## Freire Add-On (0:13)

The plan is key to revive liberal arts in prison which promotes critical pedagogy.

**Yates 9**[[1]](#footnote-1)

In the 1970s and 1980s, in part **due to** the availability of **the Pell Grant,** a **liberal arts** curriculum **became a major component of** many **prison education** programs in a way that it never had before. According to Mary Wright (2001) the correction education liberal arts programs remained in favor well into the 1990s even as it was de-emphasized in the 54 larger academic world. She gives several reasons, including the slow pace of change in prisons, the lack of flexibility and increased cost of obtaining equipment for technical job training programs. However, in the 1990s, liberal arts in a correctional setting fell into disfavor, and adult basic education and vocational education programs reasserted their primacy in the penal system (Wright, 2001). Vocational programs in prison included plumbing, carpentry, electrical wiring, painting, heating and air conditioning as well as computer literacy. In addition, the emphasis on job training spilled over into the language arts and math programs as they were retooled to focus on technical and applied reading and writing (Steuer, 2001). Between 1995 and 2000, the percentage of state prisons offering college courses decreased from 31% to 26% while those offering basic adult education increased from 76% to 80%. State prisons offering vocational education increased from 54% to 55% and in private prisons it increased from 25% to 44% in the same time period (Harlow, 2003). Several reasons are given for this change in addition to the dissolution of prisoner Pell Grants. One is the perceived threat liberal arts curricula pose to the penal institution. Wright (2001) states that “a **liberal arts** curriculum, **which** often **emphasize**s **critical thinking**, intellectual and moral reasoning and development of an inmate’s sense of self may **pose a challenge to the established order** of a correctional facility” (p. 13). In addition, **with Pell Grants gone, prison**er **education** programs **became** more **dependent** up**on outcome-based funding.** Performance-based management of these programs, like the parallel evolution in public schools, led to “school report cards” that evaluated the effectiveness of the programs in turning out their product (Linton, 2005). Curricula that can lend to empirical studies, such as testing in basic adult education, were given priority 55 over liberal arts, which seemingly has more nebulous outcomes. According to John Linton (2005) of the U.S. Department of Education‟s Correction Education division: “The current climate [requires] that expenditure of public funds be restricted to „scientifically proven‟ effective interventions” (p. 91). Job training fits well to this regime because the results of the program could be measured empirically through the numbers of the test group who are able to obtain work. In addition, recidivism rates could be obtained. Numerous studies have pointed to the inverse relationship between vocational technical programs and recidivism (Hall & Bannatyne, 2000; Mattuci & Johnson, 2003; Young & Mattuci, 2006, Gordon & Weldon, 2003). Empirical studies focusing strictly on recidivism as a measurement of achievement have not been without their faults. In his examination of the more recent works, Charles Ubah (2002) has found a tendency for the inmates to self-select into the programs. These participants were probably more motivated, as a whole, to succeed upon their release, than those who did not participate (Ubah, 2002). Ubah‟s findings bring up another important question: What about those who slip through the cracks in the empirical studies? An example may be found in Robert Mattuci‟s (2003) description of the vocational program that he set up in a New York state prison. It consisted of an eight session program to teach the students basic plumbing skills in order to increase their employment prospects upon release. Mattuci, who had a bachelor‟s degree in education and twenty years experience as a plumber, appeared to incorporate a well-thought out system of pedagogy. He relates that “many inmates have never known a positive schooling experience so they lack the needed confidence to succeed at learning something new. A key to the program is therefore validating their differences as 56 individuals and accommodating their multiple learning styles” (p. 16). Mattuci had them work in groups for all hands-on activities and encouraged group brainstorming and problem solving. Yet, despite the care in which the teacher took in order to facilitate a sense of community on the shop floor, there were a significant number of inmates who did not take to the class. “Especially for the younger inmates, gang activity is very evident. The dropout rate of the male youth in three of the groups was 90%. For those influenced by gangs, there is a total lack of respect for the process of setting goals and working toward them” (Mattuci & Johnson, 2003, p. 17). A conventional vocational program may not reach this group of inmates who, as dropouts of the program are more likely to return to prison. While recidivism is an important issue, it must be understood within context of the many variables that exist both within the inmates and, just as importantly, the conditions that exist once they are released. Barriers to post-release employment include lack of current job skills in a rapidly changing market, lack of available jobs in a tight market, the large hole in the employment history created by incarceration, and perhaps most significantly, the criminal record. With the rise of the information society, even jobs considered “menial,” require criminal background checks. The perceived and actual impediments to employment can decrease the seeker‟s motivation and self image (Pavis, 2002). Combined with conditions that facilitated a life of crime in the first place: poverty, discrimination, substance abuse, the deck is stacked against the average inmate. Conventional job training in itself is clearly not going to arm these people against the challenges of life on the outside. The attributes previously described that led some 57 prisons to reject liberal arts education; the “critical thinking, intellectual and moral reasoning” leading to a “sense of self,” must be cultivated (p. 1). **Freire** (2004), Giroux (2006) **and others have called for** a **pedagogy** that is **freed from the bonds of the “bottom-line**.**”** Mike Cole (2005) puts it succinctly, calling for schools to become sites where “teachers, other school workers and pupils/students not only agitate for changes within the classroom and within the institutional context of the school, but also support a transformation in the objective conditions in which students and their parents labor” (p. 16). In this vision, there is no room for docile workers. **Schools would be** transformed into **emancipatory institutions where workers would** not only be provided basic literacy, vocational skills and liberal arts, but would also **learn to advocate for a better world.** I explore this possibility further in Chapter 5.

