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### Introduction

 Friends of Premier Debate,

This is Premier’s first brief of the 2017-2018 season, and the topic is “Resolved: In the United States, national service ought to be compulsory.”

We’re always looking for ways to make the briefs better, so please, let us know what you think! And send them around. If you use these briefs please help us and direct other debaters to PremierDebate.com/Briefs where we will continue uploading .DOC versions of the briefs.

This is a **special edition** of the Premier Debate brief in that it was primarily compiled at the Premier Debate Institute. We’d like to thank the extremely talented debaters at the Premier17 Invitation-Only Week – **Patrick Aimone, Devansh Chauhan, Luke Eriksson, Alan George, and Frances Zhuang** – led by John Scoggin and Jonas LeBarillec. And second, thanks to the top lab at Premier16 in LA – **Nikhil Ajjarapu, Anya Poplavska, Eddy Rastgoo, Oliver Sussman, Chris Wang, and Yichen Zhu** – led by Tim Alderete, Salim Damerdji, Louisa Melcher, and Nick Steele. Their efforts toward this massive communal resource (250+ cards) produced some of the best evidence you’ll find. If you see these debaters and coaches at a tournament, thank them for their hard work! And if you want to learn to cut cards like these, apply to attend Premier Debate Institute in Summer 2018.

Lastly, we want to remind the readers about standard brief practice to get the most out of this file. **Best practice for brief use is to use it as a guide for further research.** Find the articles and citations and cut them for your own personal knowledge. You’ll find even better cards that way. If you want to use the evidence in here in a pinch, you should at least re-tag and highlight the evidence yourself so you know exactly what it says and how you’re going to use it. Remember, briefs can be a tremendous resource but you need to familiarize yourself with the underlying material first.

Good luck everyone. See you ‘round!

Bob Overing & John Scoggin

Directors | Premier Debate
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# Affirmative

## Advantage Areas

### Adventurism / Militarism

#### Plan solves interventionism—drafts spur increased interest

Oatley 15 Thomas Oatley (Thomas Oatley teaches international politics at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. He has published his scholarly work in many of the field's best journals, including International Organization, the American Journal of Political Science, and International Studies Quarterly. Dr Oatley has also written two market-leading textbooks on international political economy, edited a handbook on the political economy of the international monetary system, and written a number of commentaries on contemporary affairs that have been published in outlets such as Foreign Policy and the Washington Post). A Political Economy of American Hegemony. Cambridge University Press, Feb 23, 2015 [Premier]

Any **transformation must therefore occur through American poli- tics**. Yet, finding domestic solutions is tricky, for as we have seen, the political economy of imbalance is not the strategy of a unified rational actor that we can change through persuasion. Instead, imbalances have been unintended consequences of the opportunity structure established by America's decentralized political institutions and its global financial power. **Responsible policy thus requires some way to break the gridlock induced by American institutions**. This is challenging; gridlock has been studied by the best students of American politics (Binder 2.003; Mann and Ornstein 2012). This research has yet to identify the Archimedean Point from which an outside observer could leverage institutional change to solve problems. Consequently, even the most prominent scholars con- clude that policy reform requires extrainstitutional change. Mdiarty, Poole, and Rosenthal (2.013: 170-271), for instance, assert that “the best hope given the stability of the political system, is to begin to build a new public philosophy for dealing with the challenges of our time.” What should a new public philosophy look like to generate a more responsible global engagement? I believe that the requisite public philosophy is one that emphasizes civic engagement in foreign policy. During the last forty years the American public has disengaged from meaningful and informed discussion about foreign policy challenges. Between 2001 and 2.013, the US. government spent approximately **six trillion dol- lars fighting two wars.** (Ilose to seven thousand American soldiers were killed in action, approximately 59,000 were wounded, and an unknown number of others returned home with posttraumatic stress (United States Department of Defense 2014). And **yet, according to a recent Pew Research Center study, two-thirds of the American public report that these wars never come up in the conversations they have with family and friends**; half say that these wars have made no difference in their lives (Pew Research Center 2.01 1). And what we observe in regard to these specific wars seems to characterize the public attitude toward for- eign policy more generally. In poll after poll, the American public rarely ranks foreign policy issues among the most important problems facing the nation. Many have attributed the American public's disengagement from foreign **policy and decisions about the use of force to the shift from a draft-based to an all-volunteer military**. Julian Zelizer (10:0: 2.3 5 ) asserts that “**eliminating the draft weakened the most immediate connection that existed between the national security state and average citizens.”** Andrew Bacevich claims that the results have been “anything but dem- ocratic.” “Current arrangements have allowed and even **encouraged Americans to disengage from war at a time when war has become all but permanent.** Rather than being shared by many, the burden of service and sacrifice is borne by a few, with the voices of those few unlikely to be heard in the corridors of power” (Bacevich 2.013; see also Bailey 2.009; Eikenberry 2.013). To put this in perspective, the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq were the longest in American history, and yet were fought by the smallest share of the American public - about one half of 1 percent - of any of America’s wars (Pew Research Center 2.01 l: 8). In contrast, for instance, 9 percent of the population fought in World War II, and about 2. percent fought in the wars in Korea and Vietnam. The public seems fully aware that the burden of war fighting has been highly concentrated on a small segment of American society. According to this same Pew Center study, 83 percent ofthe American public believed that military personnel have made significant sacrifices over the last thir- teen years. And only 43 percent of the same respondents thought that the American public at large had sacrificed significantly. Moreover, 70 per- cent responded that they thought this distribution of the burden was fair (Pew Research Center 2.01 I: 63). By concentrating war fighting on to a very small proportion of the Amaican public, the all-volunteer force has enabled the American **public to view war as something other people do** and as a consequence, as something that has no particular relevance to their lives. Understandably, they invest little energy becoming informed about foreign policy to influence its direction. America's financial power has also encouraged the public to disen- gage from foreign affairs. The Gates Commission, convened by President Nixon in 1970 to evaluate the impact of shifting to an all-volunteer mil- itary, discounted concerns expressed at the time that ending the draft would reduce public engagement in decisions concerning the use of force (United States Government 1970). The Commission argued that any major expansion of military force would require additional reve- nue. And “if tax increases are needed or military spending claims priority over other public spending, a broad public debate [will take placel” (ibid: 155). Indeed, Commission members believed that “recent history suggests that increased taxes generate far more public discussion than increased draft calls” (ibid: I 55). Thus, they concluded, an all-volunteer force would actually produce greater public participation in decisions about military force (ibid). America's financial power has undermined completely this expectation by enabling politicians to use military force without needing to ask the public to pay for it or scale back expenditures on other government programs. The end of the draft and the enhancement of America’s financial power have thus weakened substantially the democratic participation in and constraint on decisions about the use of military power. Because the typi- cal citizen bea rs no direct human or economic cost from the government’s use of force, he or she has little incentive to monitor and try to limit the government’s reliance on military power. As a result, the United States probably pursues military solutions to its foreign policy challenges more often than it would if the public expected to hear some of the human and economic costs arising from military action (Eikenberry 201 3). How do we foster the civic engagement needed to constrain the exec- utive branch's use of force? **The most likely solution is instituting uni- versal national service**. The Aspen lnstitute’s Franklin Project. initiated in mid-2.011, offers one approach. Retired General Stanley McChrystal initiated the Franklin Project as a means to address his concern that the typical American had no real understanding of what service to the nation entailed. He was concerned in particular about the emergence of a huge experiential gap between the fraction of the population that serves in the military and the rest of the American public. He proposed as a means to reduce this gap that every American serve for one year in either a military or civilian capacity (The Franklin Project 2013). The Franklin Project claims, and not without reason, that the Greatest Generation was forged through such national service obligations, and as a consequence “voted more, entered public service in greater numbers, and enjoyed much lower levels of political polarization” (ibid: 5). One might hope that **a renewed culture of service would have a similar impact on the next generation**. Universal national service is no panacea. Yet, it can contribute impor- tantly to the reconstitution of citizen engagement necessary to dampen the political economy of imbalance and create a more responsible form of American engagement in global politics. There is no guarantee that such measures will prevent future imbalances and financial crises. Financial markets are complex adaptive systems that react to and amplify developments elsewhere in the global political economy. And while America’s postwar deficit-financed military buildups have constituted a very important source of such developments, they are certainly not the only source. I do not claim. therefore. to have found a magic bullet with which to end financial instability. I do believe, however, that relying less on military power and paying for the wars we do fight will make us less likely to shoot ourselves in the foot.

#### Open media and civilian controlled media means conscription deters conflict

Choi and James 08 SEUNG-WHAN CHOI; Department of Political Science, University of Illinois at Chicago; Patrick James; School of International Relations, University of Southern California; Journal of Peace Research; 2008; “ Civil-Military Structure, Political Communication, and the Democratic Peace;” [Premier]

Second, we introduce a reduced form of Model 2, in which Oneal & Russett’s democracy variable is dropped from the equation to extinguish any remaining concerns about a possible conceptual incompatibility between open media and democracy in the same logistic regression model. Model 4 reveals that open media have a strong dampening effect on the onset of MIDs. In other words, although we remove the democracy variable and rerun the reduced equation, the results in Model 4, especially with respect to open media, are very similar to those in Models 2 and 3. In sum, civilian control over the military, diplomats, and open media appear to be contributing factors in connection to peace at a dyadic level of aggregation. Model 5 distinguishes between those MIDs where the threat of force occurred and MIDs where military force was actually used. The dependent variable is the onset of war. When we ran this war initiation in model, the open media variable was automatically dropped out of the equation because there was no variation between media and war, which reduced the total dyad years to 78,327, dropping 17,653 observations. In other words, all the open media dyads (i.e. a value of 1) perfectly correspond to no onset of war (i.e. a value of 0). Consequently, the equation could not estimate the effect of the dropped observations on the other 11 variables. Model 5 reports the results free from the dropping problem by not including the media variable in the Stata command line. In this way, we keep the same dyad-years of 95,980 as the previous models for comparison.25 As speculated upon earlier, the onset of war is related closely to the civil–military structure (i.e. both military inf luence and conscription), but not related to diplomats. It appears that civilian supremacy is likely to contribute to a more peaceful world; in addition, the presence of voluntary soldiers is likely to lead to a more conf lictual world. The conscription variable turns out to be insignificant when the dependent variable is the onset of MIDs, but becomes significant when it is replaced with the onset of war. This evidence suggests that the conscription hypothesis works well only with war initiations that tend to evoke the worst casualty phobia among ordinary citizens. Each of the three Kantian peace variables seems to lose its effectiveness in predicting war occurrence. Model 6 reports the results where the dependent variable is ICB’s onset of international crises. The results are similar to those in the MID onset Models 2, 3, and 4, except for the democracy variable, which shows statistical significance at the 0.001 level, but in a counterintuitive direction. This is a startling result that will require more attention in future research, perhaps with modeling that focuses on stages of escalation. Perhaps the more democratic dyads are at greater risk of crisis onset, but less so for escalation from crisis to war. At any rate, with the many precautions concerning overlapping concepts (e.g. democracy and open media) and multicollinearity, we believe the basic association revealed here to be credible and worthy of further investigation. The results in Table III are obtained for politically relevant dyads only, which students of conf lict processes look into most commonly, owing to their relatively dispute-prone nature, that is, the most ‘dangerous’ ones. In terms of the effect of each variable of interest, the results are similar to those in Table II. In sum, it appears that international conf lict is related closely to the characteristics of regimes such as military inf luence, diplomats, and open media (and conscription with war onset), but not likely with regime type in and of itself (i.e. in the context of democratic versus non-democratic). In addition, conf lict processes do not seem to occur as a side-effect of the free market economy, at least in the light of economic interdependence in the empirical analysis reported here. It is possible that, with large samples, even a small effect can be statistically significant, but substantively trivial. Thus, it becomes increasingly important to estimate the substantive effects of variables as the sample size increases. Table IV shows the substantive significance of the seven theoretically interesting variables in the logistic regression models. As compared with a typical dyad during the period from 1950 to 1992, the likelihood that the more military-inf luenced dyads in the second column will initiate a dispute is increased 91%; for voluntary military manpower systems, the increase is 24%; for diplomats, the decrease is 24%; and for open media, the decrease is 82%. For democracy and international organizations (IOs), the increase is 20% and 23%, respectively, with a decrease of 9% for independence. As compared with a politically relevant dyad, the likelihood of a dispute in the fifth column is increased 74% with strong military inf luence and 28% with voluntary soldiers; but decreased 21% for diplomats and 71% in the presence of open media. For democracy, the increase is 17% although the coefficient is not statistically significant; for IOs, the increase is 24%; and for interdependence, the decrease is 10%. Substantive analysis for war (i.e. in columns 3 and 6) and ICB onset (i.e. in columns 4 and 7) produces a similar conclusion. This analysis of substantive effects reinforces the importance of military inf luence, diplomats, and open media (and conscription in case of wars) in the quest for peace.

#### History proves—drafts spurred protests which end wars

Hartmann 13 Hartmann, Thom. Author. “The Draft: A War Killer.” Truthout. February 23, 2013. [Premier]

**A draft** also **inserts** necessary **skeptical voices into the military** itself. **You get more whistleblowers**, for example – people who put the well-being of the nation and its people ahead of profits for **the military industrial complex** or a new star for a commanding general. Speaking of that military industrial complex, it **would** finally **be held in check if we** were to **re-instate a draft**. The lack of a draft gave rise to the professional military we have today. **That professional military** is not only a bit too enthusiastic about war – because during war promotions within the military come faster – but also **creates a revolving door between the military and the war profiteers**. Then **there are** the **implications that drafts have on public resistance to** unnecessary **wars. Look at Vietnam** for instance. **Thanks to the draft, millions of Americans** rallied and **protested in our** nation's **streets. They fought tirelessly to bring an end to one of the bloodiest wars in** American **history**. Ultimately, **it was the American people, and their opposition to the**ir sons, fathers, and brothers being **draft**ed for the Vietnam War, **that** brought our soldiers home, and **ended that devastating war. If we had a draft for** the **Iraq** War, it's almost certain that **Americans would have been in the streets years ago**, fighting to bring an end to that purposeless war. **We wouldn't have** just **blindly plunged into war under false pretenses**, and then just stood by and watched – or even ignored – as our men and women died in the Iraqi desert. Simply put, **drafts** keep and **get us out of stupid wars**.

#### Risk of death for conscripted service members discourages use of the military

Vasquez 05 Joseph Paul Vasquez III; Professor of Political Science at UCF; The Journal of Conflict Resolution; December 2005; “Shouldering the Soldiering: Democracy, Conscription, and Military Casualties;” [Premier]

This research has several implications for public policy. First, democratic societies wanting to avoid high combat casualties can constrain their governments via conscription. Alternatively, democracies that are overly constrained by other domestic institu- tions or democracies facing real threats from powerful adversaries may prefer volun- teer systems that will free their leaders to act militarily. These options are not without their disadvantages. Democracies that constrain themselves with conscription, hoping to avoid costly adventures, may be more constrained in the face of legitimate threats. Alternatively, democracies that opt for volunteer systems may remain involved in mil- itary conflicts longer than would otherwise be the case, resulting in human costs that could exceed the potential gain. Second, given the negative effect of several power variables on casualty levels in the models, democracies might be able to limit their risk of casualties by developing defense portfolios, both in physical capabilities and strate- gies, to diminish risks to their forces in the field. A third policy-related insight addresses the difficulty of conducting coalitional warfare even with other democracies. Shared democratic identity was an important factor that influenced alliances in the post-World War II period (Lai and Reiter 2000; Simon and Gartzke 1996). How- ever, as this research shows, factors beyond regime type influence democracies' will- ingness to suffer rising costs from military action. Consequently, it should come as lit- tle surprise when democracies disagree on how to wage war and the price they are willing to pay for securing their objectives. Finally, democracies with conscript forces may need to reevaluate the utility of deterrent strategies or consider ways to enhance their ability to make commitments credible since perceptions about a lack of political will could undermine such policies, especially in situations of extended deterrence.

#### All volunteer army sustains US imperial aggression because it isolates the ruling class from serving and promotes an Us vs Them nationalism

Mehr, 2008 – British journalist with multiple publications [Nathaniel, Nathaniel Mehr is a leftwing British journalist whose has written for several publications including The Morning Star newspaper and Tribune magazine and Red Pepper, Conscription Is The Antidote To Militarism And Imperialism, London Progressive Journal, March 28 2008, <http://londonprogressivejournal.com/article/96/conscription-is-the-antidote-to-militarism-and-imperialism>, Accessed July 6th 2016] [Premier]

This month marks five years since the beginning of the land invasion stage of the US/British war against Iraq, which is now in its tenth year. Whilst there has been some talk of reducing British troop numbers, it is painfully obvious that the British commitment to the imperialist aggressions in Afghanistan and Iraq is of a long-term nature. The commitment of the United States, notwithstanding any possible change in Britain’s position, appears equally enduring. An absolutely essential component of the permanent aggression, the “Long War” envisaged by Washington, is the role of the modern professional army. Those analysts who, prior to 2003, warned of a Vietnam-style catastrophe in Iraq, underestimated the scale of the disaster. For the conscripts who served in Vietnam were drawn from all sections of civil society. Integrated into the social life of the country, their disaffection eventually permeated US society and exerted a powerful motive force in the peace movement in that country. The demise of conscription, apparently motivated by decent liberal notions of voluntarism and respect for personal autonomy, has in actual fact been a very positive development from the point of view of imperialism. The professional army, though drawn from civil society, stands aloof from it, not only in terms of its culture and psyche, but crucially in terms of the loyalty inspired by a sense of professional commitment. Put simply, there is a conflict of interests and approaches between the individual citizen, who from time to time participates, criticises, dissents, and the professional soldier, whose job it is to unquestioningly obey orders, and who faces ostracism and severe punishment if he should allow matters of conscience to impinge upon his roboticism. By minimising the contact between ordinary civil life and the life of the soldier, the professional army allows for an imperialism in which the human capital of military aggression, the very soldiers without whose participation the whole project would be impossible, to be seen as a free-standing and abstract, independent force. The attempt to seal off the humanity of the soldiers is never, of course, 100% successful, and from time to time an soldier, as in the recent case of Ben Griffin, will break ranks on a point of political or conscientious principle. On the whole, however, the general rule is that the bonds of professional service and contractual obligation supersede those of citizenship, and there is little opportunity for any crossover of ideas between two largely closed-off sections. The pervasive jingoism of the popular press only serves to consolidate this split in the public mind, implicitly accepting a clear distinction between “Us” on the one hand, and “Our Boys” on the other. Put simply, if the current “Long War” were staffed by soldiers conscripted for a set period from the ranks of ordinary working people, rather than by trained killing machines with careers and pensions to think about, the project would in all likelihood be fatally undermined by civilian dissent.

#### US foreign adventurism dooms our nation to collapse – it causes an international backlash against us, escalating and permanent conflicts, and eventually defeat to a rising rival.

