## AC

Rehab is inevitable. Absent Pell Grants, it will be religious rehab which non-uniques disads but doesn’t solve crime. **Lockard 12**[[1]](#footnote-1)

This is a world to which the recently deceased Charles Colson contributed greatly, one where true knowledge comes from the bible, the Book of Mormon, and a few other holy texts. The awards dinner featured a solid contingent of Colson’s Prison Fellowship volunteers. Organized religious missions have been coming to prisons since the late eighteenth century, when the Philadelphia Society for Alleviating the Miseries of Prisonssent mostly Quaker volunteers to Walnut Street Jail. Throughout the nineteenth and into the twentieth century US **prisons were sites of religious predation**, primarily led by Christian evangelicals. Limited efforts at educational modernization through **secular** post-secondary academic **programs came to a halt with the** 1994 **ban on Pell grants** for prisoners, legislation that had profoundly counter-productive effects. Colson’s growing success at **prison evangelization** programs **coincided with** the **gutting of higher education** opportunities in prisons. But despite enjoying a law career based on the advantages of an Ivy League undergraduate education, Colson disliked higher education as a diversion from spiritual pursuits. He had no use for contemporary intellectual debates, dismissing them as “the big lie of post-modernism” that distracted from rock-solid faith in Jesus as savior. In God and Government, Colson attacked the Enlightenment as a source of a mistaken understanding of human nature that led to a disastrous pursuit of social utopianism. He denounced universities as centers of moral relativism unfit to educate students who needed guidance toward moral authority. Colson’s vision of prison ministries corresponded with what he believed lacking from secular education – a Christ-centered path to improvement of self and society. Although he adopted the language of marginalization and oppression in describing prison inmates, Colson believed that address to the social origins of crime lay in spirituality rather than education that addressed the material world. Nowhere in his extensive writings does Colson engage with Pell grants and the disappearance of higher education from prisons. The politics that Colson advocated remained as deeply reactionary after his prison sentence as before. Rather, his experience combined with a new Christian evangelism added a coloration of social care that had been absent. His very popular and much-reprinted autobiography, Born Again, is filled with recounted political dialogue in White House offices and details of conversion and Christian fellowship found among Washington insiders. He views himself as an instrument in the Lord’s hands, unconscious before his downfall and conscious afterwards. “What happened in court today,” he said to the press after sentencing, “was the court’s will and the Lord’s will—I have committed my life to Jesus Christ and I can work for Him in prison as well as out.” The state, its institutions, and legal decisions in Colson’s view coincided with and remained subordinate to his own interpretation of Christian redemption. Born Again contains no condemnation of the lack of fellowship in Nixon’s racist Southern strategy, and has only praise for his president’s decision to bomb North Vietnam and prosecute the US genocide in south-east Asia. Ironically, it was the illegality of Colson’s obstruction of justice concerning a conspiracy against Daniel Ellsberg for his Pentagon Papers revelations about Vietnam that led to a seven-month prison sentence. In Colson’s version of his life story, his mistake lay in the hubris of ignoring God while in the White House. The rest of his life was repentance and corrective spiritual action, which he construed to include anti-Darwinism, opposition to gay and lesbian rights, and an array of reactionary causes. Another reading of Colson’s life is that he remained a faithful servant of the state, one who successfully advocated spiritual submission for prisoners rather than an education that would enable them to critique society more acutely and pursue intellectual self-reliance. The Prison Fellowship Ministries collaborate with prison administrations to operate a private-public partnership for obscurantism by missionizing a captive population. Such work with a domestic underclass recapitulates historic Euro-american imperialism’s combination of state and religious power to produce passive laboring subjects. The carceral state values narratives that confess sin, embrace salvational repentance, and advocate compliance with an ordained social order. Such narratives gain official sanction because, as Tanya Erzen argues, “Personal narratives of individual transformation are central to testimonial politics, and they work in conjunction with a neoliberal vision in which social services are privatized rather than funded by the federal government…Testimonial politics support the **faith-based policies** of economic privatization that **place the onus for solving social problems on the individual and** on the power of God to transform lives.” Colson modeled the compliant subject, entirely unlike the resistant prison narratives of Jimmy Santiago Baca. For Colson, a prisoner needed to learn social conformity alongside Christian submission. Prison was a place to ask questions only of oneself, not about society. Colson **did not challenge the massive growth of US prisons** since he served time in the 1970s or the role of the drug wars in fueling that growth. The entanglement of state and religion that Colson pursued resulted in a 2007 Eighth Circuit decision,Americans United for Separation of Church and State v. Prison Fellowship Ministries, which sustained a lower court decision striking down a state-funded Fellowship-run InnerChange Freedom Initiative re-entry program in Iowa prisons that employed Bible counselors and evangelical Christian programming. Although the Iowa program no longer exists, it still functions in Minnesota and Texas. Colson’s efforts to foster Christian evangelism on taxpayer money, a clear breach of the Establishment Clause, are withering. Where he has succeeded is in bringing volunteers into prisons to do the same work free of charge, where they preach personal faith instead of educate. There are social costs in ignoring the profoundly life-altering potential of higher education. Colson’s post-Watergate career was dedicated to a blinkered Bible-centered vision of salvation and individual transformation in prisons, a vision that attached no importance to a broad humanities and sciences education. It is a legacy that needs undoing.

**Thus the Plan**: The USFG ought to grant access to Pell Grants to inmates in the United States criminal justice system.

Funding through normal means. No legal violations link because affirming means amending the laws to make the aff world consistent with them.

Advantage 1 is Crime

Pell Grants rehabilitate prisoners which solves crime and poverty. Empirics prove. **Buzzini 9**[[2]](#footnote-2)

[Brackets in original text] It’s no secret that the education system in the United States is in shambles – and not just for inmates. Students aren’t receiving a proper education, which encourages the nation’s youth to get involved in gangs, drugs, and violence. **Many inmates can’t** even **read well, ranking** in **at** “maybe a **seventh-grade level**” (Leder 1). **Were it possible** for inmates **to receive a**n education while serving time (a GED if an equivalent had not been attained, followed by a post-secondary **degree**) **they would have a much greater chance of escaping** the clutches of **poverty and** their ties to **illegal activity when** they are **released** back into society. This must have been the line of thinking that inspired the inception of the first post-secondary correctional education program, which began in 1953 at the University of Southern Illinois in Menard. Such a program must have been a bit ahead of its time, because **by 1965 only 11** more post-secondary correctional **education** (PCSE) **programs appeared.** 19**65** was a landmark year for PCSE it **marked the first** time that inmates were eligible to receive **Pell Grants** to fund their college aspirations. **Thanks to** the availability of **federal funding, programs began popping up nationwide.** In 1973 there were 182 programs; by 1982 there were 350. Programs reached their peak when, **in the** early 19**90s, there were** a total of **772** on-site college programs **in 1,287 prisons** (Taylor “Pell Grants” 2). **The majority of inmates covered their costs with** the aid of **the Pell Grant. However, in** 19**94, thanks to** the prevailing **“tough on crime” attitude** of the time, **inmates** were **no longer** able to **receive** federal aid in the form of **Pell Grants.** While peak enrollment in PCSE programs totaled at 12 percent of inmate populations, the s0-called “deteriorated state” counted less than 4 percent (Taylor “Pell Grants” 3). There is **myriad statistical data** to **show that education programs** inside prisons **aid in** actual **rehab**ilitation **and** do **reduce recidivism** rates. But these facts were glossed over as politicians wowed their constituents with their tough policies regarding crime. However, they didn’t bother to mention to their constituents that “**Massachusetts, Maryland, and New York** are among the states [that **reported**] **reductions in recidivism of** as high as **15.5 percent for inmates** who participated **in education programs** (Freedman 6).” That 15.5 percent reduction means 15.5 percent of inmates were *actually* rehabilitated, as opposed to merely punished, during their time on the inside. The numbers are even more impressive on a national scale, as “**inmates with** at least two years of **college had a 10 percent re-arrest rate; the national average is 60 percent**” (“Statehouses Debate…”). That means 50 percent less people went back to prison, simply because they completed some form of higher education. It is for reasons such as this that “critics lament the loss of **Pell Grants** as short-sighted in light of studies documenting **lower recidivism** and misconduct rates among inmates who pursue post-secondary education” (Freedman 8). It truly is a serious loss, for the depletion of funding via Pell Grants for PSCE has resulted in a devastating loss of programs nationwide, despite such programs’ ability to reduce recidivism **and** markedly **rehabilitate** many **inmates who participate.** Should the Pell Grant be re-instated, corrections in America would see a much-needed turn for the better.

