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#### Army aims to increase recruitment

**Vanden 2-12** [Tom Vanden, 2-12-2017, "Army to spend $300 million on bonuses and ads to get 6,000 more recruits," USA TODAY, http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2017/02/12/army-spend-300-million-bonuses-and-ads-get-6000-more-recruits/97757094/] NB

WASHINGTON — The Army plans to spend $300 million in a blitz of bonuses and advertising over the next eight months to recruit 6,000 additional soldiers it needs to fill out its ranks. Legislation approved by Congress and signed late last year by former president Barack Obama halted a years-long drawdown of U.S. troops. Rising threats around the world have spurred the increase. The Army’s new goal for the remaining eight months of the fiscal year is 68,500, up from 62,500 recruits. The addition of 6,000 recruits to the goal makes it the largest in-year increase in the history of the all-volunteer force that dates to 1973. Rapidly growing the Army also has come at a different type of cost in the past: lower standards for recruits produced sub-par soldiers. Many had to be culled after training. That won’t happen this time, said Maj. Gen. Jeffrey Snow, who leads Army Recruiting Command. “There is very clear guidance from the leadership in our conversations that there is no desire to lower standards,” Snow said.

#### Military recruitment from colleges increasing

**Tomsic 12** [Michael Tomsic, 8-18-2012, "In Weak Economy, College Grads 'Surge' Into Military," NPR.org, <http://www.npr.org/2012/08/18/158505630/in-weak-economy-college-grads-surge-into-military>] NB

The weak economy is helping to drive thousands more college graduates into the U.S. military. Since the recession began in 2007, there's been a steady increase in the number of college graduates joining the armed forces. The Navy and Army have seen the biggest jumps. About 60 percent more college grads joined the Navy last year than in 2007. For some of them, it's a job some would never have imagined for themselves just a few years ago. Not 'What I Thought I'd Be Doing' Louis Lam fits that bill. He's your typical good college student. He's on the dean's list at the University of Maryland, where he studies electrical engineering. He's active in campus organizations. To save money, he lives at home. He even helps his mom make dinner. "Generally I would just get the dishes and stuff ready," Lam says as his mother drips sauce onto meat sizzling in a skillet. OK, maybe he's not helping with the actual cooking. Mom jokes there's a reason for that. "He's not very good," Mydung Lam laughs. But Lam is a great son, she says. And that son's plans have changed drastically since he got to college. "What I thought that I'd be doing, going into college as an electrical engineer," Lam says, "I thought that I'd be working with gadgets, making robotic things, [tinkering with] groundbreaking technology." The idea of joining the military had never even crossed his mind, Lam says. But that was before both his parents lost their jobs. Unemployment benefits held them over for a while, but they ran out in April. "I was like, I really need to get this job as soon as possible," Lam says. "Otherwise, we might lose the house. We might have to sell some stuff." He saw his college friends struggling to find jobs or internships and says his family couldn't afford for him to go through that. Instead, he turned to the military. As the U.S. has struggled to recover from the worst recession since World War II, tens of thousands of other college students and graduates have made a similar choice. Bad Economy Drives Recruitment "When the economy worsens, as it has in recent years, we certainly see a surge in the number of young people who are highly qualified, who want to join the military," says Beth Asch, who researches military recruitment for the RAND Corp. It has studied U.S. military recruitment for more than 40 years. Asch says the surge in college graduates looks especially large this time around because of just how far the economy fell. "Since the mid-2000s, the unemployment rate has essentially doubled," she says. And since then, the Army and Navy have seen a more than 50 percent rise in recruits with college degrees, according to their latest numbers. Asch says college graduates make up a relatively small portion of total recruits. But as long as the economy stays weak, their numbers will go up. Part of the reason is that it always pays to have a job with Uncle Sam. "In order to sustain a volunteer force with high-quality people, the military finds it has to pay people more than they would get in the civilian world," Asch says. "That gap has actually increased in recent years, in part because of the continuing rise of military pay and partly because the economy has stagnated, and so civilian pay has stagnated as well." More People Than Positions At a naval-recruiting station near the University of Maryland, Lt. Mary Neal says it's almost easy right now for military recruiters. "We have more people coming than we have positions for," she says. "That's just how busy we are. It's sad when we actually have to tell them, 'Sorry, we've already met goal for this year.' " Neal says almost all the people being turned away have college degrees. She says the perks of a military job are especially appealing right now — good pay, free health care, a tax-free housing allowance and a pay raise every year. Another recruiter at Neal's station pitched all that to Louis Lam before his parents' unemployment benefits ran out. He signed up and is in for five years. Working On Ships From Home Lam says the recruiter also said he could stay close to home. He'll use his engineering background to work on nuclear reactors on submarines and ships, and he can do that from the D.C. area. While he finishes college this year, Lam says, the Navy will pay him about $50,000. "That specifically was very important to me because of our financial situation," he says. "I definitely wanted to say, 'Hey, is this what I'm going to be making? And if it is, then this is exactly what I need right now.' " Lam says the checks started coming a few months ago, and he's been spending most of them on his parents' mortgage and his student loans. For now, he's giving up the goal he had before he got to college: a career in the private sector with a big-name company. Lam says he's OK with that. There's a much better payout for helping his family and serving his country.

#### Trump wants increase in military recruiting efforts

**Newland 2-15** [Jonquil Newland, 2-15-2017, "U.S. Army ramps up recruitment efforts in historic military increase," WTVF, <http://www.newschannel5.com/news/us-army-ramps-up-recruitment-efforts-in-historic-military-increase>] NB  
At the U.S. Army Recruiting Battalion headquarters in Nashville, Lt. Col. Kevin Polosky oversees several recruitment districts in Tennessee and Kentucky. Some do a little better than others, but all of them were made responsible for increasing recruitment numbers. "The reason for the historic increase is just because we have to try and grow the Army so large in a short period of time," said Polosky. The rush to recruit stems from the National Defense Authorization Act of 2017. "We were as an Army going down to 460,000 people. The President has come in now and said that he wants that number to be 476,000; so that's a 16,000 increase in a short period of time. So the Army has to be ready with that number by October 1, 2017," Polosky said. Prior service members will also be welcomed back. $200 million in incentive bonuses nationwide may also help enrollment numbers.

