

Mr. Pogreba

AP Language

12 November 2017

94/

When I was very young, my family was on food stamps. When **my mother** realized she was pregnant with my twin sisters, **my father, then a teacher**, went back to school and got another degree in the more lucrative field of computer science, and his decreased income and college payments meant that sometimes we needed assistance with food. Over a decade after we stopped using social welfare programs, we are a solidly upper middle-class family with no criminal record and 3 college degrees. Of course, this is only one story of welfare in America, but it is a very typical one. The narrative that some would tell, one of crime caused by seemingly benevolent social programs, is not the reality for the majority of people who use these programs. Welfare does not, nor has it ever, increased or caused crime rates but simply benefits the needy, often temporarily, to help the job landscape and American society improve.

**Welfare helps needy people so that they can help themselves and contribute to society after they no longer need assistance.** There are many different types of welfare programs; some, like TANF, the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families are intended to be used for a short time, and others, like Social Security, are set in place later in life to help until, often, death. Either way, the vast majority of people on welfare **do** not stay on governmental assistance programs for their entire lives. Significant numbers of people use welfare during times of trouble and stop using welfare when they have the means to. **People using welfare programs do so because they have no other viable option, and while programs differ, most are not**

12 emphasize  
temporarily  
in the  
beginning  
of the  
(TS)

why is this true?  
(D) this claim

nearly enough to completely provide for a family's needs and are only used  
to keep life livable. For most people (excluding people with disabilities or other justification for long-term governmental assistance) welfare is intended only as a boost so families in particular can get back on their feet. People who need time to get a degree, get a new job, or pay for a loved one's medical expenses should be helped back up so they can again become productive members of society. Without welfare, the downward spiral sparked by the loss of a job or a serious injury can easily destroy a person's economic position. These people did nothing wrong and should not be unduly punished for rotten luck or being dealt a bad hand by a lifetime of poverty. A sharp increase in expenses or a decrease in income has to be compensated for in some way, and welfare provides that until other, longer-term arrangements are made.

Is this  
a moral  
claim?

(D)

if.

why not?

TP needs  
but one

extra  
step to  
say why.

I'd shape this (TS) as a boomer ↘

Welfare is not only a beneficial and moral addition to society, but crime rates and welfare simply do not have any direct correlation. They are related through poverty, but statistics don't show a direct effect that welfare has on crime rates. Some may say that welfare causes crime by encouraging deviant behavior and dependency in children, but it is unsupported, and actually, directly refuted by actual evidence. If welfare caused crime, then time before widespread welfare like the 1920s should have been relatively peaceful and crime-free. However, the 1920s was a time when organized crime ran rampant - the most famous of many gangs being the Mafia - run by people who had never received any welfare because there wasn't any to receive. Furthermore, while welfare spending has generally risen since it began (no doubt in part due to inflation), according to the Justice Research and Statistics Association, the crime rate per 100,000 people was mostly stable through the 1930s-50s, made a

In addition to the statistical and historical illegitimacy of **the argument that** welfare causes crime, the social arguments **against** welfare are also unsupported. In his article about welfare for the Heritage Foundation, Robert Rector suggests that welfare undermines the ethos in families concerning "marriage, work, education, and self-control," and this is how welfare contributes to increased crime. However, this connection is not explored in his piece, or at the very least in the excerpt. How seeking assistance in order to provide for one's family undermines one's marriage is unexplained and highly unclear. The connection to work is more obvious, being that welfare supposedly ruins work ethic and encourages laziness in poor families, but most welfare programs are temporary for most families, suggesting that the vast majority of people work to get back off welfare and continue to support themselves. **Family problems like the ones he mentions, like child abuse and illegitimacy, were more covered up in the early 20th century, and are now more widely reported and less shameful to admit. The issue now is not that child abuse has necessarily increased, but that people are finally starting to realize its prevalence and instead of addressing it, are blaming it on the very programs that abuse survivors may need to survive after escaping their abuser. And in any case, the excerpt has two fundamental errors which the argument is built on. First, that welfare was created to "artificially boost household income" to try and address "social and behavioral problems" when it was truly governmentally institutionalized during the Great Depression to help struggling families to survive and then get off welfare as soon as they were able (FDR actually hated the idea of long-term welfare) and the second being his implication that time before welfare wasn't inundated with social problems - they clearly were. The Mafia, rampant infidelity, witch burnings, political corruption and embezzlement, child neglect**