Poverty causes nuclear war. **Caldwell 03**[[3]](#footnote-3)

It would appear that global nuclear war will happen very soon, for two main reasons, alluded to above. First, human poverty and misery are [is] increasing at an incredible rate. There are now three billion more desperately poor people on the planet than there were just forty years ago. **Despite decades of industrial development, the number of** wretchedly **poor people continues to soar.** The pressure for war mounts as the population explodes. Second, **war is motivated by** resource scarcity -- **the desire of one group to acquire the land, water, energy, or other resources possessed by another.** **With each passing year, crowding and misery increase, raising the motivation for war to higher levels.**

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.

Advantage 2 is Air Power

Aerospace industry is declining now due to lack of skilled workers. Increase in community college or vocational training would solve. **Koopmans 12**[[6]](#footnote-6)

SEATTLE - Boeing has a big job ahead - after last week's announcement of airplane orders and commitments worth billions of dollars. Now, **as thousands of aerospace workers prepare to retire,** U.S. **Sen.** Maria **Cantwell** is wondering where the skilled workers will come from to build those planes. During a tour of Machinists Inc., a precision machining company and Boeing supplier in Seattle, Cantwell announced she will be holding a Senate Aviation Subcommittee hearing this week on aviation competitiveness in Washington, D.C. “Over the next 20 years, the aerospace industry is expected to grow by more than $3 trillion,” said Cantwell. “I’m bringing together aviation and aerospace leaders to talk about what they think must be done for the U.S. to remain on top of these industries.”Machinists Inc. is one of hundreds of local manufacturers that will help Boeing reach its goals. The plant will help make parts for the 396 planes Boeing took orders for last week. "Today we're here to make sure that the work force is there to help produce those planes," she said Sunday during her tour of the plant. Cantwell **says 21,000 aerospace workers will be needed over the next decade to keep up with international competitors.**"We want to remain the center of aerospace manufacturing here in the Northwest, so we want to really focus on what we're going to do to get a lot more people interested," she said. To make her point, Cantwell focuses on the numbers.  "**Half of the Boeing work force will be eligible to retire in five to seven years**, meaning that's when there will be a big demand for workers," she says. She says **getting workers in takes** a three-pronged approach.  The first is getting is children interested in aerospace early. Second is **getting the unemployed trained through community and technical colleges.** And third, attracting technically trained veterans as they return from war.  All that and more will be discussed at Cantwell's hearing, scheduled for Wednesday on Capitol Hill in Washington, D.C. The hearing will include testimony from John J. Tracy, chief technology officer for the Boeing Co.; Stan Sorscher of SPEEA; Dan Elwell, senior vice president of Aerospace Industries Association; Nick Calio, president and CEO of Airlines for America; and Pete Bunce, president and CEO of General Aviation Manufacturers Association.

Pell Grants incentivize prison community college and vocational programs which teach key tech skills. **Young 11**[[7]](#footnote-7)

Partnerships between corrections and community colleges with their links to business and industry were once common. **Until the mid-1990’s community colleges provided** large numbers of **prisoners** with **post-secondary education** and vocational training. Their programming was shown to reduce recidivism and increased returning inmates’ employment and earning power. 21 **But Pell grants** and other federal sources **that supported community college programs categorically dried up** as the result of changes in the law in the late 1990’s. 22 During the academic year 2009-2010 only 6% of all state prisoners enrolled in vocational or academic postsecondary programs and of these 86% were concentrated in just 13 states. 23 States such as Illinois that still provide community college instruction for prisoners do so with support from one or another combination of line items in the state corrections budget, student head-count funds provided to participating community colleges, or state financial aid, 24 funding that is no more likely to increase in the near future than is funding for other correctional programs. **The federal gov**ernment **could still** provide needed **support** for **a strong community college role in reentry.** In recent years **the Department of Labor awarded community colleges substantial grants for training in tech**nological **fields** such as nuclear and renewable energy, “green” retrofitting and cyber security. 25 The Program for **Prison** Reentry **Strategies would urge** that the Department of Labor invite applicant **community colleges to** collaborate with corrections agencies on one hand and businesses on the other and to integrate **return**ing **prisoners into grantfunded academic and vocational programming.** Ordinarily, gaining the attention of the leadership of a major federal agency such as the Department of Labor for an issue like prisoner reentry might be difficult. Fortunately, the Administration recently created the Federal Interagency Reentry Council and charged it with exactly this task. 26

Air and space power are key to deter WMD conflict in Asia.

**Khalilzad and Lesser 98** write[[8]](#footnote-8)

The first key implication derived from the analysis of trends in Asia suggests that **American air and space power will** continue to **remain critical for** conventional and unconventional **deterrence in Asia**. This argument is justified by the fact that several subregions of the continent still harbor the potential for full-scale conventional war. This potential is most conspicuous on the Korean peninsula and, to a lesser degree, in South Asia, the Persian Gulf, and the South China Sea. In some of these areas, such as Korea and the Persian Gulf, the United States has clear treaty obligations and, therefore, has preplanned the use of air power should contingencies arise. U.S. Air Force assets could also be called upon for operations in some of these other areas. In almost all these cases, U.S. air power would be at the forefront of an American politico-military response **because (a)** of the vast **distance**s on the Asian continent; **(b)** the **diverse** range of operational **platforms** available to the U.S. Air Force, a capability unmatched by any other country or service; **(c)** the possible **unavailability of naval assets** in close proximity, particularly in the context of surprise contingencies; **and (d)** the **heavy payload** that can be carried by U.S. Air Force platforms. These platforms can exploit speed, reach, and high operating tempos to sustain continual operations until the political objectives are secured. The entire range of warfighting capability—fighters, bombers, electronic warfare (EW), suppression of enemy air defense (SEAD), combat support platforms such as AWACS and J-STARS, and tankers—are relevant in the Asia-Pacific region, because many of the regional contingencies will involve armed operations against large, fairly modern, conventional forces, most of which are built around large land armies, as is the case in Korea, China-Taiwan, India-Pakistan, and the Persian Gulf. In addition to conventional combat, the demands of unconventional deterrence will increasingly confront the U.S. Air Force in Asia. The **Korea**n peninsula, **China, and** the **India**n subcontinent **are already arenas of** WMD **prolif**eration. While emergent **nuclear** capabilities continue to receive the most public attention, **chemical and bio**logical warfare **threats will** progressively **become future problems.** The delivery systems in the region are increasing in range and diversity. China already targets the continental United States with ballistic missiles. North Korea can threaten northeast Asia with existing Scud-class theater ballistic missiles. India will acquire the capability to produce ICBM-class delivery vehicles, and both China and India will acquire long-range cruise missiles during the time frames examined in this report.

