**Strategy and RFD:**

*Shania ran a util aff. I didn’t flow the justifications, but the advantages were recidivism, soft power (through abolishing the death penalty), and Islamic prison radicalization. In CX we established that Shania would defend an approach that was not based in prison, and that’s as far as we got with that. It was a util debate, there were about 2:00 of analytics on the AC after this stuff I read. Shania went for prison radicalization and extinction first in the 1ar, and defense on my links to extinction. The 2n was the nuclear accidents DA, crime and systemic impacts first, and non uniques on radicalization. The 2ar was the same as the 1ar, and comparison. Erik Legried voted neg off the risk of nuclear accidents compared to radicalization.*

There is no expungement in the squo due to retributive policies, but the aff expunges criminal records.

**Calvert and Bruno 10**[[1]](#footnote--1)

**An expungement order** is “the erasure of a person’s criminal record.” The term often connotes the complete destruction of a physical record and deletion of an electronic record. Indeed, as Willamette University College of Law Professor James Nafziger recently wrote, the purpose of expungement statutes: has been to **facilitate[s] a convicted person’s reentry into society.** Specifically, **statutes have had** one or more of **the** following **purpose**s: **to eliminate discrimination against convicts who have** fulfilled their sentence terms and have **been** deemed **rehabilitated**, to reduce the potential for continuing public sanction, and to reward rehabilitated convicts. Within its plain meaning, **expungement might** be expected to help **accomplish** these ends **[this] by** sealing or physically **destroying an offender’s record and** thereby **shielding it from public scrutiny.**

**Second link**, she concedes in CX that she defends transferring all offenders from prison to a non-incarceration facility, meaning there can’t be expungement records since they were never in prison.

And, expunging criminal records prevents the nuclear power industry from confirming that their employees are actually trustworthy. **Adams 12**[[2]](#footnote-0)

Please, Fairfield County council and sheriff, whatever you do, do not even think about expunging criminal records.  **The nuclear industry values honesty and dependability more than** almost **any[thing]** other characteristics in its work force **for** very **good reasons**. We do **not just** worry about **“violent” crimes**, **but** about **records that indicate a lack of** fundamental **integrity.** It would be far better for someone to provide accurate details about their youthful indiscretions and what actions they have taken to ensure that they never happen again than to fail to accurately report them.

**If there is a pattern of misbehaving, there is a** good **reason** **why that person** **is not** a good **fit for the nuclear industry.**

It would be beneficial for the people of your county if nuclear industry employers could count on your records being accurate. It would be terribly detrimental if there is even a hint that the records might have been purged to make local people look better. Just think how that knowledge would affect those people in your county who did not run into any scrapes with the law. Do you think it is possible that employers would start looking elsewhere in order to lower the possibility of hiring someone whose skeletons might be found out later?

In small towns, people have long memories. It seems likely to me that there will always be people who remember youthful indiscretions. If I was an employer, I would be worried about the risk of having someone with an expunged record on my payroll – **they might live in fear that someone will tattle** at any time. It’s even possible that **the knowledge of what used to be in the record could be used as a blackmail tool.**

To clarify, it’s not that offenders will work for the nuclear industry, but that not knowing who is an offender destroys trust within facilities.

And, the link is large – two million offenders now don’t have prison records.

Employee background checks are key to preventing accidents. **Resner 12**[[3]](#footnote-1)

The **NRC regulations** even **require** **workers** **to report** on themselves or “self-disclose” **if they**, for whatever reason, believe they **are no longer** mentally and physically **fit to safely perform their duties**. An example of this is an employee undergoing marital problems that are causing them stress that interferes with their duties. Such an employee may be referred to an Employee Assistance Program or their assigned duties may be changed until the person is deemed fit for duty.
If a determination is made to deny the person unescorted access for any reason, **their name** and that fact **is entered into an information sharing database** that NRC requires all U.S. nuclear power plants to use. Should that person attempt to enter (or get a job at) another nuclear plant, **the information** about their access status **would be available for review by the plant they were attempting to access**.
Ultimately, a **determination that an employee is not trustworthy or reliable** – based on behavior observation or self reporting — **has serious implications for that person maintaining their access** authorization **but** such determinations **are necessary to keep** nuclear **power plants operating safely** in their communities.