## Crime Econ Add-On (0:20)

Extend that Pell Grants solve crime – that’s Buzzini 9.

Crime kills the economy. **AP 8** writes[[2]](#footnote-2)

**The U**nited **S**tates **leads the world in economic loss from death**s **caused by armed crime**, according to a global survey released Friday. The United States registered an estimated loss of up to $45.1 billion in terms of economic productivity because of violent crimes, said the report by the U.N. Development Program and the Geneva-based Small Arms Survey. At least **490,000** people **are killed in armed crimes each year** worldwide, **placing a huge economic cost** and social burden **on nations**, the report said. The report did not give a country-by-country breakdown of the numbers of people killed in armed crimes. But the report said that Colombia, El Salvador, Guatemala, Jamaica and South Africa are among the countries with the highest numbers of recorded violent crimes in the world. More people are killed worldwide in violent crimes every year than in wars, it said, asserting that the phenomenon of armed killings and its economic impact on nations is largely underreported. In the 90 countries surveyed, **the economic cost from people killed by arms each year** is estimated to **total[s]** between **$95 billion** and $163 billion, according to the report. "These estimates are based on calculations of the 'lost product' that is represented by premature deaths from armed violence," said Achim Wennmann of the Small Arms Survey."These people — had they lived — would have contributed as any other individual as productive members of society. Their deaths represent a loss that can be quantified," he told The Associated Press. The cost arising from these deaths includes a wide range of expenses from medical care, legal proceedings, and lost earnings to lost investment, the 162-page report said. Wennmann said the report was based on figures compiled by international organizations and national authorities. The most recent available statistics from all the 90 countries surveyed were from 2004, said Wennmann, one of the editors of the report. He said they had more recent statistics from North America. In 2007, the region lost up to $46.76 billion from armed violence, he said. The vast majority of that loss — up to $44.8 billion — occurred in the United States, said Wennmann.

Economic crisis causes nuclear war. **Royal 10**[[3]](#footnote-3)

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defense behavior of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances **Modelski and Thompson**’s (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, **find**ing **that** rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous **shocks** such as economic crises could **usher in a redistribution of** relative **power** (see also Gilpin, 1981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, **increasing** the risk of **miscalculation** (Fearon 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflicts as **a rising power may** seek to **challenge a declining power** (Werner, 1999). Separately, Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remains unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland’s (1996, 2000) theory of trade expectations suggest that “future expectation of trade” is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behavior of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, **if** the **expectations of future trade decline**, particularly for difficult to replace item such as energy resources, the likelihood for **conflict increases**, as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states. Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write, The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favor. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self-reinforce each other. (Blomberg and Hess, 2002, p. 89) Economic **decline has also been linked with** an increase in the likelihood of **terrorism** (Blomberg, Hess and Weerapana, 2004), which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. “Diversionary theory” suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting **governments have** increased **incentive**s **to fabricate** external military **conflict**s **to create a “rally around the flag” effect**. Wang (1996), DeRouen (1995) and Blomberg, Hess and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997), Miller (1999), and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states due to the fact the democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. De DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States and thus weak Presidential popularity are statically linked to an increase in the use of force. In summary, recent economic scholarship positively correlates economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflict at systemic, dyadic and national levels. This implied connection between integration, crises and armed conflict has not featured prominently in economic-security debate and deserves more attention. This observation is not contradictory to other perspectives that link economic interdependence with a decrease in the likelihood of external conflict, such as those mentioned in the first paragraph of this chapter. Those studies tend to focus on dyadic interdependence instead of global interdependence and do not specifically consider the occurrence of and conditions created by economic crises. As such the view presented here should be considered ancillary to those views.

## Crime Soft Power Add-On (0:22)

Extend that Pell Grants solve crime – that’s Buzzini 9.

Crime kills soft power. **Falk 12**[[4]](#footnote-4)

This unabashed avowal of imperial goals is the main thesis of the article, perhaps most graphically expressed in the following words: "The United States 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.

Soft power solves multiple scenarios for extinction. **Nye and Armitage 07**[[5]](#footnote-5)

Soft power is the ability to attract people to our side without coercion. Legitimacy is central to soft power. **If a** people or **nation believes American objectives to be legitimate, we are more likely to persuade them to follow our lead** without using threats and bribes. Legitimacy can also reduce opposition to—and the costs of—using hard power when the situation demands. Appealing to others’ values, interests, and preferences can, in certain circumstances, replace the dependence on carrots and sticks. Cooperation is always a matter of degree, and it is profoundly influenced by attraction…The information age has heightened political consciousness, but also made political groupings less cohesive. Small, adaptable, transnational networks have access to tools of destruction that are increasingly cheap, easy to conceal, and more readily available. Although the integration of the global economy has brought tremendous benefits, **threats such as pandemic disease and the collapse of financial markets are more distributed and more likely to arise without warning. The threat of** widespread physical harm to the planet posed by **nuclear catastrophe** has existed for half a century, though the realization of the threat **will become more likely as the number of nuclear weapons states increases.** The potential security challenges posed by **climate change raise[s]** the possibility of an entirely **new** set of **threats** for the United States **to consider**… **States** and non-state actors who improve their ability to draw in allies will gain competitive advantages in today’s environment. Those **who alienate potential friends will stand at greater risk.** China has invested in its soft power to ensure access to resources and to ensure against efforts to undermine its military modernization. **Terrorists depend on** their ability to attract **support from the crowd** at least as much as their ability to destroy the enemy’s will to fight.