#### Trump increased military budget will help attract more recruits

**Mark Karlin, 3-1-2017, "Trump's Proposed Military Budget Increase Means More Recruits as Fodder," Buzzflash,** [**http://www.truth-out.org/buzzflash/commentary\/trump-s-proposed-military-budget-increase-means-more-recruits-as-fodder**](http://www.truth-out.org/buzzflash/commentary/trump-s-proposed-military-budget-increase-means-more-recruits-as-fodder)

Trump's proposed [$54 billion dollar increase](http://www.cnn.com/2017/02/27/politics/trump-budget-proposal/" \t "_blank) to an already bloated military budget (of approximately $550 billion dollars currently) will have winners and losers. The primary winners will be the entrenched military infrastructure and defense contractors, who will benefit from the windfall of additional expenditures. In addition, the conservative and neoliberal promoters of US hegemony -- with the nation's military serving as global police enforcing US political and economic power -- will see their goal strengthened if the billions in extra budgetary funding is granted.

#### The NDAA increases military efforts to recruit on college campuses now

**Neal 16** [Jeff Neal », 12-14-2016, "7 things every fed should know about 2017 NDAA," FederalNewsRadio, <http://federalnewsradio.com/commentary/2016/12/7-things-every-fed-should-know-about-2017-ndaa/>] NB

The National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) is an annual piece of must-pass legislation. Because of that, it typically includes provisions that apply to the entire federal government that would be hard to pass on their own. The 2017 NDAA (all 3,000 pages of it) is no exception, with seven provisions that directly or indirectly will affect every agency. Here is a summary of those provisions and why you should care about them. Direct-hire authority for the Department of Defense for post-secondary students and recent graduates. DoD, like much of the federal government, [needs to bring more young people into the workforce](https://chiefhro.com/2016/03/02/the-ticking-time-bomb-in-the-federal-workforce/" \t "_blank). This provision allows DoD to hire qualified applicants without competition. The number is limited to 15 percent of the number of competitive hires in the previous fiscal year. If it is successful, this authority may serve as a model for the rest of the government. It has the potential to make college recruiting effective again, so this is an important step in rebuilding the government’s ability to recruit young people

#### Congress defense policy increases army efforts to recruit now

**Kheel 3-20** [Rebecca Kheel, 3-20-2017, "Army tackling task of significantly boosting its ranks," TheHill, <http://thehill.com/policy/defense/324593-army-tackling-task-of-significantly-boosting-its-ranks>] NB

When Congress passed its annual defense policy bill calling for the Army to boost its ranks by 16,000 more soldiers than what was planned, the service was left to work out a way to get there. Now, the Army is in the midst of a three-pronged approach: upping recruitment, retention of soldiers and retention of officers. “Army developed a strategy, and the key message there is that the Army’s hiring,” Maj. Gen. Jason Evans, director of military personnel management, said in an interview with The Hill. “One of the challenges of this is time and really trying to turn an institution like this on a dime in a short period of time.” How the Army is dealing with the increase in its ranks this year could provide a window into how it would handle the 60,000-soldier boost that President Trump has floated. But Evans said the service has not had discussions yet about future increases, remaining focused on achieving its goal for this year that was set by Congress. “We have not gotten to that conversation with senior Army leaders and there has not be any conversation about that,” he said. “Right now we’re really focused on FY17. That’s our immediate challenge right now.” Prior to December, the Army had planned on dropping from 475,000 to 460,000 soldiers. But the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) signed into law that month called for an Army of 476,000, tasking the Army with finding and keeping 16,000 more soldiers than it had intended. “I don’t think it will be an unreachable goal,” Evans said. “It’ll be a challenge, but I have confidence that we have a strategy in place to achieve to this goal.” The first approach is to boost recruitment numbers. The Army increased its recruitment goal by 6,000 soldiers, for a total goal of 68,500 this year.
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#### Congress defense policy increases army efforts to recruit now

**Kheel 3-20** [Rebecca Kheel, 3-20-2017, "Army tackling task of significantly boosting its ranks," TheHill, <http://thehill.com/policy/defense/324593-army-tackling-task-of-significantly-boosting-its-ranks>] NB

When Congress passed its annual defense policy bill calling for the Army to boost its ranks by 16,000 more soldiers than what was planned, the service was left to work out a way to get there. Now, the Army is in the midst of a three-pronged approach: upping recruitment, retention of soldiers and retention of officers. “Army developed a strategy, and the key message there is that the Army’s hiring,” Maj. Gen. Jason Evans, director of military personnel management, said in an interview with The Hill. “One of the challenges of this is time and really trying to turn an institution like this on a dime in a short period of time.” How the Army is dealing with the increase in its ranks this year could provide a window into how it would handle the 60,000-soldier boost that President Trump has floated. But Evans said the service has not had discussions yet about future increases, remaining focused on achieving its goal for this year that was set by Congress. “We have not gotten to that conversation with senior Army leaders and there has not be any conversation about that,” he said. “Right now we’re really focused on FY17. That’s our immediate challenge right now.” Prior to December, the Army had planned on dropping from 475,000 to 460,000 soldiers. But the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) signed into law that month called for an Army of 476,000, tasking the Army with finding and keeping 16,000 more soldiers than it had intended. “I don’t think it will be an unreachable goal,” Evans said. “It’ll be a challenge, but I have confidence that we have a strategy in place to achieve to this goal.” The first approach is to boost recruitment numbers. The Army increased its recruitment goal by 6,000 soldiers, for a total goal of 68,500 this year.