Nuclear accidents risk extinction, empirical support. **Lendman 11**[[4]](#footnote-2)

"Japanese **officials (ordered evacuations) for people living near two nuclear power plants whose cooling systems broke down," releasing radioactive material, perhaps in far greater amounts than reported.**NHK television and Jiji said the 40-year old Fukushima plant's outer structure housing the reactor "appeared to have blown off, which could suggest the containment building had already been breached." Japan's nuclear regulating agency said radioactive levels inside were 1,000 times above normal.Reuters said the 1995 Kobe quake caused $100 billion in damage, up to then the most costly ever natural disaster. This time, from quake and tsunami damage alone, that figure will be dwarfed. Moreover, under **a** worst case **core meltdown**, all bets are off as the **entire region** and beyond **will be threatened with permanent contamination, making the** most **affected areas unsafe to live in**.On March 12, Stratfor Global Intelligence issued a "Red Alert: Nuclear Meltdown at Quake-Damaged Japanese Plant," saying:Fukushima Daiichi "nuclear power plant in Okuma, Japan, appears to have caused a reactor meltdown." Stratfor downplayed its seriousness, adding that such an event "does not necessarily mean a nuclear disaster," that already may have happened - the ultimate nightmare short of nuclear winter.According to Stratfor, "(A)s long as the reactor core, which is specifically designed to contain high levels of heat, pressure and radiation, remains intact, the melted fuel can be dealt with. If the (core's) breached but the containment facility built around (it) remains intact, the melted fuel can be....entombed within specialized concrete" as at Chernobyl in 1986.In fact, **that disaster killed nearly one million people worldwide from nuclear radiation exposure.** In their book titled, "Chernobyl: Consequences of the Catastrophe for People and the Environment," Alexey Yablokov, Vassily Nesterenko and Alexey Nesterenko said:For the past 23 years, it has been clear that there is a danger greater than nuclear weapons concealed within nuclear power. **Emissions from** this **one reactor exceeded a hundred-fold the** radioactive **contamination of the** **bombs dropped on Hiroshima** and Nagasaki.""No citizen of any country can be assured that he or she can be protected from radioactive contamination. **One nuclear reactor can pollute half the globe**. Chernobyl fallout covers the entire Northern Hemisphere."Stratfor explained that if Fukushima's floor cracked, "it is highly likely that the melting fuel will burn through (its) containment system and enter the ground. This has never happened before," at least not reported. If now occurring, "containment goes from being merely dangerous, time consuming and expensive to nearly impossible," making the quake, aftershocks, and tsunamis seem mild by comparison. Potentially, **millions of lives will be jeopardized.**

Constitutionality is key to credibility – violating the constitution proves that we’re not trustworthy. **Ginsburg 06**[[5]](#footnote-3)

Why might these issues of constitutional design vary across countries? We draw on the literature that treats constitutions as mechanisms for making political precommitments.61 Imagine a constitution written by a single political leader, seeking to establish legitimate authority. The **politician can promise** to behave in particular ways,

for example, not to interfere with the rights of their citizens. **But there is no reason for citizens to believe** mere **promises from their leader**. A promise at Time 1 only has value if the promisee believes that it will be obeyed at Time 2. **This problem is particularly acute when the politician cannot predict the incentives he or she will face in the future.**62 If costs and benefits vary in unpredictable ways, the politician’s promise to behave in the specified way may be less believable. To paraphrase Stephen Holmes, why should people believe their leader when sober, knowing that sometimes leaders can become drunk and behave quite differently?63 Facing this problem, **a rational** constitutional **designer might realize that it makes sense to limit her own power, in order to obtain the consent of those they govern.**

Democratic constitutions can help to serve this role. As Sunstein says, "**Democratic constitutions operate as “precommitment strategies**” in which nations, aware of problems that are likely to arise, take steps to ensure that those problems will not arise or that they will produce minimal damage if they do."64 **Constitutions help make the promises**

**credible by imposing costs on those who violate promises.**65 By tying their own hands, **politicians actually** can **empower their own authority.**

How the US follows their own promises lets other nations know how honest the US will be with them.

Rehabilitation disrespects 5th and 14th Amendment due process protections. **Bull 10**[[6]](#footnote-4)

 The operation of **rehab**ilitative model **has led to sentences that are indeterminate, on the basis that a person should only be released** from obligations **when**, in the opinion of the experts, **a “cure” has been achieved.** The problems associated with rehabilitative approaches include: Limited empirical evidence of their success (Martinson 1974), although recent meta-analysis of large numbers of small rehabilitative schemes has suggested that positive results can be obtained in favorable circumstances and selected offenders (Hudson 2003, p. 30) **[This leads to] A lack of due process; indeterminate** or semi-determinate **sentence place** the **release of offenders in the hands of prison** or probation **authorities**, often **without firm criteria for decision-making, clear accountability or avenues for appeal.** A disregard for the rights of individuals, that they are not to be subjected to compulsory state intervention that is disproportionate to the seriousness of the crime committedThe potential for net widening: even if the crime is relatively minor, an offender who is assessed as needing help might be drawn into the criminal justice system and subject to state control for a considerable period

**On Crime:**

**1. Offenders admit that punishment deters crimes.**

Criminologist’s interviews with juveniles reveals that punishment deters **violent crimes** and reduces recidivism. **Redding 05**