The second key implication derived from the analysis of trends in Asia suggests that **air and space power will function as a vital rapid reaction force** in a breaking crisis. Current guidance tasks the Air Force to prepare for two major regional conflicts that could break out in the Persian Gulf and on the Korean peninsula. In other areas of Asia, however, such as the Indian subcontinent, the South China Sea, Southeast Asia, and Myanmar, the United States has no treaty obligations requiring it to commit the use of its military forces. But as past experience has shown, American policymakers have regularly displayed the disconcerting habit of discovering strategic interests in parts of the world previously neglected after conflicts have already broken out. Mindful of this trend, it would behoove U.S. Air Force planners to prudently plan for regional contingencies in nontraditional areas of interest, because naval and air power will of necessity be the primary instruments constituting the American response. Such responses would be necessitated by three general classes of contingencies. The first involves the politico-military collapse of a key regional actor, as might occur in the case of North Korea, Myanmar, Indonesia, or Pakistan. The second involves acute politicalmilitary crises that have a potential for **rapid escalation**, as **may occur in** the **Taiwan** Strait, **the Spratlys,** the **India**n subcontinent, **or** on the **Korea**n peninsula. The third involves cases of prolonged **domestic instability** that **may** have either **spillover** or contagion effects, as **in China, Indonesia, Myanmar, or North Korea.** In each of these cases, U.S. responses may vary from simply being a concerned onlooker to prosecuting the whole range of military operations to providing post-conflict assistance in a permissive environment. Depending on the political choices made, Air Force contributions would obviously vary. If the first response is selected, contributions would consist predominantly of vital, specialized, airbreathing platforms such as AWACS, JSTARS, and Rivet Joint—in tandem with controlled space assets—that would be necessary for assessment of political crises erupting in the region. The second response, in contrast, would burden the entire range of U.S. Air Force capabilities, in the manner witnessed in Operation Desert Storm. The third response, like the first, would call for specialized capabilities, mostly in the areas of strategic lift and airborne tanker support. The third key implication derived from the analysis of trends in Asia suggests that despite increasing regional air capabilities, U.S. Air Force assets will be required to fill gaps in critical warfighting areas. The capabilities of the Asian states, including those of U.S. allies and neutral states, have been steadily increasing in the last two decades. These increases have occurred largely through the acquisition of late-generation, advanced combat aircraft such as the MiG-29, and the F-15, F-16, and F/A-18 together with short-range infrared and medium-range semi-active air-to-air missiles. Despite such acquisitions, however, the states that possess these aircraft have not become truly effective users of air power, in part because acquiring advanced combat aircraft and their associated technologies is a small part of ensuring overall proficiency in the exploitation of air power. The latter includes incorporating effective training regimes, maintaining large and diverse logistics networks, developing an indigenous industrial infrastructure capable of supporting the variegated air assets, and integrating specific subspecialties such as air-to-air refueling, electronic warfare, suppression of enemy air defenses, airspace surveillance and battle management capabilities in a hostile environment, and night and adverse weather operations. Most of the Asian air forces lack full air-power capabilities of the sort described above. The Japanese and South Korean air forces are, as a rule, optimized mostly for air defense operations. Both air forces are generally proficient in all-weather defensive counterair operations, and they possess relatively modest day ground-attack capabilities as well. Because of their specific operating environments, however, the Japanese air force is particularly proficient in maritime air operations, whereas the South Korean air force has some close air support (CAS) experience as well. The Chinese air force (People’s Liberation Army Air Force, [PLAAF]) is still a predominantly daylight defensive counterair force with limited daylight attack capabilities, as are most of the Southeast Asian air forces, but the PLAAF has recently demonstrated an impressive ability to integrate its new weapon systems (e.g., the Su-27) much faster than most observers expected. The air forces of the Indian subcontinent have somewhat greater capabilities. Most squadrons of the Indian and Pakistani air forces are capable of daylight defensive counterair, a few are capable of all-weather defensive counterair, and several Indian units are capable of battlefield air interdiction and deep penetration-interdiction strike. None of these air forces, however, is particularly proficient at night and all-weather ground attack, especially at operational ranges. They lack advanced munitions, especially in the air-to-surface regime. With the exception of Japan and Singapore, they lack battle management command, control and communications (BMC3 ) platforms as well as the logistics and training levels required for successful, extended, high-tempo operations. **The brittle quality of Asian air forces implies that U.S. Air Force** assets **will be required** to fill critical gaps in allied air capabilities as well as to counter both the growing capabilities of potential adversaries such as China and the new nontraditional threats emerging in the form of ballistic and cruise missiles, information warfare, WMD, and possibly even the revolution in military affairs. The fourth key implication derived from the analysis of trends in Asia suggests that there will be increasing political constraints on en-route and in-theater access. Problems of basing for en-route and in-theater access will become of concern as the Asian states grow in confidence and capability. For the moment, however, such problems have been held in check because of the continuing threats on the Korean peninsula and recent revitalization of the U.S.-Japanese security treaty. But these developments constitute only a reprieve, not an enduring solution. The availability of the Korean bases after unification is an open question. Even if these and the Japanese bases continue to be available, their use will be increasingly restricted by the host countries for routine training operations and especially for nontraditional out-of-area operations. The recent difficulties caused by the refusal of the Gulf states to permit U.S. air operations against Saddam Hussein will become the norm in the Asia-Pacific region as well. There are already some indicators to this effect. For example, constitutional and legal restraints in the form of Article 9 could prevent Japan from providing access, logistical support, and reinforcements in the context of crises in Asia. There is also relatively weak political support for all but the most narrow range of contingencies, as became evident in Japanese, Korean, and Southeast Asian reluctance to support U.S. gunboat diplomacy during the recent (1995–1996) China-Taiwan face-off. Even the Southeast states, which benefit most from U.S. presence and deterrent capabilities in the region, were conspicuously silent—and in some cases even undercut American efforts at restraining Chinese intimidation of Taiwan. Besides these growing political constraints, the fact remains that in some feasible contingencies the U.S. Air Force will have little or no access whatsoever to some regions in Asia. The absence of air bases in Southeast Asia and the northern Indian Ocean, for example, could threaten the execution of contingency plans involving either South Asia or Myanmar. The vast distances in the Asia-Pacific region could come to haunt Air Force operations, because existing facilities at Diego Garcia and in the Persian Gulf are too far away for any but the most minimal operations. Increasing political constrictions coupled with the sparse number of operating facilities available imply that even such potentially innovative U.S. Air Force solutions as the “air expeditionary force” and “composite air wings” could run into show-stopping impediments beyond U.S. Air Force control. This, in turn, has four consequences. First, American policymakers should investigate the possibility of securing additional air base access in Asia. The most attractive candidate, especially in the context of a rising China, is Cam Ran Bay in Vietnam. Other alternatives, especially for contingencies in the Persian Gulf and the greater South Asian region, could include transit rights in India or Pakistan. Second, U.S. Air Force planners will have to devote relatively greater resources to mobility assets and support platforms such as airborne tankers to keep a smaller combat force capable of long-distance operations. Third, planners must begin to give some thought to novel technologies capable of mitigating the access and staging problem. These technologies can include, at the more radical end, floating air bases of the kind proposed by RAND several decades ago, or at the more conservative technical end, more-efficient engines, longer-range aircraft, and the like. Fourth, U.S. Air Force planners must increasingly think in terms of joint operations not merely at the cosmetic level, as in the cruise missile strikes against Iraq, but in terms of a true division of labor, especially in the early stages of a distant contingency. The fifth key implication derived from the analysis of **trends in Asia suggest**s **that WMD**-shadowed environments **will pose new** operational **challenges to air power.** There is little doubt that the **number of** states possessing different kinds of **WMD will increase** during the time frames examined in this report. While Russia, China, North Korea, India, and Pakistan are the only nuclear-capable states in Asia at the moment, several other states likely are virtual nuclear powers (Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan), with Iran and Iraq in the wings. All these states are threatened by nuclear capabilities in some form, and many will be able to mount nuclear threats of their own at some point. Although nuclear capabilities concentrate the mind in a way that few other weapons do, **chemical and bio**logical **weapon**s will also come in to their own, and their **use for** either operations or **terror may be even more probable.** All three forms of WMD, as well as radiological weapons, could be delivered by either ballistic or cruise missiles, advanced combat aircraft, or unconventional means of delivery. These regional operating environments will thus become more complicated over time. In this context, **the** U.S. **Air Force will require** both **new capabilities** and new concepts of operations for successful combat in such environments. **These** new capabilities **include** better means of **localizing WMD** holdings **at long range;** better means of **interdicting storage facilities**, especially those relying on depth or dispersal for survival; **and** better means of effectively **intercepting WMD carriers** if their prelaunch destruction is not possible. New concepts of operations involve devising and using better ways to continue combat operations amidst a WMD environment, new forms of warfare including information warfare to subvert an adversary’s combat capability rather than physically destroying it, and, finally, new “nonlethal” weapons to attain results previously attainable by lethal means alone.

