termination of parental rights, could thus ensue because of a parent’s incarceration—even if the parent is participating in rehabilitative services or parenting classes. However, there are statutory exceptions to the possibility of termination of parental rights, including when adoption may not be in the best interests of the child. Data regarding how many children have been impacted since the Adoption and Safe Families Act was enacted in 1997 are complex, because termination of parental rights due to incarceration was on the rise before then. Moreover, courts’ interpretation of the Adoption and Safe Families Act depends on state law, and several states (Massachusetts, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, and Oklahoma) have enacted laws prohibiting termination of parental rights solely on the basis of incarceration. More than one-third of minor children whose parent or parents are incarcerated will turn 18 years old while a parent is incarcerated. The Adoption and Safe Families Act may impact many incarcerated parents, as the vast majority of parents in state and federal prisons serve sentences that are a year or longer.

DISADVANTAGES

1. Harmful to children. Children are better off separated from criminal moms.

Link: Surprise! Criminals make bad parents, so the less time kids spend with them, the better

[Charles Fain Lehman](https://www.manhattan-institute.org/expert/charles-lehman) 2021 (fellow at the Manhattan Institute, working primarily on the [Policing and Public Safety Initiative](https://www.manhattan-institute.org/policing-public-safety), and a contributing editor of *City Journal*) 24 May 2021 “Parents and Prisons” [Institute for Family Studies](https://ifstudies.org/blog/parents-and-prisons)  https://www.manhattan-institute.org/parents-and-prisons (accessed 31 Oct 2021)

The subset of the population that ends up incarcerated is disproportionately likely to have character traits particularly adverse to good parenting. As my colleague Rafael Mangual [has noted](http://www.city-journal.org/fathers-families-incarceration-harm), antisocial personality disorder is 10 to 23 times more common in prisoners than it is in the general population, suggesting that prisons tend to select personalities at risk for harming their children. High rates of recidivism—more than 80% of prisoners released are rearrested within 10 years, the Bureau of Justice Statistics [has found](http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/18upr9yfup0514.pdf)—similarly support the idea that prison populations are made up of those most prone to taking advantage of and harming others, including their children. The evidence on partner behavior in the paper, indicating that some parents make their partners more likely to commit crimes, also supports this notion that some parents are just dangerous influences.

**[Background on the Ohio Study evidence below: All the parents in the study are in the criminal justice system – they’re all criminals. The study compared the kids of criminal parents where the parents were in prison versus kids with criminal parents who were not in prison (e.g. probation, or some other non-prison scenario). The kids with criminal parents IN prison turned out better than the kids with criminal parents NOT in prison.]**

“Kids with parents in prison do poorly” – No surprise, they’re bad parents. Ohio study finds troubled kids do better when their criminal parents are in prison (where the kids can’t interact with them)

[Charles Fain Lehman](https://www.manhattan-institute.org/expert/charles-lehman) 2021 (fellow at the Manhattan Institute, working primarily on the [Policing and Public Safety Initiative](https://www.manhattan-institute.org/policing-public-safety), and a contributing editor of *City Journal*) 24 May 2021 “Parents and Prisons” [Institute for Family Studies](https://ifstudies.org/blog/parents-and-prisons)  https://www.manhattan-institute.org/parents-and-prisons (accessed 31 Oct 2021)

Pointing to [evidence](http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.526.2929&rep=rep1&type=pdf) that children with incarcerated parents [do worse](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3703506/) on a host of indicators than their peers with intact families, they argue that the costs of "breaking up" a family often outweigh the benefits to public safety, and that therefore pro-family conservatives must necessarily be in favor of decarceration. Much of the evidence used to make this argument, however, is limited in its capacity to really establish a causal link between parental incarceration and worse outcomes. Children of incarcerated parents may already be on a worse path for reasons other than the fact of their parent's incarceration—a worse family environment precipitated by the same character traits that made their parent likely to be a criminal offender. To really separate out the effect of parental incarceration on children's outcomes, researchers need a source of randomness in a parent's propensity to be incarcerated, one necessarily uncorrelated with their children's outcomes. [A new study](http://poseidon01.ssrn.com/delivery.php?ID=796114123085010071121111102092080092006004029014029041005112113024101113081025026002049056033008027023042096111112101097114003104075040023033103071123084065016105023067033085065126080099109069030116066113086029003120084113025026116019065004091072094105&EXT=pdf&INDEX=TRUE), [forthcoming](http://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/aer.20190415&from=f) in the American Economic Review, identifies just that, and the results are startling. Contrary to the assumption that parental incarceration is destructive to children, the paper finds that parental incarceration reduces children's propensity to be incarcerated and improves their adult neighborhood quality, while having no significant effect on their academic performance.

Methodology of the Ohio study and quantification: Having criminal parents in prison = 40% reduction in chance of child being incarcerated before age 25, compared to criminal parents not in prison

[Charles Fain Lehman](https://www.manhattan-institute.org/expert/charles-lehman) 2021 (fellow at the Manhattan Institute, working primarily on the [Policing and Public Safety Initiative](https://www.manhattan-institute.org/policing-public-safety), and a contributing editor of *City Journal*) 24 May 2021 “Parents and Prisons” [Institute for Family Studies](https://ifstudies.org/blog/parents-and-prisons)  https://www.manhattan-institute.org/parents-and-prisons (accessed 31 Oct 2021)

To reach their conclusions, the paper's authors assembled a rich array of data on prisoners and their children from the three Ohio counties home to Columbus, Cleveland, and Cincinnati. About 60% of the parents in the survey are male, with an average of 1.86 children, who range in age from 1 to 19 years old at the time of their parent's court date. Using these data, they conducted a "judge assignment" study, taking advantage of the random assignment of offenders to judges with a known variability in their propensity to incarcerate as a source of randomness that permitted isolating the effects of parental incarceration from other variables.  Their biggest finding is the effect on children's future propensity to be incarcerated: parental incarceration was linked to a 20% reduction in a child's likelihood of being charged, a 22% cut in chance of being convicted, and a 40% reduction in the chance of being incarcerated before age 25. Notably, those effects are driven by the black children in their data.