#### The NDAA increases military efforts to recruit on college campuses now

**Neal 16** [Jeff Neal », 12-14-2016, "7 things every fed should know about 2017 NDAA," FederalNewsRadio, <http://federalnewsradio.com/commentary/2016/12/7-things-every-fed-should-know-about-2017-ndaa/>] NB

The National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) is an annual piece of must-pass legislation. Because of that, it typically includes provisions that apply to the entire federal government that would be hard to pass on their own. The 2017 NDAA (all 3,000 pages of it) is no exception, with seven provisions that directly or indirectly will affect every agency. Here is a summary of those provisions and why you should care about them. Direct-hire authority for the Department of Defense for post-secondary students and recent graduates. DoD, like much of the federal government, [needs to bring more young people into the workforce](https://chiefhro.com/2016/03/02/the-ticking-time-bomb-in-the-federal-workforce/" \t "_blank). This provision allows DoD to hire qualified applicants without competition. The number is limited to 15 percent of the number of competitive hires in the previous fiscal year. If it is successful, this authority may serve as a model for the rest of the government. It has the potential to make college recruiting effective again, so this is an important step in rebuilding the government’s ability to recruit young people

#### Colleges are successfully limiting anti-war speech now – it’s key to boosting recruitment

**SW 5** [(Socialist Workers) Cracking down on student protests, International Socialist Review10-7-2005] AT

CAMPUS ADMINISTRATORS are cracking down on student activists who stand up against the presence of military recruiters at their schools. In late September, peaceful protests by students at three campuses--Holyoke Community College (HCC), George Mason University (GMU) and the University of Wisconsin-Madison--were met with police repression that denied students their right to free speech. -- At Holyoke Community College in western Massachusetts, about 30 students were conducting a peaceful picket of an Army National Guard recruiting table in the school cafeteria. The activists had been assured by campus officials that they could leaflet and chant during their picket of the recruiters. But they were attacked by campus security after a few approached the recruiters' table to inquire if their homosexuality would make them ineligible to enlist. One student, Charles Peterson, was put in a chokehold by campus officer Scott Landry--and maced. Landry, who assaulted several other students and bystanders, happens to serve as a staff advisor to the HCC College Republicans, who were enthusiastically encouraging the attack from behind the police lines. Landry then saw another activist wearing a gay and lesbian liberation button, and loudly commented to another officer, "He'll have fun in jail." The counter-recruitment demonstration was called by the HCC Anti-War Coalition (AWC), an affiliate of the Campus Antiwar Network (CAN). A diverse group of activists--black, white, Latino, gay and straight--answered the call. "I was there to speak for my brother," said one student, a member of the AWC Steering Committee. "He was wounded in Iraq...He was promised money for college and a chance to see the world. But he went to Iraq, and he wasn't the same when he came back." Rather than take action against the officers who attacked protesters, campus police threatened Peterson with arrest if he came back to campus. Though an administration official later told him that he is welcome on campus, Peterson has yet to receive any such assurance from the campus police. Peterson says he won't back down, though. "The next time the recruiters are there, I'll be on the front ranks," he said. Following a successful October 3 press conference, preparations were underway for an October 6 solidarity action organized by student antiwar activists from University of Massachusetts-Amherst. -- Meanwhile, hundreds of miles away, campus police at George Mason University in Fairfax, Va., used the same sort of violent tactics against student Tariq Khan, a former airman turned counter-recruitment activist. Khan, who has protested recruiters on his campus before, taped a sign to his chest that read "U.S. out of Iraq, U.S. out of Palestine, U.S. out of North America: Resist tyranny" and silently sat down in a chair several feet away from recruiters. For this modest protest, Khan was exposed to abuse and battery from campus police and other students, pushed off a stage, subjected to pain compliance, and charged with disorderly conduct and trespassing--at his own school! As right-wing students shouted epithets in his face, his sign was ripped off his chest. A former Marine who had been to Iraq told Khan to "shut up," and when Khan asked him how many people he'd killed, the Marine responded "not enough." As Khan began to make another sign, an officer told him, "You're not allowed to do that" and ordered him to leave. When Khan refused, the officer tried to arrest him. Some students repeatedly chanted "Let him go!" as Khan squirmed out of various headlocks and grips, and other students began to jump in with the police, according to several witnesses. "I am being nonviolent while they are using violence against me!" shouted Khan. After finally handcuffing Khan, police dragged him to a police car. Khan, who is half Pakistani, said he received the worst racist abuse at the police station. "You people are the most violent people in the world," he recalls one cop telling him. Another told him not to mouth off in jail because they "will hang you from the ceiling by your feet," a veiled allusion to prisoner torture at Guantánamo Bay. -- At the University of Wisconsin-Madison, 25 people mobilized to confront military recruiters at a career fair on one day's notice last week. But the police and administration were intent on preventing the protest from taking place. Ten cops were already inside, and building managers distributed a copy of the administrative code for protests in UW buildings to protesters on their arrival. But this code didn't seem to matter much, since the protesters weren't violating any part of it--they weren't preventing the event from taking place, blocking the recruiters' tables, using signs with sticks, or blocking entrances and exits. Police refused to give protesters any justification for their imminent arrest, and after some time, the protesters decided to move outside and began chanting and handing out leaflets for another hour. With enlistment slumping, military officials are increasingly desperate to find potential recruits. As of September 30, the military had fallen some 7,000 recruits short of its goal for fiscal year 2005--and the National Guard and Army Reserve did even worse. Military officials predict that meeting the coming year's goal will be even more difficult. "I think there's been a big shift in U.S. politics over the last few months," said Elizabeth Wrigley-Field, a student at New York University and member of the Campus Antiwar Network. "The resurgence of the antiwar movement--especially among students who are focusing on counter-recruitment--promises to erect even more barriers to filling the ranks of the military. The antiwar movement has gone from feeling like an embattled minority to feeling like the majority we are. "But we're running up against college administrations that don't want to lose control of the campuses. And they may be facing pressure from a government that's seeing the Army in its worst recruiting slump since 1979--and telling administrators that they need to do whatever it takes to guarantee their success on campuses. "Last semester, there were cases of repression against counter-recruiters, and some of them sparked defense campaigns that were successful and showed the administration that they couldn't get away with repressing student protests. This time, what's amazing is how quickly the schools seemed prepared to deal with the protesters and how happy they were to collude with right-wing students who were singling out individual protesters. "But now we have the successes of last spring to draw on, so HCC and GMU students can have a connection to City College of New York and San Francisco State students who won. Most importantly, the whole student antiwar movement is growing and becoming more confident, and that means the HCC and GMU students have a more powerful movement that's got their back."