Advantage 3 is Prison Violence

Pell Grants solve prison violence. **Page 4** writes[[9]](#footnote-9)

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**[[10]](#footnote-10)

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**[[11]](#footnote-11)

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.**

Advantage 4 is R&D

Funding for university research is declining now due to budget shortfalls.

**Matthews 12**[[12]](#footnote-12)

Historically, **the federal government has been the primary source of funding for basic research at** colleges and **universities.** In FY2008, **the fed**eral government **provided** approximately **60% of** an estimated $51.9 billion of **R&D funds** expended by academic institutions. 31 In current dollars, federal support for academic research increased by 2.5% between FY2007 and FY2008. When inflation is taken into account, federal funding increased 0.2% from FY2007 to FY2008 following two years of decline in constant dollars since FY2005. 32 Data from the NSF reveal that federal funding of research and development has focused more on basic than applied research, while private sector funding support has focused on development. 33 NSF found that in FY2008, **institutions of higher education perform**ed approximately **56% of the nation’s basic research.** 3 **Many** colleges and universities, especially **state schools**, **are experiencing declining revenues, due to reductions in state support**, endowments, and in some instances, tuition. 35 According to one source, it is estimated that approximately **35 states have experienced** a **decline in revenue for** FY**2012, with many states operating in a deficit.** 36 As a result, state funding for universities has fallen in many states. Some colleges are considering deferring maintenance projects and proposing increases in tuition. While states are cutting funding to address revenue declines and decreases in their operating budgets, these same institutions are simultaneously viewed as partners in further developing the economy of their respective states.

The plan’s key to university funding. Empirics prove. **Mentor 4**[[13]](#footnote-13)

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.

Federal funding for university R&D is key to solve warming, disease, and economic growth. **Dooley and Paxson 12-31** write[[14]](#footnote-14)

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 **provid[e]**ing **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.

Ocean studies prove warming causes extinction. **Sify 10** writes[[15]](#footnote-15)

Sydney: Scientists have sounded alarm bells about how growing concentrations of **greenhouse gases are driving irreversible** and dramatic **change**s **in** the way the **oceans** function, providing evidence that humankind could well be on the way to the next great extinction. **The findings** of the comprehensive report: 'The impact of climate change on the world's marine ecosystems' **emerged from a synthesis of recent research** on the world's oceans, carried out **by two of the world's leading marine scientists**. One of the authors of the report is Ove Hoegh-Guldberg, professor at The University of Queensland and the director of its Global Change Institute (GCI). 'We may see sudden, unexpected changes that have serious ramifications for the overall well-being of humans, including the capacity of the planet to support people. This is **further evidence that we are well on the way to** the next great **extinction** event,' says Hoegh-Guldberg. 'The findings have enormous implications for mankind, particularly **if the trend continues.** The earth's ocean, which produces half of the oxygen we breathe and absorbs 30 per cent of human-generated carbon dioxide, is equivalent to its heart and lungs. This study shows worrying signs of ill-health. It's as if the earth has been smoking two packs of cigarettes a day!,' he added. 'We are entering a period in which the ocean services upon which humanity depends are undergoing massive change and in some cases beginning to fail', he added.

Economic crisis causes nuclear war. **Royal 10**[[16]](#footnote-16)

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.

Existential risk outweighs every other impact by orders of magnitude because of the lost potential for future generations. **Bostrom 11**[[17]](#footnote-17)

Even if we use **the most conservative** of these **estimates,** which entirely ignores the possibility of space colonization and software minds, we **find that the expected loss of an existential catastrophe is greater than** the value of **1018 human lives.  This implies that** the expected value of **reducing existential risk by a mere one millionth of one percentage point is at least ten times the value of a billion human lives.**  The more technologically comprehensive estimate of 1054 human-brain-emulation subjective life-years (or 1052 lives of ordinary length) makes the same point even more starkly.  Even if we give this allegedly lower bound on the cumulative output potential of a technologically mature civilization a mere 1% chance of being correct, we find that the expected value of reducing existential risk by a mere one billionth of one billionth of one percentage point is worth a hundred billion times as much as a billion human lives.

Moral uncertainty is high now, but there’s room for improvement. **Parfit 84** writes[[18]](#footnote-18)

Some people believe that there cannot be progress in Ethics, since everything has been already said. Like Rawls and Nagel, I believe the opposite. How many people have made Non-Religious Ethics their life's work? Before the recent past, very few. In most civilizations, **most people have believed in** the existence of a **God**, or of several gods. A large minority were in fact Atheists, whatever they pretended. But, **before the recent past, very few Atheists made Ethics their life’s work.** Buddha may be among this few, as may Confucius, and a few Ancient Greeks and Romans. After more than a thousand years, there were a few more between the Sixteenth and Twentieth centuries. Hume was an atheist who made Ethics part of his life's work. Sidgwick was another. **After Sidgwick,** there were several **atheists** who were professional moral philosophers. But most of these **did not do Ethics. They did Meta-Ethics.** They did not ask which outcomes would be good or bad, or which acts would be right or wrong. They asked, and wrote about, only the meaning of moral language, and the question of objectivity. **Non-Religious Ethics has been systematically studied**, by many people, **only since the** 19**60s. Compared with the other sciences**, Non-Religious **Ethics is** the youngest and **the least advanced.**

Adopt a parliamentary model to account for moral uncertainty. This entails minimizing existential risks. **Bostrom 9** writes[[19]](#footnote-19)

It seems people are overconfident about their moral beliefs.  But **how should one** reason and **act if one** acknowledges that one **is uncertain about morality** – not just applied ethics but fundamental moral issues? if you don't know which moral theory is correct?

It doesn't seem **you can[’t] simply plug your uncertainty into expected utility** decision theory and crank the wheel; **because many** moral **theories** state that you **should not** always **maximize** expected **utility.**

Even if we limit consideration to consequentialist theories, it still is hard to see how to combine them in the standard decision theoretic framework.  For example, suppose you give X% probability to total utilitarianism and (100-X)% to average utilitarianism.  Now an action might add 5 utils to total happiness and decrease average happiness by 2 utils.  (This could happen, e.g. if you create a new happy person that is less happy than the people who already existed.)  Now what do you do, for different values of X?

The problem gets even more complicated if we consider not only consequentialist theories but also deontological theories, contractarian theories, virtue ethics, etc.  We might even throw various meta-ethical theories into the stew: error theory, relativism, etc.

I'm working on a paper on this together with my colleague Toby Ord.  We have some arguments against a few possible "solutions" that we think don't work.  On the positive side we have some tricks that work for a few special cases.  But beyond that, the best **we have managed** so far is **a** kind of **metaphor, which** we don't think is literally and exactly correct, and it is a bit under-determined, but it **seems to get things roughly right** and it might point in the right direction:

**The Parliamentary Model.**  Suppose that you have a set of mutually exclusive moral theories, and that you assign each of these some probability.  Now imagine that **each** of these **theorie**s **gets to send** some number of **delegates to The Parliament**.  The number of delegates each theory gets to send is **proportional to the probability of the theory.**  Then the delegates bargain with one another for support on various issues; and the Parliament reaches a decision by the delegates voting.  What you should do is act according to the decisions of this imaginary Parliament.  (Actually, we use an extra trick here: we imagine that the delegates act as if the Parliament's decision were a stochastic variable such that the probability of the Parliament taking action A is proportional to the fraction of votes for A.  This has the effect of eliminating the artificial 50% threshold that otherwise gives a majority bloc absolute power.  Yet – unbeknownst to the delegates – the Parliament always takes whatever action got the most votes: this way we avoid paying the cost of the randomization!)