## Heg Add-On (0:23)

Pell grants are key to competitiveness. **Chazelle 11**[[6]](#footnote-6)

The practical benefits of educating prisoners are well documented. **Over ninety percent of inmates eventually return to society**; those who receive educational programming behind bars are more likely to find jobs and do without government assistance. They have greater hcapacity to support relatives financially, contribute in positive ways to their communities, and help their kids succeed in school and stay out of trouble. The benefits extend to te wider public, as well, as study after study shows that educating inmates reduces recidivism – the rate at which they commit new crimes leading to re-arrest or re-incarceration. Although statistics vary, it appears that recidivism among offenders who complete some college work in prison drops by ten percent or more, even if they do not finish a degree. **Postsecondary** correctional **education is**, moreover, a **cost-effective** tool for improving public safety, since it is invariably less expensive than prison (an average of $25,251 per federal inmate in 2009). By lowering recidivism it saves taxpayers’ money, **and given our massive incarcerated population – over 2**.3 **million – it helps address the growing education gap between the US and other countries.** That prisons should offer postsecondary education would therefore seem common sense, yet this trait is in short supply among our politicians. The problem lies on both sides of the political spectrum: when it comes to educating inmates or, indeed, to implementing any reform that might mitigate the harshness of our penal system, Democrats, fearful of the soft-on-crime label, are as bad as – if not worse than – Republicans. The Clinton era illustrates this well. Our jail and prison population soared under Clinton, who signed into law the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, a bill sponsored by Democrat Representative Jack Brooks and written by then-Senator Joe Biden. Among the measures of this legislation, sometimes called the “Biden Law,” was a $9.7 billion plan to build new prisons and a sharp increase in the number of crimes subject to the death penalty. Although the bill provided $6.1 billion for prevention initiatives, it contained a bipartisan amendment egregiously counter-prevention: inmates were henceforth barred from Pell grants, the major federal source of college financial assistance for low-income students. The average grant was small, only about $1500 per student in 1994, yet the cumulative impact was huge. With passage of the 1965 Higher Education Act, on which Pell grants were based, the number of postsecondary correctional education programs shot up from twelve that year to 350 during the Reagan presidency. **Ending Pell grants to inmates saved** enough to increase grants to **non-prison students** by **a paltry $5 each** per semester, **while decimating prison** postsecondary **education** programs. After 1994, only eight remained open.

Empirics prove that competitiveness creates economic hegemony which solves global conflict. **Hubbard 10** writes[[7]](#footnote-7)

Using the data from the Correlates of War Project, I was able to perform a number of statistical analyses on my hypothesis. To measure hegemonic strength, I used the Composite Index of National Capability, a metric that averages together six different dimensions of relative power as a share of total power in the international system. **I** then **matched this data with data cataloging all conflicts** in the international system **since 1815**. I organized this data into five-year increments, in order to make statistical analysis more feasible. Regression analysis of the data revealed that there was a statistically significant negative correlation between relative hegemonic power and conflict levels in the international system. However, further statistical tests added complications to the picture of hegemonic governance that was emerging. Regression analysis of military actions engaged in by the hegemon versus total conflict in the system revealed a highly positive correlation for both American and British hegemony. Further **analysis revealed** that in both cases, **military power was a less accurate predictor of** military **conflict than economic power**. There are several possible explanations for these findings. It is likely that economic stability has an effect on international security. In addition, **weak**er **hegemons are** more likely to be **challenged militarily** than stronger hegemons. Thus, the hegemon will engage in more conflicts during times of international insecurity, because such times are also when the hegemon is weakest. Perhaps the **most important** implication of this research **is that hegemons may** well **be more effective in promoting peace through economic power** than through the exercise of military force. II. Research Question In examining hegemonic stability theory, there are several important questions to consider. First of all, an acceptable definition of what constitutes a hegemon must be established. Secondly, a good measure of what constitutes stability in the international system must be determined. Certainly, the frequency and severity of interstate conflict is an important measure of stability in the international system. However, other measures of stability should also be taken into account. Conflict in the international system takes on a wide range of forms. While military conflict is perhaps the most violent and severe dimension, it is only one of many forms that conflict can take. Conflict need not be confined to wars between traditional states. Terrorism, piracy, and guerilla warfare are also types of conflict that are endemic to the international system. Economic conflict, exemplified by trade wars, hostile actions such as sanctions, or outright trade embargos, is also an important form of conflict in the international system. States can also engage in a range of less severe actions that might be deemed political conflict, by recalling an ambassador or withdrawing from international bodies, for example. Clearly, “stability” as it pertains to the international system is a vast and amorphous concept. Because of these complexities, a comprehensive assessment of the theory is beyond the purview of this research. However, completing a more focused analysis is a realistic endeavor. Focusing on international armed conflicts in two select periods will serve to increase the feasibility the research. I will focus on the period of British hegemony lasting from the end of the Napoleonic wars to 1939 and the period of American hegemony beginning after the Second World War and continuing until 1999, the last year for which reliable data is available. The proposed hypothesis is that in these periods, the hegemon acted as a stabilizing force by reducing the frequency and severity of international armed conflict. The dependent variable in this case is the frequency and severity of conflict. The primary independent variable is the power level of the hegemon. This hypothesis is probabilistic since it posits that the hegemon tended to reduce conflict, not that it did so in every single possible instance. One way to test this hypothesis would be through a case-study method that examined the role of Britain and the United States in several different conflicts. This method would have the advantage of approaching the problem from a very feasible, limited perspective. While it would not reveal much about hegemony on a broader theoretical level, it would help provide practical grounding for what is a highly theoretical area of stuffy in international relations. Another method would be to do a broader quantitative comparison of international conflict by finding and comparing data on conflict and hegemonic strength for the entire time covered by British and American hegemony. The hypothesis is falsifiable, because it could be shown that the hegemon did not act as a stabilizing force during the years of study. **It** also **avoids** some of **the pitfalls** associated **with the case study method, such as selection bias and** the inherently **subjective** nature of **qualitative analysis.**