#### Campus activism against war undermines morale and forces withdrawal – collapses American presence abroad and causes massive instability that culminates in extinction

Levy 07 [Janet Levy 7 [(Janet Levy, ) Iraq’s only Similarity to Vietnam: Its Dangerous Anti-War Movement, Accuracy in Media 2-28-2007] AT]

Contrary to media reports and the perception of a majority of Americans, the United States was winning the war in Vietnam following the successful watershed battle known as the Tet Offensive. Sadly, the Vietnam War was not lost on the battlefield. The carnage and repressive regimes that followed the U.S. exit may have been avoided had the truth been known by the American public. The United States was defeated by a carefully conceived, multi-pronged propaganda campaign that set the stage for America’s eventual failure in the region. The ingredients for the U.S. defeat consisted of the funding and encouragement of the anti-war movement by Hanoi and Communist splinter groups, enlistment of “useful idiots” in Hollywood to publicize and popularize the movement, media complicity with negative portrayals of the war, anti-American proselytizing by professors and students on American university campuses, denigration and demonizing of the military and, ultimately, withdrawal of support and appropriations by the U.S. Congress. All these factors led to the perceptual reframing of the Vietnam War as an ignoble imperialistic atrocity, a far cry from its launch as a fight to extinguish communism in Southeast Asia. Today, many of these same elements have reappeared as the United States struggles to defeat Islamic terrorists in Iraq and Afghanistan and to apprehend a fifth column of jihadists at home. Inherited from the Vietnam experience, they are now evident within the new conflict. This time, the risks to our country’s future are even greater should they succeed. Anti-War Groups As was true during the Vietnam War, today’s anti-war groups hide their anti-Americanism behind the politics of peace. Recruiting others on a platform of “peace,” they ally themselves with radical Islamists, glorify the enemy’s goals and identify themselves as “freedom fighters,” battling an imperialistic world power. In the lead up to the war against Iraq, anti-war activists effectively mobilized some of the largest protests and demonstrations since the Vietnam War. They attacked the war effort abroad and security measures at home, sympathized with Saddam Hussein as a victim of American war-mongering and even served as strategically-placed human shields. Although Operation Iraqi Freedom was welcomed by the vast majority of Iraqis and succeeded in liberating 25 million people from the ravages of a murderous despot, anti-war protestors decried the U.S. “occupation” of Iraq and the alleged subjugation of the Iraqi people. Their steadfast position was that any use of American military power was an attempt to establish American hegemony in the region and exploit Iraq’s oil resources. The discovery of Saddam’s mass graves and torture chambers were ignored by the anti-war movement in the service of demonizing the actions of the evil, American empire. Hollywood Similarly, in the tradition of Hanoi Jane Fonda, Hollywood plays a highly visible role in opposing the Iraq war and in spearheading demonstrations. Fonda is back in the anti-war fray as Jihad Jane joined by actors Susan Sarandon, Tim Robbins, Sean Penn and others. Before the invasion by coalition forces, Penn embarked on a “fact finding mission” in Iraq, where he met with Saddam Hussein. In a propaganda coup for the anti-war movement and the Baathists, Penn proclaimed to the media that the United States had initiated the war effort on false and illegitimate premises and declared that Iraq was free of weapons of mass destruction. Since then, the Hollywood anti-war cabal has threatened the political future of elected representatives unwilling to support the recent, nonbinding resolution against the war. As Hollywood stars use their celebrity in their attempts to sabotage the U.S. war effort, they fail to mention Saddam’s rape rooms, gassing of Kurds and murder of children in front of their parents. These movie stars deny the valiant purpose of the U.S. mission and its committed and brave soldiers. Instead, they give aid, comfort and legitimacy to the enemy. Mass Media As in the Vietnam era, the media has become the propaganda machine for the anti-war movement, using the same tactics of the 1960s and 1970s. The overwhelmingly negative and biased reporting of the Vietnam War era is very much in evidence in today’s Iraq coverage. The press continually advances the notion that life was better for the Iraqis under Saddam, minimizes the atrocities committed by Saddam and his henchman, and focuses instead on the U.S. role in “destabilizing” Iraq. The “good news” about economic recovery, business successes, progress made by the Iraqi government and improvements in public services are ignored in favor of stories of civil strife. Every attack on American soldiers and Iraqis is magnified and featured prominently, while successes are largely ignored or reported in passing. Few news stories focus on the heroism and generosity of American troops. Any hint of malfeasance, allegations of combat errors or misconduct on the part of the U.S. military gets center stage. U.S. forces are portrayed as an enemy as dangerous or even more so, than the terrorist groups they fight. U.S. soldiers are portrayed as acting without regard to the rule of law and abusing the rights of captured “insurgents.” Schools Equally reminiscent of the ’60s and ’70s, university and high school campuses are hotbeds for anti-American and anti-war sentiments. Prior to the inception of Operation Iraqi Freedom, the “Books Not Bombs” strike was coordinated on campuses nationwide by the National Youth and Student Peace Coalition, whose members include the Young Communist League, USA, and the Muslim Students’ Association of the U.S. and Canada. This anti-war protest was endorsed by professors in a wide variety of disciplines, from economics to biology, who cancelled classes or assured anti-war students they would not be penalized for absences. Some professors even focused the day’s class material on the potential war. Thus, a majority of institutions of higher education appeared to expect conformity of anti-war opinion and, in some cases, actually imposed the strike on the student population. This behavior continues today as literature and anthropology professors use classroom time to express their opinions against the war and pressure students to toe their ideological line. Often, students who agree with the Bush administration’s policy in Iraq jeopardize their grades by coming forward. They are treated with disdain and even disrespect in the classroom. Returning Iraq war veterans have been insulted, harassed and called “baby killers” in university classrooms. The Military Finally, as was the case during the U.S. fight against communism in Southeast Asia, the mission of the military has been undermined by blatant hostility and blanket condemnations. Venomous slurs have been directed toward the dedicated servicemen and women who toppled a brutal dictator, struggled against radical Islamists, and fought for a better life for the Iraqi people. Politicians have been extremely negative. For example, Illinois senator Barrack Obama referred to the “wasted” lives of our soldiers. Massachusetts Senator John Kerry insulted the intelligence of our armed forces by proclaiming that people end up in the military if they’re not smart or studious. Anti-military groups have tried to stop military recruitment drives and job fair participation in high schools and on college campuses. Even though all recruits today are committed volunteers who believe in the U.S. mission, anti-war activists portray them as victims, mercenaries or butchers. Isolated military improprieties committed by a few soldiers, like the Haditha incident and the Abu Ghraib scandal, receive outsized attention and are portrayed as representative of all military conduct. The slightest hint of misconduct is used to characterize all recruits and to malign the entire military mission. Anti-militarism has even been expressed by sweeping, local government measures. The city of San Francisco has engaged in various actions to rid itself of any relationship whatsoever to the military. Residents recently passed a symbolic measure demanding the withdrawal of troops from Iraq and prohibiting recruitment at high schools and colleges. City residents tried to stop Navy sponsorship of a summer concert, successfully blocked the docking of the USS Iowa at the Port of San Francisco and are trying to eliminate Fleet Week and the Blue Angels air shows. Congress In Congress, many Democrats and several Republicans are invoking the Vietnam “quagmire” descriptive to support demands to curtail the Iraq war and withdraw U.S. troops. The Democrat electorate has chosen to interpret recent election results as a sign that the public is opposed to the war, rather than opposed to the way the war is being fought. According to a recent national survey by Public Opinion Strategies, a majority of Americans (57%) wants to win the war in Iraq and makes the connection between Iraq and the global jihad. Fifty-three percent feel the Democrats are acting precipitously in pushing for immediate withdrawal and a majority (56%) also believes that Americans should stand behind the president in times of war. Most telling, 74% of those surveyed disagreed with the statement, “I don’t care what happens in Iraq after the U.S. leaves. I just want the troops brought home.” Last week, on the same day that Iraqi Prime Minister al-Maliki told Bush that the new security plan and heightened troop presence in Baghdad were “a dazzling success,” the House passed a non-binding resolution rejecting Bush’s 21,500-troop surge in Iraq. In the Senate, the resolution was just four votes short of the sixty required for cloture, which would have limited debate on the resolution and ensured passage. As a consequence of this narrow defeat, Democrats have pledged to repeal a 2002 measure authorizing and defining the mission of U.S. troops in Iraq. With no consideration of how this plays with the enemy, the morale of U.S. troops and the U.S. ground troops’ ability to build alliances with Iraqis, Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid issued a statement that the invasion of Iraq was “the worst foreign policy mistake” in U.S. history. In further attempts to block the deployment of more troops, House Democrats hope to restrict parts of a $100 billion emergency military funding request by the President. Rep. John Murtha (D-PA) and other Democrats have joined forces with anti-war groups to limit the President’s powers as Commander-In-Chief. Murtha and company plan to attach stipulations to any military appropriations; embark on a multi-million dollar, anti-war advertising campaign; and target vulnerable Republicans. Murtha is also seeking legislation as part of what he calls his “slow bleed strategy.” It would prevent military units from being deployed unless they meet certain standards and receive a break of at least one year between deployments. This damaging action by politicians and their failure to support the U.S. government “destroys morale, stymies success and emboldens the enemy,” says Rep. Sam Johnson (R-TX), a former Vietnam prisoner of war. “Words cannot fully describe the horrendous damage of the anti-American efforts against the war back home to the guys on the ground,” Johnson said. “We must stick by ‘the troops.’ We must support them all the way. To our troops we must remain always faithful.” This inattention to the message being sent to our soldiers is part of the broader failure by Iraq war opponents to recognize the dire consequences of U.S. withdrawal. It completely escapes opponents of the war on all fronts anti-war activists, Hollywood, colleges and universities and politicians that the conflict is not regional and one from which we can walk away without harm. It is positively stunning that they fail to recognize that Iraq could fall to Islamic terrorists. If this happened, Iraq would be a fertile base for Al Qaeda and other terrorist groups and a haven from which emboldened terrorists could attack U.S. allies and interests and threaten the very existence of our nation.