1  
Isn't it possible, Frank, that (u) was shifted?  
1

sharp jump upward at the end of the 1950s, plateaued slightly during the 60s, and rose until the 1980s, when it fell, and then rose again until 1991, when it began to decrease until 1998, when data became unavailable (United States Index). Overall, the crime rate did crudely rise over the 20th century, but this dubious similarity is just rough correlation, not causation. Many other things rose during the 20th century that are entirely unrelated to welfare and crime. The length of fashionable hairstyles for women also rose during the 30s through 50s, jumped up quickly during the 60s, and rose steadily through the 70s and 80s. Clearly, however, longer hairstyles do not cause crime. **The main argument concerning a connection between crime and welfare appears to be that poverty can't cause crime because in times like the 1920s there was apparently less crime and more poverty than today, and the only thing that changed since the 1920s, and thus the only thing that could have caused an increase in crime, is welfare.**

*This feels like it's not needed. You're already covered this from!*

**Of course, there are numerous possible reasons why crime has apparently increased, not the least of which is that it's just far easier to catch and record criminals now. It's also possible that societal standards, being vastly different at the time, resulted in data that is difficult to accurately compare. Another possibility is that poverty does actually cause crime because people are desperately trying to raise their standard of life and status, but during times when huge percentages of the population were at similar poverty levels the incentive to commit crimes was gone, since they were already in the majority. The reality is that the supposed connection between welfare and crime, is, at its absolute best, murky, and at its worst, a thinly veiled attempt to take away help from the most in need to save the undeserving taxpayer a buck.**

*I don't know that this adds as a whole add much new to TP*

and abuse (e.g. sweatshops), lynchings, tar-and-featherings, and slavery are just few examples of twisted morals and outright crime that all occurred before the Great Depression. He is idealizing a highly imperfect era and using to justify his own belief that welfare is atrocious, but his argument is full of holes, and it makes it seem as though welfare is merely being used as a scapegoat for the incredibly complex reasons behind crime. Home life is obviously an important factor in crime; it has been clearly shown that abuse, neglect, and poor parenting all increase the likelihood of criminal behavior, but none of these have an inherent connection to welfare. On the contrary, poor parenting would be letting a two-year old go hungry instead of accepting aid programs specifically designed to help people. The social and "family values" arguments that surround welfare's supposed culpability to American crime are immaterial and incorrectly assign blame on the most needy.

Welfare was created to, adjusted to, and continues to help people continue working, eating, and feeding family members through targeted and varied aid programs. Its connection to crime is entirely through poverty, not any sort of cause and effect scenario. Welfare is being blamed for American crime, a complicated and multi-layered issue that will certainly remain unsolved by removing programs meant to help the most vulnerable in society. Like my family a decade ago, and many of their contemporaries, welfare more often than not benefits and improves people's socioeconomic standing and encourages rather than stagnates the job market. In order to tackle America's crime problem, it will be essential to focus on things that have been clearly shown to cause crime, not slander valuable programs to promote unrelated ideologies.

My one big concern about essay  
is balance — try to avoid  
making 70% of the body  
a refutation of (w).  
The defense of it was  
a bit weaker.

Also, don't get  
fixated on 3  
TPs. There's way  
too much here  
for 3 TP  
studies.

Works Cited

“United States Index Crime Rate.” *Historical Data*, Justice Research and Statistics Association,

[www.jrsa.org/projects/Historical.pdf](http://www.jrsa.org/projects/Historical.pdf).

Mr. Pogreba

90/

AP Language

12 November 2017

When I was very young, my family was on food stamps. Before my sisters were born, my dad was a second-year teacher, my mother mostly stayed home to take care of her daughter but also worked as a substitute and at Sunday school. But when they realized my mother was pregnant with my twin sisters, they understood that their financial situation would need to be re-evaluated. My father went back to school and got another degree in the more lucrative field of computer science, and my dad's decreased income and college payments meant that sometimes we needed assistance with food. Over a decade after we stopped using social welfare programs, we are a solidly upper middle-class family with no criminal record and 3 college degrees in the house. Of course, this is only one story of welfare in America, but it is a very typical one. The narrative that some would tell, one of crime caused by seemingly benevolent social programs, is not the reality for the majority of people who use these programs. Welfare does not, nor has it ever, increased or caused crime rates but simply benefits the needy, often temporarily, to help the job landscape and American society improve.