## Education Tradeoff Add-On (0:30)

The plan’s key to university funding. Empirics prove. **Mentor 4**[[8]](#footnote-8)

Ironically, **in the** 19**90's we** also **began** to see **a dollar-for-dollar tradeoff between corrections and education spending.** New York, for example, steadily increased its Corrections budget by 76 percent to $761 million while reducing funding to university systems by 28 percent, to $615 million. Much of **the** increase in corrections **spending was the result of longer** prison **terms and** the need for increased **prison construction. Research by** the **RAND** Corporation **demonstrates that** crime prevention is more cost-effective than building prisons and that **education is the most cost-effective crime prevention method** (Greenwood, 1996). Policies that focused on increasingly punitive incarceration, for longer periods of time, were not having the desired impact on crime prevention and resulted in reducing learning opportunities for everyone. Benefits of Corrections Education In 2000, the total number of prisoners in federal or state facilities was almost 1.4 million. Nearly 600,000 inmates were released in 2000, either unconditionally or under conditions of parole. Many of those released will be rearrested and will return to prison. Corrections education has the potential to greatly reduce the costs associated with the destructive cycle of incarceration and reincarceration. For example, one study indicated that those who benefited from correctional education recidivated 29% less often that those who did not have educational opportunities while in the correctional institution (Steurer, Smith, and Tracy, 2001). A 1987 Bureau of Prisons report found that the more education an inmate received, the lower the rate of recidivism. Inmates who earned college degrees were the least likely to reenter prison. For inmates who had some high school, the rate of recidivism was 54.6 percent. For college graduates the rate dropped to 5.4 percent. Similarly, a Texas Department of Criminal Justice study found that while the state's overall rate of recidivism was 60 percent, for holders of college associate degrees it was 13.7 percent. The recidivism rate for those with Bachelor's degrees was 5.6 percent. The rate for those with Master's degrees was 0 percent. Changing Minds: The Impact of College in a Maximum-Security Prison (**Fine et. al**, 2001) **was the first** major **study** to examine the impact of college in prison **since Pell grants were eliminated.** This study was conducted at Bedford Hills Correctional Facility, New York's only maximum-security women's prison. **The** Changing Minds **study demonstrated that college** prison **programs** can **save** taxpayers **millions** of dollars. This study demonstrated that college prison programs transform lives, reduce recidivism, create safer prisons and communities, and significantly reduce the cost of prisons.

University funding is key to the economy. **Dooley and Paxson 12-31** write[[9]](#footnote-9)

As leaders in Washington and Rhode Island consider the current economic circumstances -- the Fiscal Cliff -- numerous budget "deals" and possible sequestration, we urge all to consider the importance of and need for strategic investment in one of our nation's most valuable resources: higher education. Without question, the looming deficit, expiring tax cuts and threat of across-the- board spending reductions requires difficult decisions to address America's long-term needs. But, when possible cuts to federal education and research funding threaten the future of American progress and creativity, then we will have truly jumped off a cliff. In Rhode Island, the state's leading **research universities**, the University of Rhode Island and Brown, **are** being seen by the private, public and nonprofit sectors as providing the **essential** fuel **to** propel **the** state's **economy.** Through education and research, our universities attract vital resources to support the advancement of knowledge, ideas and innovation. In turn, and in fulfillment of our missions, we prepare a significant segment of the state's workforce and provide the infrastructure upon which companies, and jobs, are built. Continuing to do **this** successfully **demands** a **stable** source of **federal** research **funding.** This is particularly critical as state support for higher education has diminished, incentives for charitable giving are threatened and we seek to moderate tuition increases while ensuring access for qualified students. In 2011 URI and Brown brought to the state about $250 million in federal research dollars. In addition to providing the funds needed to advance research and understanding of areas ranging from autism to Alzheimer's disease, to forms of cancer, global warming, transportation and alternative energy, these funds have also employed thousands of people. Combined, more than 6,700 faculty and staff work at our institutions, and we enroll more than 25,100 graduate and undergraduate students. The majority of our employees live in Rhode Island, have homes here, pay state and local taxes and contribute otherwise to the fabric of our communities. Basic research is essential for long-term growth and is a cornerstone of the state's economy. According to the Rhode Island Science and Technology Advisory Council, more than 20,000 individuals are employed in research and development-related positions in Rhode Island and 118 companies are directly engaged in R&D pursuits. The National Science Foundation estimates that R&D represents 2.6 percent of Rhode Island's gross domestic product. The state's colleges and universities provide much of the innovation and human capital to support this R&D infrastructure. We attract and support the talented faculty, students and staff to our campuses and provide them with the facilities, tools and equipment to advance research and discovery, which in turn leads to commercialization, companies and employment. As decision makers identify opportunities for spending cuts, we urge that they keep in mind that funding for research and education, which makes up a tiny portion of the relatively small total federal discretionary budget, has already borne the brunt of recent federal cutbacks. In fact, since 2010, federal programs that support most scientific research have been cut by 10 percent on average, and face further cuts of more than 8 percent should our nation's leaders fail to prevent a fall from the fiscal cliff. Nationwide, this would mean about $12 billion in reductions across the board to R&D affecting the National Institutes of Health, National Science Foundation, the Department of Education and nearly every other agency. Locally, our institutions alone could see a loss of up to $25 million in just a single year. Such reductions would affect jobs, spending and ultimately revenue collected by the state. Perhaps more devastating would be the long-term implications of such cuts. We know that as much as **half of** U.S. **economic growth since World War II is a** direct or indirect **result of tech**nological **innovation**, much of which was **made possible through federally funded** scientific **research.** We must spare from continued cuts areas that are critical to our nation's ability to generate the ideas, discoveries and enterprises of the future. Rhode Island has been hit especially hard by the nation's severe recession and has been slow to recover. The state and local governments are struggling to provide services, and unemployment still exceeds 10 percent. It is not surprising that, at times like this, some may question the value of investing in basic research. Although the fruits of scholarship are not always predictable, **one thing is clear: If America's universities don't undertake this work** that not only solves problems but creates new, sustainable jobs, **no one will.** And the community, the nation and the world would be poorer as a result.