Ohio study finds kids with criminal parents in prison have slightly better socioeconomic status than when criminal parents are not in prison

[Charles Fain Lehman](https://www.manhattan-institute.org/expert/charles-lehman) 2021 (fellow at the Manhattan Institute, working primarily on the [Policing and Public Safety Initiative](https://www.manhattan-institute.org/policing-public-safety), and a contributing editor of *City Journal*) 24 May 2021 “Parents and Prisons” [Institute for Family Studies](https://ifstudies.org/blog/parents-and-prisons)  https://www.manhattan-institute.org/parents-and-prisons (accessed 31 Oct 2021)

Just as surprising are the other findings. Parental incarceration actually led to a slight increase (4.1 percentiles) in the socioeconomic status of the neighborhood the child ended up living in. And it had almost-zero, non-significant effects on children's academic performance (math and reading scores, GPA, absenteeism, risk of repeating a grade) and risk of teen parenthood—parental incarceration did not improve these measures in the study, but it didn't harm them, either.

Colombia and Norway studies confirm Ohio study results

[Charles Fain Lehman](https://www.manhattan-institute.org/expert/charles-lehman) 2021 (fellow at the Manhattan Institute, working primarily on the [Policing and Public Safety Initiative](https://www.manhattan-institute.org/policing-public-safety), and a contributing editor of *City Journal*) 24 May 2021 “Parents and Prisons” [Institute for Family Studies](https://ifstudies.org/blog/parents-and-prisons)  https://www.manhattan-institute.org/parents-and-prisons (accessed 31 Oct 2021)

The Ohio study is actually not the only study to find that parental incarceration can have positive effects. Research from Colombia [finds that](http://static1.squarespace.com/static/5664c583e4b0c0bb910ceb3b/t/5bd78c5af9619ae1464f2587/1540852835737/JMP_ARTEAGA_Oct2018.pdf) parental incarceration increased children's years of schooling, while evidence from Norway [offers](http://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w24227/w24227.pdf) similar null estimates.

Impact: Bad childhood leads to bad adulthood, including violence, mental health problems and substance abuse

Dr. James Garbarino 2017 (PhD; Dept of Psychology, Center for the Human Rights of Children, Loyola University) ACEs in the Criminal Justice System ACADEMIC PEDIATRICS September–October 2017 <https://capwayne.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Materials-for-10-Tips-for-Sentencing-Advocacy.pdf> (accessed 4 Dec 2021)

It should not come as a surprise that childhood adversity is common and prominent among individuals who kill people. Childhood adversity leads to trauma and toxic stress, and trauma and toxic stress lead to the kind of developmental damage that in turn can lead to violence (as one among many outcomes, or other outcomes such as substance abuse and mental health that could similarly have repercussions for incarceration either as juveniles or adults) in the United States.

2. Removing women from other recidivism programs

Link: Status Quo federal prison assignment puts women in facilities with programs corresponding to their needs

US Commission on Civil Rights 2020. (an independent, bipartisan agency established by Congress in 1957) Women in Prison: Seeking Justice Behind Bars Briefing Report Before The United States Commission on Civil Rights Held in Washington, D.C. Briefing Report February 2020 <https://www.usccr.gov/files/pubs/2020/02-26-Women-in-Prison.pdf> (accessed 4 Dec 2021)

Women convicted of federal crimes are housed in one of the 29 BOP facilities for women, and there are 111 federal facilities for men. BOP states that it attempts to assign women in prison to facilities that correspond with their security level and programmatic needs (e.g. specific educational, vocational or substance abuse programs).

Link: AFF Plan changes the criterion from their program needs to their location

That’s the whole goal of their plan. A woman may be in a prison that has programs she needs to rehabilitate, but instead she will be transferred to a prison unsuitable for her needs, simply because it’s closer to her children’s location. We’re trading rehabilitation for location.

Impact: The programs women would be losing are the only thing that might reduce recidivism, if it can be reduced at all

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.

3. Masking Disad. AFF diverts resources and attention away from the real solutions

Resources for the AFF plan should instead be directed toward the real solution: Alternatives to mass incarceration

Prof. Julie Poehlmann-Tynan 2015 (Professor of Human Ecology at the University of Wisconsin–Madison) Focus Vol. 32, No. 2, Fall/Winter 2015–16 “Children’s contact with incarcerated parents” <https://www.irp.wisc.edu/publications/focus/pdfs/foc322c.pdf> (accessed 4 Dec 2021)

The implications of mass incarceration for children and families are well-documented. Through short-sighted overreliance on crime policies to address challenging social problems, the United States has created a significant and growing public health crisis for its children and has increased racial disparities in health and well-being of children. Many children who experience the incarceration of a parent are vulnerable and need substantial help now and in the future. These children are at risk for a host of negative outcomes, including the development of antisocial behavior and long-term health and mental health problems. Consideration of alternatives to incarceration may help ease the social and economic burden of corrections on families and society and free up resources that could be used for implementation of preventive interventions to help children with corrections-involved parents become more resilient.