

Hello and welcome to **30 Brave Minutes**: a podcast of the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of North Carolina at Pembroke. In **30 Brave Minutes**, we'll give you something interesting to think about. Joining our host Jeff Frederick, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences are faculty from the department of Sociology and Criminal Justice. With us are Mario and Judy Papparozzi, Renee Lamphere, and Bob McDonnell. Their topic: Crime and Punishment.

FREDERICK: We've all seen it a million times: you tune in to your favorite police drama on television and in sixty minutes or less the crime of the century has been solved, without a shadow of a doubt. Clues magically appear and get put into context immediately. Joe, down at the lab, the municipal government lab, that has every modern laser and mass spectrometer ever invented, turns around a footprint in an hour and tells the investigating officer that it was a size eleven shoe, manufactured by a boutique firm in England. Three computer key strokes later you find the only retailer in the state that carries the footwear. After arriving on the scene and engaging in some witty and flirty banter, an attractive young manager unearths the credit card receipt that shows just who bought the size elevens, and when. Speeding off to find the suspect in his 8,000 square foot New York apartment (I mean, how unbelievable is that?), the detectives use their cunning to soon extract a confession, and then a couple of right-crosses later, to prevent an escape. The suspect is soon cuffed and booked, and hauled off to the station, where more witty banter ensues, often in front of a perpetually angry captain, who complains about one thing or another before throwing the detectives out of his office. Later, they reconvene at the local bar and throw down a couple of brews, all while reminiscing over solved cases, like a little-leaguer, remembering his first home run. Undoubtedly, there is much more to it. The art, craft, and most importantly, the science of Criminology: a field related to Criminal Justice, but not a synonym, doesn't ever seem to come across on television or film. Neither does the amount of time required to solve a case. Suspects don't always confess, and most lawyers never have a 'Perry Mason' moment. But people do, however, go to jail. Over 2.3 million are currently incarcerated and as many as eleven million come in and out of jail each year. About 20 percent or more of arrests are for drug related offenses. When folks get out, many end up going right back in for one reason or another. The US has less than five percent of the world's total population, but over twenty percent of the globe's prisoners. Why is this? How does the law enforcement community actually solve crime? Do prisons work? Why do we have so many people - over four million - on probation and parole? These, and other questions, today. Our topic is Crime and Punishment. Our guests: Dr. Mario and Judy Papparozzi, Renee Lamphere, and Bob McDonnell. So let's start with a softball. What does TV get right, if anything, and what does it get wrong about law enforcement and the criminal justice system?

M. PAPAROZZI: Wow, what a great question! By the way, if they put what really happens in crime and justice on the street on television, there would be a lot of dead air. No one would watch. Things happen so quickly on those TV shows and people have such a skewed opinion about how crimes are committed, and by whom and how they are solved, and so on. I loved your introduction. Frankly, it just doesn't happen in real life, but I do like watching Law and Order. I watch it every night before I go to sleep and I sit there and often, along with Judy, say, "you can't do that; they don't do this!" The prosecutors and the interrogators are doing things that they are not allowed to do, to elicit confessions that they shouldn't have gotten in the first place, and so on. All I can say, I guess, in short, is that what we watch on TV, Forensic File, and NCIS, is just not an accurate depiction of reality. This business of criminal profiling - my goodness - if you watch these criminal profiling shows, you would think that it is a real hard science, and it is just not.

J. PAPAROZZI: One of the most basic things that they get wrong on television is that they think Miranda has to be given upon arrest. That is such a mistake, because if you are arrested drunk, what is the use of doing Miranda warnings? This is a good example of what you mentioned at the beginning. A Miranda warning is only given when there is custodial interrogation. So, you are in custody and you are being interrogated. I have to teach my students every semester: "No, it is not like TV; it is more like this." The Supreme Court decision on this was Miranda vs. Arizona.

MCDONNELL: I think another thing that I can tell from my own personal experience of forty-seven years as a criminal investigator, is that I know that you don't get the lab results back in an hour. (Everyone laughs.) Sometimes a year, it depends on the priority of the case, dependent on the type of evidence. Something like a footprint, or even DNA, the labs are so backed up with other requests and priorities. It wouldn't be unusual for me to send in a lab request and have to wait six months before I actually got the results. In the meantime, you still have to work the case, follow the leads, do the interviews, and interrogations. Another impact I want to mention is this 'CSI-effect', this forensic belief by the public that you do get this turn around so quick. It does have a negative impact on juries now because juries expect that every case that goes to trial, they are going to see forensic evidence, or DNA evidence. (They think) they are going to see all these scientific techniques being put in play in every case that occurs. That is not reality because you are not going to get it every time.