Economic crisis causes nuclear war. **Royal 10**[[10]](#footnote-10)

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defense behavior of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances **Modelski and Thompson**’s (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, **find**ing **that** rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous **shocks** such as economic crises could **usher in a redistribution of** relative **power** (see also Gilpin, 1981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, **increasing** the risk of **miscalculation** (Fearon 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflicts as **a rising power may** seek to **challenge a declining power** (Werner, 1999). Separately, Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remains unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland’s (1996, 2000) theory of trade expectations suggest that “future expectation of trade” is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behavior of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, **if** the **expectations of future trade decline**, particularly for difficult to replace item such as energy resources, the likelihood for **conflict increases**, as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states. Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write, The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favor. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self-reinforce each other. (Blomberg and Hess, 2002, p. 89) Economic **decline has also been linked with** an increase in the likelihood of **terrorism** (Blomberg, Hess and Weerapana, 2004), which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. “Diversionary theory” suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting **governments have** increased **incentive**s **to fabricate** external military **conflict**s **to create a “rally around the flag” effect**. Wang (1996), DeRouen (1995) and Blomberg, Hess and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997), Miller (1999), and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states due to the fact the democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. De DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States and thus weak Presidential popularity are statically linked to an increase in the use of force. In summary, recent economic scholarship positively correlates economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflict at systemic, dyadic and national levels. This implied connection between integration, crises and armed conflict has not featured prominently in economic-security debate and deserves more attention. This observation is not contradictory to other perspectives that link economic interdependence with a decrease in the likelihood of external conflict, such as those mentioned in the first paragraph of this chapter. Those studies tend to focus on dyadic interdependence instead of global interdependence and do not specifically consider the occurrence of and conditions created by economic crises. As such the view presented here should be considered ancillary to those views.

## ILaw Add-On (0:25)

Prison education is key to ILaw. **Whitney 09**[[11]](#footnote-11)

International law considers the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as customary international law, which means that it has been recognized as “international custom, as evidence of a general practice accepted as law” under the Statute of the International Court of Justice (“ICJ”). So, with “state practice, and a sense of legal obligation, or opinio juris,” a customary norm is born.145 While not binding, customary norms are still highly influential. International legal scholar Richard Bilder has observed that: **[S]tandards set by the U**niversal **D**eclaration of **H**uman **R**ights, although initially only declaratory and non-binding, **have** by now, **through wide acceptance and recitation** by nations as having normative effect, **become binding** customary law**.** Whatever may be the weight of this argument, it is certainly true that the Declaration is in practice frequently invoked as if it were legally binding, both by nations and by private individuals and groups. While not binding, customary norms are still highly influential. International legal scholar Richard Bilder has observed that: **Article 26** of the Declaration speaks directly to the fundamental right to education. It succinctly **states that “[e]veryone has a right to education.”**147 The purpose of this general statement is to “[develop] . . . the human personality” and promote respect, tolerance, and appreciation among all groups of people.148 This purpose aligns with the conclusion in McGee v. Aaron stressing the importance of education in improving self-esteem and contributing to a person’s successful functioning in society.149 Richard Pierre Claude, author of The Right to Education and Human Rights Education, discusses Article 26 in detail Education takes on the status of a human right because it is integral to and enhances human dignity through its fruits of knowledge, wisdom, and understanding. . . . It is a social right because in the context of the community it promotes the full development of the human personality. It is an economic right because it facilitates economic self-sufficiency through employment or self-employment. It is a cultural right . . . . In short, education is a prerequisite for individuals to function as fully human being in modern society.151 **Because the Declaration** of Human Rights **is customary** international **law, it is** s **binding on** all nations, including **the U**nited **S**tates**.** **Prisoners**, though restricted in some of their rights, **are still citizens. The U**nited **S**tates **is obligated under** customary **i**nternational **law to ensure that all** of its citizens, and thus its **prisoners**, **have access to education.**

I-Law solves multiple scenarios for extinction but US commitment is key.