### 1NC- War- BIW + Barrett

#### US leadership prevents great power war and existential governance crises

**Brooks, Ikenberry, and Wohlforth ’13** (Stephen, Associate Professor of Government at Dartmouth College, John Ikenberry is the Albert G. Milbank Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University in the Department of Politics and the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, William C. Wohlforth is the Daniel Webster Professor in the Department of Government at Dartmouth College “Don’t Come Home America: The Case Against Retrenchment,” International Security, Vol. 37, No. 3 (Winter 2012/13), pp. 7–51)

A core premise of deep engagement is that it prevents the emergence of a far more dangerous global security environment. For one thing, as noted above, the United States’ overseas presence gives it the leverage to restrain partners from taking provocative action. Perhaps more important, its core alliance commitments also deter states with aspirations to regional hegemony from contemplating expansion and make its partners more secure, reducing their incentive to adopt solutions to their security problems that threaten others and thus stoke security dilemmas. The contention that engaged U.S. power dampens the baleful effects of anarchy is consistent with influential variants of realist theory. Indeed, arguably the scariest portrayal of the war-prone world that would emerge absent the “American Pacifier” is provided in the works of John Mearsheimer, who forecasts dangerous multipolar regions replete with security competition, arms races, nuclear proliferation and associated preventive war temptations, regional rivalries, and even runs at regional hegemony and full-scale great power war. 72 How do retrenchment advocates, the bulk of whom are realists, discount this benefit? Their arguments are complicated, but two capture most of the variation: (1) U.S. security guarantees are not necessary to prevent dangerous rivalries and conflict in Eurasia; or (2) prevention of rivalry and conflict in Eurasia is not a U.S. interest. Each response is connected to a different theory or set of theories, which makes sense given that the whole debate hinges on a complex future counterfactual (what would happen to Eurasia’s security setting if the United States truly disengaged?). Although a certain answer is impossible, each of these responses is nonetheless a weaker argument for retrenchment than advocates acknowledge. The first response flows from defensive realism as well as other international relations theories that discount the conflict-generating potential of anarchy under contemporary conditions. 73 Defensive realists maintain that the high expected costs of territorial conquest, defense dominance, and an array of policies and practices that can be used credibly to signal benign intent, mean that Eurasia’s major states could manage regional multipolarity peacefully without the American pacifier. Retrenchment would be a bet on this scholarship, particularly in regions where the kinds of stabilizers that nonrealist theories point to—such as democratic governance or dense institutional linkages—are either absent or weakly present. There are three other major bodies of scholarship, however, that might give decisionmakers pause before making this bet. First is regional expertise. Needless to say, there is no consensus on the net security effects of U.S. withdrawal. Regarding each region, there are optimists and pessimists. Few experts expect a return of intense great power competition in a post-American Europe, but many doubt European governments will pay the political costs of increased EU defense cooperation and the budgetary costs of increasing military outlays. 74 The result might be a Europe that is incapable of securing itself from various threats that could be destabilizing within the region and beyond (e.g., a regional conflict akin to the 1990s Balkan wars), lacks capacity for global security missions in which U.S. leaders might want European participation, and is vulnerable to the influence of outside rising powers. What about the other parts of Eurasia where the United States has a substantial military presence? Regarding the Middle East, the balance begins to swing toward pessimists concerned that states currently backed by Washington— notably Israel, Egypt, and Saudi Arabia—might take actions upon U.S. retrenchment that would intensify security dilemmas. And concerning East Asia, pessimism regarding the region’s prospects without the American pacifier is pronounced. Arguably the principal concern expressed by area experts is that Japan and South Korea are likely to obtain a nuclear capacity and increase their military commitments, which could stoke a destabilizing reaction from China. It is notable that during the Cold War, both South Korea and Taiwan moved to obtain a nuclear weapons capacity and were only constrained from doing so by a still-engaged United States. 75 The second body of scholarship casting doubt on the bet on defensive realism’s sanguine portrayal is all of the research that undermines its conception of state preferences. Defensive realism’s optimism about what would happen if the United States retrenched is very much dependent on its particular—and highly restrictive—assumption about state preferences; once we relax this assumption, then much of its basis for optimism vanishes. Specifically, the prediction of post-American tranquility throughout Eurasia rests on the assumption that security is the only relevant state preference, with security defined narrowly in terms of protection from violent external attacks on the homeland. Under that assumption, the security problem is largely solved as soon as offense and defense are clearly distinguishable, and offense is extremely expensive relative to defense. Burgeoning research across the social and other sciences, however, undermines that core assumption: states have preferences not only for security but also for prestige, status, and other aims, and they engage in trade-offs among the various objectives. 