Greider, 16- The Nation’s national affairs correspondent[William, The Nation’s national affairs correspondent, How Obsolete, Triumphalist Militarism is destroying America, The Nation, January 29 2016, < <https://www.thenation.com/article/how-obsolete-triumphalist-militarism-is-destroying-america/>>, July 6 2016] [Premier]

The bellicose Republicans who sneer at the president are essentially peddling their own nostalgic version of false bravado. Limited war may seem to be smart politics in the short run, especially when Americans are freaked out by terror attacks. But the war whoops draw the country into one more battlefield, and then another, until patriotic fervor is exhausted. What Americans want is peace, not another confused war on yet another ambiguous battlefield. The American people are pro-war so long as it happens somewhere else. When the war comes home, military doctrine has failed. This is, essentially, the predicament that faces our military institutions, though the failure rightly belongs with the politicians. The long-term implications of this abuse of military power are far more threatening to America’s future than any rogue terror groups. Most politicians don’t want to talk about this contradiction. They stick to familiar bromides about America’s obligations to the world. They moon over generals and soldiers, as well as the military contractors who make these wars possible with their advanced weaponry. History tells us that what brought down mighty empires of the past was hubris—the confusion of weakness for strength. Might America be next? Cheerleaders insist that the United States is exempt from the lessons of history, but don’t count on it. We are now governed by an obsolete militarism that does not serve the national interest. The obsession with arming ourselves for World War III is backward-looking, and so, too, is the madness of deploying forces in hundreds of overseas bases. The warrior nation goes looking for trouble in other people’s neighborhoods. Sure enough, we sometimes find it.Our over-reaching military doctrine suggests masculine insecurity among military planners—a crisis of virility, so to speak. If America looks weak, then the Pentagon must keep pushing for more and smarter guns that will bolster our national self-confidence. On the home front, this feeling of inadequacy is expressed in the new “open carry” laws. It’s not enough simply to own a deadly weapon; a real man needs to wear his “piece” holstered on his hip. He needs to take it everywhere, so no one can doubt that he’s a tough character. The point is, American culture and politics are drenched in warrior celebration. Faith in military might is deeply grounded in the national psyche. After the failing wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, we began to see patriotic rituals staged at baseball games and other public events to thank the returning veterans and their families, including the dead and wounded. But thank them for what? For their service and sacrifice, of course. It would have been offensive—unpatriotic—at those commemorations if anyone had talked about the utter failure of these costly wars. Yet even in defeat, the authorities stick to cloying triumphalism and tell stories of American goodness that people long to hear. The national dilemma boils down to this: We cannot tell ourselves the truth about who we are and what we have become. In the history of nations, that failure has often led to tragedy. Brooding on the American predicament, I began to grasp that our situation threatens to resemble the tragic fate of Samson, the legendary biblical warrior. Samson’s struggle was portrayed in Samson Agonistes, the epic drama by 17th-century English poet John Milton. I first read Milton’s work in college, long ago. Re-reading it now was a disturbing experience. Our agony is like Samson’s; he was never able to escape his habits of violent mind and thought. Samson was the Old Testament giant said to have slain a thousand foes with the jawbone of an ass. When he was captured by the Philistines, however, the mighty warrior was shorn of power—they cut off his hair, the source of his God-given strength, and plucked out his eyes (“O dark, dark, dark, amid the blaze of noon”). “Blind among enemies! O worse than chains,” Samson laments, in Milton’s great poem. The fallen Samson is rendered “eyeless in Gaza, at the mill with slaves / Himself in bonds under Philistian yoke.” Samson’s agony was never being able to escape his own habits of violent mind and thought, and his prison was “the dungeon of thyself.” The hero ended badly: Samson pulled down the temple and destroyed the Philistines, but also himself.

#### Congressional Opinion - A draft would decrease adventurism because it would force Congress to appreciate the consequences of war and because it would engage soldiers as citizens

**Rangel, 03 – US representative of New York’s 13th Congressional district** (Charles, Symposium - Q: Is restoring universal military conscription in the United States a good idea? YES: Those who call for war against Iraq should be willing to put their own sons and daughters in harm's way. Insight on the News, 4 Feb 2003, <http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1571/is_4_19/ai_97450991> Accessed 4 July 2016) [Premier]

But as a combat veteran of the Korean conflict, I believe that if we are going to send our children to war the governing principle must be that of shared sacrifice. Throughout much of our history, Americans have been asked to shoulder the burden of war equally. That's why I have asked Congress to consider and support legislation I have introduced to resume the military draft. Carrying out the administration's policy toward Iraq will require long-term sacrifices by the American people, particularly those who have sons and daughters in the military. Yet the Congress that voted overwhelmingly to allow the use of force in Iraq includes only one member who has a child in the enlisted ranks of the military; just a few more have children who are officers. I believe that if those calling for war knew that their children were likely to be required to serve--and to be placed in harm's way--there would be more caution and a greater willingness to work with the international community in dealing with Iraq. A renewed draft will help bring a greater appreciation of the consequences of decisions to go to war. Service in our nation's armed forces no longer is a common experience. A disproportionate number of the poor and members of minority groups make up the enlisted ranks of the military, while the most privileged Americans are underrepresented or absent. We need to return to the tradition of the citizen soldier, with alternative national service required for those who cannot serve because of physical limitations or reasons of conscience.

#### Public opinion - Conscription discourages because it mobilizes public opposition

Horowitz & Levendusky, 11 – Assistant Political Science Professors @ UPenn [Michael C., Matthew, Assistant Political Science Professors @ UPenn, Drafting Support for War: Conscription and Mass Support for Warfare, JSTOR, May 13 2011, Accessed July 6 2016] [Premier]

Are citizens in nations with standing conscription armies less willing to go to war than citizens in nations with all-volunteer forces? Research on domestic political regimes and military action highlights the centrality of mass support in the decision to go to war (Bueno de Mesquita 2003; Reiter and Stam 2002). A long line of both military and political discourse argues that conscription, by more equitably distributing the costs of war, makes the public more sensitive to sending troops into harm’s way (Ricks 1998). Historical examples from World War I (Rowe 2002) and the U.S. Civil War (McPherson 1988) support this argument, suggesting that when societies conscript, the mass public becomes more skeptical of the decision to use force. Yet other scholars challenge this conclusion, claiming that a fair draft increases mass support for war by signaling the importance of the conflict (Moskos 2001). This debate has taken on renewed significance in recent years. Given the increasing strains on the U.S. military from the conflicts in Iraq, Afghanistan, and around the globe, numerous political leaders have called for a reintroduction of the draft (Crabtree 2009; Hagel 2004). Indeed, some military leaders have even speculated that current deployments could necessitate a return to the draft. In 2007, Lieutenant General Douglas Lute, special assistant to the president and ‘‘war czar’’ for Iraq and Afghanistan, stated that a return to the draft ‘‘has always been an option on the table.’’ While he stated that the United States’ all volunteer force currently satisfied its military requirements, he discussed the strains to the military from so many deployments (All Things Considered 2007).1 More recently, retired Marine Major General Arnold Punaro argued that the rising cost of the all-volunteer force would force the United States to consider returning to a conscription system (Wilson 2009). Recent political events illustrate the continued political sensitivity of the draft. Stephen Paglicua, a Democratic primary candidate for the U.S. Senate in Massachusetts in 2009, announced he supported reinstating the draft. The resulting political uproar was sufficiently loud that he reversed course within a day (Johnson 2009). Though this is only one example, it suggests that how the United States staffs its armed forces remains a divisive issue and has important consequences for how ordinary citizens weigh the costs of conflict.

#### Movements - the volunteer army prevents critical movments by separating citizens from the reality of war – the draft mobilizes dissent.

Sirota, 13- author of The Uprising [David, author of The Uprising, How Dropping the Draft turned America into a Militaristic State, Alternet, May 9 2013, < <http://www.alternet.org/how-dropping-draft-helped-turn-america-militaristic-state>>, July 6 2016] [Premier]

The pattern suggests that in the absence of conscription, dissent - if it exists at all - becomes a low-grade affair (an email, a petition, etc.) but not the kind of serious movement required to compel military policy changes. Why? Because as former Defense Secretary Robert Gates put it, without a draft "wars remain an abstraction - a distant and unpleasant series of news items that does not affect (most people) personally.”The danger, says West Point's Lance Betros, is that Americans then"reflexively move towards a military solution before they will try all the other elements of national power." That reality has prompted some lawmakers in recent years to propose reinstating the draft. They argue it is the only way to compel Americans to truly care about the foreign policy and national security decisions of their government. Well-meaning people can certainly disagree about whether a modern-day draft is a good idea or not (and it may not be). But forty years into the all-volunteer experiment, it is clear that ending conscription was as much about giving citizens the liberty to abstain from as about quashing popular opposition to martial decisions. By design, it weakened our democratic connection to the armed forces - a connection that is the only proven safeguard against unbridled militarism.

#### Military Resistance - Only the draft ends unpopular foreign adventures by enabling revolt from within the military – conscripted soldiers are not compliant.

Willdorf, 2005 - former Judge Pro Tem, San Francisco Superior Court [WHY THERE IS NO DRAFT August 21, Barry <http://agauchepress.com/2005/08/21/why-there-is-no-draft/>] [Premier]

Our founding fathers and Jeffersonian republicans in particular recognized that in a democracy a popular militia is a bulwark against tyranny. A military organization made up of citizen-soldiers, by its very nature, they believed, would reflect the diversity of political expression found in society at large. As such it would naturally resist military adventurism in general and foreign entanglements in particular. It was for that reason that Jeffersonian republicans demanded the 2nd Amendment to our Constitution, which speaks of a well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state. For the first one hundred and fifty plus years of our existence, we remained faithful to those principals. Except during times of war, our country had a tiny standing army, but a much larger militia. That only changed with the post-World War II peacetime draft which created a “citizen army.” Still, given a reasonably universal draft, the Jeffersonian principal of the citizen-soldier who would resist abuse of his service in foreign adventures, held true. However, the GI revolt during the Vietnam war demonstrated to military planners that a conscripted army is not politically reliable in controversial wars. In other words, the Constitutional check upon presidential adventurism that was a militia-based national defense worked. It forced an unwilling government to withdraw from a misguided war and, had it been in existence in 2003, would have prevented the rush to war in Iraq as well. But the lesson learned from the Vietnam experience by the neocons was something apart from Jefferson’s prescient wisdom. They decided to disregard the admonitions of our founding fathers and instead of retaining the draft and foreswearing controversial conflicts, to create a large professional army that would be at their disposal for any venture that suited their whims. For the ruling elite of this country today, the lesson of the GI revolt stands as a major deterrent to the reinstitution of the draft. The policy-makers simply don’t want a citizen army but rather want a compliant military that will go anywhere and do anything they ask. So they further their agenda by means of a large professional standing armed force that violates the spirit, if not the letter of our Constitution.

#### The US is committed to permanent global war – it is an endless battle that the US cannot win

Greider, 16- The Nation’s national affairs correspondent[William, The Nation’s national affairs correspondent, How Obsolete, Triumphalist Militarism is destroying America, The Nation, January 29 2016, < <https://www.thenation.com/article/how-obsolete-triumphalist-militarism-is-destroying-america/>>, July 6 2016] [Premier]

In 2006, even as the Bush administration’s misadventure in Iraq was coming unraveled, the Pentagon issued a quadrennial review promoting its “Long War” strategy. The struggle, it said, “may well be fought in dozens of countries simultaneously and for many years to come.” The generals turned out to be right in ways they did not foresee but that now plague the Middle East and have created new burdens for Washington. Pentagon leaders are now whispering to favored national security reporters that endless war is harder than they promised. The problem is that distant adversaries are no longer so scared of US military might. They have figured out how to avoid the traditional battlefield, where they would surely lose in the face of superior American firepower. They know that irregular warfare can sow rampaging fear among comfortable US citizens, whose government is bombing their villages (the United States has been bombing the Middle East off and on since 1991; Iraq is still a favorite target). Americans call this irregular warfare “terrorism” and see themselves as innocent victims of incomprehensible, mindless violence. But this is what our enemies know: The United States trashed the international rules of war a long while back with its own irregular terrorism, which includes the Army’s Special Forces and the CIA’s secret armies, the sponsored overthrow of selected governments we don’t like, and the assassinations of unfriendly leaders through drone strikes and by other means. When American bombs kill defenseless villagers, we write it off as “collateral damage.” The United States cannot win these conflicts, yet it cannot easily get out of them, either. Why not? Because America’s governing elites have declared us the “indispensable nation,” an exceptional status not mentioned in the Geneva Conventions. President Obama has tried to back away from our aggressive posture, promoting diplomacy over armed conflict and making important progress in some areas. But he’s also tried to have it both ways. One day he talks softly, the next day he’s swinging the big stick, personally supervising individual assassination by drone—arguably a crime when soldiers do it. Right-wing warriors ridicule the president’s limp leadership, but what will they say when one day a foreign power decides to murder an American leader? Why not victory? That was the battle cry of right-wing politicians when the United States was knee-deep in the big muddy of Vietnam. Their complaint is being recycled by the current generation of chicken hawks. Despite our disaster in Vietnam, the United States has continued to misuse its awesome killing power, often not to conquer adversaries but to persuade their leaders to change policies. That’s why modern US wars are so prone to failure: Our violence is tailored diplomacy. Obama is guilty of this misconception, but so are the GOP hawks. When the president boasts about the nation’s military dominance, as he did in his last State of the Union speech, he’s really invoking our nation’s nostalgia for World War II—the glorious past when America stepped up and took on the role of singular global power.

#### Military draft decreases adventurism – politicians think twice about sacrificing privileged soldiers, and it would restore civic responsibility

Thompson, 07 - Pulitzer Prize-winning reporter (Mark, Would National Service Be Better Than the Draft? TIME, 30 Aug 2007, [http://content.time.com/time/specials/2007/article/0,28804,1657256\_1657626\_1656898,00.html](http://content.time.com/time/specials/2007/article/0%2C28804%2C1657256_1657626_1656898%2C00.html) Accessed 5 July 2016) [Premier]

Moskos says there is a sense of selfishness afoot in the country today. "This is the first war in American history where no sacrifice of any kind is being asked of our citizenry," he says. "And the soldiers in Operation Iraqi Freedom know this — 'patriotism lite' is the ethos of the day." That can be seen, he says, in our national politics. "In the last four presidential elections, the American public has voted for the draft dodger over the server," Moskos says, slighting the current President's controversial tenure in the Texas Air National Guard. "Contrary to conventional wisdom, being a military veteran is not a political advantage. It would be with the draft back in play." Moskos, like Rangel, believes that having a cross-section of the nation's youth serving in uniform means the nation would be less-inclined to go to war. "If you have privileged youth serving, going to war is much more debated, and you're much less likely to go in," he says. "But if privileged youth are in there, once you go to war, you're much more likely to hang in there."

#### The draft reduces our willingness to adopt pre-emptive, unilateral military strikes because it spreads the responsibility for the consequences to the families of decisionmakers

**Rangel, 03 – US representative of New York’s 13th Congressional district** (Charles, Symposium - Q: Is restoring universal military conscription in the United States a good idea? YES: Those who call for war against Iraq should be willing to put their own sons and daughters in harm's way. Insight on the News, 4 Feb 2003, <http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1571/is_4_19/ai_97450991> Accessed 4 July 2016) [Premier]

There are those who would want to believe that the introduction of this legislation at this time is because I want to show my objections and feelings against the United States of America being involved in a unilateral pre-emptive strike against the people and the government of Iraq. Others would believe that I would want to make it clear that if, indeed, there is a war that there would be more equitable representation of the American people making the sacrifices for this great country of ours. Both of those objectives are mine. I truly believe that those who make the decision and those who support the United States going into war would feel more readily the pain that's involved, and the sacrifice that's involved, if they thought that the fighting force would include the affluent and those who historically have avoided this great responsibility. Question: Is this an equity issue or is this because we're standing on the brink of war? Rangel: With my whole heart I hope this country does not go to war. With my whole heart I do not believe that there is this imminent threat to the security of the United States. I have a lot of reservations about this war. But as I tried to say, if for whatever reason war is inevitable, then I mean every word that I said about the defense of this country. I would use this [the proposed draft] as a platform for peace and diplomacy. But I don't want to take away from the fact that we're treating North Korea differently than we're treating Iraq--North Korea has no oil. Iraq has the oil. But assuming I was pro-war, I would be taking the very same position I'm taking today. If I thought it was necessary to wipe out Saddam Hussein and to attack North Korea and to look for Osama bin Laden in Afghanistan and to preserve the peace in Europe, I would say that the cavalier way in which people talk about taking out people--it appears to me they're talking about some French Foreign Legion. We are talking about Americans here. And that responsibility should be shared by all Americans. Question: You seem to be implying that Americans are fighting the war on terrorism, but affluent parents aren't willing to support it. Rangel: I'm not saying that they're not willing to support it. I'm saying that those that support the war that come from these classes have no need to fear that their kids would be involved. I've had a lot of Marines and Army people and veterans and others say that if they thought for one minute that when we said that "we will take out these people" that you meant their sons, that they would take a different attitude.

#### Conscription reduces support for wars – it increases self-preservation instincts in citizens

Horowitz & Levendusky, 11 – Assistant Political Science Professors @ UPenn [Michael C., Matthew, Assistant Political Science Professors @ UPenn, Drafting Support for War: Conscription and Mass Support for Warfare, JSTOR, May 13 2011, Accessed July 6 2016] [Premier]

Does Conscription Change Support for War? What factors determine public support for war? In existential wars, where the survival of the nation is at risk, democratic publics (and often even nondemocratic ones) will rally and support a war. American support for World War II, from public opinion data, is the prototypical example of such a conflict, though there were many reasons for its popularity (Mueller 1973; for a more nuanced account see Berinsky 2009). Yet in recent American history, most wars have not been perceived as all out struggles for the future of the nation. This paper focuses on less severe conflicts, the ones more typical in American foreign policy and in the world as a whole. Democratic leaders that seek to go to war have to build at least some degree of public support for their actions, especially if the war is potentially costly. The conventional wisdom is that casualties drive war support: as casualties mount, support for war wanes (Mueller 1973, 2005). Others, however, have argued that the context matters as much as the raw casualty levels (Gartner 2008a). Context can take a number of forms, including whether or not the public perceives that they are winning the conflict (Gelpi et al. 2009), elite rhetoric (Berinsky and Druckman 2007), or the degree to which national interests are at stake (e.g., the argument that the public is ‘‘pretty prudent’’; see Jentleson 1992). In this paper, we address a related but distinct question—how would a move to reinitiate a draft influence support for going to war? Does having a conscript army (vs. an all-volunteer force) shape attitudes toward conflict? While there is a scholarly debate about the effects of conscription on military outcomes (Horowitz, Simpson, and Stam 2011; Vasquez 2005), less is known systematically about how conscription affects public support for war. We argue that a conscript military makes the public more hesitant to send troops into harm’s way. When soldiers are conscripted in a fair draft, a larger segment of the population is called to serve in the military, and the military looks more like society at large (Moskos 1970). This broadens the number of citizens engaged with and interested in whether or not the country should go to war and shifts the way they evaluate the costs and benefits of casualties (Gartner 2008a). As a result, more voters have a direct stake in the decision to go to war: they know that their children (or they themselves) could be sent into harm’s way, so they more carefully weigh the potential costs and benefits of armed conflict. When a broader swath of the population must bear the heavy costs of war via a fair draft, support for war declines (Vasquez 2005). This logic has propelled a number of U.S. political elites to call for a reintroduction of a military draft system (e.g., Crabtree 2009; Heilprin 2006; Holmes 2003; Rangel 2002). In a congressional hearing on the Iraq war in 2004, Senator Chuck Hagel (R, NE) posited that returning to a draft military would be beneficial because it would force more Americans to confront the costs of war personally by directly bearing and observing the costs of war themselves (Hagel 2004).2 The role of self-interest in politics provides the rationale for this argument. While symbolic factors often outweigh self-interest (Sears, Hensler, and Speer 1979), when the stakes are high, self-interest drives citizens’ behavior (Citrin and Green 1990). Indeed, studies of self-interest in the Vietnam War show that self-interest (in the form of the draft lottery) has a significant impact on attitudes toward the war (Bergan 2009; Erikson and Stoker 2009). We expect to find that self-interest operates in a similar way with respect to conscription, especially when combined with the power of social ties.