**IEER 2**[[12]](#footnote-12)

The evolution of international law since World War II is largely a response to the demands of states and individuals living with**in a global society with a deeply integrated world economy.** In this global society, the repercussions of the **actions** of states, non-state actors, and individuals **are not confined within borders, whether we look to greenhouse gas** accumulations, **nuclear testing,** the danger of **accidental nuclear war, or** the vast **massacre**s of civilians that have taken place over the course of the last hundred years and still continue. **Multilateral agreements** increasingly have been a primary instrument employed by states to meet extremely serious challenges of this kind, for several reasons. They clearly and publicly embody a set of universally applicable expectations, including prohibited and required practices and policies. In other words, they **articulate global norms, such as** the protection of human rights and **the prohibitions of genocide and use of** **w**eapons of **m**ass **d**estruction. **They establish predictability and accountability** in addressing a given issue. States are able to accumulate expertise and confidence by participating in the structured system offered by a treaty. However, influential U.S. policymakers are resistant to the idea of a treaty-based international legal system because they fear infringement on U.S. sovereignty and they claim to lack confidence in compliance and enforcement mechanisms. This approach has dangerous practical27 implications for international cooperation and compliance with norms. U.S. treaty partners do not enter into treaties expecting that they are only political commitments by the United States that can be overridden based on U.S. interests. **When a powerful** and influential **state like the U**nited **S**tates is seen to **treat[s] its legal obligations as a matter of convenience** or of national interest alone, **other states will see this as** a **justification to** relax or **withdraw from their** own **commitments.** If the United States wants to require another state to live up to its treaty obligations, it may find that the state has followed the U.S. example and opted out of compliance.

## ILaw Biodiversity Add-On (0:30)

Prison education is key to ILaw. **Whitney 09**[[13]](#footnote-13)

International law considers the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as customary international law, which means that it has been recognized as “international custom, as evidence of a general practice accepted as law” under the Statute of the International Court of Justice (“ICJ”). So, with “state practice, and a sense of legal obligation, or opinio juris,” a customary norm is born.145 While not binding, customary norms are still highly influential. International legal scholar Richard Bilder has observed that: **[S]tandards set by the U**niversal **D**eclaration of **H**uman **R**ights, although initially only declaratory and non-binding, **have** by now, **through wide acceptance and recitation** by nations as having normative effect, **become binding** customary law**.** Whatever may be the weight of this argument, it is certainly true that the Declaration is in practice frequently invoked as if it were legally binding, both by nations and by private individuals and groups. While not binding, customary norms are still highly influential. International legal scholar Richard Bilder has observed that: **Article 26** of the Declaration speaks directly to the fundamental right to education. It succinctly **states that “[e]veryone has a right to education.”**147 The purpose of this general statement is to “[develop] . . . the human personality” and promote respect, tolerance, and appreciation among all groups of people.148 This purpose aligns with the conclusion in McGee v. Aaron stressing the importance of education in improving self-esteem and contributing to a person’s successful functioning in society.149 Richard Pierre Claude, author of The Right to Education and Human Rights Education, discusses Article 26 in detail Education takes on the status of a human right because it is integral to and enhances human dignity through its fruits of knowledge, wisdom, and understanding. . . . It is a social right because in the context of the community it promotes the full development of the human personality. It is an economic right because it facilitates economic self-sufficiency through employment or self-employment. It is a cultural right . . . . In short, education is a prerequisite for individuals to function as fully human being in modern society.151 **Because the Declaration** of Human Rights **is customary** international **law, it is** s **binding on** all nations, including **the U**nited **S**tates**.** **Prisoners**, though restricted in some of their rights, **are still citizens. The U**nited **S**tates **is obligated under** customary **i**nternational **law to ensure that all** of its citizens, and thus its **prisoners**, **have access to education.**

And, I-Law solves biodiversity loss. **Glennon 90**[[14]](#footnote-14)

It is now possible to conclude that customary **i**nternational **law requires states to** take appropriate steps to **protect endangered species.** Customary norms are created by state practice "followed by them from a sense of legal obligation." 250 Like highly codified humanitarian law norms that have come to bind even states that are not parties to the instruments promulgating them, 251 **wildlife protection norms** also have **become binding** on nonparties **as customary law**. Closely related to this process of norm creation by practice is that of norm creation by convention: **customary norms are created** by international agreements "when such agreements are intended for adherence by states generally and are in fact widely accepted." 252 Several such [\*31] agreements are directed at wildlife protection, 253 and CITES is one of them. It is intended for adherence by states generally 254 and is accepted by the 103 states that have become parties. In addition, some nonparties comply with certain CITES documentary requirements so as to trade with parties. 255 CITES is not "rejected by a significant number of states"; 256 only the United Arab Emirates has withdrawn from the agreement. In such circumstances, the International Court of Justice has observed, international agreements constitute state practice and represent law for nonparties. 257 Moreover, customary norms are created by "the general principles of law recognized by civilized nations." 258 Because CITES requires domestic implementation by parties to it, 259 and because the overall level of compliance seems quite high, 260 the general **principles** embodied **in states' domestic endangered species laws may be relied upon as another source of customary law.** 261 Even apart from the CITES requirements, states that lack laws protecting endangered species seem now to be the clear exception rather than the rule. 262 That there exists opinio juris as to the binding character of this obligation 263 is suggested by the firm support given endangered species [\*32] protection by the UN General Assembly and various international conferences. 264