76 In addition, they define security not just in terms of territorial protection but in view of many and varied milieu goals. It follows that even states that are relatively secure may nevertheless engage in highly competitive behavior. Empirical studies show that this is indeed sometimes the case. 77 In sum, a bet on a benign postretrenchment Eurasia is a bet that leaders of major countries will never allow these nonsecurity preferences to influence their strategic choices. To the degree that these bodies of scholarly knowledge have predictive leverage, U.S. retrenchment would result in a significant deterioration in the security environment in at least some of the world’s key regions. We have already mentioned the third, even more alarming body of scholarship. Offensive realism predicts that the withdrawal of the American pacifier will yield either a competitive regional multipolarity complete with associated insecurity, arms racing, crisis instability, nuclear proliferation, and the like, or bids for regional hegemony, which may be beyond the capacity of local great powers to contain (and which in any case would generate intensely competitive behavior, possibly including regional great power war). Hence it is unsurprising that retrenchment advocates are prone to focus on the second argument noted above: that avoiding wars and security dilemmas in the world’s core regions is not a U.S. national interest. Few doubt that the United States could survive the return of insecurity and conflict among Eurasian powers, but at what cost? Much of the work in this area has focused on the economic externalities of a renewed threat of insecurity and war, which we discuss below. Focusing on the pure security ramifications, there are two main reasons why decisionmakers may be rationally reluctant to run the retrenchment experiment. First, overall higher levels of conflict make the world a more dangerous place. Were Eurasia to return to higher levels of interstate military competition, one would see overall higher levels of military spending and innovation and a higher likelihood of competitive regional proxy wars and arming of client states—all of which would be concerning, in part because it would promote a faster diffusion of military power away from the United States. Greater regional insecurity could well feed proliferation cascades, as states such as Egypt, Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, and Saudi Arabia all might choose to create nuclear forces. 78 It is unlikely that proliferation decisions by any of these actors would be the end of the game: they would likely generate pressure locally for more proliferation. Following Kenneth Waltz, many retrenchment advocates are proliferation optimists, assuming that nuclear deterrence solves the security problem. 79 Usually carried out in dyadic terms, the debate over the stability of proliferationchanges as the numbers go up. Proliferation optimism rests on assumptions of rationality and narrow security preferences. In social science, however, such assumptions are inevitably probabilistic. Optimists assume that most states are led by rational leaders, most will overcome organizational problems and resist the temptation to preempt before feared neighbors nuclearize, and most pursue only security and are risk averse. Confidence in such probabilistic assumptions declines if the world were to move from nine to twenty, thirty, or forty nuclear states. In addition, many of the other dangers noted by analysts who are concerned about the destabilizing effects of nuclear proliferation—including the risk of accidents and the prospects that some new nuclear powers will not have truly survivable forces—seem prone to go up as the number of nuclear powers grows. 80 Moreover, the risk of “unforeseen crisis dynamics” that could spin out of control is also higher as the number of nuclear powers increases. Finally, add to these concerns the enhanced danger of nuclear leakage, and a world with overall higher levels of security competition becomes yet more worrisome. The argument that maintaining Eurasian peace is not a U.S. interest faces a second problem. On widely accepted realist assumptions, acknowledging that U.S. engagement preserves peace dramatically narrows the difference between retrenchment and deep engagement. For many supporters of retrenchment, the optimal strategy for a power such as the United States, which has attained regional hegemony and is separated from other great powers by oceans, is offshore balancing: stay over the horizon and “pass the buck” to local powers to do the dangerous work of counterbalancing any local rising power. The United States should commit to onshore balancing only when local balancing is likely to fail and a great power appears to be a credible contender for regional hegemony, as in the cases of Germany, Japan, and the Soviet Union in the midtwentieth century. The problem is that China’s rise puts the possibility of its attaining regional hegemony on the table, at least in the medium to long term. As Mearsheimer notes, “The United States will have to play a key role in countering China, because its Asian neighbors are not strong enough to do it by themselves.” 81 Therefore, unless China’s rise stalls, “the United States is likely to act toward China similar to the way it behaved toward the Soviet Union during the Cold War.” 82 It follows that the United States should take no action that would compromise its capacity to move to onshore balancing in the future. It will need to maintain key alliance relationships in Asia as well as the formidably expensive military capacity to intervene there. The implication is to get out of Iraq and Afghanistan, reduce the presence in Europe, and pivot to Asia— just what the United States is doing. 83 In sum, the argument that U.S. security commitments are unnecessary **for peace** is countered by a lot of scholarship, including highly influential realist scholarship. In addition, the argument that Eurasian peace is unnecessary for U.S. security is weakened by the potential for a large number of nasty security consequences as well as the need to retain a latent onshore balancing capacity that dramatically reduces the savings retrenchment might bring. Moreover, switching between offshore and onshore balancing could well be difªcult. Bringing together the thrust of many of the arguments discussed so far underlines the degree to which the case for retrenchment misses the underlying logic of the deep engagement strategy. By supplying reassurance, deterrence, and active management, the United States lowers security competition in the world’s key regions, thereby preventing the emergence of a hothouse atmosphere for growing new military capabilities. Alliance ties dissuade partners from ramping up and also provide leverage to prevent military transfers to potential rivals. On top of all this, the United States’ formidable military machine may deter entry by potential rivals. Current great power military expenditures as a percentage of GDP are at historical lows, and thus far other major powers have shied away from seeking to match top-end U.S. military capabilities. In addition, they have so far been careful to avoid attracting the “focused enmity” of the United States. 84 All of the world’s most modern militaries are U.S. allies (America’s alliance system of more than sixty countries now accounts for some 80 percent of global military spending), and the gap between the U.S. military capability and that of potential rivals is by many measures growing rather than shrinking. 85