#### Conscription stops public support for dangerous conflicts - The best empirics flow neg

Horowitz & Levendusky, 11 – Assistant Political Science Professors @ UPenn [Michael C., Matthew, Assistant Political Science Professors @ UPenn, Drafting Support for War: Conscription and Mass Support for Warfare, JSTOR, May 13 2011, Accessed July 6 2016] [Premier]

To begin, we consider how support for war changes under different experimental conditions. Figure 1 below shows how public support for going to war varies depending on the experimental conditions— conscription versus volunteer army and low versus high expectations of casualties.9 Here, we see a very large effect of conscription: averaging across expected casualty levels, moving from an all-volunteer to a conscript army decreases support by 17% (from 54% to 37%). This provides initial support for Hypothesis 1: conscription, by increasing the perceived costs of war, decreases mass support for war. Further, note the similarity between public support for a volunteer army expected to take high casualties (46%) and a conscript army expected to take low numbers of casualties (41%). The similarity between these figures strongly suggests that the decision to conscript, rather than just variations in the level of expected casualties, drives the results. While these results are preliminary, they strongly support the argument that conscription has a major effect on how citizens view the decision to go to war. To more formally test our hypothesis, we use regression to analyze the data from our experiment. We model support for sending troops into conflict as a function of the experimental factors and a series of control variables. The control variables include whether the respondent has any prior service in the military (Feaver and Gelpi 2004, 58), the respondent’s gender (Conover and Sapiro 1993),10 the respondent’s hawkishness (given that hawkish respondents should be more likely to approve sending troops, Wittkopf 1990), partisanship, and the respondent’s age and income (see the online appendix for variable coding rules).11 Table 1 gives the results of a probit regression predicting willingness to commit troops (15support sending troops; 05oppose) as a function of our experimental manipulations and the associated control variables. Table 1 demonstrates that both the reintroduction of the draft and expected casualties influence support for going to war. Consistent with Hypothesis 1, reintroducing the draft decreases support for war. Likewise, Americans are also more opposed to conflicts with higher expected casualties. The positive and statistically significant coefficient on the interaction term demonstrates that when respondents expect high casualties, the composition of the military has a smaller effect on attitudes. The difference between the draft/volunteer conditions is only 12% when causalities are high, but is 22% when causalities are low (all calculations in this section are based on model predictions, holding all other variables at their mean/median values). While the draft always has a large and significant effect on attitudes toward conflict, it has a smaller effect when subjects expect high casualties due to the increased resistance of all subjects to sustain high U.S. losses. All other things being equal, when many troops might die, Americans are opposed to committing both volunteer and conscripted troops. The subjects’ attitudinal and demographic factors also shape their willingness to send troops into harm’s way, though to a much smaller extent than our experimental manipulations. Four of our control variables reach statistical significance at conventional levels: gender, age, partisanship, and hawkish attitudes. None of these variables, however, has a substantively large effect on support for war. For example, partisanship has the largest effect: moving from being a leaning Democrat (the median category) to being an Independent increases the probability of support by 4%, all else equal. These findings suggest that it is our experimental manipulations, rather than these demographic attributes, that drives support for sending troops into harm’s way.12 We can also test the underlying self-interest mechanism driving our theory, which argues that support falls in the draft condition because individuals realize they or their loved ones could be sent into harm’s way. While we cannot test this argument for all subjects in our sample, we can test it for two groups of individuals. First, Hypothesis 1A states that young people (here, those ages 18–40)—the prime targets of any reinstated draft—should be especially opposed to war in the draft condition. Our draft question is worded broadly and does not specifically exclude women, since women are now integrated into much of the military, so we test our argument on both men and women.13 Second, we also argue that parents of children should be especially resistant to the draft, given that their children could then be sent into harm’s way. Table 2 below reestimates the model from Table 1, but examines whether these groups are especially sensitive to draft information. Our results strongly support the self-interest mechanism underlying H1 and H1A. Young people become much more strongly opposed to the conflict when the draft is reinstated. Take, for example, the effect on the young, who would be called to serve in the draft. Reintroducing the draft decreases the probability of support for a young respondent by 23%, whereas that shift only decreases support by 11% among older respondents. In the draft condition, draft-eligible respondents are approximately 9% less supportive than their older counterparts, all else equal. This is an effect of the draft itself, and not simply pacifism among this group: young respondents are actually slightly more supportive of deploying troops in the all-volunteer condition than other respondents, though the effect is not statistically significant. Our results show that young people become relatively more opposed to war only when they will have to shoulder the costs of fighting that war, exactly in line with the prediction of our self-interest model. For the parents of children that could eventually become eligible for a draft, we see a similar but slightly weaker story. Here, parents are more opposed in the draft condition (as we would expect), but the effect is only marginally statistically significant (p50.09, one-tailed). The draft may have a weaker effect on parents since only some of them may have draft-eligible children, though we leave it for future analyses to explore this in more detail. As a whole, Table 2 strongly supports our theoretical argument. Not only does the draft decrease public support for war, it does so for the reason we articulated: self-interest. Those who would most directly bear the costs of a draft war (young people) are much more sensitive to the reintroduction of the draft than other respondents are, and those who would indirectly bear that cost (parents) are somewhat more sensitive as well. When subjects believe a draft system will be put in place, self-interest weighs more heavily on their decision to support or oppose war. One limitation of the findings in Tables 1 and 2, however, is that they are based on a hypothetical scenario. As we discussed above, this sort of scenario is needed to establish a baseline relationship between conscription and support for war. What happens, however, in more realistic settings? To test the robustness of our findings, we conducted three independent follow-up experiments measuring public support for war over a range of contingencies involving China, Iran, and Yemen, drawing on the setup used in Hermann, Tetlock, and Visser (1999) and Gelpi et al. (2009; for full details, see the online appendix). The scenarios also varied the principle policy objective (PPO) of the mission to add another layer of realism to our setup. As we would expect, introducing specific scenarios and different PPOs does influence public support, but in a way that bolsters our claims. Given space constraints, we cannot fully discusses these results here and refer the reader to the online appendix for a complete discussion of them. We simply note here that these follow-up experiments demonstrate that across every scenario, condition, and casualty level, the prospect of reintroducing the draft significantly decreases public support for going to war. These results demonstrate that our findings replicate in a variety of different settings and are not simply limited to one abstract scenario.

#### The draft would solve militaristic adventurism by forcing all families to face the burden of interventions.

Thompson, 07 - Pulitzer Prize-winning reporter (Mark, Would National Service Be Better Than the Draft? TIME, 30 Aug 2007, [http://content.time.com/time/specials/2007/article/0,28804,1657256\_1657626\_1656898,00.html](http://content.time.com/time/specials/2007/article/0%2C28804%2C1657256_1657626_1656898%2C00.html) Accessed 5 July 2016) [Premier]

Rep. Charles Rangel, a New York Democrat, has pushed unsuccessfully since 2002 for a wartime-only draft. The Korean War veteran (he served in the Army from 1948 to 1952) and Bronze Star and Purple Heart winner unabashedly declares that his legislation would reduce the number of wars the nation fights. But he also adds that it would inspire a greater sense of citizenship among young people. "Shouldn't young Americans be given an opportunity to know and serve their country for two years?" he asks, recalling his own service. "There was something about that flag, something about the march, something about the music," he said in an interview with Time. "I know every son-of-a-bitch who got out with me felt patriotic." Many in the military brush off Rangel's call because they think it is more of an anti-war proposal cloaked in civic-responsibility garb. They particularly disliked his original claim that minorities are over-represented in the all-volunteer military (after it became clear that was not the case, Rangel shifted his argument to focus on how the military's current makeup allegedly relies heavily on the poor. In a June report, the Congressional Budget Office said the scant available data on socio-economic status of the families of military members "suggest that individuals from all income groups are represented roughly proportionately in the enlisted ranks of the AVF.") Now chairman of the ways and means committee, Rangel unveiled a retooled version of his original bill — which lost in the full House, 402-to-2 shortly before the 2004 election — in January. "My bill requires that, during wartime, all legal residents of the U.S. between the ages of 18 and 42 would be subject to a military draft, with the number determined by the President," he said then. "No deferments would be allowed beyond the completion of high school, up to age 20, except for conscientious objectors or those with health problems. A permanent provision of the bill mandates that those not needed by the military be required to perform two years of civilian service in our sea and airports, schools, hospitals, and other facilities." Rangel says the civilian national service requirement would continue during peacetime under his proposal. "I know that if we had those people at Katrina their presence would have given so much hope to that community," he said in an August 24 interview. "If you went to the airports, they don't need guns — all they need is that (flag) patch (on their shoulder) and knowing that our country is there. The same in the train stations, school rooms and hospitals — there's so much that young people can do." He says his bill would make the U.S. less tilted toward war. "We never would have gone to war" in Iraq if legislation like his had been on the books, Rangel says. "I go to Wall Street for the last five years for one reason or the other. I'm in front of every Business Roundtable, the U.S. Chamber, and members of Congress and there's one question: if you knew at the time the President said he was going to invade Iraq, and there was a draft and your kids and grandkids would be vulnerable, would you support the President? And no honest son-of-a-bitch has ever told me 'yes' — never," Rangel says. "When some of them mumble that, and their wives are there, I just look at the wives and they grab their husband's hand and say 'No, we would not support it.' If going to war meant talking about sending my kid, the answer would be 'Hell no, let's talk this over, let's wait awhile, let the UN come in, let's see where France is, I mean, let's see where the world is before you grab my kid." But if war did come, under Rangel's bill some young men and women would be forced to serve in uniform against their will if the military needed their bodies. "Mine is no exceptions, no exclusions, nobody's deferred" except for reasons of health or conscientious-objector status, Rangel says. "Under my bill, there are nine chances out of 10 your kid wouldn’t go, but goddam he'd be required to be eligible to go if he was drafted, and thats the part that sticks in the craw of most members of Congress," Rangel says. "You take your chances — for every guy who gets killed, there's a hundred guys who don't come anywhere near the guy who gets killed — so your chances of getting shot are slim, but they're real."

#### Conscriptions decrease support for war dramatically - experiments prove.

Horowitz & Levendusky, 11 – Assistant Political Science Professors @ UPenn [Michael C., Matthew, Assistant Political Science Professors @ UPenn, Drafting Support for War: Conscription and Mass Support for Warfare, JSTOR, May 13 2011, Accessed July 6 2016] [Premier]

Direct causal evidence about the influence of conscription on mass support for war, however, remains relatively elusive. Previous efforts to estimate the causal effect of conscription on support for war have focused primarily on the effects of the Vietnam draft lottery (Bergan 2009; Erikson and Stoker 2009). While important, these studies only yield estimates of the effects of conscription for a subset of the population (namely, draft-eligible males) at a particular moment in American history (when the draft lottery was imposed in the midst of the Vietnam War). We build on this research by utilizing a new research design that looks at how conscription affects attitudes towards war in the broader population in a number of different scenarios. We use original experiments to directly test the linkage between conscription and support for war, and find that mass support falls by 17% when there is a draft (relative to when there is an all-volunteer force), a finding that replicates in a number of different settings and scenarios. Further, we also provide evidence that this shift is driven by selfinterest: support falls most sharply among those who would most directly shoulder the burden of a draft (the young, who would themselves be drafted, and parents, who would see their children drafted). This provides the microfoundations for some of the effects of conscription previously hypothesized—but never empirically verified—by earlier works. The effect of the draft on attitudes toward conflict raises profound normative questions about the public’s role in the decision to go to war. Because the draft changes the public’s attitudes toward conflict, draft militaries in democracies present leaders with a different set of constraints when they consider going to war than those presented by an all-volunteer force. It could influence when the public is willing to go to war and the way leaders have to sell the decision to go to war, meaning draft militaries may end up fighting different wars or entering wars at different points than their volunteer military counterparts. The decision to use a conscript or volunteer military also influences the credibility of the signals sent when a democracy attempts to commit to escalation through activities like troop mobilizations in a crisis (Schultz 2001; Slantchev 2005). Conscription changes the degree to which the mass public constrains leaders, which has important implications for our understanding not only of war and peace (Bueno de Mesquita 2003; Reiter and Stam 2002), but, more generally, about when the mass public can constrain elites’ foreign policy decisions (Feldman, Huddy, and Marcus 2008).

#### The Draft solves military intervention —Americans will always be selfish—wars won’t stop until they’re perceived as harming our own interests

Ford ’03 – Mutual Black Network news anchor (Glen, “No Draft, No Peace: Rangel and Conyers are right,” The Black Commentator, Issue Number 24 - January 9, accessed 7/4/16, <http://www.blackcommentator.com/24/24_commentary_pr.html>) [Premier]

The generals have good reason to be confident that they will enjoy free rein abroad. Americans don't care who they kill. "As far as I can see, Americans don't care about foreign casualties," said John Mueller, an expert on U.S. public opinion about war. "When we ask people point-blank in polls, they say it does matter. But the polling evidence suggests it really doesn't in the end," said the Ohio State University political scientist. For example: "How many American lives is worth one Somali life? Not one." No, the bulk of this cocooned population, which has the power to extinguish the species, cares only about itself. Before they will embrace humanity, they must first be given cause for personal anxiety. A draft is both moral and a practical necessity, if there is to be any impediment to Americans' second-hand, long-distance, mass killing sprees - crimes that we will all pay for, eventually, in poisoned water, irradiated cities, crippled communications or any other vengeance that aggrieved foreigners can inflict against the people behind the war machine: us.

#### Movements: A draft would solve military intervention – conscripted armies affect everyone which motivates antiwar movements – Vietnam and Iraq prove.

Gobry ’13 – lecturer at HEC Paris business school (Pascal-Emmanuel, “The Libertarian Case for National Military Service,” Cato Unbound, 9/9, accessed 7/6/16, <http://www.cato-unbound.org/2013/09/09/pascal-emmanuel-gobry/libertarian-case-national-military-service>) [Premier]

We also have to talk about the impact of military service on foreign policy. Does military service make a country more hawkish or more dovish? It seems obvious that having a conscript military will give a dovish bias to a country’s military stance. The case of Switzerland here is crystal clear. We can also look at the United States, and the difference between the Vietnam War and the Iraq War. During Vietnam, the antiwar movement only gained steam once conscripts were shipped in large numbers to Southeast Asia. Meanwhile, the United States stayed in Iraq for much longer than in Vietnam, and the antiwar movement was much more subdued. America elected a President who had opposed the war, but this President chose to unwind the war on basically the same timetable as the Bush Administration, while strengthening the U.S. presence in Afghanistan and embarking in more foreign adventures. The adventurism of the current U.S. administration is hardly surprising, given that the vast majority of U.S. families will never have to bear a price for it. The reason why military service gives a dovish bias to a country’s foreign policy is obvious: the entire country bears the cost of military action. Everyone has a child or at least knows someone who is in the military. Those who have seen firsthand the cost of war are all around, instead of confined to a subculture. That is, in short, how it should be: what it means for a nation to decide to go to war is not to send some other entity, apart from the society, whose members we do not know, to go fight somewhere for something, but it’s okay because we have miniature flags and two days out of the year where we don’t work and remember how swell they are. When the nation decides to go to war, the nation decides to go to war: every word in that sentence matters.

#### The draft would end pointless wars – an engaged public enables effective protest movements, and angry conscripted soldiers prevent intervention efforts from the inside – Vietnam proves.

Ford ’03 – Mutual Black Network news anchor (Glen, “No Draft, No Peace: Rangel and Conyers are right,” The Black Commentator, Issue Number 24 - January 9, accessed 7/4/16, <http://www.blackcommentator.com/24/24_commentary_pr.html>) [Premier]

Anti-war and anti-draft are not the same things, although the issues were largely conflated at the height of the Vietnam War, when the unlucky draftee could pretty much count on being sent to that particular destination at the end of his brief training. Selective Service shutdown in 1973 rendered the argument moot for millions of "anti-war" proponents who were, in reality, simply "anti-draft." Having disentangled themselves from the apparatus of conscription (and mistakenly taking full credit for its demise), these young cohorts and their families became disengaged from U.S. foreign policy concerns. U.S. troop strength in Vietnam reached 536,000 in 1968, the year of the Tet Offensive, the My Lai Massacre, and the war's worst American casualties: 11,000 killed and 45,000 wounded. Large-scale troop withdrawals began in 1969, by which time it had become painfully clear to commanders in the field that the Army, in particular, was no longer an effective force. Racial tensions exploded into full-blown firefights involving large numbers of men. Military prisons rebelled and burned. Every soldier counted his days before return to "the world." The citizen army was not suited to the mission. The internal disintegration of the U.S. Army in Vietnam was at least as crucial to the eventual American exit as anti-war (or anti-draft) protests at home. The protestors disbanded in synch with American troop withdrawal, while the generals dived enthusiastically into the task of building an all-volunteer force. Thirty years later, they are preparing to turn the machinery loose on the planet - confident that the disengaged, non-serving classes will cheer the exploits of somebody else's boys and girls.

#### Elites: A draft reduces elite support for war – the AVF insulates the elites from conflict through underrepresentation

Horowitz & Levendusky, 11 – Assistant Political Science Professors @ UPenn [Michael C., Matthew, Assistant Political Science Professors @ UPenn, Drafting Support for War: Conscription and Mass Support for Warfare, JSTOR, May 13 2011, Accessed July 6 2016] [Premier]

Conclusion and Broader Implications Every time the United States goes to war, questions arise about both the sustainability and the desirability of the all-volunteer force. From a sustainability perspective, many question whether the all-volunteer army can effectively meet the U.S.’s needs, given deployments in Iraq, Afghanistan, and around the globe. Even if it can, others question whether this produces beneficial outcomes for society. For example, many bemoan the passing of the ‘‘Greatest Generation’’ from the American political scene: because many of these leaders were drafted into World War II, they had valuable insights into conflict that helped shaped post-War American foreign policy (Ambrose 1997). Others call into question the fairness of the all-volunteer force given the distribution of who serves in the military (Kreiner and Shen 2010). With the U.S. military currently deployed around the world, questions about the draft and mass support for conflict are unlikely to disappear anytime soon. At the most basic level, our results provide the microfoundations for arguments linking conscription and mass support for war. While many scholars, politicians, and popular analysts have argued that conscription decreases mass support for war by spreading the costs of war more evenly throughout society, there was very little evidence supporting this viewpoint (outside of studies of the effect of the Vietnam War draft lottery for draft-age males). Using original experiments, we find strong support for this hypothesis: all else equal, reintroducing a draft decreases public support for war across a variety of different conditions (relative to an all-volunteer force). Further, our results show that this is likely because of self-interest: those with the most at stake in a draft war (young people) are the most sensitive to reintroducing the draft. Our results also shed important light on the broader question of the domestic determinants of foreign policy, especially in democracies. A shift back to a draft military might influence the willingness of the American public to support military action abroad in limited wars. While all leaders have to appeal to their selectorates to build support for going to war, democratic leaders generally have to appeal to wider audiences due to the nature of the political system (Bueno de Mesquita 2003). Our results show that decisions about military labor policy influence when governments can expect to receive support. Conscription makes the mass public more involved in foreign policy decisions in a more subtle way as well. While the all-volunteer army is not as biased toward the ‘‘have nots’’ as is commonly assumed,14 it is true that elites—those at the top of the distribution of economic and political power— are underrepresented in the all-volunteer force. Fair and equitable conscription would bring more elite members of society into the military, people who have a large and disproportionate voice in the governmental system. They will ensure their voices are heard by government leaders, so if their sons and daughters were likely to be drafted, their skepticism about the use of force would likely increase considerably, which provides a potential argument in favor of the draft for those wishing to restrain the use of force. However, conscription does not just make it harder for leaders to go to war; it also might change the wars a country fights. All leaders have to be sensitive to popular sentiment. To the extent that a conscript military raises the level of scrutiny on potential military campaigns, it makes countries less likely to engage in some types of military action. However, conscript also means that when public support exists for going to war, that support is likely to be broad based, giving a leader more of a mandate to fight. One potential consequence of these dynamics, though more research is necessary, might be to increase the credibility of signals sent by conscript militaries in a crisis.