The idea here is that moral theories get more influence the more probable they are; yet **even a** relatively **weak theory can still get its way on some issues** that the theory think are extremely important **by sacrificing** its influence **on other** i**s**sues that other theories deem more important.  For example, **suppose you assign 10% probability to** total **util**itarianism and 90% to moral egoism (just to illustrate the principle).  Then **the Parliament** would mostly take actions that maximize egoistic satisfaction; however it **would make some concessions to util**itarianism **on** issues that utilitarianism thinks is especially important.  In this example, the person might donate some portion of their income to **existential risks** research and otherwise live completely selfishly.

I think there might be wisdom in **this model**.  It **avoids the** dangerous and **unstable extremism** that would result **from letting one’s current favorite moral theory completely dictate action**, while still allowing the aggressive pursuit of some non-commonsensical high-leverage strategies so long as they don’t infringe too much on what other major moral theories deem centrally important.

I don’t need to win that weighing values is possible. Extinction precludes all values, so it is wrong under any moral code. **Seeley 86**[[20]](#footnote-20)

In moral reasoning prediction of consequences is nearly always impossible. One balances the risks of an action against its benefits; one also considers what known damage the action would do. Thus a surgeon in deciding whether to perform an operation weighs the known effects (the loss of some nerve function, for example) and risks (death) against the benefits, and weighs also the risks and benefits of not performing surgery. Morally, however, **human extinction is unlike any other risk. No conceivable human good could be worth** the **extinction** of the race, **for** in order **to be a human good it must be experienced by human beings.** Thus extinction is one result we dare not-may not-risk. Though not conclusively established, **the risk of extinction is real enough to make nuclear war** utterly **impermissible under any** sane **moral code.**

No theory is so absolute that extinction is irrelevant. Even deon has a threshold.

**Korsgaard 02** writes[[21]](#footnote-21)

But actions are also events in the world (or correspond to events in the world, at least), and they too have consequences. There are a number of different ways in which one can deal with worries about what happens to the consequences in Kant’s ethical theory. It is worth pointing out that **Kant himself** not only **did not ignore** the **consequences**, but took the fact that good actions can have bad effects as the starting point for his religious philosophy. In his religious thought, Kant was concerned with the question how the moral agent has to envision the world, how he has to think of its metaphysics in order to cope with the fact that the actions morality demands may have terrible effects that we never intended, or may simply fail to have good ones. **I** myself **see** the development of what Rawls has called **“nonideal theory” to be the right way of taking care of** a certain class of **cases, in which the consequences** of doing the right thing just **seem too appalling** for us **to simply wash our hands of.** But I do not want to say that just having bad consequences is enough to put an action into the realm of nonideal theory. I think there is a range of bad consequences that a decent person has to be prepared to live with, out of respect for other people’s right to manage their own lives and actions, and to contribute to shared decisions. But I also think that **there are cases where our actions go wrong in such a way that they turn out** in a sense **not to be the act**ions **we intended** to do, or to instantiate the values we meant them to instantiate. I think that some of **these cases can be dealt with by** introducing **the** kind of **double-level structure** into moral philosophy that I have described in the essay on “The Right to Lie: Kant on Dealing with Evil.” 3 But I also think there are cases that cannot be domesticated even in this way, cases in which, to put it paradoxically, the good person will do something “wrong.” I have written about that sort of case too, in “Taking the Law into Our Own Hands: Kant on the Right to Revolution.” 4

The nature of the US government is to minimize existential risks.

**Abraham Lincoln 64**[[22]](#footnote-22)

I am naturally anti-slavery. If slavery is not wrong, nothing is wrong. I can not remember when I did not so think, and feel. And yet I have never understood that the Presidency conferred upon me an unrestricted right to act officially upon this judgment and feeling. It was in the oath I took that I would, to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. I could not take the office without taking the oath. Nor was it my view that I might take an oath to get power, and break the oath in using the power. I understood, too, that in ordinary civil administration this oath even forbade me to practically indulge my primary abstract judgment on the moral question of slavery. I had publicly declared this many times, and in many ways. And I aver that, to this day, I have done no official act in mere deference to my abstract judgment and feeling on slavery. I did understand however, that **my oath to preserve the constitution** to the best of my ability, **imposed upon me the duty of preserving**, by every indispensabale means, that government — **that nation — of which that constitution was** the organic **law.** Was it possible to lose the nation, and yet preserve the constitution? By general law life and limb must be protected; yet often **a limb must be amputated to save a life;** but a life is never wisely given to save a limb. I felt that measures, otherwise unconstitutional, might become lawful, by becoming indispensable to the preservation of the constitution, through the preservation of the nation. Right or wrong, I assumed this ground, and now avow it. **I could not** feel that, to the best of my ability, I had even tried to **preserve the constitution, if**, to save slavery, or any minor matter, **I should permit the wreck of** government, **country, and Constitution all together.**

Infinite values don’t paralyze calculation. **Lauwers and Vallentyne 04** write[[23]](#footnote-23)

**Zero Independence holds that the ranking of two worlds is determined by** the pattern of **differences in local value. This**, we claim, **is highly plausible** in the context of finitely additive value theories. In the finite case, finitely additive value theories always satisfy Zero Independence. Although they typically get expressed as judging a world as at least as good as another (having the same locations) if and only if its total value is at least as great, the **reference to the total is not needed.** An equivalent statement is that one world as at least as good as the second if and only if the sum of the differences in value is at least as great as zero. **Only the pattern of differences matters**. **Even in the infinite case**, Zero Independence is “partially” implied by Sum and Loose Pareto. Sum ranks U as at least as good as V if and only if Sum ranks U-V as at least as good as its zero world. Moreover, if two worlds U and V satisfy the antecedent clause of Loose Pareto, then Loose Pareto ranks U as at least as good as V if and only if it ranks U-V above its zero world. Zero Independence is thus, we claim, highly plausible for finitely additive theories.

Zero Independence is equivalent to a condition in social choice theory known as Translation Scale Invariance when it is restricted to the case where locations are the same.[[24]](#footnote-24) This latter condition holds that interlocational comparisons of zero points are irrelevant to the ranking of worlds. The zero point for value at each location, that is, can be set independently of how it is set for other locations (although, of course, when comparing two worlds, the zero point used for a given location in one world must also be used for that location in the second world). For example, if a location has values of 10 in world U and 5 in world V, both measured on the basis of some particular zero point (the same for both worlds), those values could be changed to 7 and 2 (by making the zero point 3 units higher for that location), and this, according to Translation Scale Invariance, would not alter how the two worlds are ranked.

Zero Independence is equivalent to Translation Scale Invariance (restricted to the case where locations are the same), since any change in the zero points for the locations in worlds U and V can, for some W, be represented by U+W and V+W. (For example, if there are just two people, and the first person’s zero point is decreased by two units, and the second person’s zero point is increased by one unit, then the resulting two representations of the value of U and V are simply U+W and V+W, where W is <2,-1>.) Zero Independence and Translation Scale Invariance thus each hold that U ≥ V if and only if U+W ≥ V+W.

Translation Scale Invariance (and hence, Zero Independence) is highly plausible for finitely additive value theories. (Recall that our goal is to defend a particular extension of finite additivity, not to defend finite additivity against non-additive theories.) **If there is no natural zero point that separates positive from negative value** (if there is just more or less value with no natural separating point), **then any particular zero point is arbitrary** (not representing a real aspect of value). In this case, interlocational comparisons of zero-points are uncontroversially irrelevant. **If**, on the other hand, **there is a natural zero for value, it is still** plausible for finitely additive value theories to hold that it is **irrelevant** for ranking worlds. **What matters** (e.g., **from** a **util**itarian perspective), as argued above, **are** the **differences in value at each location between two worlds—not the absolute level of values** at locations. No interlocational comparison of zero points is needed for this purpose.