#### Hegemony solves extinction

**Barret 11** [Thomas P.M. Barnett 11 Former Senior Strategic Researcher and Professor in the Warfare Analysis & Research Department, Center for Naval Warfare Studies, U.S. Naval War College American military geostrategist and Chief Analyst at Wikistrat., worked as the Assistant for Strategic Futures in the Office of Force Transformation in the Department of Defense, “The New Rules: Leadership Fatigue Puts U.S., and Globalization, at Crossroads,” March 7 http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/8099/the-new-rules-leadership-fatigue-puts-u-s-and-globalization-at-crossroads]

It is worth first examining the larger picture: We live in a time of arguably the greatest structural change in the global order yet endured, with this historical moment's most amazing feature being its relative and absolute lack of mass violence. That is something to consider when Americans contemplate military intervention in Libya, because if we do take the step to prevent larger-scale killing by¶ engaging in some killing of our own, we will not be adding to some fantastically imagined global death count stemming from the ongoing "megalomania" and "evil" of American "empire." We'll be engaging in the same sort of system-administering activity that has marked our stunningly successful stewardship of global order since World War II. Let me be more blunt: As the guardian of globalization, the U.S. military has been the greatest force for peace the world has ever known. Had America been removed from the global dynamics that governed the 20th century, the mass murder never would have ended. Indeed, it's entirely conceivable there would now be no identifiable human civilization left, once nuclear weapons entered the killing equation. But the world did not keep sliding down that path of perpetual war. Instead, America stepped up and changed everything by ushering in our now-perpetual great-power peace. We introduced the international liberal trade order known as globalization and played loyal Leviathan over its spread. What resulted was the collapse of empires, an explosion of democracy, the persistent spread of human rights, the liberation of women, the doubling of life expectancy, a roughly 10-fold increase in adjusted global GDP and a profound and persistent reduction in battle deaths from state-based conflicts. That is what American "hubris" actually delivered. Please remember that the next time some TV pundit sells you the image of "unbridled" American military power as the cause of global disorder instead of its cure. With self-deprecation bordering on self-loathing, we now imagine a post-American world that is anything but. Just watch who scatters and who steps up as the Facebook revolutions erupt across the Arab world. While we might imagine ourselves the status quo power, we remain the world's most vigorously revisionist force.¶As for the sheer "evil" that is our military-industrial complex, again, let's examine what the world looked like before that establishment reared its ugly head.The last great period of global structural change was the first half of the 20th century, a period that saw a death toll of about 100 million across two world wars. That comes to an average of 2 million deaths a year in a world of approximately 2 billion souls. Today, with far more comprehensive worldwide reporting, researchers report an average of less than 100,000 battle deaths annually in a world fast approaching 7 billion people. Though admittedly crude, these calculations suggest a 90 percent absolute drop and a 99 percent relative drop in deaths due to war. We are clearly headed for a world order characterized by multipolarity, something the American-birthed system was designed to both encourage and accommodate. But given how things turned out the last time we collectively faced such a fluid structure, we would do well to keep U.S. power, in all of its forms, deeply embedded in the geometry to come.¶To continue the historical survey, after salvaging Western Europe from its half-century of civil war, the U.S. emerged as the progenitor of a new, far more just form of globalization -- one based on actual free trade rather than colonialism. America then successfully replicated globalization further in East Asia over the second half of the 20th century, setting the stage for the Pacific Century now unfolding.