### Civil-Military Gap

#### The volunteer army entrenches the civil military gap – when the draft ended, it caused the military to become partisan and less diverse – this is key to the gap.

Mazur 04 - professor of law at the University of Florida [Diane, Diane Mazur is a professor of law at the University of Florida and a former aircraft and munitions maintenance officer in the Air Force, Military isolated from society, Star News Online, 1/6/04, <http://www.starnewsonline.com/news/20040106/military-isolated-from-society>, Accessed July 4 2016] [Premier]

Diane Mazur is a professor of law at the University of Florida and a former aircraft and munitions maintenance officer in the Air Force. The court once understood that civil-military relations suffer when the military ties its fortunes to political and ideological partnership. When the United States lost the military draft a generation ago, it lost a lot. It lost the ability to have a meaningful discussion about anything that involves the military. The Pentagon recently began a significant call-up for the next major rotation of troops in Iraq, but it has no realistic plan for covering military and domestic security commitments without exhausting reserve forces. Yet no serious attention was given to a bill Rep. Charles Rangel, D-N.Y., introduced last January to reactivate the draft. Further, any suggestion to reconsider the military status quo is met with a charge of not "supporting the troops." The military has become the new third rail of politics, scaring off anyone who dares to have an original thought about the armed forces. Even former general and Democratic presidential candidate Wesley Clark tiptoed around the military when he proposed a new Civilian Reserve, to be mobilized in times of national need. How did this happen? The Supreme Court is largely to blame for the decline in civil-military relations. A year after the end of the draft in 1973, the court discarded legal tradition going back to the Civil War in which the military was expected to share the same constitutional values as the rest of the United States. In a series of cases beginning in 1974, Chief Justice William Rehnquist designed a new legal doctrine requiring courts to "defer" to executive or congressional choice on military matters. Military judgment no longer needed to be justified, or even explained, Chief Justice Rehnquist said, because the military was "a society apart" from America. The military was better than America, so it was exempt from the Constitution. There’s absolutely no basis in the Constitution for the idea that the military is a constitutionally separate society. But the court drove the military in that direction and caused lasting damage. Together with the demise of the draft, which ended the natural exchange of experience between military and civilian worlds, the court’s rulings increased the distance between civilians and military people. The military increasingly viewed itself as separate, distant and morally superior. This separatist mind-set changed the mix of those who joined the military. Without the leavening effect of the draft, the United States lost an ideologically and politically diverse military. It was no coincidence that the all-volunteer era saw the military discard its traditional professional ethic of political neutrality, openly aligning with the Republican Party. Just after the end of the Vietnam War, the Supreme Court wrote that civilian control of the military could not be strong unless the military avoided "both the reality and the appearance of acting as a handmaiden for partisan political causes." (No one seemed to remember that admonition during the 2000 presidential campaign and the absentee-ballot aftermath.) The court once understood that civil-military relations suffer when the military ties its fortunes to political and ideological partnership. It no longer understands that.

#### The Civil Military Gap is increasing – congress lacks vets and ideological tensions strain the gap - causing the military to resist civilian leadership

Wetherbee 07 –fellow at Center for the Study of the Presidency and Congress (Michael A., “Closing the Civil-Military Gap,” accessed 7/5/16, <http://cspc.nonprofitsoapbox.com/storage/documents/Vater/Wetherbee.pdf>) [Premier]

In addition to a mirrored sense of superiority, the lack of political representation by former military members also suggests the validity of a civil-military gap. In the history of our nation it has been commonplace for veterans to be overrepresented in congress, and this remained the case up until the 1990s.xx In fact, the representation of veterans in congress has been rapidly decreasing, and “the number of congressmen and congresswomen who are also veterans is only about one-third what it was a generation ago, in 1960.”xxi This is startling, considering that the 1990s marked the first time in the 20th century that veterans were under-represented rather than over represented in Congress.xxii The decreasing percentage of the population who has served in the military can explain the decreasing amount of veterans in congress, but it does not explain the under representation in congress with relation to the American population. The absence of veterans from congress is somewhat alarming, and indicates that a civil-military gap truly exists. What is even more alarming, however, is that while the United States is engaged in a massive idealistic war, “Only slightly more than one percent of members of Congress have a child serving.”xxiii While Congress continues to support the arduous tasks in Iraq and Afghanistan, very few of their kin are located at the pointy end of the sword. When you look at our history, it was once commonplace for sitting presidents to have a child in uniform. Yet, since Lyndon Johnson, no president has had a child or even a son-in-law in uniform. And before his time, it was not only “public servants who shared the responsibility-movie stars and professional athletes joined the ranks when asked. It was considered the right thing to do. Somewhat along the lines of the biblical adage that of those to whom much has been given much will be required.”xxiv The fact that the elite society has disappeared from military service reflects that this is not a value that has withheld the test of time. Another trend that indicates the validity of the civil-military gap, is the disparity between the political tendencies of society as a whole and the military institution. Exit polls from the 2004 presidential elections show that 45 percent of the nation’s population was moderate and 21 percent liberal. At the same time, an Annenberg School study showed that 40 percent of military officers considered themselves moderate, while only seven percent considered themselves liberal. Additionally, 15 percent of officers were democrats, while 47 percent were republicans.xxv Another factor that demonstrates an increasing civil-military gap is the current trend of former powerful military members attacking the current administration. Although military members have historically showed political ambition, recently it seems that retired Generals have used their position, not to launch political campaigns, but to attack their former civilian leaders and make political statements. An example of this is “Anthony Zinni, Tommy Frank’s predecessor as commander of Central command” who “described the actions of the Bush administration as ranging from ‘true dereliction, negligence, and irresponsibility’ to ‘lying, incompetence, and corruptions.’” xxvi Zinni also called Secretary Rumsfeld, while he was still the Secretary of Defense, “incompetent strategically, operationally, and tactically.”xxvii Additionally, in April of 2006, “a number of retired Army and Marine Generals publicly called for the resignation of Secretary Rumsfeld.”xxviii Regardless of whether the attacks come from the left or the right, the attacks of former high profile military officials clearly demonstrate a perceived animosity between the military and its civilian leadership.

#### The gap threatens civilian control of the military – it causes military leaders to distrust and disobey civilian leaders

Wetherbee 07 –fellow at Center for the Study of the Presidency and Congress (Michael A., “Closing the Civil-Military Gap,” accessed 7/5/16, <http://cspc.nonprofitsoapbox.com/storage/documents/Vater/Wetherbee.pdf>) [Premier]

 As the professional military becomes more isolated from the nation's governing elite—or the other way around, military members may question whether our leaders have sufficient appreciation of the horror and unpredictability of war?”xxxix As a result of this, “elite military officers now believe that it is their role to insist rather than merely advice or advocate in private, on key decisions, particularly those involving the use of force.”x This clearly contradicts the idea of civilian control upon which our nation is founded, and thus is dangerous to the stability of our country. Additionally, healthy civil-military relations dictate that military officers do “not engage in public debate over matters of foreign policy, including the decision to go to war.”xli Within proper civil-military relations, it is essential that soldiers carry out any decision of their civilian superior, whether they agree with the decision or not. If civil-military relations break down and military officers shirk the orders they are given, this undermines the foundation of civilian control. James Kitfield of the National Journal also asserts that if there is an “‘increasingly uneasy intersection of the military and mainstream American society,’” then this can compromise every aspect of “the all-volunteer force,” including “‘recruitment, retention, equipment modernization, morale, [and] readiness to fight.’” A large civil-military gap can cause all of these problems, destabilizing the effectiveness of the military.

#### A draft relieves the burden borne by the permanent military class – sharing the responsibility can prevent sacrificing one class of society

**Rangel 2014 – New York Representative** [Charles Rangel, Rangel: It’s Time for a War Tax and a Reinstated Draft, Sept. 19, 2014, Time, July 5th, 2016, <http://time.com/3403976/rangel-draft-tax/>] [Premier]

While I am optimistic about our Commander-in-Chief’s strategy to defeat the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, I voted against the Continuing Appropriations Resolution 2015 that would grant the President the authority to provide funds to train and arm Syrian rebels against the enemy. I opposed the amendment because I strongly believe amassing additional debt to go to war should involve all of America debating the matter. That is why I have called for levying a war tax in addition to bringing back the military draft. Both the war surcharge and conscription will give everyone in America a real stake in any decision on going to war, and compel the public to think twice before they make a commitment to send their loved ones into harm’s way. As a Korean War veteran, I know the plight of war. Our military is the best in the world, but war is unpredictable and chaotic. In the event that the conflict in Iraq and Syria necessitates American troops on the ground, everyone should share the sacrifices instead of the small few who are already carrying that burden. For a decade I have been calling for the reinstatement of the draft because our military personnel and their families bear a tremendous cost each time we send them to fight. Since 2001, nearly 7,000 soldiers have paid for these wars with their lives. More than 52,000 have been wounded, many narrowly saved by the miracle of modern medicine. The 3.3 million military households have become a virtual military class who are unfairly shouldering the brunt of war. Many men and women in uniform serve multiple tours, as many as 10, and 25 percent of America’s active duty military personnel suffer from Post-traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD). It is unacceptable that on average 22 veterans die by suicide every day. If war is truly necessary, we should all come together in defense of our nation, not just one percent of America. In addition to the significant number of precious lives lost in Iraq and Afghanistan, we have accumulated too much debt to finance these wars. The United States has borrowed almost $2 trillion to fund our military engagements on foreign soil. It is estimated that the total cost would be close to $6 trillion; we continue to pay a heavy toll for these conflicts. Each dollar spent on war is a dollar not spent on education, energy, housing, or healthcare. We cannot afford to tread this same path when we are slashing domestic programs that are the lifelines for so many Americans. I will soon introduce a bill that will impose war tax to ensure that we do not have to choose between further gutting the social safety net and adding to the $17.7 trillion of national debt.

#### Draft Key to closing the civil military gap – isolating the military from society undermines democracy and promotes responsible use of force globally

Barno and Bensahel, 16 – retired US lieutenant general & Scholar @ American University (David and Nora, Nonresident Senior Fellows at the Atlantic Council, WHY WE STILL NEED THE DRAFT, 23 Feb 2016, War on the Rocks, <http://warontherocks.com/2016/02/why-we-still-need-the-draft/> Accessed 6 July 2016) [Premier]

Yet there is an even more profound reason to maintain the Selective Service system: It plays a very important role in linking the American people to military service. Without the possibility of a draft, however remote, the American people will never again have any personal exposure, no intimate skin in the game in the weighty national decision to go to war. The gap between the American people and their military is growing ever larger, which is the less talked-about downside to the success of the all-volunteer force. Relying on self-selected volunteers to carry the nation’s burden of going to war has slowly become an accepted norm, somewhat like the roles of firefighters and police. Most Americans believe it is perfectly acceptable for those who volunteer to fight for the nation to do so — others need not concern themselves, and don’t. They have effectively outsourced war to others — the sons and daughters of military families, rural youngsters from the south and west, high school students looking toward generous G.I. Bill benefits — all volunteers admirably wanting to serve their country. But this outlook is deeply unhealthy for the nation. It is morally wrong to shift the nation’s only exposure to large-scale mortal risk in defending our society onto only a handful of fellow citizens. That responsibility belongs to all of us. It is a fundamental tenet of the American experiment in democracy that all citizens share the burdens of defending the nation in times of crisis. We let that long-held touchstone of American citizenship disappear at great risk. Once gone, the will and ability to mobilize the larger nation to fight — even when necessary — would be immensely hard to resurrect, both practically and philosophically. Selective Service preserves a slender thread connecting the American people to the force of arms, to society’s momentous and always-deadly decision to go to war. Maintaining mechanisms for a draft also provides a strategic “shock absorber” so that the country can mobilize parts or all of society in an existential crisis. Absent the possibility of a draft, Americans will grow ever more distant from the military, from the debates by their elected leaders on the use of force, from the need to think about America’s changing role in a dangerous world, and most importantly, from personally sharing the risks of war. The distance today between those who fight and those who ultimately send them to war has grown substantially in the last decade and a half. Maintaining Selective Service is a small but important way to ensure it grows no wider.

#### The draft promotes engagement. A civil military gap undermines civic responsibility by training elite youth that they are “above” the military

**Fick, 2006 – Marine Corps veteran** [Nathaniel, review of Ghost Warriors Kathy Roth-Douquet and Frank Schaeffer, The Washington Post, June 18, 2006, Accessed July 4, 2016, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/06/15/AR2006061501424_pf.html>] [Premier]

The greatest problem with an isolated military, however, is even less tangible. "When those who benefit most from living in a country contribute the least to its defense and those who benefit least are asked to pay the ultimate price, something happens to the soul of that country," write the authors. That argument makes for the most powerful reading in the book: "We are shortchanging a generation of smart, motivated Americans who have been prejudiced against service by parents and teachers. Their parents may think they are protecting their children. Their teachers may think they are enlightening them. But perhaps what these young people are being protected from is maturity, selflessness, and the kind of ownership of their country that can give it a better future."

#### Elites deliberately exclude members of the military – Ivy ROTC policies prove

Wetherbee ’07 –fellow at Center for the Study of the Presidency and Congress (Michael A., “Closing the Civil-Military Gap,” accessed 7/5/16, <http://cspc.nonprofitsoapbox.com/storage/documents/Vater/Wetherbee.pdf>) [Premier]

Since it is widely accepted that a civil-military gap exists, it is pertinent to analyze where this gap is. The gap is contained in the diverging beliefs of the elite and the military, the political under representation of veterans, the political views of the elite and the military, and finally the public remarks of former military officials. Although the elite population has a great deal of respect and gratitude for the military, it is clear that many of them feel as if the military is a different part of society. For example, in the book AWOL, by Kathy Roth-Roth-Douquet and Frank Schaeffer, one member of the elite society is quoted, “People like us—educated, urban, in careers where you make good money, and interested in the good life, good food, travel—entire extended communities of people like us, know nothing about the military.”x Another Los Angeles doctor asserts, “‘I’ve raised my sons to be sensitive to others, and to be critical thinkers, so I don’t think they’d be well suited for the military.’” In addition to the ignorance about military society, some members of the elite society feel that the military has no place in their world. William T. Bianco says, “Frankly, some academic activists continue to believe the rarefied atmosphere of ivy-covered walls is profaned by the presence of the military in any form.”xii Despite the amount of respect and appreciation the military may feel from the elite society, this sort of irreverence for the military institution invading their own grounds is disheartening. It is incredible that while the nation is at War with an all volunteer force, top-tier schools such as Harvard and Yale still refuse “Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) cadets to train on their campuses.”xiii The subtle hostility towards the military by the elite class goes beyond these minor actions, and creeps into their trust for the military. While society as a whole asserts that they have “a ‘great deal’ of confidence in the military, only about a third of those in the elite classes said the same.”xiv These feelings of the elites alone suggest that there is civil-military gap that has become imbedded within our society.

#### A voluntary military creates a gap between the military and civil society that threatens humanity – it causes passive spectators - irresponsible citizens disengaged from politics and foreign policy

Ford ’03 – Mutual Black Network news anchor (Glen, “No Draft, No Peace: Rangel and Conyers are right,” The Black Commentator, Issue Number 24 - January 9, accessed 7/4/16, <http://www.blackcommentator.com/24/24_commentary_pr.html>) [Premier]

Black Congressmen Charles Rangel (NY) and John Conyers (MI) are correct in advocating a return to universal military service. In the 30 years since the last young American was drafted, the U.S. has constructed a volunteer military machine that is disconnected from the life of the nation, a foreign legion-like force to which whole sectors of the population have only the most tenuous ties or - among the most privileged - none at all. The existence of this volunteer force has encouraged much of the U.S. citizenry to disassociate themselves from the consequences of their franchise. They are spectators, having invested nothing more in the ghastly dramas unfolding upon the world than their tax dollars and vague, sports fan-like notions of national prestige. They have opted-out of responsibility for crimes perpetrated in their name. No longer liable to become citizen soldiers, Americans act less and less like citizens of any kind. Collectively, they have become a threat to humanity at large - including their oblivious selves. The all-volunteer Army, for which anti-war activists of three decades ago claimed far too much credit, has produced social distortions that fundamentally threaten the national polity. The U.S. military has become an alienated instrument of a piratical oligarchy that is quite content to extend the privilege of non-service to most of the non-interfering population. In turn, the people abrogate their role as citizens, and call it freedom.

#### The volunteer army widens the civil military gap – a draft ensured that elites would participate in the military

**Fick, 2006 – Marine Corps veteran** [Nathaniel, review of Ghost Warriors Kathy Roth-Douquet and Frank Schaeffer, The Washington Post, June 18, 2006, Accessed July 4, 2016, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/06/15/AR2006061501424_pf.html>] [Premier]

In World War I, the United States imposed a military draft for a reason that seems strange today: to prevent too many of the nation's most privileged citizens from rushing toward the sound of the guns. A draft would spread sacrifice beyond the elite, went the argument, and ensure that the country didn't lose too many future leaders. Contrast this with the run-up to the Iraq War in 2003, when the New York Civil Liberties Union challenged a federal law allowing military recruiters to contact graduating seniors at public high schools. "Students," the organization's executive director said, "have a right to not be bothered by aggressive military recruiters." How did we change from a nation where military service was a duty of citizenship -- akin to paying taxes or serving on a jury -- to one where simply being asked to consider time in uniform is an infringement of civil rights? In their compelling and inspiring cri de coeur , Kathy Roth-Douquet and Frank Schaeffer trace this societal shift, arguing that the schism between America's military and its opinion-making class threatens the nation's welfare. Both authors qualify as opinion-makers, and both have personal connections to the military. Roth-Douquet, a self-described "former agitator, feminist, Ivy Leaguer, Clintonite," is married to a Marine pilot. Schaeffer, a novelist, painter and film-maker, saw his plans for his children -- "top college, good grades, smart jobs, wife/husband, Subaru/Volvo, membership at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, IRA started early, kids, college fund" -- derail when his youngest son enlisted in the Marines after high school.