Cost-benefit analysis is feasible. Ignore any util calc indicts. **Hardin 90** writes[[25]](#footnote-25)

**One** of the **cute**r **charge**s **against util**itarianism **is that** it is irrational in the following sense. **If I take the time to calculate** the consequences of various courses of action before me, **then** I will ipso facto have chosen the course of action to take, namely, to sit and calculate, because while I am calculating the other **courses of action will cease to be open to me. It should embarrass philosophers that they have ever taken this** objection **seriously. Parallel considerations in other realms are dismissed** with eminently good sense. Lord Devlin notes, “If the reasonable man ‘worked to rule’ by perusing to the point of comprehension every form he was handed, the commercial and administrative life of the country would creep **to** a standstill.” James March and Herbert Simon **escape** the quandary of **unending calculation** by noting that often we satisfice, **we do not maximize: we stop calculating** and considering **when we find a merely adequate choice** of action. **When**, in principle, **one cannot know what is** the **best** choice, **one can nevertheless be sure that** sitting and **calculating is not the best choice.** But, one may ask, How do you know that another ten minutes of calculation would not have produced a better choice? And one can only answer, You do not. At some point the quarrel begins to sound adolescent. It is ironic that **the point** of the quarrel **is almost never at issue in practice** (as Devlin implies, **we are** almost all **too reasonable** in practice **to bring the world to a standstill**) but only in the principled discussions of academics.

Ignore permissibility and presumption because moral uncertainty means we’ll always have a non-zero credence in the existence of morality, so there’s always a risk of offense in favor of one action.

The neg must defend one unconditional policy option. Conditionality is bad because it makes the neg a moving target which kills 1AR strategy. He’ll kick it if I cover it and extend it if I undercover it, meaning I have no strategic options. Also, it’s unreciprocal because I can’t kick the AC.

Contention 4 is Stop Wasting your time on Theory, Danny

I define rehab as federal support for reentry programs. Prefer this interpretation.

First, it sets the best limits. Here’s a caselist. **Nielson 11** writes[[26]](#footnote-26)

Rehabilitation has been considered a primary goal of the prison system throughout the twentieth century, even though it has not been in vogue for many decades (Harvard Law Review, 2010). The debate about rehabilitation has a long, complex history in the US. Bottom line: "Effective programming requires money, effort, and a recommitment to rehabilitation. But it is not only an investment in safe prisons and jails. It is also an investment in safe and healthy communities" (Gibbons & Katzenbach, 2006). Rehabilitation is a critical to overcome the collateral consequences of being a convict which limit the convicted individuals social, economic, and political opportunities after release (Pinard, 2006). If society wants ex-prisoners to succeed, to be rehabilitated, then it has to provide them tools while they are still incarcerated to prepare for the moment of release to reenter society and reenter their families and communities. Reentry begins inside the prison with programs that provide inmates with the stability necessary to transition back into their communities (Muhlhausen, 2010). **Offender reentry programs would be an excellent way to narrow a debate about rehab**ilitation, but before I get to the sorts of affirmative and negative I think are viable under a prison rehabilitation topic, I would like to discuss the benefits of prison reform as a controversy area to the debate community.

**[…]**

The following discussion is focused around mainstream reentry and **rehab**ilitation **programs** which **could be** increased (**created** or expanded) **by Congress.**

**One clear option** for prison reform **is** the improvement of and increase of **education** and training programs. "Prisoners--who are less likely to have completed high school or obtained a General Equivalency Diploma (GED) than the general population--typically enter prison with an educational disadvantage. In fact, there is a direct correlation between a lack of education and the probability of incarceration" (Colgan, 2006). Leaving prison with that same education deficiency has been linked to recidivism; in contrast, educational programs are linked with lowering recidivism (Colgan, 2006). Basic education, vocational programs, & post-secondary education are all possible affirmatives on a prison reform topic (Nixon et al, 2008). Affirmatives may mandate vocational programs offering particular career training to fill holes in the economy (Colgan, 2006). Affirmatives could reform the fees system used by education programs which would encourage enrollment in education programs. **Aff**irmatives **could provide incentives for community college**s to offer **programs for prisoners** to help **with** applications, necessary testing, and **financial aid.**

**Another** affirmative option **is work release**. The unemployment rate for ex-offenders is 33% (Burt, 2010). "There are a number of studies that demonstrate that employment is a fundamental component of the reentry process, and that ex-offenders who are able to find stable employment are much more likely to succeed in their rehabilitation than those who cannot find work" (Nuñez-Neto, 2008). Without income offenders are likely to commit another crime as a means of support (Burt, 2010). "Employment is one of the strongest predictors that an ex-offender will be successful after release and not backslide into crime" (Nuñez-Neto, 2008). If ex-offenders face continual rejection in the labor market, then they are more likely to give up looking for a job and turn to criminal activity to provide an income. Work release allows prisoners to engage in full-time or part-time employment in order to facilitate their re-entry into the labor market after release. Legislation could introduce partnerships between the states Department of Corrections and businesses to provide incentives for businesses to hire prisoners from work release programs post-release (Colgan, 2006). The federal government could also create temporary job programs for ex-prisoners (Burt, 2010).

**Drug** and alcohol **treatment programs** are a practical necessity that many affirmatives could advocate. "Nationally, at least 30 percent of convicted persons report they used illegal drugs at the time of their offense" (Colgan, 2006). Roughly 80% of prisoners report drug use in their history, even if not at the time of the crime (Colgan, 2006). Providing chemical dependency treatment programs would help a large segment of the prison population. The general population believes that putting an addict in prison eliminates their ability to access the substances of their addiction which cures the addiction, but after release without a treatment program many recovering addicts return to substance abuse (Kendrick, 2011). There is solid empirical evidence that ordering inmates into treatment programs and getting them to participate in treatment reduces recidivism (Kendrick, 2011).

**Health** services are a fundamental need in prisons. Health care costs are a huge issue for prison systems and when the state is completely responsible for footing the bill the quality of inmate care may suffer (Quinn, 2009). Inmate health care "is frequently so inadequate that "preventable suffering and death behind bars" has been "normalized" (Dolovich, 2009). There are facilities with four or five thousand prisoners and only three or four doctors and some physicians are limited to work in correctional facilities because they are not qualified to care for the general population (Gibbon & Katzenbach, 2006). Courts have held that inmates have the right to health care, but the quality of the care is still up for debate (Quinn, 2009). 30 states have some form of co-payments for health care required of inmates which discourages prisoners from seeking treatment (Quinn, 2009; Gibbon & Katzenbach, 2006). The Commission on Safety and Abuse in America's Prisons recommends co-pay laws be revoked and Medicaid and Medicare be extended to eligible prisoners (Gibbon & Katzenbach, 2006). Mental health services are desperately needed in prisons. The prevalence of mental illness in prisons is 2 to 4 times higher than that of the general public (Colgan, 2006). Many prisoners do not receive any treatment for mental illness. There is a lack of staffing, medication, and supervision for prisoners with mental illnesses. "The consequences of failing to provide mental health care include suffering, self-mutilation, rage and violence, unnecessary placement in segregation, victimization, and suicide" (Colgan, 2006). The lack of mental health care also poses a risk to inmates who are not ill because inmates with mental illness are more likely to cause disciplinary problems than other inmates. Another significant problem is the inability to reenter society; untreated mental illness makes it more difficult for inmates to become productive, law-abiding citizens (Kendrick, 2011). The most common treatment is segregation which mental health professional argue often worsens the illness (Colgan, 2006). Children **& family services** are an important part of successful rehabilitation. 1.5 million children have parents in the DOC (Colgan, 2006). There is significant evidence about the impact of prisons on family and social networks. Children are taken from parents when they are incarcerated and often there is no visitation once the children are removed. Family structures face intense strain when prisoners reenter the family (Lyles-Chockley, 2009). Parents strain to reconnect with their children and children can go through serious trauma as parents reenter their lives; neither have had a chance to build a relationship during incarceration (Lyles-Chockley, 2009). The racial disparities in incarceration rates have a devastating impact on communities practically dissolving important social networks, particularly in black families (Lyles-Chockley, 2009). There will be affirmatives providing services for prisoners to interact with their children (Colgan, 2006).