## 2NR – Link

### OV

Even if the affirmative doesn’t intentionally destroy heg, heg decline is a consequence of their method, the 1NC ev proves that being critical of the military as an instiutiton destroys our status and undermines our resolve against rising powers, if you want to reform the military reform it from within by doing this, critiquing specific decisions is more productive than making broad overarching claims that trash the entire military and weaken resolve

### TL Overview: Link Turns

#### 1. default to evidence on the link debate, it outweighs their analytical link turns because a. our authors are experts who have conducted actual research in the field which means that it's a better depiction of what the real world is like, b. they refer to actual empirical instances of the link scenarios which take into account every single factor but their arguments are simply predictive

#### 2. you should be very skeptical of these link turns because they are in direct contrast to their cx answers in which they framed the aff as a method to end military primacy abroad through spillover and actual policies which is also another reason their link turns, which are honestly just excuses of arguments because they know they can't beat us on the heg debate.

### AT: Backlash

#### 1. Your magnitude weighing argument doesn’t make sense here, so it’s not a reason to prefer the link turn over the link

#### 2. uniqueness deficit- if protests are stable right now that's a uniqueness argument for the neg because we maintain current recruitment levels whereas you drop them. we don't cause even more people to protest because the 1nc doesn’t propose to censor more people so there is 0 change in how much protests occur

#### 3. no link- if the 1ac link ev. is true that policing free speech actually chills academics from speaking out then that proves that we actually mitigate the amount of protests that happen rather than cause more of them otherwise the aff doesn't do anything

### AT: Critical Thinking Military Reform

#### 1. Weak Strength of link- checking the military is an excuse for dramatically weakening it, that’s proven by the 1AC evidence which indicates that there will be military drawdown i.e. your spillover claims

#### 2. The 1NC link outweighs: A. you wreck recruitment levels which is a shitty way of changing the military, that outweighs because recruitment levels are on the brink right now whereas the aff pushes them way over . They are also the strongest internal link back to actual heg because it's a question of hard power., B. the aff nebulosuly improves critical thinking but destroys the foundations of the army which is a prerequisite for any actual heg.

#### 3. Protests don't direct better policies for the military, the military uses rigorous defense analysis and highly academic research to find threats so we should trust them- there is a disconnect between telling the military to back out of potentially dangerous areas that require stabilization from the hegemon.

#### 4. Even if they do win that protests reform the military, liberalization will redirect the military to the far left and make them too soft which simply reinstates our threats.

### AT: No Link- Don’t Decrease Military

#### not our argument, it's about weakening resolve and commitment to military primacy, recruitment on college campuses, and selective readings which distance the public from the military which hurts civil-miilitary relations. You make us look perceptually incapable and not threatening enough to carry out deterrence

## 2NC

### 2NC- BIW

**BIW 13- US Leadership prevents great power war and existential governance crises**

- Deep engagement gives the US leverage to restrain partners from taking provocative actions

- The US commitment to alliances also deter states that aspire to be regional hegemons and that contemplate expansion

- Mearsheimer forecasts that multipolar regions replete with security competition, arms races, nuclear prolif, and regional power wars.

**^Retrenchment advocates (Authors who want the US to reduce/decrease forces) have two responses**

**A. The U.S. Security guarantees are not necessary to prevent dangerous rivalries and conflicts within Eurasia, this flows from defensive realism in which they think for Eurasian states, there are high expected costs of territorial conquest, defensive dominance, and an array of policies and practices that can be used to signal benign intent which means that Eurasia's major states could manage regional multipolarity peacefully- but this is wrong**

---- there is an absence in states that are able to put these policies and practices in place consistently, they can't stabilize

---- regional expertise: there is large doubt that European governments will pay costs of increased EU defense coop and military budgets, that also makes a Europe that is incapable of securing itself i.e. 1990 Balkan wars, which kills cooperation against bigger threats

---- in the middle east, if the US withdrew from Israel, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, their actions could intensify security dilemmas.

---- in the east, if US withdrew from Japan and South Korea, they'd increase nuclear capacity which could hurt rels w/ China. Like in the cold war, the only reason they were stopped from obtaining weapons was because of US

---- this defensive realism theory assumes that states have only one preference and that is to be defensive, but offense costs a lot more than defense and states have preferences not only for security but also status. Even relatively secure states engage in highly competitive bhevario- empirical studies

**B. Prevention of Rivalry and Conflict in Eurasia is not a US interest**

---- if there are threats, it is most definitely a US interest.

---- First, overall higher levels of conflict make the world a more dangerous place. Were Eurasia to return to higher levels of interstate military competition, one would see overall higher levels of military spending and innovation and a higher likelihood of competitive regional proxy wars and arming of client states

---- stats show that proliferation stability decreases a ton as the numbers go up.

Retrenchment advocates say off-shore balancing, stay on your own coast, pass the help to others and then have them do the dangerous deep engagement against local resistance actors

---- There is the issue of China, they are becoming a regional hegemony in the east and their coatal competitors are not strong enough to do it by themselves. This also explains the pivot to Asia-

### 2NC- Barrett

**Barret 11- Heg solves extinction**

- In the status quo, we live in a world where there is a lack of mass violence.

- The US is responsible for stopping the world from entering war- We are responsible for the international liberal trade order which collapsed empires, explosion of democracy, spread of human rights, liberation of woman, doulbing of life expectancy 10 fold increase in GDP, and persistent reduction in conflicts

- The last global period of structural change was in the middle of 1900s which saw a death toll of 100 million due to world wars. Calculations suggest a 99% relative drop in deaths due to war.