Although only 40% of the **participants reported** considering the chances of getting caught when they committed the offense, **they felt the transfer law would have deterred them had they been aware that they could** be tried as an adult and **receive a lengthy** adult **sentence.** As one juvenile said, “What are you talking about? I’m not doing ten years!” **Overall, they felt that the consequences** of committing the crime **were worse than they had expected. Seventy-six percent thought that being in** jail or **prison would make it less likely that they would commit crimes in the future;** “I don’t want to go through this again,” one participant commented.In comparison to the sanctions they had received in the juvenile court (which many characterized as “a slap on the wrist”), **many felt that** their experiences in **the criminal justice system had finally taught them that there will be serious consequences if they commit crimes:** “This ain’t no juvenile daycare—I’m facing real time now.” “[Being tried as an adult] showed me it’s not a game anymore. Before, I thought that since I’m a juvenile I could do just about anything and just get six months if I got caught. So, I didn’t care and thought I could get away with anything.” The juveniles said they had offended previously inpart because they perceived that the chances of getting caught and receiving a serious sanction were slim.[[7]](#footnote-5)

This evidence comes first:

1. Only criminals can know what works best, so it’s a direct source.
2. Empirics and studies are tainted by current trends in the world or by uncontrolled factors, direct interviews come before imperfect studies. That there are so many studies with opposite conclusions supercharges this argument.

And, deterrence outweighs because 1. it controls the internal link to recidivism mattering and 2. prevents the initial unbeneficial crime from occurring in the first place. Only neg accesses deterrence so I control the first layer of the crime debate.

But, **Redding** also speaks to recidivism so that functions as a turn that outweighs because of data source.

**2.** Rehabilitation comparably failed when evaluating recidivism and violent crimes. **Fishman[[8]](#footnote-6):**

**Rehabilitation** by the Projects **Was** Considered To Be **a Failure.** The failure of the projects was particularly evident with young clients, and **in relation to violent crime.** Overall, the judgment of failure is based upon the magnitude and severity of the criminal recidivism of project clients of all ages which resulted in great cost to both society and to the victims.53 **Failure** **is** also **indicated** **by** **comparison** **of** some project outcomes with those of **a** "**control**" **group**. Cost of Recidivism to Society and Victims.Of the 2,860 clients from seven to seventy-one years of age, 1,182, or **41%, were arrested** a total of 2,072 times during the twelve months **after project entry. These arrests reflect several thousand victims** and many millions of dollars in the costto victims of theft, property damage and injury**.** However, of the 2,072 arrests, 605 **(29%) were for violent crimes.** This means that **about fifty persons may have been killed or raped and 555** robbed or **severely assaulted by these recidivist clients.** This portion of the outcome is the main reason for the conclusion that the human costs of this recidivism are too high.Nor does this conclusion change if the cost is examined for each of the thirteen types of clients shown on Table 3 by age and prior arrests. For example, the comparatively "good" 29% recidivism rate of the 134 clients in the thirty-to-thirty-nine age group does not show that, out of their 147 arrests, about one in five was for a violent crime. When the results of representatives of the primary target groups54 are examined, **most outcomes are actually worse than the summary statistics for all** 2,860 **[three thousand] clients .**55It could be asserted that a 41% recidivism rate indicates that 59% of the clients were successfully rehabilitated. They were non-recidivists. This assertion, however, is not acceptable.When measured in terms of serious and violent crimes, the consequences of recidivism are qualitatively different than those of other measures such as failure to pass a test in reading achievement or job skills. Failure or recidivism in the context of serious or violent crime implies the presence of victims.

Prefer this study:

1. It compared control groups that tested punishment only so it’s a direct comparison to the resolution.
2. It evaluated about 3k people.
3. The study did follow up exams, which is key to ensuring the impact sticks.
4. It’s specific to violent crime, so even if she wins her study is better, my impact outweighs.

Crime kills international credibility, UN reporters confirm. **Falk**[[9]](#footnote-7)
This unabashed avowal of imperial goals is the main thesis of the article, perhaps most graphically expressed in the following words: "**The U**nited **S**tates **can** increase the effectiveness of its military forces and **make** the world safe for soft power, America's inherent comparative advantage." As the glove fits the hand, **soft power** complements hard power within the wider enterprise of transforming the world in the United States' image, or at least in the ideal version of the United States' sense of self.
The authors acknowledge (rather parenthetically) that **their strategy may not work if the US continues** much longer **to be seen unfavourably abroad as a national abode** **of** drugs, **crime**, **[and] violence**, fiscal irresponsibility, family breakdown, and political gridlock. They make a rather meaningless plea to restore "a healthy democracy" at home as a prelude to the heavy lifting of democratising the world, but they do not pretend medical knowledge, and offer no prescriptions for restoring the health of the American body politic. And now, 16 years after their article appeared, it would appear that the adage, "disease unknown, cure unknown", applies.

This means crime turns back the soft power arguments, other countries are watching.

But, systemic impacts outweigh her impacts:

1. If the impact is large, the government will intervene to prevent it. If an advantage leads to nuclear war, affirming the resolution isn’t exclusive solvency. The President or Congress will solve. This operates inside Parfit and Bostrom, if extinction won’t happen then risk doesn’t matter.

2. If the impact will happen, it will happen anyways. Just because we avoid causing extinction today doesn't mean something else won't cause it later.
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