#### Military attitudes cause the gap - members are self-righteous and show contempt for civilians, which undermines civilian control of the military

Wetherbee ’07 –fellow at Center for the Study of the Presidency and Congress (Michael A., “Closing the Civil-Military Gap,” accessed 7/5/16, <http://cspc.nonprofitsoapbox.com/storage/documents/Vater/Wetherbee.pdf>) [Premier]

This subtle hostility, however, does not merely flow in one direction. Although it appears the elite society looks down upon the military society, at the same time evidence suggest that the military has a “lack respect for civilian society.”xv In fact, “More and more, enlisted as well as officers are beginning to feel that they are special, better than the society they serve.”xvi The military clearly believes that it adheres to a higher ethical standard than its civilian counterparts, and that it treats minorities more fairly: “Seventy-eight percent [of military members] think that racial and ethnic minorities are treated more fairly in the military than in larger society.”xvii As a result of all of this, it is no surprise that the military is much more likely than the rest of society to believe that civilian society is troubled and necessitating reform, and that if military values were wide spread in society, than society would be much better off.xviii The feeling of superiority of the military is best articulated by retired Admiral Stanley Arthur, who was the commander of U.S. naval forces during the first gulf war: “‘today the armed forces are no longer representative of the people they serve. More and more, enlisted [men and women] as well as officers are beginning to feel that they are special, better than the society they serve. This is not healthy in an armed force serving a democracy.’”xix

#### Militarist tyranny is expanding due to the civil military gap isolating the military from popular mobilization in society

Ford ’03 – Mutual Black Network news anchor (Glen, “No Draft, No Peace: Rangel and Conyers are right,” The Black Commentator, Issue Number 24 - January 9, accessed 7/4/16, <http://www.blackcommentator.com/24/24_commentary_pr.html>) [Premier]

George Bush plans to wage wars without end. There is no choice but to build networks of popular mobilization, to protest with no end, if need be. Sober activists should understand that the anti-draft War Party is at a tremendous advantage. By immunizing 95 percent of American families from the immediate consequences of war - but not the account that will become due - the militarists have purchased consent to use the armed forces as they see fit. The deal was concluded in 1973. At some point, in order to make "a significant and profound change in American life and policy," that agreement will have to be broken. Or we will perish in an orgy of war.

#### A civil military gap undermines civic engagement by training elite youth that they are “above” the military

**Fick, 2006 – Marine Corps veteran** [Nathaniel, review of Ghost Warriors Kathy Roth-Douquet and Frank Schaeffer, The Washington Post, June 18, 2006, Accessed July 4, 2016, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/06/15/AR2006061501424_pf.html>] [Premier]

The greatest problem with an isolated military, however, is even less tangible. "When those who benefit most from living in a country contribute the least to its defense and those who benefit least are asked to pay the ultimate price, something happens to the soul of that country," write the authors. That argument makes for the most powerful reading in the book: "We are shortchanging a generation of smart, motivated Americans who have been prejudiced against service by parents and teachers. Their parents may think they are protecting their children. Their teachers may think they are enlightening them. But perhaps what these young people are being protected from is maturity, selflessness, and the kind of ownership of their country that can give it a better future."

#### The gap threatens civilian control of the military – it causes military leaders to distrust and disobey civilian leaders

Wetherbee ’07 –fellow at Center for the Study of the Presidency and Congress (Michael A., “Closing the Civil-Military Gap,” accessed 7/5/16, <http://cspc.nonprofitsoapbox.com/storage/documents/Vater/Wetherbee.pdf>) [Premier]

 As the professional military becomes more isolated from the nation's governing elite—or the other way around, military members may question whether our leaders have sufficient appreciation of the horror and unpredictability of war?”xxxix As a result of this, “elite military officers now believe that it is their role to insist rather than merely advice or advocate in private, on key decisions, particularly those involving the use of force.”x This clearly contradicts the idea of civilian control upon which our nation is founded, and thus is dangerous to the stability of our country. Additionally, healthy civil-military relations dictate that military officers do “not engage in public debate over matters of foreign policy, including the decision to go to war.”xli Within proper civil-military relations, it is essential that soldiers carry out any decision of their civilian superior, whether they agree with the decision or not. If civil-military relations break down and military officers shirk the orders they are given, this undermines the foundation of civilian control. James Kitfield of the National Journal also asserts that if there is an “‘increasingly uneasy intersection of the military and mainstream American society,’” then this can compromise every aspect of “the all-volunteer force,” including “‘recruitment, retention, equipment modernization, morale, [and] readiness to fight.’” A large civil-military gap can cause all of these problems, destabilizing the effectiveness of the military.

#### The gap poses security risks by killing effective policy-making, deprives the military of talent, and prevents access to the benefits of military participation

Wetherbee ’07 –fellow at Center for the Study of the Presidency and Congress (Michael A., “Closing the Civil-Military Gap,” accessed 7/5/16, <http://cspc.nonprofitsoapbox.com/storage/documents/Vater/Wetherbee.pdf>) [Premier]

There is a problem with the civil-military gap in today’s nation, and it is hurting our nation. If the gap continues to grow, the damage to all parties will intensify: “It hurts our country, particularly our ability to make the best policy possible. It undermines the strength of our civilian leadership, which no longer has significant numbers of members who have the experience and wisdom that comes from national service. Finally, it makes our military weaker in the long run.”xlv Although we have arguably the most legitimate democracy and effective military in the world, neither is able to reach their full potential because of the large civil-military gap. By allowing the absence of the majority of the elite civilian population, the nation’s military is missing some of the best minds of the generation: “As retired Lt. Gen. Daniel Christman wrote last year in Blueprint, bans on ROTC units ‘not only deny opportunities to hear alternative voices on college campuses, but they also muffle the academic voice in our armed forces.’”xlvi Additionally, by not participating in civil service, the elite society is losing the character development opportunities provided by military service.xlvii

#### The gap threatens military security – it conflates the military’s self-interest with national interest – the military will shirk commands from civilians

Wetherbee ’07 –fellow at Center for the Study of the Presidency and Congress (Michael A., “Closing the Civil-Military Gap,” accessed 7/5/16, <http://cspc.nonprofitsoapbox.com/storage/documents/Vater/Wetherbee.pdf>) [Premier]

It is clear that there is a civil-military gap, and that it is necessary for the effectiveness of the military. Yet, it is important to recognize that it is a crucial problem if the gap becomes too wide. As Roth-Douquet and Schaeffer proclaim, “When those who benefit most from living in a country contribute the least to its defense and those who benefit less are asked to pay the ultimate price, something happens to the soul of the country.”xxxvi An excessive gap between the military and the elite civilian population not only hurts the soul of the country, but it also can compromise national security. If the military begins to feel so alienated from the leaders they serve, they may begin to “equate the national interest with the self-interest of the institution.”xxxvii At the same time, if the civilian leaders lose touch with a comprehensive understanding of military capabilities, they may begin to make decisions that are strategically ineffective, as some argue happened during the Vietnam War. In healthy civil-military relations, officers not only have the right but also the duty to stand up to policies that they perceive as flawed. Owens believes “They must convey their concerns to civilian policy makers forcefully and truthfully.”xxxviii Yet, “As the professional military becomes more isolated from the nation's governing elite—or the other way around, military members may question whether our leaders have sufficient appreciation of the horror and unpredictability of war?”xxxix As a result of this, “elite military officers now believe that it is their role to insist rather than merely advice or advocate in private, on key decisions, particularly those involving the use of force.”

#### A Volunteer military is widening the civil military gap. Elite detachment from military experience crushes decision making – universal service solves through exposure

Cohen ’02 – CEO of P-3 Ventures (Steve, “It’s time for universal national service,” United States Naval Institute, May, 2002 Vol. 128, Iss. 5; pg. 4, accessed 9/4/16, <http://www.usni.org/magazines/proceedings/2002-05/its-time-universal-national-service>) [Premier]

Some of those challenges are unintended consequences of the success of all-volunteer armed forces. The most troubling aspect is the increasing and unhealthy "gap" in our society between those who have served in the military and those who have not. Most of our civilian elites—business, academic, professional, and political—have not served, and most do not know anyone of their generation who has. Former Secretary of Defense William Cohen recently worried about "a chasm developing between the military and civilian worlds, where the civilian world doesn't fully grasp the mission of the military, and the military doesn't understand why the memories of our civilians and civilian policy makers are so short, or why the criticism is so quick and so unrelenting." The vast majority of U.S. senators and representatives have little knowledge of military capabilities and limitations. They simply lack experience: In 1971, 75% of members of Congress had been in the military; today, that figure is 34%. Moreover, it is bound to continue dropping because only 6% of Americans under the age of 65 have ever served in the military. When the Harvard Crimson asked Harvard students if they supported military action against the perpetrators of the terrorist attacks, 69% answered yes. But the "bad news," as the Crimson put it, was that only 38% of the undergraduates said they were willing to take part in military actions. This is not surprising from a university that has not had a Reserve Officer Training Corps unit on campus since the late 1960s. However, it is sad confirmation of the notion that "other people" should serve. Universal national service will begin to eliminate the civil-military gap. Young people from every part of society will be exposed to discipline and experience the demands and satisfaction of teamwork. They will provide important services to their nation, bringing alive the ideals of citizenship—and they will learn to live with each other. The military was an early force for racial integration in the United States and one of its great strengths is that it is largely a color-blind meritocracy.

#### The Draft would close the civil military gap by forcing the elite class to have a stake in war.

**Rangel House.gov 2015** [Press Release, March 19, 2015, rangel.house.gov, July 5, 2016, <https://rangel.house.gov/news/press-releases/rangel-introduces-bills-require-military-draft-and-tax-times-war>] [Premier]

Washington, D.C. – On the 12th anniversary of the start of the Iraq War, Congressman Charles B. Rangel, who represents New York's 13th Congressional District that includes Upper Manhattan and parts of the Bronx, introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives two separate bills that would compel everyone in America to share the burden of war. Rangel's Draft Act calls for reinstating the military draft for all males and females from 18-25, and the War Tax Act levies a tax for war funds whenever Congress authorizes a declaration of war or use of military force. "Armed conflict is unpredictable, chaotic, and costly. When I served, the entire nation shared the sacrifices through the draft and increased taxes. But today, only a fraction of America shoulders the burden. If war is truly necessary, we must all come together to support and defend our nation," said Rangel. " As a Korean War veteran, I know the toll war takes." Since the Iraq War began on March 19, 2003, 4,478 Americans have been killed and 32,244 have been wounded according to the Department of Defense (as of today). Another 2,355 Americans have been killed and 20,067 have been wounded in Afghanistan. Moreover, hundreds of thousands of soldiers returned home with invisible wounds, suffering from traumatic brain injuries and post traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). Rangel is introducing the two bills as Congress debates President Obama's recent request for authorization of the use of military force (AUMF) to fight the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) and just after 47 Republican Senators sent a letter to Iran's leaders attempting to undermine the President’s negotiations on halting Iran’s nuclear program. Rangel believes that, by undermining diplomacy, the letter recklessly brings the United States and Iran closer to war. "I have long called for reinstating the military draft, simply because I believe strongly that a national decision to go to war must also include a broad commitment to share its burdens," said Rangel. "I feel the same about paying for wars. Those making the decision to fight need to feel the burden--not just our future generations as we've done with Iraq and Afghanistan." Rangel's Draft Act requires all men and women between the ages 18 to 25 to register for the Selective Service System and for the reinstatement of a lottery to draft them into the military whenever an authorization on the use of military force or declaration of war is in effect. According to the Selective Service System, there are currently nearly 16 million men registered within the Selective Service System. By requiring women to register, Rangel's bill would double the number of U.S residents available for military service. It would also be in line with the Pentagon's updated policy to include women in combat. The War Tax Act requires that current and future war funding be paid for with revenue increases. A permanent federal income tax, made possible by the 16th Amendment in 1913, was employed to help defray the costs of America's involvement in World War I. In 1968 a temporary 10% surtax was imposed to offset the escalating costs of the Vietnam War. Taxes were raised in 1990 in part to pay for deficits increased by the first Gulf War. The Iraq and Afghanistan wars are a major exception to this tradition. Together they are variously estimated to have cost us cost from $4 to $6 trillion--the most expensive wars in our history. "The current attitude of 'fight now, pay later (or never)' should make us all wary of decisions to commit to wars undertaken by those who won't experience their consequences," said Rangel. "Whenever Congress decides to fund a war or other U.S. combat activities, it must provide a means to pay for it--then and there--not later." Rangel added: "If we don't have the will to fully share the burdens of war, then we have no right to send our sons and daughters into harm's way."

#### The draft would solve the civil military gap – military scholars see it as the best solution

Wetherbee ’07 –fellow at Center for the Study of the Presidency and Congress (Michael A., “Closing the Civil-Military Gap,” accessed 7/5/16, <http://cspc.nonprofitsoapbox.com/storage/documents/Vater/Wetherbee.pdf>) [Premier]

 From the office of the presidency, there are many steps that could be taken to close the civil-military gap. These steps range from large changes such as reinstituting the draft, to small changes such asking the nations elite to serve, recreating a sense of patriotic duty that was once a part of the fabric of our country. In between these extremes, lies the possibility of restructuring aspects of the military institution to promote social contact between military members and society, including the elite society. Finally, outside of this spectrum lies a change that could happen with a simple vote in congress, and it would have sweeping effects, although it would face fierce opposition. This change is the removal of the “Don’t ask, Don’t Tell” policy, allowing homosexuals to serve openly in the military. It may be argued that this change would compromise military effectiveness in order to make the military look too much like society. Recent studies by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, John Shalikashvili, when the “Don’t ask, Don’t Tell” policy was enacted, however, show that allowing gay military members to serve openly would not decrease military effectiveness. The presidential driven change that would have the most dramatic affect on closing the civil-military gap would be a reinstatement of the draft. This would be a radical change in our nation, but surprisingly it has the support of many scholars. One scholar who supports reinstituting the draft is William Galston, a professor, former domestic-policy adviser for President Clinton, and former draftee who served as a marine.xlix Galston suggests that our country adopt a system of compulsory service, where every American would be required to serve for eighteenmonths upon graduation from high school or their eighteenth birthday.l He realizes that compulsory service may leave the nation with more service members than are needed and may then create unnecessary bureaucracy. This he feels could be addressed by instituting a lottery that contained no exemptions, so that all segments of society would be equally affected. Finally, Galston suggests that service would not only include military service, but civil service as well, so that people who objected to serving in the military could still serve their nation in other aspects.li

#### Increased contact and exposure solves the gap—elites are often not anti-military but a-military—forced confrontation with the concept of service bridges perceived differences and motivates involvement

Wetherbee ’07 –fellow at Center for the Study of the Presidency and Congress (Michael A., “Closing the Civil-Military Gap,” accessed 7/5/16, <http://cspc.nonprofitsoapbox.com/storage/documents/Vater/Wetherbee.pdf>) [Premier]

One of the biggest problems with the desire of young people to serve their nation is not that they are not grateful for what they have been given, but they have never even been confronted with idea of military service. There are indeed people in the elite classes who would step up to military service if they were confronted with the idea. The problem, however, is as Michael Messe suggests, “young people today are not anti-military, they are a-military—they don’t know anything about the military, or what service entails.”lxxxvii Roth-Douquet and Schaeffer argue that “Since the Vietnam War we have not even tried to make the case to our most privileged young people for why they should consider service. We seem to have just accepted the received ‘wisdom’ that the upper classes will reject military service out of hand.”lxxxviii This acceptance is really the root of the problem, and not a lack of character in the upper classes. Thus, it is up to the President and those under him to inspire today’s youth of the value of national service and patriotism, and ask them to serve their nation. As of now President Bush has not used the power of his office to convince American youth of the honor in service or to challenge them to serve their nation in this trying time. In addition to using his own voice, the President should also urge the creation of a system that allows members to build relationships with the youth of America. For, “Analysis of why people choose to join the military shows that the single biggest factor is whether someone has a direct personal experience with someone they admire who is in or was in the service.”lxxxix Thus, it is suggested that “We should consider sending young alums of top colleges who are in the service on a speaking tour of like campuses, in civilian clothes, to talk to their peers honestly about their experiences.”xc Although the President asking America’s youth to serve could be powerful, nothing is more powerful than the influence of their peers. If a peer of theirs, who has experienced military service, is able to convince them of its value, then this is the best possibility of inspiring them to serve. The absence of military service today is not because a lack of character in America’s elite youth: it is because they have never even been forced to consider the possibility. If they were confronted with the possibility, great progress would be made in closing the civil-military gap.

### Gender

#### A modern draft would be a huge step towards gender equality in our military – it would be the first time it included women

**Hall 2016 – Contributor for WSWS** [Tom Hall, Contributer to the World Socialist Web Site, June 17, 2016, US Senate votes to include women in the draft, World Socialist Web Site, July 5, 2016, <https://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2016/06/17/draf-j17.html>] [Premier]

On Tuesday, the Senate voted 85 to 13 to require women to register for the Selective Service System, making them liable to a future military draft for the first time. The move gave final passage to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, which approved $602 billion in funding for the US military. Six conservative Republicans voted against the NDAA, largely because they opposed requiring women to register on religious fundamentalist grounds. Seven Democrats also opposed the bill, mainly because it continues the legal ban on closing the Guantanamo Bay prison camp, which led to an Obama veto of a previous funding bill. The Senate and House versions of the bill must now be reconciled in a conference committee, where it is uncertain whether the amendment will survive. Language expanding the draft to women was inserted and then removed from the House version of the bill, and the ultra-right opposition is stronger in the House than in the Senate. The United States officially ended the draft in 1973 at the end of the Vietnam War, in response to mass opposition to conscription. However, the federal government still requires all male citizens and resident aliens between the ages of 18 and 25 to register with the Selective Service, which maintains the necessary records in case the draft is reinstated. The move follows December’s announcement by the Obama administration that it would begin allowing women in the military to serve in combat roles. The decision was understood at the time to also potentially expose women to the requirement of registering for the draft, because a 1981 Supreme Court ruling only exempted women from registering because they did not participate in frontline combat duty. While hailed by elements within and around the Democratic Party as a victory for gender equality, the move was motivated in large measure by the need to update the apparatus for mass conscription, which the Pentagon currently opposes using for its current operations, but which would become necessary in the event of a war against a major adversary such as Russia or China, or even Iran. The decision to admit women into combat roles was initially opposed by some elements within the military, with the Marines’ leadership citing a study that found that gender-integrated units were “less lethal,” but the top military brass all supported women registering for the draft in congressional testimony this February. “I think that all eligible and qualified men and women should register for the draft,” Robert Neller, commandant of the Marine Corps, told Congress. The Amendment passed with broad bipartisan support from Senate Republicans. “I support it [because] I don’t think you want to take half your population off the sidelines in case of a national emergency,” South Carolina Senator Lindsey Graham told the Huffington Post in May. Republican Senator John McCain, who opposed December’s decision, has also spoken out in support of the expansion of the draft. Democratic Party leaders have portrayed the vote to include women in the draft as a victory for “gender equality.” Presumptive Democratic presidential nominee Hillary Clinton, whose campaign has systematically promoted issues of racial and gender identity as a cover for her right-wing, pro-war politics, voiced her support for the measure the day after the vote. Steny Hoyer, the second-highest ranking Democrat in the House of Representatives, told reporters in May, “Women ought to be treated equally. If you’re going to have Selective Service registration continue, and you’re going to have women available to serve in the armed forces in either front-line capacity or support capacity…then I think it makes sense to have eligible individuals, male or female, register as long as you have registration.”