FREDERICK: A lot of jurors who hated science in high school and college suddenly have become experts.

M. PAPPARROZI: Can you imagine?

MCDONNELL: That is exactly correct, and this is something that the prosecutors have to deal with. They have to try to overcome the expectation, which is false. Some cases do have DNA. It would be wonderful if every case had a DNA and you know you can link somebody to it, or a fingerprint, or something like that, but it just doesn't happen that way. Unfortunately, this is something that the criminal justice system has learned to deal with and this is one of the negative impacts of television, CSI, and forensic science.

J. PAPPARROZI: Sadly, rape-kits seem to be the one piece of evidence that are most delayed in our system. As much as two years in many states. I am very sad about that.

LAMPHERE: I, too, am a big Law and Order fan, especially SVU. I love Oveda Benson; she is one of my favorite characters of all time. Something that I notice and I talk about in class, with shows like Law and Order, is that oftentimes they will have the person in the position of detective and they are doing seven, or eight jobs that would be available in the criminal justice system. Also, one of my pet peeves is when there is a suspect running down the street and they just fire their gun, all willy-nilly, at anybody. A police officer is responsible for every single bullet that is issued to them, so if you are going to shoot a bullet out of your gun, that is going to come with a stack of paperwork. So, there is no doing that. A show that I like, not law enforcement, but Orange is the New Black. The show about women's prisons that came out on Netflix last year. I think it is an interesting show and it does depict some aspects of the correction system that are correct. It talks about the pseudo-families that women form; it talks about how racial and ethnic minorities tend to group together while they are incarcerated. Then, they really lose the story line when they have a wild chicken that is running through the prison and they are all trying to capture it. I applaud any new attempt that tries to show the correction system, but I think sometimes it almost glamorizes it. As somebody who has spent a lot of time studying correction systems, prisons and jails, I can tell you that there is nothing glamorous about it.

FREDERICK: We'll come back and pick that up in a minute, but before we get them incarcerated, we have to solve the case, in some sense. So, talk about how it actually does work. How do cases get solved? Or, do they? Do a significant percentage of crimes get caught?

MCDONNELL: Well, that's a good question. If you just look at statistical numbers, violent crimes have the highest resolution rates relative to what we call 'clearance rates'. That is where either an investigation results in an arrest or in some manner an individual can be connected to the crime. Maybe they were serial rapists and they get arrested for one rape, and then we can connect them to twenty-nine other rapes. As you move down from violent crime to property crimes you see a much less percentage of cases that actually are solved, simply because just the sheer numbers of crimes reported. Larceny is the number one reported crime in the US, and that can be anything from pick-

pockets to somebody stealing somebody's books in their dorm room. Because of the sheer number of it, there are not enough investigators or police to be able to give the adequate attention that you would have to provide to try to get a solution rate of 100 percent.

J. PAPAROZZI: However, I would disagree on only one thing. Not with Bob, but in terms of narcotics. I was a narcotics prosecutor. The investigation is there; the political will is there to have narcotics investigated, so we are getting everything from street dealers, all the way up to kings of these drug networks. Bob is right, homicide, rape, any kind of kidnapping is going to be a high priority for any police department, but narcotics seems to be the one other crime outside of the violent crime that is going to be prosecuted. We do catch a fair number of them because, honestly, they are right out in front of us most of the time.

M. PAPAROZZI: That depends on where you are as well. If you are in a major city, Charlotte, New York City, wherever. Car break-ins, for example, in New York City, just ain't no big deal. I had my car broken into one night, years ago, in New York City, and I called the Emergency Box on the pole, and I happily waited on the corner. After about fifteen minutes, here comes a police car with two cops in it. They didn't even get out of the car. They said here is a number to call tomorrow for your incident report. I said, "Aren't you going to get out and dust the car for prints?" They said, "There are so many of these every night, there is not much we can do about it." Never got out of the car!

J. PAPAROZZI: That goes to my point about political will, though, because Rudi Juliani, when he became mayor of New York City, what did he do, Mario?

M. PAPAROZZI: He did exactly that! He took the small level crimes under that theory that we all know, we all talk about, the broken windows theory. He said if you solve the small problems of disorder, low level crimes and things that aren't even crimes, just disorderly, then you probably could lay a foundation for a healthier community that doesn't breed as much crime, in essence.