Biodiversity loss causes extinction. **Diner 94**[[15]](#footnote-15)

Biologically diverse ecosystems are characterized by a large number of specialist species, filling narrow ecological niches. These ecosystems are inherently more stable than less diverse systems: "**'The more complex the ecosystem, the more** successfully **it can resist** a **stress...[**l]ike a net, in which each knot is connected to others by several strands, such a fabric can resist collapse better than a simple, unbranched circle of threads which if cut anywhere breaks down as a whole." By causing widespread extinctions humans have artificially simplified many ecosystems. **As biological simplicity rises, so does the risk of ecosystem failure. The spreading Sahara desert in Africa, and the dustbowl** conditions **of** the 1930s in **the U.S. are** relatively **mild examples** of what might be expected if this trend continues. Theoretically, **each new** animal or plant **extinction, with all its dimly perceived and intertwined affects, could cause total ecosystem collapse, and human extinction.** Certainly, each new extinction increases the risk of disaster. Like a mechanic removing, one by one, the rivets from an aircraft's wings, mankind may be edging closer to the abyss.

## Racism Add-on (0:22)

Providing Pell Grants to prisoners challenges racism. It’s key to the social advancement of people of color. **Taylor 8**[[16]](#footnote-16)

According to USA Today editorial: Like it or not, college has become the new high school. This reality is why forward thinking educators and government officials are looking for ways to ensure more high school graduates go on to get associate, if not **bachelor**, **degrees**. That’s especially **[are] important for** poor and **minority students at risk of** falling even further behind and **becoming part of a permanent underclass."** On average state invest as much as ($24,000) supporting their students’ public school earned baccalaureates as they spend annually ($25,000) incarcerating their prisoners. The standard return on the states’ higher education investments are approximately $2 million in economic stimulus and $375,000 in state tax revenues during each graduate’s working lifetime. This return on investment in the prisoner-student becomes further manifest when factoring in all the socio-economic savings from significantly reduced criminal behaviors, coupled with the increased state and federal tax revenues, and the productive and consumptive economic stimulus generated by the more highly educated worker. Consider this positive economic outcome as opposed to the all-too-common disruptive anti-social actions and demand for revenue-draining social services that recidivistic offenders can create. With the primary goal of education and treatment programs to reduce crime, in one of the first assessments of prison college programs nearly thirty-five years ago this holistic benefit was summarized as: "Simply, and aside from humanitarian concerns – it is cheaper in the no-so-long run to pay (adequately) for effective anti-recidivism measures, than to finance law enforcement, justice administration, and penal services and apparatus." Or as J. Michael Quinlan, the former director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons during the Reagan and Bush Administrations so bluntly put it, "I recognize," the director explains, "that the cost of college is really very insignificant (i.e., 10% of a year of annual cost of incarceration alone) when you compare the cost and damage done by crime." \*In 1930, the rate of African-American incarcerations was three times that of Anglo-Americans. By 1990, that ratio had increased to five times the number of blacks to whites. In 1996, there were eight African-Americans to every Anglo-American incarcerated in proportion to the racial composition of the nation. At the end of the millennium, one-in-three black men aged 20-29 were under some form of correctional supervision. One of the effects of this focused criminal justice effort is that **by their thirties,** almost **twice as many black men will** have been **cycle**d **through the penal system as** have **receive**d **baccalaureates.** Charles Sullivan, the executive director of the public advocacy group Citizens United for the Rehabilitation of Errants (CURE), claimed during the **exclusionary legislation** debate that it **"smacks of racism since** the majority of the penal population is composed of minorities." and thus Sullivan reasoned **minority groups had been clearly disproportionably affected by ban**ning prisoners **from the Pell Grant** programs. With more black males in prison than on college campuses, Sullivan wondered, as absurd as the concept was about having to go to prison to receive a college education, were we then going to close off that avenue as well? The answer is apparently yes. Across the country, the enrollment demographics of prison-college programs supported Sullivan’s contention. The composition of incarcerated collegiate student bodies generally mirrored the makeup of the penal populations. Thus once creating the most generally racially integrated university settings in the nation. Moreover, the racial composition that paid short-and-long term social dividends. Besides experiencing significantly reduced recidivism, these prisoner-students were some of the best behaved and also served as some of the few positive role models in a milieu normally bereft of such. Robert Powell, the assistant academic affairs officer at Shaw University observed in 1991, "**if you want to educate black men**, if you want **to reclaim that talent** out there, **you have to go into the prison.**" Ironically, Shaw University created its own prisoner-student fee-waiver scholarship program that was later negated by the state prison system, because it was in conflict with its’ policies prohibiting such inmate-exclusive funding programs.