**The largest aff** on the topic **would be comprehensive transition**al service programs, which are all in one programs including education, job training and placement, life skills, family reunification services, assistance, chemical dependency treatment, and mental health services (Colgan, 2006). Several states (Tennessee, Hawaii, & New York) have comprehensive programs that could be modeled on a federal level (Colgan, 2006). Holistic reentry services provide for prisoners needs across the board instead of in small pieces. Comprehensive reentry programs recognize the linkages between jobs, education, and social services. "By starting a prisoner with a Plan which identifies all of his or her needs and addresses them holistically, the likelihood of success while in prison and upon release are improved" (Colgan, 2006). In general, access to social services which some are explicitly denied would help convicts overcome significant obstacles to reentry.

Second, debating reentry policies is key to criminal justice education.

Empirics confirm. Reentry is the most important and least discussed form of criminal justice education. **Swanson et al 10** write[[27]](#footnote-27)

In this research, **the authors utilize a survey** of members of a national criminal justice organization (Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences) in an effort **to gauge the coverage of reentry** issues **in criminal justice education.** The selection of reentry issues is based on the review of reentry literature. The survey is designed to assess the relative amount of time respondents devote to each topic in fractions of a 16-week semester. The survey was administered electronically through an email link to the instrument. The survey was sent to a total of 1,631 individuals. Thirty-seven were returned as undeliverable or as automated out- of-office replies and another 35 potential participants were bounced out of the survey by the program. A total of 408 respondents completed the survey out of the remaining 1,559 potential participants, resulting in a response rate of 26%. While this response rate is relatively low, web-based surveys commonly result in lower response rates than telephone or male surveys (Couper 2000; DiNitto et al. 2008; Tourangeau 2004). There are several explanations for the relatively low response rate. Recipients included criminal justice educators, practitioners, students, and others interested in criminal justice. The sampling frame does not provide for discerning which recipients teach classes in academic settings. Correspondence from numerous recipients indicates that many members of the national organization do not teach classes. Those individuals who indicated that they did not teach were asked not to complete the survey. In addition, the first two survey questions asked whether the respondent taught in a four- or two-year program, respectively. Only those respondents indicating that they taught in either a four- or two-year program were included in the analysis. Furthermore, the email message introducing the survey identifies its purpose as obtaining information about reentry issues. Return emails from recipients indicates that many of them did not participate because reentry is not their area of interest or expertise. While recipients who showed a reluctance to participate were encouraged to complete the survey, the authors believe that many recipients did not contribute because they felt their responses were not relevant to the research. Thus, it is likely that the results actually overestimate the treatment of reentry issues in criminal justice education due to the self- filtering of many recipients who do not cover such issues in their courses. Those who teach research methods, policing, and courts are possible examples Results Of the 408 respondents, 92.1% indicated that they taught in either a four- or two-year program (see Table 1). Since the focus of this analysis is on criminal justice education, only those respondents indicating that they taught were included in the analysis, resulting in 372 total cases for analysis. Due to the relatively small sample size, pairwise deletion was utilized to maximize the sample size for each analysis. The percentage of cases missing data ranged from 3.2% to 15.6% for the variables used in the analysis. While the missing data produce the potential for biased results, the authors feel that the data provide a solid baseline for this exploratory analysis. The overwhelming majority of respondents, 88.7%, teach in four-year programs. The mean number of majors in their programs is 429 students, with an average of nine faculty members in their departments and average class sizes of 34 students. There is a relatively even split between academic ranks for the respondents: 27.2% hold the rank of professor; 26.2% hold the rank of associate professor; and 32.5% hold the rank of assistant professor. The remaining 15% of respondents are either instructors or adjunct faculty. Nearly three-quarters of the respondents have a PhD, while just over 17% earned their highest degree at the master's level. For the majority of respondents, 55%, their highest degree is in criminal justice, criminology, or justice studies. Seventeen percent hold a degree in sociology, while 14.5% of respondents indicate "other" for their degree field. Open-ended responses indicate that the "other" category primarily includes education, public administration, and psychology. In addition, one-third of respondents designate employment experience in the corrections field. The majority of respondents teach courses in introductory criminal justice and corrections, **while a substantial percentage teach criminology,** policing, **theory, and research** methods courses. **Only 2%** of respondents report **teach**ing **a course on** prisoner **reentry**, while 4% teach a drug-related course. Thus, it appears that when reentry issues are addressed, they are largely covered in more general courses.

**Over 60%** of the respondents **reported that** offender **reentry is** a **very important** topic **in criminal justice education, while another 28% view the topic as important.** Table 2 provides the survey findings for the treatment of numerous reentry issues in criminal justice education. A majority of respondents address 13 of the 14 reentry issues listed. The most commonly covered topics are those involving drug and substance abuse, mental health, and the impact of prisoner reentry on communities with over three-quarters of respondents reporting that they provided some attention to these issues. The least addressed reentry topics are parenting, case management, literacy, and anger issues. Table 3 provides a breakdown of the amount of coverage of each reentry issue for only those respondents who reported they addressed the topics.2 While the previous table shows that a majority of respondents covered reentry issues, the findings in Table 3 indicate that the treatment of those issues with respect to time-frame is very limited. For each issue, **over two-thirds** of the respondents **report** that they provide the **minimum** amount of **coverage**, one to two weeks. Community impact, mental health, and victim issues are most likely to receive additional attention, with over one-third of respondents reporting at least three to four weeks of coverage in their courses.

In an effort to better understand the context under which reentry issues are taught in criminal justice education, a reentry scale was created which measures the overall coverage of all reentry issues. The scale had a range of 1.0 to 5.0, with 1.0 representing no coverage and 5.0 indicating maximum coverage. Means tests were utilized to determine the effects of courses taught, academic rank, and degree field of respondents on reentry coverage. Table 4 reports the findings of the means tests broken down by courses taught. The findings show that those teaching courses on reentry, drug issues, corrections, and theory generally provide the most coverage of reentry issues. There is a significant difference in the amount of attention provided to reentry issues among those who teach these courses and those who do not teach them. This finding is not surprising given the nature of these courses, although our discussion on the relevance of reentry to a variety of topics might provide useful examples of how reentry issues can be more broadly integrated into criminal justice curricula. Tables 5 and 6 display the findings from means tests examining the effects of academic rank and degree field, respectively, on the reentry scale. In most cases, no statistically significant differences were uncovered. However, there is a significant difference in the treatment of reentry subjects by instructors. It appears that instructors cover reentry issues to a greater extent than instructors of other ranks. Perhaps this finding emerges because instructors are more likely to have work experience in the field and are more acutely aware of the importance of reentry issues.3 It is also possible that instructors are more likely to teach courses in which reentry issues are deemed more relevant to the focus of the course. Future research should examine the forces behind this finding. Discussion and Implications The results of the survey provide a positive picture with regard to reentry issues in criminal justice education, yet also indicate several areas for improvement.