FREDERICK: Let's go back to something Renee introduced a little bit ago. Let's talk about our prison system. Are we in the punishment business? Are we in the rehabilitation business?

M. PAPAROZZI: Should we be, or are we?

FREDERICK: Yes.

J. PAPAROZZI: I started working in prisons in 1972 in New Mexico. I worked in the prison in New Mexico that had the worst riot in the history of the US. Thirty-three inmates were killed, twelve hostages were taken, all brutalized, but all lived. Believe it or not, that prison did the best rehabilitation programs I have ever seen - before the riot. Four years before the riot, all the rehabilitation programs were pulled. At the same time, wonderful victim's advocates like John Walsh, were appearing on the scene. If you don't know who John Walsh is, he is the father of Adam Walsh, who was killed in Florida. John Walsh was Mr. America's most wanted that we saw for years. Mario and I luckily became very involved in the prison system, but then the prison system went from rehabilitation to totally just desserts and punishment, which Mario can talk about, and Renee as well. I don't think that the pendulum has swung back to where any focus is on rehabilitation. I worked in three different states. I was a teacher in a prison in Pennsylvania, I worked for the Parole Board in New Jersey, spent almost fifteen years in prisons, locked-up, and I never saw what I saw in the early seventies, post Attica, and post the terrible Arkansas discoveries in the prisons there. I've never seen the pendulum swing back. When I visited Scotland Correctional Institution, the classrooms were tinier than the room we are in today, just very little. There wasn't a focus on education, which I think is a major key to rehabilitation, and the big area was the sewing room, the tailor's shop, filled with men. They are not Italian tailors either, like we would see in Italy, but I saw when I talked to the corrections officer leading us around and giving a tour, rehabilitation programs were below, the kitchen detail, the license-plate making, and so forth. It broke my heart, after being in the system for thirty years. It broke my heart to see that.

FREDERICK: Just one correction: we are currently in the palatial 30 Brave Minutes studio.

LAMPHERE: I think that when you are talking about rehabilitation and the correction system, that you can't ever really get too far removed from public opinion, and how that influences it. I think if you are talking about an individual, say you have a brother, or cousin, who is incarcerated, you individually want that person to be rehabilitated. But when you are talking about criminals as a group, the general public just doesn't care about rehabilitation. When it comes down to, "Do I want my money spent on education for my children, on schoolbooks, or do I want my money spent on rehabilitating inmates?" People are going to pick their children and schoolbooks. We are definitely in the business of punishment in this country. I think the only silver lining that I see is that there has been a push towards evidence-based programming and evidence-based research in the field of justice and criminology, especially within the past ten years. I think if anything is going to push us into that rehabilitation era again, I think it is going to be evidence-based policies.

M. PAPAROZZI: Renee, I think, made a critical point that I would like anybody who listens to this podcast to hear and understand. I think this way about it. I worked for thirty years in a department of corrections and I learned after twenty-nine years that we shouldn't market our goal to the American public as being rehabilitation. Rehabilitation is a means to an end, and that end is public safety. A lot of people don't like rehabbing bad guys, and some people don't mind rehabbing bad guys. We can set that aside if we understand that the end game is public safety and if the research evidence tells us that the absolute best way to get the most public safety from this very difficult criminogenic population would be to rehabilitate them, even if we don't like to do that, we must do it or else we are negligent. That is the important point here, and I think that a lot of people who work in the business don't even understand that. If I talk to a group of senior people in departments of correction and say what are we in the business to do? Somebody might say rehabilitation. Rarely, but they might say that. That is not a good goal to market to the people, but everybody wants to be safe. If the preferred way to be safe, based on research, is to provide rehabilitative services, evidence-based practices, you must do it. I would like that dialogue to shift because liberals and conservatives can come together on that issue.

FREDERICK: Let me just follow up on that briefly. If the goal was public safety, and the means to reaching that goal was rehabilitation, would we know how to rehabilitate prisoners? Do we have enough information to be successful at it, assuming we had the will?

J. PAPAROZZI: When I worked in the prison in New Mexico that I just mentioned, the case of Furman v. Georgia had just been decided in 1971. I started in 1972. I went to college with about ten men and women who had been on death row. That is the ultimate punishment that we give in this country, but my college which was in Sante Fe, stepped in. Every inmate graduated from college as one, two, three, four, and five, in their respective classes. Not one of those inmates ever went back to prison, and yet they had been on death row and were repeat offenders. I found early on that nothing can empower an individual like an education and a job. The counseling programs I saw in the many prisons I worked in, which includes Raleigh State Prison, Trenton State Prison, prisons in Pennsylvania, and New Mexico, as I mentioned, I didn't see in New Jersey the focus on education that I saw, luckily, earlier in my career. I do believe you can rehabilitate people because I began my career seeing the absolute benefits of education and good counseling as rehabilitative means to an end, as you mentioned.