Our racist culture must be challenged to prevent extinction. **Barndt 91**[[17]](#footnote-17)

To study racism is to study walls. We have looked at barriers and fences and limitations, ghettos and prisons. The prison of racism confines us all, people of color and white people alike. It shackles the victimizer as well as the victim. The walls forcibly keep people of color and white people separate from each other; in our separate prisons we are all prevented from achieving the human potential that God intends for us. The limitations imposed on people of color by poverty, subservience, and powerlessness are cruel, inhuman, and unjust; the effects of uncontrolled power, privilege, and greed, which are the marks of our white prison will inevitably destroy us as well. But we have also seen that the walls of racism can be dismantled. We are not condemned to an inexorable fate, but are offered the vision and the possibility of freedom. **Brick by brick,** stone by stone, the prison of individual, institutional, and cultural **racism can be destroyed.** You and I are urgently called to join the efforts of those who know it is time to tear down, once and for all, the walls of racism. The danger of self-destruction seems to be drawing ever more near. **The result**s **of centuries of** national and **worldwide** conquest and **colonization,** of **military buildups** and violent aggression, of overconsumption **and environmental destruction may** be **reach**ing **the point of no return. A small** and predominantly **white minority** of global population **derives its power** and privilege **from suffering**s **of** the vast majority of **peoples of color. For the sake of the world** and ourselves, **we dare not allow it to continue.**

## Prison Violence Add-on

Pell Grants solve prison violence. **Page 4** writes[[18]](#footnote-18)

PSCE [postsecondary correctional **education**] **programs help prison workers maintain carceral order.** In **a** 1974 **study** of a PSCE program in a maximum-security prison, Alfred Blumstein found that the program ‘improves institutional climate’ and made the prisoner-students ‘more manageable residents’ (quoted in Duguid, 1987: 23). PSCE programs, like all ‘meaningful program opportunities available to prisoners’, are good ‘institutional management tools’ (DiIulio, 1991: 114), for **they keep prisoners busy; they are ‘carrots’ that can be taken away if prisoners act up; and they help prisoners develop pro-social,** non-violent and **non-criminal identities, making them less likely to resort to physical confrontation** to solve problems (Taylor, 1993).

Prison violence leads to AIDS spread in prisons. **Shah 05**[[19]](#footnote-19)

Prisons are hostile environments. Assaults among prisoners, **violence between prisoners** and prison officers, suicide, self-mutilation, and open syringes and needles containing blood as a result of drug usage are all occurrences in prison environments. Such actions **expedite** the **transmission of** communicable **disease**s**.** In an effort to thwart disease spread, prison guards and employees are encouraged to take precautions to prevent contracting or spreading diseases. Usage of impermeable gloves and a uniform worn only in the prison are the minimum precautionary measures to reduce exposure to diseases, as recommended by the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID) [1] for prison guards and employees. Ideally, all prison guards, employees, and inmates should be provided with gloves. **Protective** eyewear, aprons, tongs or forceps, and disinfectant solution are all additional measures that should seriously limit disease-causing contact with prisoners and thereby reduce disease spread [2]. Unfortunately, such preventive **measures are costly** and considered impractical at the current time, leaving prisons mostly only able to screen inmates for health problems. Meanwhile, involuntary actions such as the **increasing** numbers of **rapes** in prisons are **fuel**ing **disease spread** as well. According to Laura Stemple, executive director of the human rights group Stop Prison Rape, the rate of sexual abuse is as high as 27% among women in some prisons. In the general United States population, only three in every ten thousand people have been raped according to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) [3]. However, in prisons, one in five has been sexually assaulted, while one in ten has been raped while in prison [4]. Thus, disease spread through rape is far more likely in prisons. Many victims of rape find it embarrassing to reveal that they have been raped and refuse HIV/AIDS testing and other tests for sexually transmitted diseases. Oftentimes, prisons ignore rapes because it clearly displays to the public and government that the prison administration has not been effective. Rape is not death and therefore is easy to conceal. Thus, many prisons have gotten away with concealing rape incidences and are not pressured to prevent it from occurring. In response, Congress introduced the Prison Rape Reduction Act in 2002 to establish a national commission to drastically reduce rape occurrences in prisons nationwide. The Act established committees by the Justice Department that review prisons annually. Those prisons with unusually high rape incidents would have to undergo examination and determine how to improve. An acute disease such as HIV/AIDS is already a health obstacle in American society. According to the NIAID, **the rate of** HIV/**AIDS** infections **has been** continuously **increasing** despite increased efforts taken by the government and activist groups to control the HIV/AIDS spread. Shockingly, the rate of HIV/**AIDS spread is five to ten times higher in prisons** than that in the general population according one study by the U.S Department of Justice [5]. **When** prison **inmates are released** back into society**,** the **chances of** incidence of HIV/**AIDS are dramatically increased. An already deadly** and difficult-to-control **disease is becoming more difficult to control.** Health concerns are not monitored closely enough in prisons. The Prison Rape Reduction Act is a step in the right direction; however, more funding should be allocated to ensure prisons are safer. After all, those same individuals who are disregarded as **prisoners will return to society** as regular citizens **and** will **spread** communicable **disease**s**.**

AIDS causes extinction. **Lederberg 91**[[20]](#footnote-20)

Will Aids mutate further ? Already known, **a** vexing **feature of AIDS is its** antigenic **variability,** further **complicating** the task of developing **a vaccine.** So we know that **HIV is still evolving.** Its global spread has meant there is far more HIV on earth today than ever before in history. **What are the odds of** its learning the tricks of **airborne transmission?** The short is, “**No one can be sure.**” But we could make the same attribution about any virus; alternatively the next influenza or chicken pox may mutate to an unprecedented lethality. As time passes, and HIV seems settled in a certain groove, that is momentary reassurance in itself. **However,** given its other ugly attributes, **it is hard to imagine a worse threat to humanity than** an **airborne** variant of **AIDS. No rule of nature contradicts such a possibility;** the **prolif**eration **of AIDS** cases with secondary pneumonia **multiplies the odds of such a mutant, as an analogue to** the emergence of **pneumonic plague.**
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