Intro could probably be condensed to get in practice of writing shorter ones, but it's a good explosion of welfare myths

Make sure that (TS) expresses an argument, not a fact.

[There are many different types of welfare programs; some, like TANF, the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families are intended to be used for a short time, and others, like Social Security, are set in place later in life to help until, often, death.] Either way, the vast majority of people on welfare do not stay on governmental assistance programs for their entire lives. Significant numbers of people use welfare during times of trouble and stop using welfare when they have the means to welfare programs. For most people (excluding people with disabilities or other

1:2 (2) this TP has focusing on when we should, as a society, offer this help

justification for long-term governmental assistance) welfare is intended as a boost so families in particular can get back on their feet. Without welfare, the downward spiral sparked by the loss of a job or a serious injury can easily destroy a person's economic position. A sharp increase in expenses or a decrease in income has to be compensated for in some way, and welfare provides that until other, longer-term arrangements are made.

(Transition) Welfare and crime rates do not have any direct correlation. They are both related through poverty, but statistics don't seem to show a direct effect that welfare has on crime rates. If welfare caused crime, then time before widespread welfare like the 1920s should have been relatively peaceful and crime-free. However, the 1920s was a time when organized crime ran rampant - the most famous of many gangs being the mafia - run by people who had never received any welfare because there wasn't any to receive. Furthermore, while welfare spending has generally risen since it began (no doubt in part due to inflation), according to the Justice Research and Statistics Association, the crime rate per 100,000 people was mostly stable through the 1930s-50s, made a sharp jump upward at the end of the 1950s, plateaued slightly during the 60s, and rose until the 1980s, when it fell, and then rose again until 1991, when it began to decrease until 1998, when data became unavailable. Overall, the crime rate did crudely rise over the 20th century, but this dubious similarity is just rough correlation, not causation. Many other things rose during the 20th century that are entirely unrelated to welfare and crime. The length of fashionable hairstyles for women also rose during the 30s through 50s, jumped up quickly during the 60s, and rose steadily through the 70s and 80s. Clearly, however, longer hairstyles do not cause crime. The supposed connection between welfare and crime, is, at its absolute best, murky, and at its worst, a thinly veiled attempt to take away help from the most in need to save the undeserving taxpayer a buck.

Since you're using outside info, make sure to cite it.

given that the source in the prompt says the opposite, I'd use him as a narrator so you can respond to this claim





the argument that

In addition to the statistical and historical illegitimacy of welfare causing crime, the social arguments for welfare are also unsupported. In his article about welfare for the Heritage Foundation, Robert Rector suggests that welfare undermines the ethos in families concerning "marriage, work, education, and self-control," and this is how welfare contributes to increased crime. However, this connection is not explored in his piece, or at the very least in the excerpt. How seeking assistance in order to provide for one's family undermines one's marriage is unexplained and highly unclear. The connection to work is more obvious, being that welfare supposedly ruins work ethic and encourages laziness in poor families, but most welfare programs are temporary for most families, suggesting that the vast majority of people work to get back off welfare and continue to support themselves. His argument is full of holes, and it makes it seem as though welfare is merely being used as a scapegoat for the incredibly complex reasons behind crime. Home life is obviously an important factor in crime; it has been clearly shown that abuse, neglect, and poor parenting all increase the likelihood of criminal behavior, but none of these have a connection to welfare. On the contrary, poor parenting would be letting a two-year old go hungry instead of accepting aid programs specifically designed to help people. The social and "family values" arguments that surround welfare's supposed culpability to American crime are immaterial.

1/2 deal w/ crime all in one spot in essay

Feels like you need to poke more holes 1st


I'd like to see more of this - a chance for more powerful, passionate written help

Last TP needs to be stronger: instead of just

Welfare was created to, adjusted to, and continues to help people continue working, eating, and feeding family members through targeted and varied aid programs. Its connection to crime is entirely through poverty, not any sort of cause and effect scenario. Welfare is being blamed for American crime, a complicated and multi-layered issue that will certainly remained unsolved by removing programs meant to help the most vulnerable in society. Like my family a decade ago, and many of their contemporaries, welfare more often than not benefits and

Certainly RSP, often a more powerful ~~factor~~ of ~~of~~ of (u)

|



improves people's socioeconomic standing and encourages rather than stagnates the job market.

In order to tackle America's crime problem, it will be essential to focus on things that have been clearly shown to cause crime, not slander valuable programs to promote unrelated ideologies.