MCDONNELL: You know I have arrested repeat offenders before. People that had been in prison, come out, and I always used to ask them that question: Hey, what are you doing back here? We investigated you five years ago; you went off for four or five years. The answer would invariably hit on what you are saying - "They just took me and dumped me back in the neighborhood with no resources, no education, no job training, and really no hope, and I had no way to put food on the table so I went right back to doing what I was doing, whether it was selling drugs or robbing liquor stores." It was very frustrating for us as criminal investigators because there we are using our time to re-investigate somebody that has

already been to prison. Hopefully, if the system had been better we could have moved on to more important work.

M. PAPAROZZI: These anecdotes are nationally out there, all over the country. These are not just little stories that we happen to know. You can go anywhere in the country and you will hear the same stories over and over again about what we are not doing in the prisons. Renee, you had something?

LAMPHERE: I think about rehabilitation, to a certain extent you have to have a willing offender, you have to have somebody that wants to be rehabilitated. I don't think that you can force it on somebody. You can put somebody in the best evidence-based treatment program possible, and if there is a part of them that doesn't want to get better, or get rehabilitated, you are going to be hard pressed to rehabilitate somebody. Not to harp on the same point, but what Bob said, when you take somebody and you give them treatment and programs, and then put them back into the same neighborhood, the same conditions and living environment that they came from, I don't think you can expect them to do anything but fail. I think we set people up for failure. It is very easy to get lost in the criminal justice system.

J. PAPAROZZI: Absolutely.

M. PAPAROZZI: It's like a meat grinder.

J. PAPAROZZI: Once inside, there is almost no way out of it. That is the scary part, so I always believe. Not only was I a prosecutor, I was also a public defender for a long time as well. The key with me was I would talk to my cops: "Can we keep this person out of the criminal justice system?" Because you are going to do more harm than good, and how many parents came to me and said, "I want my kid to learn a lesson!" I said, "Well then, teach it to them; don't make my officers teach it to them." Once inside, like Renee said, they are ensnared. Breaking from a prior record is almost impossible.

LAMPHERE: And just to note, the great state we are in, North Carolina, is one of two states where you automatically go to the adult court system at age sixteen. North Carolina and New York.

FREDERICK: I would be remiss while we were talking about prisons, to not throw this out there: what does the data show about private prisons, or corporate-owned prisons? Do they work? Are they punishment side, rehabilitation side? Is it just a profit center? Talk about that for a minute.

M.PAPAROZZI: By the way, I did a lot of work in Tennessee for Governor Bredesen a few years ago, and they have private prisons out there. You know, I worked in a state prison system and we privatized some services, not our prisons. We wrote the specs. We weren't doing a very good job, so we wrote specs for the private sector to do the kind of job we were doing, but cheaper. So my observation is that they are neither more, nor less effective. They pay less money, so they have higher staff turnover. That could be a good or a bad thing, given some of the staff that I have seen over the years. But I don't really think that you could say that private prisons, in general, are producing a better or a worse result. I think they are producing about the same result because the people who are contracting with them wrote the specifications, and they weren't very good in the first place.

J. PAPAROZZI: There is another point, too, that dovetails with what Mario is saying and what Bob said before. When you have a big case blow up of an ex-offender going out and shooting ten people, or whatever, back to the words 'political will.' The political will completely changes and we become a system of warehousing and just because the state prison does it, you think that the private prison won't. But the private prison also wants no escapees, so they have trained their officers and a lot of people who work in corrections didn't have any background in criminal justice or criminology. They train their officers to be the goon squads that go in and they can know how to extract somebody from the cell. They become specialists only at one thing, which is warehousing.

M. PAPAROZZI: People without backgrounds in corrections. What I say in a lot of talks that I give is that if you can hire the top person, the director of corrections, the secretary of corrections, commissioner of corrections, whatever you call them, depending on the state, politically, based on their political credentials, then you can do anything you want below that. And too often, these jobs are political appointees without backgrounds. They, then run the system based upon their favorite flavor of the year, and not on the research evidence. So the political nature of the system has really conflicted and impeded the professionalization of what we would like to accomplish in our prisons and jails.