#### Rangel’s new draft system fosters Gender equality by forcing both men and women to sign up

**Rangel 2013 – New York Representative** [Charles B. Rangel, CNN, January 26, 2013, A more equal military? Bring back draft, July 5th, 2016, <http://www.cnn.com/2013/01/25/opinion/rangel-military-draft/>] [Premier]

On Thursday, Defense Secretary Leon Panetta announced the Defense Department would lift the ban on women serving in combat, marking another significant milestone for equality in our nation. Taking this critical step forward to include women in combat strengthens our military by reducing the burden of the disproportionate number of soldiers who are making sacrifices. I sincerely hope that this will spark a national debate about who is fighting our wars and whether all of America can say that we're sharing the sacrifice. Since January 2003, at the height of the debate on the possible unilateral strike against Iraq, I have advocated for a reinstatement of the military draft to ensure a more equitable representation of people making sacrifices in wars in which the United States is engaged. In the past decade, more than 2 million soldiers have served in Iraq and Afghanistan. The Iraq war took more than 4,422 lives and wounded some 32,000 in nine years; to date, 2,168 American soldiers have died and 18,215 have been wounded in Afghanistan. Rep. Charles Rangel Opinion: Women in combat a dangerous experiment Currently the burden of defending our nation is carried by less than 1% of the American population. The 2.2 million members of the armed forces in active duty, the National Guard and the Reserve have become a virtual military class that makes the ultimate sacrifice of laying down life and limb for our country. As a result of high combat exposure, combined with multiple deployments, we have seen unprecedented incidences of veterans with post-traumatic stress disorder, traumatic brain injury and veterans committing suicide. Since we replaced the compulsory military draft with an all-volunteer force in 1973, our nation has been making decisions about wars without worry over who fights them. I sincerely believe that reinstating the draft would compel the American public to have a stake in the wars we fight as a nation. That is why I wrote the Universal National Service Act, known as the "draft" bill, which requires all men and women between ages 18 and 25 to give two years of service in any capacity that promotes our national defense.

### Military Readiness

#### The Military will face a personnel crisis soon - recruitment will begin to fail soon due to economic recovery and shrinking budgets

Wagner 16—Navy Reserve officer and is a student at the Naval War College and Vice President with ScoutComms, an award-winning veteran-owned benefit corporation that helps for-profit and not-for-profit organizations effectively work with veterans and military families [Brian, “The Military Could Soon Face Increased Recruiting Challenges”, Task & Purpose, February 18, 2016, <http://taskandpurpose.com/the-military-could-soon-face-increased-recruiting-challenges/>, July 6, 2016] [Premier]

After more than a half-decade operating in a favorable recruiting environment that allowed the U.S. military to be increasingly selective and to meet most recruitment goals, the new environment is “likely to become significantly less fertile in the near future,” according to a new summary report released by CNA. “Population Representation in the Military Services” is CNA’s annual congressionally mandated study of the demographic makeup of the personnel serving in the U.S. military. This year’s report, released on Feb. 10, pins 2014 — the most recent year for which data is available — as a turning point in which the increasingly strong civilian labor market and declining Department of Defense budget begin to erode the bargaining position of recruiters interacting with American young adults. The report warns the DoD that “without sufficient planning and resources, military recruiting will be characterized by ‘boom and bust’ periods, as has been the case in past years.” The downsides of increased volatility in recruiting are plentiful, including higher recruiting costs and the potential to recruit lower-quality service members. RELATED: 5 TIPS FOR RECRUITING HIPSTERS INTO THE MILITARY » CNA researchers note that a strong economy and smaller recruiting budget is leading to a talent pool that is shrinking faster than the military is downsizing. Since 2009, there have been a decreasing number of applicants for each enlisted position available across the services. Over the last 30 years, notes CNA, approximately 60% of all non-prior service, or NPS, applicants for enlisted positions have been accepted by the military; today, applicants have a 70% chance of being accepted. CNA notes that even though the military has largely met recruiting goals in recent years, it no longer has much margin for error, and as a result “should expect NPS recruit quality to fall.”

#### Volunteerism cannot provide adequate personnel to guarantee national security – Sept 11th empirically proves. Only a universal draft can solve.

Cohen 02 – CEO of P-3 Ventures (Steve, “It’s time for universal national service,” United States Naval Institute, May, 2002 Vol. 128, Iss. 5; pg. 4, accessed 9/4/16, <http://www.usni.org/magazines/proceedings/2002-05/its-time-universal-national-service>) [Premier]

In his State of the Union message, President George W. Bush announced a new volunteer effort dubbed "Freedom Corps." The same month, Senators John McCain (R-AZ) and Evan Bayh (D-IN) introduced legislation allowing shorter military enlistments coupled to financial incentives. Although both initiatives are admirable half steps, we need a program of universal national service. Advocating such a policy in the pages of Proceedings may not seem terribly radical. What makes it surprising is that it reflects the sentiment of a growing contingent of downtown Manhattan (read liberal), Ivy League parents—like me—whose kids soon will be graduating from "elite" private schools. I still do not want the draft reinstituted—at least not in the form it took during the Vietnam War. Nonetheless, there is a good chance that the demands of fighting terrorism abroad and ensuring homeland security will far outstrip current resources. Protecting fragile sites, such as airports, bridges, and power plants, will be labor intensive. Because police forces have insufficient people and funds to do these jobs alone, many others will have to be trained, organized, and disciplined. Volunteerism might be the answer. Unfortunately, there is little evidence that people are willing to do so. After the post-11 September outpouring of contributions, blood donations, and rescue assistance, volunteering and military enlistments are back at former levels. So, how do we best meet critical national needs? Requiring virtually every 18 year old to serve two years in some capacity, military or "regimented civilian," would go a long way toward protecting and strengthening our country. Myriad details about universal service must be debated: the nature of service; how much discretion an individual should have in choosing a "branch"; training and compensation; and exemptions. All are issues that deserve serious thought and discussion. But unless we take bold steps to begin the debate, the United States is likely to be ill equipped for the challenges of the coming decade.

#### Draft solves military shortages – long-term troop supply necessary to fight the war on terror

Thompson 07 - Pulitzer Prize-winning reporter (Mark, Would National Service Be Better Than the Draft? TIME, 30 Aug 2007, [http://content.time.com/time/specials/2007/article/0,28804,1657256\_1657626\_1656898,00.html](http://content.time.com/time/specials/2007/article/0%2C28804%2C1657256_1657626_1656898%2C00.html) Accessed 5 July 2016) [Premier]

Today's military was built to fight Colin Powell's kind of war — brief and intense — like the 1991 Gulf War. The U.S. military really doesn't have the depth to wage a sustained ground campaign as we are now doing in Iraq, many military officers say. If the U.S. thinks its future will consist of drawn-out campaigns like that now underway in Iraq, the prospect of a draft makes more sense. While the 1.4 million-strong U.S. military (with another 1 million reservists) is at the breaking point with only 162,000 troops in Iraq, that total is well below what experts estimated would be needed to tame that country. The Rand Corp. said in 2003 that, based on historical troop-to-population ratios from prior wars, the number of troops needed in Iraq would range from 258,000 (based on Bosnia) to 321,000 (based on post-World War II Germany) to 528,000 (based on Kosovo). The numbers suggest that if the U.S. really believes there is a war on terror to be won — and, if as the Bush Administration keeps saying, it is going to be a long war — more troops are going to be required to wage it.

#### The draft deters great power wars – it sends a signal of readiness and preparation

Barno and Bensahel 16 – retired US lieutenant general & Scholar @ American University (David and Nora, Nonresident Senior Fellows at the Atlantic Council, WHY WE STILL NEED THE DRAFT, 23 Feb 2016, War on the Rocks, <http://warontherocks.com/2016/02/why-we-still-need-the-draft/> Accessed 6 July 2016) [Premier]

We will never again need a draft. Why are we even having this conversation? No one can predict the future of war. As former Secretary of Defense Robert Gates once quipped, since the Vietnam War, the United States has a perfect record of predicting the next war: “we have never once gotten it right.” As we wrote last month, the U.S. military must remain prepared to fight a really big war that might require a much larger force — which could well require a draft. Even though that scenario remains unlikely, the consequences of being unable to wage such a war could prove disastrous. The Selective Service System also helps serve as a deterrent and a symbol of national will. Deterrence is not only a function of current power; it also includes the nation’s potential power when galvanized — military, economic, diplomatic, and even social. Maintaining the mechanism to implement conscription means that in times of crisis, the United States can send an indisputable signal of national resolve by choosing to start a draft, even one of modest size. Draftees dilute the quality of the force and diminish military effectiveness. This inaccurate perspective is a clear legacy of Vietnam. By the end of that war, the U.S. military was plagued by drug abuse, racial tensions, and serious indiscipline. Many military personnel equate these maladies with conscription — despite the fact that as one of us can personally attest, these problems also plagued much of the first decade of the all-volunteer force. The military’s experience with large draft armies in 1917, 1941 and 1953 further demonstrates that this perspective is simply wrong. Draftees performed remarkably well during those wartime periods, perhaps because they were serving in conflicts widely supported by the American people. We now refer to the draftees who served in World War II as “The Greatest Generation.” There is no reason to expect that would automatically be any different in the future. And even though only 29 percent of those recently surveyed said that the United States should have a military draft, public opinion could shift quickly — especially in the aftermath of an attack on the United States (terrorist or otherwise) that were to kill tens or even hundreds of thousands of Americans (let alone millions). Wars are way too complicated today for anyone but long-serving professionals. Draftees will be useless or worse, disruptive. Conscription in the future could look very different than the draft calls of Vietnam or Korea, which were designed to provide more infantrymen for the fight. The changing shape of future wars may require conscripting the nation’s best experts at code writing, hacking, and cyber security to rapidly build a world-class cadre of cyber warriors. There might be an immediate need to put financial experts and market analysts into uniform to help protect the nation from potentially disruptive economic warfare. Or the military might need to mobilize social media gurus who can help understand and then undercut the insidious messaging of highly sophisticated adversaries aiming to inflame and radicalize populations at home and abroad. These targeted conscripts might also be drafted to be reservists, splitting time between uniformed and civilian jobs and leveraging skills from both. This 21st-century, cutting-edge human capital is unlikely to be found in today’s military — yet may prove crucial in a future major war. These points show that the draft has both a current and future practical role in the nation’s defense. Abolishing Selective Service would strip an important arrow from the quiver of American defenses. The prospect of a future draft — even a modest, targeted one — serves as a quiet but important hedge against an unknowable future filled with ever-changing threats to the nation. The United States must always retain an emergency way to respond to existential threats, and if necessary, mobilize parts or all of society in response.

#### The military faces international instability and multiple potential crises – without a draft, our personnel levels are inadequate

**Hall 2016 –** Contributor for WSWS [Tom Hall, Contributer to the World Socialist Web Site, June 17, 2016, US Senate votes to include women in the draft, World Socialist Web Site, July 5, 2016, <https://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2016/06/17/draf-j17.html>] [Premier]

He continued, parenthetically, “Internationally, we are in a very unstable context. Therefore, it may well make sense to continue to have a pool available, a large pool available, in the event that we need to, in very rapid order, ramp up the numbers of folks in the armed forces.” By “unstable context,” Hoyer means the real possibility that the innumerable small-scale conflicts stoked by American imperialism could coalesce into a broader war drawing the United States into conflict with its chief geopolitical rivals, above all Russia and China, two nuclear-armed powers. Tuesday’s vote has been treated in the press and by politicians of both parties as having a largely symbolic value because of the current absence of a draft, which, they argue, will continue for the indefinite future. But a large-scale conflict with Russia and China would almost certainly require conscription on a huge scale, and the danger of such a course is made more and more likely by the extremely aggressive and provocative posturing by the United States and its allies. On June 13, NATO announced the deployment of 4,000 additional troops to eastern Europe as part of its military buildup along Russia’s western border. In Southeast Asia, the navies of the United States, Japan and India are currently engaged in joint military exercises that are clearly directed against China, which has responded by having its own ships tail the American-led operation.

#### Closing the civil military gap is critical to military effectiveness – the gap destroys sound decision making and creates and “us vs them” relationship

**Fick, 2006 – Marine Corps veteran** [Nathaniel, review of Ghost Warriors Kathy Roth-Douquet and Frank Schaeffer, The Washington Post, June 18, 2006, Accessed July 4, 2016, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/06/15/AR2006061501424_pf.html>] [Premier]

In their compelling and inspiring cri de coeur , Kathy Roth-Douquet and Frank Schaeffer trace this societal shift, arguing that the schism between America's military and its opinion-making class threatens the nation's welfare. Both authors qualify as opinion-makers, and both have personal connections to the military. Roth-Douquet, a self-described "former agitator, feminist, Ivy Leaguer, Clintonite," is married to a Marine pilot. Schaeffer, a novelist, painter and film-maker, saw his plans for his children -- "top college, good grades, smart jobs, wife/husband, Subaru/Volvo, membership at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, IRA started early, kids, college fund" -- derail when his youngest son enlisted in the Marines after high school. That their stories are rare is a recent phenomenon. In 1956, 400 of Princeton's 750 graduates served in uniform. By 2004, only nine members of the university's graduating class entered the military. Harvard, Yale, Brown, Columbia and many other schools do not even allow ROTC on their campuses. The gulf is growing in Congress, too. In 1971, three-quarters of our representatives had military experience. Now, fewer than a third do, and that number drops with each passing year. Some citizens see no problem with this. We are indeed fortunate not to live in a militarized society, and our hyper-capable armed forces enjoy, at least superficially, broad support from the American people. But Roth-Douquet and Schaeffer, who've written the book in alternating sections, unite to argue convincingly that there are at least three dangerous consequences of a civil-military divide. First, it hurts the nation's ability to make sound military choices. Uniformed service is not a prerequisite for individual expertise in the conduct of war. Abraham Lincoln -- arguably America's greatest wartime president -- never served in uniform (although he spent three months in an Illinois militia). In the aggregate, however, we benefit from having veterans in every corner of our decision-making apparatus: as presidential advisers, members of Congress and active citizens. Without them, our civilian leaders embody less and less of that visceral wisdom forged in harm's way, and the problem perpetuates itself: If young people don't serve today, then we won't have older veterans in leadership positions tomorrow. Second, a schism between the military and the rest of us weakens the armed forces. Absent broad and deep ties throughout society, the military becomes "them" instead of "us." Roth-Douquet and Schaeffer fear that such a force "will be overused and underled and that support will run out fast for any project that becomes a political liability." Consider that Franklin Roosevelt and Winston Churchill, unlike most political leaders today, both had children in uniform in the Second World War. Whether such personal connections actually affect policy is almost impossible to say, but common sense supports the authors' assertion that "the grunt on the ground is best equipped, best trained, and best served when the opinion makers have a personal stake in his or her well-being."

#### Impact: Military readiness prevents major global conflicts by deterring aggression

Spencer 2000 - Research Fellow at Thomas A. Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies. [“The Facts About Military Readiness.” 9-15-2000. Jack <http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2000/09/BG1394-The-Facts-About-Military-Readiness>) [Premier]

America's national security requirements dictate that the armed forces must be prepared to defeat groups of adversaries in a given war. America, as the sole remaining superpower, has many enemies. Because attacking America or its interests alone would surely end in defeat for a single nation, these enemies are likely to form alliances. Therefore, basing readiness on American military superiority over any single nation has little saliency. The evidence indicates that the U.S. armed forces are not ready to support America's national security requirements. Moreover, regarding the broader capability to defeat groups of enemies, military readiness has been declining. The National Security Strategy, the U.S. official statement of national security objectives,3 concludes that the United States "must have the capability to deter and, if deterrence fails, defeat large-scale, cross-border aggression in two distant theaters in overlapping time frames."4According to some of the military's highest-ranking officials, however, the United States cannot achieve this goal. Commandant of the Marine Corps General James Jones, former Chief of Naval Operations Admiral Jay Johnson, and Air Force Chief of Staff General Michael Ryan have all expressed serious concerns about their respective services' ability to carry out a two major theater war strategy.5 Recently retired Generals Anthony Zinni of the U.S. Marine Corps and George Joulwan of the U.S. Army have even questioned America's ability to conduct one major theater war the size of the 1991 Gulf War.6 Military readiness is vital because declines in America's military readiness signal to the rest of the world that the United States is not prepared to defend its interests. Therefore, potentially hostile nations will be more likely to lash out against American allies and interests, inevitably leading to U.S. involvement in combat. A high state of military readiness is more likely to deter potentially hostile nations from acting aggressively in regions of vital national interest, thereby preserving peace.

#### The AVF doesn’t maintain troop quality – recruiting cannot keep up with high demand specialists which causes the use of untrained reservists

Glastris, 03- editor in chief of The Washington Monthly [Paul, First draft: the battle to create universal national service has just started Here's how it can be won., Washington Monthly, Mar 1, 2003, <[http://www.thefreelibrary.com/First+draft 3A+the+battle+to+create+universal+national+service+has+just...-a098829847](http://www.thefreelibrary.com/First%2Bdraft%203A%2Bthe%2Bbattle%2Bto%2Bcreate%2Buniversal%2Bnational%2Bservice%2Bhas%2Bjust...-a098829847)>, July 4, 2016] [Premier]

For the first decade; this force was a disaster; the quality of recruits and retention rates plummeted. Over time, however, as Congress beefed up military pay and benefits and the Pentagon got better at recruiting and managing volunteers, the quality of the force rose dramatically. By the 1990s, the average enlisted man or woman had substantially higher test scores and more years in uniform than in 1973, when the draft ended (though not necessarily higher scores than during the 1950s, when many more college-grade men were drafted). Greater aptitude and experience proved a boon to the new high-tech military. Studies began to show that smarter recruits were easier to train and did a more effective job manning everything from Patriot missiles to complex communication systems. And every soldier who reenlisted was one less soldier who had to be recruited and trained. The amazing success and low casualty rates of recent military engagements, from the Gulf War to Bosnia to Kosovo to Afghanistan, convinced most Pentagon leaders that the all-volunteer force was a blessing, and that any return to conscription would be militarily disastrous. In the meantime, however, fundamental flaws in the all-volunteer force began to show. In the late 1990s, the military especially the Army, started having serious trouble meeting recruitment targets without lowering standards. The percentage of enlistees deemed high quality dropped from 74.4 percent in 1992 to 59.1 percent in 1999. Retention rates also fell. More importantly, the increasing scope and pace of overseas deployments started eroding readiness and wearing out the troops. (See "G.I. Woe," page 34 Since 9/11, many troops in the highest-demand specialties such as light infantry, military police, and civilian affairs have been spending the majority of every year away from their families, whether in training exercises in California or in tents in the Middle East desert. Because the active-duty military simply doesn't have enough of these troops, the burden falls increasingly on reservists, who signed up for part-time duty but have become, in effect, part-time civilians. When not called to duty, these reservists typically work as police officers, firefighters, emergency medical technicians, hospital nurses--precisely the jobs most needed should a terrorist attack strike this country. But for reasons of law and fairness, municipalities are not allowed to fill slots left by deployed reservists. Nor would it be easy to hire capable replacements without bidding up salaries higher than many municipalities can afford. So the more the military is overstretched, the more homeland security erodes. If America invades and occupies Iraq, this overstretch will increase dramatically.

#### The Draft is essential to fight ISIS – sharing the burden can provide a ready military to defend our interests

**Rangel 2014 – New York Representative** [Charles Rangel, Rangel: It’s Time for a War Tax and a Reinstated Draft, Sept. 19, 2014, Time, July 5th, 2016, <http://time.com/3403976/rangel-draft-tax/>] [Premier]

I continue to believe that under President Obama’s leadership, the international community will rid itself of this cancer. Secretary of State John Kerry has reported that nearly 30 countries have stepped up to support the fight against ISIS. These countries intend to provide financial resources, intelligence, equipment and training. Furthermore, the Iraqi Prime Minister Haider al-Abadi stated that their government also does not want President Barack Obama to send American ground troops to fight in Iraq. Nevertheless we must be prepared for the worst. ISIS militants are a real threat. They have already killed two American journalists and thousands of Syrians and Iraqis in their brutal attempt to establish an Islamic caliphate. If left unchecked, they can jeopardize our core interests abroad and at home. We must share the burden in diminishing their impact to our national security. Containing their spread will help America and our allies to feel safe whether at home or abroad. Reinstating the draft and imposing the war tax will ensure that our safety is sustainable, our financial engagements abroad are not borrowed, and that all Americans have a role in defending and protecting our nation.