Table 6 Comparison of mean level of coverage of reentry issues by degree field

 Degree field

CJ/Criminology Other Significance

1.93 1.87 .454

Sociology Other

1.82 1.92 .335

Social work Other

1.81 1.90 .850

Political science Other

1.73 1.91 .245

Law Other

1.61 1.92 .061

The upside is that it appears that reentry issues are being addressed in criminal justice education. Students are exposed to many of the important reentry issues primarily in courses on corrections, drug abuse, and in those few courses offered specifically addressing prisoner reentry. But teachers also address reentry subjects broadly in other courses, often classified as core subjects. Nevertheless, given the implications of the vast numbers of offenders who will be returning to society as a result of decades of punitive crime policies, prisoner reentry arguably could assume greater prominence and more wide- spread coverage in criminal justice education. **While** the findings reported here indicate that **reentry issues are addressed, depth and breadth** of coverage **appear**s to be **lacking** as measured by the amount of time devoted to the subject and the variety of courses in which reentry is addressed. As indicated in Table 4, respondents teaching courses in policing, courts, research and statistics, and introductory criminal justice and criminology are less likely to cover reentry issues. As noted earlier, it can be argued that **the impact of reentry** issues **on all aspects of** the **criminal justice** system **points to a need to cover the topic** in courses in which reentry can be thought of as relevant. Our contention is that reentry is relevant to these courses. The central question, it seems, is this: Is criminal justice education adequately preparing students to address the needs of contemporary criminal justice in practice?

Criminal justice education outweighs other offense. **Nielson 11** writes[[28]](#footnote-28)

Second, **if a large percent**age **of debaters enter** into **law** school, **political science, or social justice** work post their undergraduate studies, **then the prison topic would be valuable** as practical **research for** their **future studies. Debate skills, such as research**, listening, public speaking, personal expression, problem-solving skills, **are highly transferable** in these areas of graduate study. We are all familiar with research indicating **70% of judges recommend** participation in **intercollegiate debate as a precursor to law school** (Freely & Steinberg, 2009). **Debaters** themselves **list law school prep**aration **as one** of the **advantage**s **of** intercollegiate **debate** (Williams, McGee & Worth, 2001). You aren't likely go to law school and skip over a discussion of the penal system. **The debate community has an opportunity to prepare** our undergraduates **for** work in **a field they are most likely to go into.**

Third, case is a disad to theory. Pell Grants discourse is key to real world reform.

**Abdul-Alim 12** writes[[29]](#footnote-29)

John J. Farmer, Jr., former New Jersey attorney general and now **Dean** and Professor **of Law at** the **Rutgers** School of Law, **called** the restoration of **Pell grants for prisoners “one of the most important dialogues we can have in** the context of **law enforcement.”** “I think that education in our prisons is the key to preventing recidivism,” Farmer said. Farmer made his remarks Thursday at the Rutgers University Paul Robeson Campus Center during an event titled “Pell Grants and Prison Education: How Pell Grant Access in Prison Transforms Lives.” Among those who spoke in support of lifting the ban on Pell grants to prisoners was Dallas Pell, daughter of the late U.S. Sen. Claiborne Pell, father of Pell grants. Pell, who is founder of an organization called Pell Grants for Public Safety, said providing education for individuals in prison is a “no-brainer” and “one of the most effective tools we have to make our community safe.” Pell and various speakers noted how a plethora of studies have repeatedly found that higher education for prisoners significantly reduces their likelihood of returning to prison. Indeed, a 2005 Institute for Higher Education report, titled “Learning to Reduce Recidivism,” noted how “research consistently demonstrates that participation in educational programs while incarcerated reduces recidivism rates by increasing an individual’s ability to successfully rejoin mainstream society upon release from prison.” The paper also recommends restoration of Pell grants for prisoners. While academic support for education in correctional settings is easy to find, political will to lift the federal ban on Pell grants to prisoners has been more difficult to garner. **Farmer** said toward the end of his stint as New Jersey Attorney General from 1999 to 2002, he **tried to sponsor legislation** that would provide for increased educational opportunities for prisoners in order to make it easier for them to reenter society. “At the time **there** just **was no traction** among the political people to pass legislation like this,” Farmer said. The group that organized Thursday’s discussion – **The E**ducation from the **I**nside **O**ut Coalition – has faced similar challenges. Over the past few years, the organization has **approached key members of Congress** and, more recently, officials at the U.S. Department of Education in an attempt to get them **to reverse the** 1994 **ban** on Pell grants for incarcerated individuals. Each time, those involved in the effort say, they leave the table with the idea that **they must first build** broad **public support before any official will take the issue on.**

## 1AR

TURN – The federal ban on Pell Grants for prisoners was engrained in neoliberal logic of economic competitiveness that privileged vocational training over liberal arts education. **Yates 09**[[30]](#footnote-30)

In 1971, Supreme Court Justice Warren Burger spoke at the first National Conference on Corrections, “We know that today the programs of (prisoner) education range from nonexistent to inadequate, with all too few exceptions. However we do it, the illiterate and the unskilled who are sentenced for substantial terms must be given the opportunity, the means, and the motivation to learn his way to freedom” (Burger, 1985 p. 193). Prison-based programs have dated back to the 1800s as reformers sought to extend basic and vocational education, as well as moral education to those who had been convicted of crimes (Welch, 1996). Gehring and Wright (2003) propose that many of these early reformers were not just interested in improving the virtues of the inmates, but also had a sophisticated understanding of the anti-democratic nature of penal systems. They had the progressive notion that prisoners were capable of being agents in their own reformation by taking responsibility for education. Gehring and Wright call the presence of these early radical prison educators, “the hidden heritage of correctional education” (p. 52 5). They suggest this thread of progressiveness extended up through World War II after which Cold War pragmatism resulted in a return to basic education (Gehring & Wright 2003). Much of the **programs of the** 19**60s and** 19**70s** followed a functionalist approach that **equated an inmate’s** future **success** as a law-abiding citizen **with** the knowledge required to obtain lawful employment and negotiate legal society. These skill sets focused primarily on obtaining **vocational skills** and basic literacy. Howard Davidson describes this theory: “it propounds that crime results from individuals making poor (i.e. criminal) decisions when faced with life‟s many problems. **Out of neoliberalism comes the market metaphor, in which individuals make rational decisions based on calculating benefits against costs**” (Davidson, 1995, p.4). How did the modern functionalist approach to prisoner education take root? Much of the impetus seems to have arisen from human capital theory. **One** of the **primary feature**s **of neoliberal thought** and practice **is the reliance upon** human capital theory to explain the purpose of education. Human capital theory has been described by Robert Hart and Thomas Moutos (1995) as an investment of **skills training in workers that seeks to balance the costs of training with the return on** the **investment.** Even the proponents of human capital theory describe it as reductionist, mechanical and based upon “homogenized factors.” During the reign of neoliberalism, human capital theory slithered from its manufacturing origins into the corridors of education. Perhaps the most succinct description of the human capital theory of education is provided (without apparent irony) by Joop Hartog and Hessel Oosterbeek (2007): “The basic human capital model of schooling envisages two options (1) go to school for s years and earn an income Ys every year after leaving school, or (2) go to work right away and earn 53 annual income Yo” (p. 7). This reductionist view of the role of schooling does not take into account exogenous factors that can affect income level such as discrimination and availability of jobs in the market (Livingstone, 1997). The role of human capital theory in education reached a high level of urgency among neoliberals as concern arose regarding the United States competiveness in global markets. Chief among the proponents were Presidents George Bush and Bill Clinton through the Goals 2000 project which set the priority for education to create the workers who could increase the U.S. efficacy in international capitalism (Briscoe, 2000). A center-piece of the thrust toward implementation of human capital theory in education was the No Child Left Behind legislation which narrowed the focus of educational curricula toward those basic skills required for technical society such as math, reading and science at the expense of those for an active, well-rounded life such as social studies, art, music and physical education. According to Pauline Lipman (2007) No Child Left Behind is “explicitly designed to meet the needs and technical rationality of business… symbolically, as well as practically, national testing constitutes a system of quality control, verifying that those who survive the gauntlet of tests and graduate have the literacies and dispositions business requires” (Lipman, 2007, p. 46). Lipman sees the legislation as a disciplinary process with the end product being docile workers, the ultimate in human capital. Prisoner job training programs fulfilled this need. 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** 19**90s, 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 **emphasizes 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). **Friere** (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.
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