J. PAPAROZZI: And Joe DiMaggio was a New York State Parole Board member.

M. PAPAROZZI: Can you imagine?

FREDERICK: Well qualified.

PRODUCER RICHARD GAY: We'll return to 30 Brave Minutes in a moment, but first, thank you for listening and for your financial support of the College of Arts and Sciences. Please consider a contribution to the Arts and Sciences Dean's Fund. The Dean's Fund exists to help students and faculty make meaningful connections to the community, the state, and beyond through intellectual inquiry, research, and scholarship of the Humanities, Social Sciences, and STEM fields. Mark your envelope 'The Dean's Fund, College of Arts and Sciences, UNCP, Hickory Hall, Pembroke, NC 28372 or call the College of Arts and Sciences at 910-521-6198. You can also find us on the web. Now, back to 30 Brave Minutes and your host, Jeff Frederick.

FREDERICK: Let's see if we can turn the glass of water half full. Most of the crime statistics for the last decade or so are relatively optimistic. Is there good reason that Americans should feel reasonably safe in their daily life?

M. PAPAROZZI: Crime statistics in my almost fifty years now go up and down on their own. I really don't know why and it is not a function of incarcerating more or incarcerating less. I think it has something to do with a whole bunch of other societal factors: employment situations, social assistance programs, culture, etc., but we should feel better that crime rates have gone down, but frankly, I think it is also a function that we are counting things a little differently, and so on. There are still many unsafe parts of New York City, in spite of Mayor Juliani's commentary to the contrary.

LAMPHERE: It could also be an effect of the model penal code that was used by states around the country in the late seventies and early eighties to have a truth in sentencing. So a lot of parole was eliminated, eventually a lot of parole release was eliminated, and we are seeing people locked up for a longer period of time, which also may be one of those factors that affect what we are seeing nationally in statistics.

MCDONNELL: I would agree with that and I also think that we have seen an increase in the professionalism in the criminal justice profession itself. Here at our school we put out a lot of criminal justice graduates, and a lot of them are going to local, state, and even federal law enforcement. Getting a higher-educated candidate into the system bodes well for the future, just because they are better educated, more dedicated, more motivated and really the money hasn't gotten any better, so we are really fortunate. I think that, along with the things that you two just mentioned has had a positive impact on bringing that crime rate down or on a downward trend over the last, say, twenty years.

FREDERICK: Probation officers are historically way overworked in terms of their case load and in terms of their responsibilities. How could we make probation officers more successful in the things that they do when someone has been released from, not even prison, but from jail for a relatively minor offense.

M. PAPAROZZI: Hire our graduates. (Everyone laughs.) I am serious. Because of people like Renee, myself, Judy, Bob and others, who have worked in the field and also have a strong scholarly background. I know that our students are getting a different flavor when they take our classes. They are not just learning about what a system looks like, how it functions, and so on. I think they are going out there with a broader perspective about things. Again, if they can't like offenders, they need to get another career or act as if they like them. That is what a probation officer needs to do, or else he can't work for me. I think they are hearing that message in a lot of our classes. Frankly, I think that is why they are so successful, in particular in probation and parole. We have a load of graduates working in probation and parole in this state. They are well-liked, well thought of. I have talked to the chiefs.

FREDERICK: That is great input. Let me give you all a tremendous amount of power. You have the ability to step in and make a major alteration to one element of the criminal justice system. The goal is to get the most success in the overall series of problems that combine for where we are at. What would you do? And why would it work?

M. PAPAROZZI: Plea-bargaining. I hate it. If you talk to anybody they say, "If we don't do plea-bargaining the system will come to a halt." Well, we are not in business for a system to forward or come to a halt. We are in business to seek justice. When you lord over somebody's head that you are going to go to jail for a gazillion years unless you cop a plea to this lesser offense for ten years, and you don't have any money for an attorney, other than a public defender, no offense, but they are not as good as F. Lee Bailey. A lot of people cop pleas that they should not be copping to. On the flip side victims are wondering why he went to jail for robbery when he really raped me, hit me in the head with a hammer, and etc. Victims of crimes are misled by district attorneys all the time because district attorneys like to win, and public defenders like to win. We have a system based on winning and losing, so they play 'Let's Make A Deal' so that somebody can win a notch on their belt for "I won the case" or "I lost the case." That is not a just system. And this business about 'you have a right to an attorney.' Well, if somebody I loved got in trouble, the first thing I would be doing would be hiring the best attorney that money can buy, not the one that the state would provide for me, that has a thousand cases and cannot even remember your name an hour after he meets you.