#### A draft would solve military readiness, while at the same time preventing the abuse of military strength – it would force public education of global issues and promote democratic checks on militarism

Bright-Fishbein, 2004 – Writer @ The Brown Daily Herald [Benjamin, Writer @ The Brown Daily Herald and Student at Brown University, The Brown Daily Herald, 11/15/04, <http://www.browndailyherald.com/2004/11/15/the-case-for-a-universal-draft>, Accessed 7/4/16] [Premier]

A universal draft will give the country strength in a number of ways. Most obviously, it would benefit the army overseas, which is overextended as it is. Second, it is hard to deny that it would greatly increase the health of the nation; the draft is a great way to promote regular exercise and better eating habits. Third, and probably most important, a draft would increase awareness of international affairs, lifting us out of the general ignorance that pervades our society. Everyone in America would feel compelled to follow the latest developments in the world. Remember, this draft is universal, which means everyone is deeply affected by troop deployments. As counterintuitive as it may sound, a draft will even promote peace. Society will cast its ballots for the candidate who will keep their children out of harm’s way. With a draft, we never would have entered Iraq in the first place. Additionally, a draft will completely change the way representatives legislate. Obviously, they have their constituents to win over, but they also have their own children to protect. A universal draft excludes no one, and especially not the children of politicians.

#### The draft is necessary for military readiness – the military is overstretched currently

**Rangel, 03 – US representative of New York’s 13th Congressional district** (Charles, Symposium - Q: Is restoring universal military conscription in the United States a good idea? YES: Those who call for war against Iraq should be willing to put their own sons and daughters in harm's way. Insight on the News, 4 Feb 2003, <http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1571/is_4_19/ai_97450991> Accessed 4 July 2016) [Premier]

There is no doubt that going to war against Iraq severely will strain military resources already burdened by a growing number of obligations. There are daunting challenges facing the 1.4 million men and women in active military service and those in our National Guard and Reserves. The Pentagon has said that as many as 250,000 troops may be mobilized for an invasion of Iraq. An additional 265,000 members of the National Guard and Reserves, roughly as many as were called up during the Persian Gulf War in 1991, also may be activated. Already, we have long-term troop commitments in Europe and the Pacific, with an estimated 116,000 troops in Europe, 90,000 in the Pacific (nearly 40,000 in Japan and 38,000 in Korea) and additional troop commitments to operations in Afghanistan, Bosnia, Kosovo and elsewhere. There also are military trainers in countries across the world, including the Philippines, Colombia and Yemen. We can expect the evolving global war on terrorism to drain our military resources even more, stretching them to the limit. The Bush administration has yet to address the question of whether our military is of sufficient strength and size to meet present and future commitments. Those who would lead us into war have the obligation to support an all-out mobilization of Americans for the war effort, including mandatory national service that asks something of us all. The following is a partial transcript of Rep. Rangel's statements at a Capitol Hill press conference on Jan. 7 as published by Reuters: As many of you know, I have introduced a bill that will require mandatory military and national service for all of our young people, without exceptions for college or graduate courses, with the exception of allowing youngsters to finish high school at a given age.

#### A draft is key to solve military readiness by increasing personnel to avoid overstretch

**Rangel, 2002 – Representative of New York** [Charles, Democrat representative, Bring Back the Draft, December 31, 2002, Accessed – New York Times July 4, 2016, <http://www.nytimes.com/2002/12/31/opinion/31RANG.html>] [Premier]

There is no doubt that going to war against Iraq will severely strain military resources already burdened by a growing number of obligations. There are daunting challenges facing the 1.4 million men and women in active military service and those in our National Guard and Reserve. The Pentagon has said that up to 250,000 troops may be mobilized for the invasion of Iraq. An additional 265,000 members of the National Guard and Reserve, roughly as many as were called up during the Persian Gulf War in 1991, may also be activated. Already, we have long-term troop commitments in Europe and the Pacific, with an estimated 116,000 troops in Europe, 90,000 in the Pacific (nearly 40,000 in Japan and 38,000 in Korea) and additional troop commitments to operations in Afghanistan, Bosnia, Kosovo and elsewhere. There are also military trainers in countries across the world, including the Philippines, Colombia and Yemen. We can expect the evolving global war on terrorism to drain our military resources even more, stretching them to the limit. The administration has yet to address the question of whether our military is of sufficient strength and size to meet present and future commitments. Those who would lead us into war have the obligation to support an all-out mobilization of Americans for the war effort, including mandatory national service that asks something of us all.

#### Only the draft improves military decision making by giving policy makers a personal stake in the war.

**Rangel, 2002 – Representative of New York** [Charles, Democrat representative, Bring Back the Draft, December 31, 2002, Accessed – New York Times July 4, 2016, <http://www.nytimes.com/2002/12/31/opinion/31RANG.html>] [Premier]

But as a combat veteran of the Korean conflict, I believe that if we are going to send our children to war, the governing principle must be that of shared sacrifice. Throughout much of our history, Americans have been asked to shoulder the burden of war equally. That's why I will ask Congress next week to consider and support legislation I will introduce to resume the military draft. Carrying out the administration's policy toward Iraq will require long-term sacrifices by the American people, particularly those who have sons and daughters in the military. Yet the Congress that voted overwhelmingly to allow the use of force in Iraq includes only one member who has a child in the enlisted ranks of the military — just a few more have children who are officers. I believe that if those calling for war knew that their children were likely to be required to serve — and to be placed in harm's way — there would be more caution and a greater willingness to work with the international community in dealing with Iraq. A renewed draft will help bring a greater appreciation of the consequences of decisions to go to war. Service in our nation's armed forces is no longer a common experience. A disproportionate number of the poor and members of minority groups make up the enlisted ranks of the military, while the most privileged Americans are underrepresented or absent. We need to return to the tradition of the citizen soldier — with alternative national service required for those who cannot serve because of physical limitations or reasons of conscience.

#### Universal service ensures US military prowess—broadens the talent pool and is perceived as a much-needed hard stance on terror

Cohen ’02 – CEO of P-3 Ventures (Steve, “It’s time for universal national service,” United States Naval Institute, May, 2002 Vol. 128, Iss. 5; pg. 4, accessed 9/4/16, <http://www.usni.org/magazines/proceedings/2002-05/its-time-universal-national-service>) [Premier]

Universal service will provide a larger pool of talent for the military services to better accomplish their increasingly diverse missions. Perhaps most kids facing national service would choose domestic, social-service jobs. Yet many others, having to serve in some way, would volunteer for military units. Not least, universal service will send an important message to friend and foe alike that we are committed to a long-term war on terrorism. Some may argue that universal national service is too disruptive a message, a point that might have been persuasive before 11 September. Now we need a message that is neither ambiguous nor fleeting—and there is no more convincing a message than a call for universal service.

#### Elite opposition is key to preventing intervention – elite rhetoric alone can shift support against war

Horowitz & Levendusky, 11 – Assistant Political Science Professors @ UPenn [Michael C., Matthew, Assistant Political Science Professors @ UPenn, Drafting Support for War: Conscription and Mass Support for Warfare, JSTOR, May 13 2011, Accessed July 6 2016] [Premier]

Since there are higher domestic political costs to mobilizing a conscript military— ranging from potential domestic opposition to a heightened risk of audience costs—when mobilization occurs during a crisis situation, other actors on the international stage should view it as especially credible (Fearon 1994). Finally, our findings also underline the critical role elite rhetoric plays in debates about going to war. It is important to remember that our experimental scenario does not test the way national interests might influence citizens’ attitudes toward war. If all elites agree that a war is necessary for our vital national interests (e.g., World War II post-Pearl Harbor), then voters will use national interest, not self-interest, to evaluate war. So elite framing, which we downplayed in our experiment, is crucial. If the President and other key elites successfully frame the decision to go to war as part of a shared national sacrifice (as they did in World War II) or due to a severe threat to the country (such as the threat of WMDs utilized in elite rhetoric after 9/11), then our results might not hold. When people criticized George W. Bush’s failure to invoke an ethic of national sacrifice after the events of September 11, 2001, instead telling Americans to go shopping, they were tapping into a link between support for war and a sense of shared sacrifice. If the president can build such a belief and coalition, support is likely to last much longer than it otherwise would. In a world without this type of rhetoric, however, a return to a draft army would cause people to view the decision to go to war in terms of self-interest, making them less likely to support military interventions.15 Though we ignored it here in the interest of simplicity, future work will need to explore how elite positions shape citizens’ views toward conscription. More generally, our results show that the way the United States recruits its soldiers substantively influences public support for war in some situations. While it is far from the only factor, it is a significant factor, and one that must be taken into account in explanations of mass support for war. But beyond even the U.S. case, our results establish that how democracies staff their militaries has important implications for how the mass public supports wars. Acknowledgments This is one of several joint papers by the authors; the ordering of their names reflects the principle of rotation. NSF Grant 0094964 partially funded for this research. The online appendix for this paper is available on the Cambridge University Press website at http://journals.cambridge.org/JOP. Data and syntax to replicate these analyses will also be made available at http://dvn.iq.harvard.edu/dvn/dv/mleven by the date of publication. The authors thank Adam Berinsky, Scott Gartner, Jeffrey Green, Diana Mutz, and Alex Weisiger for helpful comments on this paper

### Passive Public

#### A voluntary military creates a gap between the military and society that threatens humanity – it causes passive spectators - irresponsible citizens disengaged from politics and foreign policy

Ford ’03 – Mutual Black Network news anchor (Glen, “No Draft, No Peace: Rangel and Conyers are right,” The Black Commentator, Issue Number 24 - January 9, accessed 7/4/16, <http://www.blackcommentator.com/24/24_commentary_pr.html>) [Premier]

Black Congressmen Charles Rangel (NY) and John Conyers (MI) are correct in advocating a return to universal military service. In the 30 years since the last young American was drafted, the U.S. has constructed a volunteer military machine that is disconnected from the life of the nation, a foreign legion-like force to which whole sectors of the population have only the most tenuous ties or - among the most privileged - none at all. The existence of this volunteer force has encouraged much of the U.S. citizenry to disassociate themselves from the consequences of their franchise. They are spectators, having invested nothing more in the ghastly dramas unfolding upon the world than their tax dollars and vague, sports fan-like notions of national prestige. They have opted-out of responsibility for crimes perpetrated in their name. No longer liable to become citizen soldiers, Americans act less and less like citizens of any kind. Collectively, they have become a threat to humanity at large - including their oblivious selves. The all-volunteer Army, for which anti-war activists of three decades ago claimed far too much credit, has produced social distortions that fundamentally threaten the national polity. The U.S. military has become an alienated instrument of a piratical oligarchy that is quite content to extend the privilege of non-service to most of the non-interfering population. In turn, the people abrogate their role as citizens, and call it freedom.

#### We can’t pass the plan – this parallels the position of Representative Charles Rangel, Democrat from New York, who is an African American Veteran of the Korean War, when he proposed the Universal National Service Act of 2003. He did not propose the draft as a policy that he intended to be passed – he didn't even vote for it himself. He proposed the draft as a method of criticizing his fellow members of congress for their hypocrisy, because while the Congress voted overwhelmingly for the Invasion of Iraq, only one member of congress had an immediate family member who was deployed. It is necessary to give it a public hearing – the issues are important

Rose, 2004 – staff for the NY Daily News, Derek October 6, 2004 “Bill to Bring Back Draft Voted Down” LexisNexis [Premier]

SEEKING TO SQUASH INTERNET rumors, the House of Representatives overwhelmingly voted down a bill to revive the military draft yesterday. Republicans accused Democrats of spreading lies about a secret Republican draft plan in an election year bid to hurt the President. The vote was 402 to 2. Even Rep. Charles Rangel, the Harlem Democrat who had sponsored the measure, voted against it. "For months now, the American people have been subjected to - and had their intelligence insulted by - a manipulative, dishonest, and willful campaign of misinformation," said House Majority Leader Tom DeLay (R-Tex.). Rangel said he voted against his own bill because it deserved more consideration than the 40 minutes of debate it got last night. "What we are seeing now is election-year politics," Rangel said. "This is hypocrisy of the worst kind."

#### The lack of public discussion on this issue leaves the public ignorant and isolated from the military – this leaves the public with displays of empty patriotism creating public apathy

Mazur, 2004 - professor of law at the University of Florida [Diane, Diane Mazur is a professor of law at the University of Florida and a former aircraft and munitions maintenance officer in the Air Force, Military isolated from society, Star News Online, 1/6/04, <http://www.starnewsonline.com/news/20040106/military-isolated-from-society>, Accessed July 4 2016] [Premier]

Why doesn’t anyone ever talk about how much the military has changed? Or about how weak civil-military relations have become, preventing honest discussion of matters important to the military and to national security? It is because, with the help of the Supreme Court, the United States has come to view military concerns as being, for most of civilians, none of their business. When military service is no longer seen as a shared obligation, civilian America is reluctant, and maybe a little embarrassed, to offer a voice on matters of military concern. There is need to talk about how who serves in the military is chosen and who carries the obligation for shared defense. The strong sense of civilian control of the military that came from citizens who had the knowledge and the willingness to engage in serious debate on military issues was lost with the end of the draft. The military is admired more than other public institutions, but the admiration is in empty patriotism. A true constitutional patriotism is found in a civilian society that has a connection with military service strong enough to enable its citizens to contribute to the constitutional responsibility of civilian control. The patriotism conceived by the Constitution will never be achieved with an all-volunteer force alienated from civilian society, especially when the military is the only part of America asked to sacrifice in its defense.

#### Demanding the Draft is necessary to promote dialogue on the Injustice of the AVF - irrelevant of whether Congress will adopt it. Rangel has pushed Draft Legislation even Though he knows that there is no chance it will pass. His advocacy exposes Injustice, due to the Righteousness of his demand.

**Shane 2015 – Staff Writer for the Military Times** [Leo Shane III, Why one lawmaker keeps pushing for a new military draft, March 30, 2015, Military Times, July 5, 2016, <http://www.militarytimes.com/story/military/2015/03/30/charlie-rangel-draft-fight/70373594/>] [Premier]

Rep. Charlie Rangel has no doubt that bringing back the military draft will make America safer. He just hasn't had any success convincing other lawmakers that he's right. "It would take a lot of courage for people to vote on this," the 84-year-old New York Democrat said in an interview with Military Times last week. "We wouldn't be in the mess we're in if [Congress] knew their kids might be drafted. "I know this is the right thing to do." Earlier this month, Rangel reintroduced legislation that would reinstate the military draft for all men and women ages 18 to 25, arguing that "if war is truly necessary, we must all come together to support and defend our nation." It's an argument he has made year after year, with little progress. Since 2003, Rangel has introduced similar legislation seven times. The closest the idea came to a full chamber vote was nearly 12 years ago, when the measure failed a procedural vote on the House floor. But Rangel — a Korean War veteran who volunteered to serve in the Army — keeps bringing it back. "If we're going to get into wars, we have to be prepared to make sacrifices," he said. "It shouldn't just be poor-ass kids volunteering to do the work." In past years, when the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan were at their peak, his pitch was fueled by the carnage and casualties of those conflicts. Now it's the possibility of extended military action in Iraq against Islamic State fighters. He's also pushing for a new War Tax Act, mandating that current and future war spending be paid for with new taxes on all income brackets. Every few years, the revived legislation grabs a few Capitol Hill headlines but little serious scrutiny. But there's little hope for either proposal in the Republican-controlled House, and Rangel's draft bills aren't expected to get a significant conversation at the committee level this year. And military leaders repeatedly have shot down the idea, saying they now boast a much smaller but more highly trained and highly disciplined fighting force than they did before the draft was abolished in 1973. But Rangel insists that the public is interested in a broader debate on the draft's merits — and the added pressure it would put on government bureaucrats contemplating military action anywhere in the world. "I've been surprised the religious community hasn't called for it," he said. "The number of dead and wounded we've had in the recent wars … that's a hell of a thing to happen to our young people. It would seem to me religious leaders would see this as a way to keep us out of those fights." Until he gets that kind of groundswell, Rangel said he's content to be the lonely Hill voice pushing the issue. "You know I'm right. I know I'm right," he said. "We're getting somewhere on this issue, but Congress is not."

#### Advocating the Draft is necessary to raise issues of class, race, privilege, and military sacrifice. We initiate a public discussion of these issues. This discussion is necessary in times of war and in a neo conservative environment, as class and race are the defining issues of American oppression.

**Ford 2003 – Mutual Black Network** (Glen, “No Draft, No Peace: Rangel and Conyers are right,” The Black Commentator, Issue Number 24 - January 9, accessed 7/4/16, <http://www.blackcommentator.com/24/24_commentary_pr.html>) [Premier]

This past Tuesday, children frolicked in the halls and aisles of the U.S. House and Senate, a family-day tradition on the opening of each new Congress. Most of the members gave George Bush a blank check on Iraq, last session. Yet they plan to keep their own children immune from future conscription and insure that the privilege of non-service remains nearly general, a shield against the unpleasantness of war. Deluded, they fail to realize that nothing can truly insulate the congressional children and their playmates from the blowback of wars waged by other Americans. Rather, the delusion guarantees that there will be permanent war, fought by kids they'll never meet, against people they care nothing about - spectacles that will inevitably consume the spectators. Rep. Conyers remarked that his fellow lawmakers might be more concerned about death and destruction abroad "if their own family members and neighbors faced the prospects of serving in the military on the front line.'' That also applies to the bulk of the upper middle classes, who support the War Party while physically opting out of war. Forget moral questions, for a moment. The volunteer Army, which many Seventies-era supporters naively (selfishly?) hoped would purge the nation of militarism, has instead given armchair and soccer mom militarists immunity from direct family and class participation in the deadly games. They are like citizens of Rome, bloodthirsty in their Coliseum seats, yet not a gladiator among them, fatly and flatulently demanding gore and honor! This is what the volunteer military has bestowed on the nation: privileged noncombatant video war-watchers. According to surveys, well-educated white youth are the most grizzly-minded - and least likely to enlist - of them all.

#### The Rangel bill forces a public debate on meaningful policy issues

The Montreal Gazette, 2003 [January 16, “Debating the draft is worthwhile” LexisNexis] [Premier]

With an all-volunteer military, the answer is obvious. Many who answer the call do so for economic reasons, which, for good or ill, ends up producing a military heavily peopled with minorities and people from low-income backgrounds. Of course, Americans from all economic strata continue to volunteer and serve. But the ranks are filled with conscripts for whom the military represents - and often delivers - the means to a better life. Though he is criticized for doing so, Representative Rangel is right to push to the fore the issue of who serves and who doesn't. U.S. troops are being deployed to the Persian Gulf for possible war with Iraq. Factor this into Rangel's motivation: He opposes war with Iraq. Nevertheless, the congressman raises a sensitive but meaningful policy issue. Only a handful of Congress members have any immediate relatives in the military. The question might be unsettling, but it deserves a full and honest debate.