FREDERICK: So Mario just got rid of plea-bargaining. What about the rest of you all?

LAMPHERE: If I could wave my criminal justice wand I would make sure that policies were enacted based on things like data and not public fears and public opinion. There are so many things that we do; we talk about the dare program in my classes. The Dare program makes everybody feel so good on the outside, but what does the research tell us about Dare - the Drug Abuse Resistance Education program? It tells us that it is not working. There are some studies that indicate that Dare is actually the first time that many people are introduced to drugs and some studies that show that it has an aggravating effect; it almost makes drug use worse. But, do you want to be the politician that goes through your jurisdiction saying "I'm going to end the Dare program if you elect me"? That is just one example of so many programs and policies that we implement that are based on public opinion and public fear. I was just looking at the 2015 Uniform Crime Report this morning when I was getting ready for the podcast and this is the tenth year of decline that we have seen in our property crimes. We saw a slight increase in violent crime rates this year compared to 2014, but again, like Mario said, that usually shakes out within a year or two. If you ask somebody like my grandma, she will tell you that crime is at an all-time high, that kids are crazy, that the world is going to end, and I think that the general public doesn't have an understanding of crime, like criminologists do. I just wish that policy was based on more criminological aspects, as opposed to public fears.

MCDONNELL: Renee, you bring up an excellent point. I think that media has a lot to do with that, with the sensationalization of cases. They will take cases and the way they sensationalize them, you would think that violent crime was just rampant everywhere and you are right, the facts are not the same. If I was going to have something, I would like to see some tort reform. The appellate processes can be very frustrating. So many individuals have so many levels of appeal that sometimes the appeals go on for

years and years. Whether you agree with the death penalty or not, a person can sit - what is the average? About fourteen years on death row, I believe.

FREDERICK: Arkansas, last night, executed two people, one of which had been on death row for twenty-two years.

LAMPHERE: They were executed on the same gurney. I read that this morning; that is how eager they were to execute them.

MCDONNELL: That is kind of bizarre. I am just talking about the actual appeal process. If they could streamline the system that would be beneficial and also cost-effective.

J. PAPAROZZI: Since Mario has attacked lawyers through plea-bargaining, and Bob attacked lawyers through the appellate division, I am not going to defend lawyers because I agree with them both, except about plea-bargaining. I worked in every aspect of the criminal justice system. I was blessed to be in all parts of it: law enforcement, prosecutor, municipal courts, prisons, probation and parole. I would say that once somebody is in the system, like said before, we have to focus on what happens to them while they are incarcerated. Like Renee mentioned, which I love, we have to base our programming on what works, and I'm sure you have all heard that term here, as well. I have seen education work, and as an adjunct professor here, I see education working every day and lives are being changed and people are being empowered. I think I would focus my attention on putting education programs inside of every prison in the country and it would have to be - not mandatory, but you would have to earn the right into it. No one wants to do something that is mandatory. Nobody wants to do something that is a gift, but if you have to earn your right to enter a school and stay in that school because you are doing well, you are learning lessons that you are never going to learn anywhere else. A mom is going to be nice to you, whatever. That is what I would change; not plea-bargaining.

FREDERICK: And the last word goes to Judy. (Everyone laughs.) Thanks for a really lively and fascinating discussion. We have covered a lot of ground and I appreciate all of your different perspectives. Many thanks to the panel. Thanks to all of you listening and if you like what you are listening to, pass it on to a friend. See you next time on 30 Brave Minutes.

Today's podcast was produced by Richard Gay and transcribed by Janet Gentes. Theme music created by Reilly Morton. This content is copyrighted by the University of North Carolina at Pembroke and the College of Arts and Sciences. It is to be used for educational and non-commercial purposes only and is not to be changed, altered, or used for any commercial endeavor without the express written permission of authorized representatives of UNCP. The views and opinions expressed by any individuals during the course of these discussions are their own and do not necessarily represent the views, opinions or positions of UNCP or any of its subsidiary programs, schools, departments, or divisions. While reasonable efforts have been made to ensure information discussed is current and accurate at the time of release, neither UNCP, nor any individual presenting material makes any warranty that information presented in the original recording has remained accurate due to advances in research, technology or industry standards.

**Thanks for listening to 30 Brave Minutes, and Go Braves!**