#### It is important to frame the confrontation with the congress in terms of advocating policy action – Rangel's argument, when made before he was advocating a draft, had little impact – no one will listen until you try to hold the state to its own ideals

The San Diego Union-Tribune, 2003 [November 16, LexisNexis“VOLUNTEER FORCE; Ending the draft revolutionized the military” [Premier]

Rep. Charles Rangel, D-N.Y., and other members of the congressional black caucus raised the question of whether the volunteer concept properly met the challenge of ethnic and educational balance. In effect, they asked whether undue pressure to serve was being placed on less educated minorities while wealthier whites escaped service. One reporter phrased Rangel's question as asking whether the wealthy elite who make campaign contributions and who make decisions about war and peace have children represented in the military. A senior Defense Department official, speaking on background, pointed out to the reporter that many serving in Iraq as members of the reserves and of National Guard units also are leaders in their local communities. Approximately 22 percent of the enlisted forces are African-American. Service represents a career opportunity to many. The Hispanic percentage in the armed forces is slightly below that for the civilian population. In terms of education background, the minority numbers are about equal between enlisted military and civilian populations.

#### Sharing the responsibility for military service is key to both criticizing the military and working within the military

Rangel, 2003 **– US representative from New York** [Charles, Symposium - Q: Is restoring universal military conscription in the United States a good idea? YES: Those who call for war against Iraq should be willing to put their own sons and daughters in harm's way. Insight on the News, 4 Feb 2003, <http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1571/is_4_19/ai_97450991> Accessed 4 July 2016) [Premier]

Rangel: With my whole heart I hope this country does not go to war. With my whole heart I do not believe that there is this imminent threat to the security of the United States. I have a lot of reservations about this war. But as I tried to say, if for whatever reason war is inevitable, then I mean every word that I said about the defense of this country. I would use this [the proposed draft] as a platform for peace and diplomacy. But I don't want to take away from the fact that we're treating North Korea differently than we're treating Iraq--North Korea has no oil. Iraq has the oil. But assuming I was pro-war, I would be taking the very same position I'm taking today. If I thought it was necessary to wipe out Saddam Hussein and to attack North Korea and to look for Osama bin Laden in Afghanistan and to preserve the peace in Europe, I would say that the cavalier way in which people talk about taking out people--it appears to me they're talking about some French Foreign Legion. We are talking about Americans here. And that responsibility should be shared by all Americans.

#### The Rangel Bill is not being introduced in order to pass the policy – it is a method to criticize and undermine support for the neocon permanent war

**Rosen 2004 – reporter for 850 KOA** [Michael Rocky Mountain News, April 30, 2004 Lexis Nexis “DRAFT BILLS A CYNICAL RUSE” [Premier]

These bills aren't going anywhere. The Senate bill has been referred to the Pentagon for comment, and the Pentagon opposes it. The House bill hasn't even been assigned to a committee and will be buried by the Republican leadership. Now, let's cut through the baloney. The bills' sponsors don't even want them to pass. These liberals don't really desire a larger military; they routinely vote against more defense spending. This is a ruse, a scam. It's not about conscription; it's about undermining support for Bush and the war by raising the perceived cost in the minds of the folks back home, especially moms who don't want their little boys and girls to get caught in a draft.

#### Draft decreases civil Disengagement – draftees experience government and military processes, and the responsibility to use that process wisely

Aisen, 16 – US Navy officer (Joshua, Universal service in military would benefit the nation, 05 June 2016, Knoxville News Sentinel, <http://www.knoxnews.com/opinion/columnists/universal-service-in-military-would-benefit-the-nation-343a1694-091e-3ebd-e053-0100007f98b8-381807431.html> Accessed 05 July 2016) [Premier]

Only around 1.4 million Americans (0.4 percent) are currently on active duty, and the Veterans Administration estimates that in 2014 there were around 22 million veterans, for a total of less than 8 percent of the population. Required military service would allow everyone to have a view of how the government works — the good, the bad and the ugly. People would obviously not have identical experiences, but each experience would serve as a lens to understanding the use of military force for the rest of our lives. An informed citizenry with an understanding of the strengths and limitations of our military would be an enormous asset to our nation. n It would enhance accountability for our use of military force. We tend to discuss accountability in the crucial terms of either lives lost or dollars spent. There are additional measures of accountability, however. Every bomb dropped or bullet fired in anger comes not only from the president, a general or a soldier, but from the entire United States of America. More widespread military service might force more of us to come to grips with the awesome responsibility that accompanies our enormous power after seeing and experiencing the effects of using that power.

#### Draft increases Social Discourse and Discussion – it forces interaction with others and checks political extremism

Aisen, 16 – US Navy officer (Joshua, Universal service in military would benefit the nation, 05 June 2016, Knoxville News Sentinel, <http://www.knoxnews.com/opinion/columnists/universal-service-in-military-would-benefit-the-nation-343a1694-091e-3ebd-e053-0100007f98b8-381807431.html> Accessed 05 July 2016) [Premier]

We all feel the effects of increasing polarization in public life. Politics have become more nasty and personal, and with another election cycle always around the corner, this nastiness has seeped into the nation at large. Requiring everyone to fulfill military service would force everyone to at least meet and work with people from different backgrounds and with different viewpoints, and they might even become friends. It's a lot more difficult to be nasty and personal when there's a friend's face attached to a disagreeing perspective. First-hand experience would also serve as a check on extremism in both the right and left wings of American politics as people come to understand that the military is neither the source of nor the solution to most of our problems.

#### The draft would boost civic engagement because it focuses on individuals helping the community

Wetherbee ’07 –fellow at Center for the Study of the Presidency and Congress (Michael A., “Closing the Civil-Military Gap,” accessed 7/5/16, <http://cspc.nonprofitsoapbox.com/storage/documents/Vater/Wetherbee.pdf>) [Premier]

Finally, Schaeffer asserts along the Galston argument that “we need a draft by lottery that will include all American young people […] a provision for conscientious objectors would be made by allowing them to serve in the civilian component.”liv Roth-Douquet and Schaeffer both assert, however, that if a civilian component is offered within the lottery, those who choose the military option should be rewarded more: “We believe that those who choose military service […] should be rewarded in a special way for the additional risk and time commitment necessary. For instance, there could be long term tax incentives that would demonstrate that the nation is truly grateful.”lv Additionally, “those who have served for four years or more in the military should receive discounted or free college education in both private and public institutions that they qualify for academically.”lvi All of these authors agree that mandatory civil service would be beneficial for the military, as well as for the character of those required to serve. They do not, however, argue that everyone will have a pleasant experience in the military, but rather they will have a character building experience. As Roth-Douquet and Schaeffer write, “Others will counter that service can be tedious, unpleasant, even fatal. We are not suggesting that everyone will have a wonderful, Outward Bound—type ‘growth experience’ in the military.”lvii Finally, they also believe that universal service would not only help individuals, but also the community, because it would promote civil engagement: “Universal service would promote civic engagement, which as, Harvard social scientist Robert Putnam has persuasively argued in Bowling Alone, has been declining.”lviii

#### The Rangel bill is a focal point to mobilize activism and discussion about the draft, racism and the military

Hulse, 2004 – writer for The New York Times, [Carl July 3, 2004 “Military Draft? Official Denials Leave Skeptics” <http://www.nytimes.com/2004/07/03/us/military-draft-official-denials-leave-skeptics.html?_r=0> [Premier]

But top lawmakers, joined by Pentagon leaders and administration officials, say that there are definitely no plans to resume the draft and that the military is much better off relying on a substantially motivated volunteer force rather than on conscripts. ''The idea of bringing back the draft, I think the chances are slim and none -- and slim left town,'' one member of the House committee, Representative Ken Calvert, Republican of California, said this week after returning from Iraq. ''People can relax about that issue.'' The senior Democrat on the Senate Armed Services Committee, Carl Levin of Michigan, agreed. ''I don't think we're going to need to reinstitute the draft,'' Mr. Levin said. ''The combination of recruiting and retention is doing fairly well.'' The roots of the anxiety about the draft can be traced to several developments, among them recent steps taken by the Defense Department to bolster forces stretched by service in Iraq and Afghanistan. Earlier this year the Pentagon issued an order requiring some soldiers to remain in uniform beyond their expected dates for leaving the service. This week the military announced that it would recall to the barracks 5,600 former active-duty soldiers with certain skills who have time remaining as reservists. And Congress is moving to expand the size of the Army and the Marines. Lawrence J. Korb, an assistant secretary of defense in the Reagan administration, says unease about the prospect of a draft surfaces frequently in his travels around the country. He says unwillingness to accept official reassurances is attributable to public cynicism about the Bush administration's case for war in Iraq. ''I think it is skepticism that we have been misled so many times about this war: weapons of mass destruction, ties to Al Qaeda, a cakewalk,'' said Mr. Korb, now at the liberal Center for American Progress. ''People are clearly worried and figure, 'They are just waiting until the election is over to spring the bad news on us.''' He and others said this could appear to those people to be nothing less than logical progression, after the military's resorting to an extension of tours of duty and the recall of former active-duty soldiers. ''I think what is behind the current public discussion is the sense the Defense Department is using coercion to maintain the service of those who might otherwise get out,'' said James Burk, a sociology professor at Texas A&M who studies the intersection of military and public policy issues. ''That kind of coercion has a resonance of what the draft is all about.'' Neither Mr. Korb nor Professor Burk believes that compulsory service will be reinstituted without mobilization of a scale far beyond anything now needed. But neither do they believe that the buzz will subside. ''It will simmer on the back burner and in the chat rooms,'' Professor Burk said. The issue has also been addressed on opinion pages of newspapers around the country. A column in The Seattle Post-Intelligencer called a draft a ''poison pill'' too unrealistic for the president to consider. Another, in The Chicago Tribune, said that with a military whose members are all volunteers, ''we lose our sense of shared sacrifice as a nation.'' Indeed, many editorials and op-ed articles focus on the idea that a draft would distribute the burden of war across racial and economic divides. In The Washington Post this week, Noel Koch, who as a Nixon speechwriter wrote a legislative message on the draft's end, said nonetheless that the draft had ''shattered class distinctions'' in the military, mixing high school dropouts with college graduates, rich with poor. Seeking to blunt public speculation, the Web site of the Selective Service System carries a long notice saying in part that ''both the president and secretary of defense have stated on more than one occasion that there is no need for a draft for the war on terrorism or any likely contingency, such as Iraq.'' ''Additionally,'' the notice says, ''the Congress has not acted on any proposed legislation to reinstate the draft.'' ''The bottom line,'' said Dan Amon, a spokesman for the Selective Service System, ''is it would take an act of Congress because we could not turn it on ourselves. And there is no mood or sentiment in Congress whatsoever for the draft.'' Polls show there is little public sentiment for it either, no small consideration in the Congressional thinking. In a recent New York Times/CBS News poll, 70 percent of those surveyed were against reinstating the draft, and the opposition was shared almost equally among Democrats, Republicans and independents. The speculation was initially spurred last year when the Selective Service System began trying to fill vacancies on local draft boards. That was accompanied by reports that the agency had received an extra $28 million in its budget. But Mr. Amon said the draft board recruitment effort had been undertaken because of the expiration of the 20-year terms of members appointed after President Jimmy Carter re-established registration in 1980. And the $28 million was the agency's regular budget, cut to $26 million by Congress, he said. E-mail messages circulating about a draft also point to legislation pending in both houses of Congress that would require either military or some other national service. But those measures, written by Representative Charles B. Rangel of New York and Senator Ernest F. Hollings of South Carolina, both Democrats, are much more a political statement than potential law, since they have no Republican support and no chance of passage this year. Mr. Rangel acknowledges that his initial goal in introducing his measure was to stir opposition to the war in Iraq, his point being that privileged Americans -- including politicians -- would be far less eager to commit troops if their own sons and daughters had to fight alongside those who join the military to get ahead. He said the inequality in the burden of warfare was being borne out by the ''cruel'' Pentagon decision to call back former active-duty soldiers. And he said Americans were right to remain vigilant about the possibility of a draft, given the Iraq conflict. ''If we are really saying we are going to stay there for as long as it takes and we don't have international people sharing the sacrifice,'' Mr. Rangel said, ''sooner or later Americans have to say, 'They are now talking about us.'''

### Race

#### Current military recruitment exploits low income youth by capitalizing on their lack of economic mobility

Friends Committee on National Legislation 2005 Is an Economic Draft Already Here? Washington Newsletter, February, http://www.thirdworldtraveler.com/War\_Peace/Economic\_Draft.html, July 4, 2016 [Premier]

Recruiters Seek Likely Prospects With recruiting costs rising to $15,000 per recruit, the Pentagon must employ its recruiters where they have the best prospect for success. A February 2001 study for the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences reveals the recruiters' game plan. The study "suggested that categorizing potential recruits based on their career decision-making patterns and their parents' socioeconomic status may be useful for targeting recruiting strategies. For example,...more financially constrained, goal-oriented youth may respond more positively to the educational or financial benefits available through military service." This focus on financially vulnerable youth in the "lower middle class" is a key part of recruiting efforts today. Technology in the form of computer-assisted tracking of teens in "financially constrained" urban areas, where unemployment is high and opportunities for advancement is limited, has become standard practice. But this is just the beginning: the pursuit goes well beyond electrons and beyond local high schools. It goes into shopping malls frequented by "financially restrained" families, to weekend events, and even into youth "hangouts." Focus on Low Income Neighborhoods Traditionally, "financially constrained" translated into minority enclaves where many regard the military as a way to improve one's prospects honorably. But when recruiters consciously target a neighborhood or school-or as the Boston Globe put it, "saturates life at ...a working class public school,"-the public issue shifts from the opportunities available to fulfill the aspirations of teens to the fairness of a system that intentionally exploits the economic aspirations of others. Recruiting inducements include money for college (up to $70,000), scholarships, job training, and some very large-as much as $15,000-bonuses for enlisting. Once they sign a few new enlistees, recruiters know and play on two teen propensities to pull in more and more recruits: peer pressure to "join the herd" by doing what their friends do, and the inability to fully comprehend consequences in formulating long-term plans. The fact that military recruiters are an insistent economic "presence" in carefully targeted locales gives credence to the charge that the Pentagon's tactics for filling the forces amounts to an "economic draft."

#### The AVF is the worst form of White Supremacy – it disproportionately discards black lives, but locks them out of command roles

Gabriel 80, prof of politics and History US Army War College, [Richard America Magazine, cited in The Military Draft, ed by Jason Berger, pp101-102 [Premier]

Even a cursory examination of the facts of the AVF leads one to conclude that a return to the draft is both a practical necessity and a moral imperative. If America is to remain faithful to its social values and its military commitments, it can no longer rely upon the “forces of the marketplace” to meet its military manpower requirements. To do so conceals two devastating truths: The AVF is among the most discriminatory social institutions allowed to exist in the United States since slavery; from the perspective of military power, the AVF is simply not an effective fighting force. Social composition. An examination of the social composition of the AVF reveals it to be one of the most unrepresentative social institutions in American history. Ironically, during the Vietnam war, opposition to the draft was based on the inaccurate perception that blacks and other minorities were bearing an unfair share of the burden of military service and combat death. The AVF was supposed to put an end to such discrimination and produce an armed force roughly proportionate in social composition to the society as a whole. What has resulted, however, is a military institution that is further removed from representing American society than it has ever been in our history. The social composition of the AVF today indicates just how unrepresentative and how removed from the mainstream of American society it is. Thirty-six percent of the soldiers in the AVVF are black. If Pentagon projections hold, by 1985, fully 65 percent of the army will be black. Blacks are over represented in the armed forces by a number three times as larger as their proportion in the population. In combat units, an even higher percentage of blacks is found: in some instances, it exceeds 50 percent. While blacks comprise three times their fair share of soldiers in the enlisted ranks they comprise only half, six percent, of their fair share of officer ranks.

#### The draft reorients society to Value military lives – democratic and communal obligations remove the racist stigmas from military service

Ford 03 – Mutual Black Network news anchor (Glen, “No Draft, No Peace: Rangel and Conyers are right,” The Black Commentator, Issue Number 24 - January 9, accessed 7/4/16, <http://www.blackcommentator.com/24/24_commentary_pr.html>) [Premier]

Black Commentator publishers Peter Gamble and Glen Ford are veterans of the Sixties-era U.S. Army, ill-educated volunteers at the time. Our support of universal service is based on democratic principles as well as the political exigencies of the day. In a society stratified by money, universal service may be the only institutional means to maintain national ties of commonality. Political equality - equal citizenship - means shared obligations to the larger community, the kind you can't cash-out. We believe that's what Congressman Conyers was addressing when he said, "Once the conscription process for service in the military becomes universal and mandatory for all those who meet the criteria... it removes the long-held stigma that people of color and persons from low-income backgrounds are disproportionately killed and injured while serving as ground troops on the front line." Absent universal service, and in a society where wealth is the measure of men and women, the soldier is devalued. Although they will never admit it, generals like that arrangement; it allows them freedom of action. The troops may be dear to their families, but are mainly abstractions to the majority of citizens. Highly paid TV talking heads call them heroes, but can't find their neighborhoods. Rangel and Conyers appear to have assumed that Blacks remain clustered in the most hazardous "line" units, as during the Vietnam era, a misperception shared by the general public. (This lingering assumption may be an example of society's devaluation of soldiers - such duty must be disproportionately African American.)

#### A draft solves economic exploitation – it ensures everyone must share the responsibility of service

Bright-Fishbein 04,– Writer @ The Brown Daily Herald [Benjamin, Writer @ The Brown Daily Herald and Student at Brown University, The Brown Daily Herald, 11/15/04, <http://www.browndailyherald.com/2004/11/15/the-case-for-a-universal-draft>, Accessed 7/4/16] [Premier]

A draft is the best thing that could happen right now for our country. And to everyone in our liberal community already itching to sink their teeth into my throat, I’ll first remind you that the bill in the House is being proposed by a liberal Democrat from New York. There is no better way to promote equality than through a universal draft. The army is comprised mostly of the poor and working class who have few other options to escape their neighborhoods or obtain education benefits. Does this seem fair? The lower-classes are sacrificing their lives for those fortunate souls who happened to be born in a higher tax bracket. They’re dying for our (supposed) security. Economists would argue that the rich have a free ticket to ride the backs of the poor. They even might suggest taxing the well-off so that the cost of the death of poor soldiers is recovered. But with four more years of Bush on the way, that will never happen. Besides, it is not right that a monetary donation precludes you from service to the nation, even if it’s how the American war factory has worked since its inception. A universal draft would fix this problem with a total integration of the classes. All Americans would share the burden of protecting our country, instead of rationing off the job to those people who don’t have a choice in the matter. Some argue that forced conscription is just as bad as leaving the system the way it is. After all, what’s the point of equality and justice if you’re violating individual rights? To this I say: define “violating.” For example, we can just as easily say that taxes “violate” individual rights: The government takes money away from the people who earned it. But the idea is that society gets that money back in the form of services provided by the government. The same is true of the draft: Young men and women sacrifice their time, and in some cases, their lives, so that we are all better off. Yes, a universal draft may violate individual rights of a few, but it does so in order that everyone else might benefit. Here’s the situation: Either way, there’s going to be injustice. We have a choice: We can be unjust and weak without it, or we can be unjust and strong by universalizing it.

#### Specifically – the AVF Whitens the military through a drive for Professionalism – the military recruits through racist networks – historical incidents prove the draft solves

Ford ’03 – Mutual Black Network news anchor (Glen, “No Draft, No Peace: Rangel and Conyers are right,” The Black Commentator, Issue Number 24 - January 9, accessed 7/4/16, <http://www.blackcommentator.com/24/24_commentary_pr.html>) [Premier]

It is here that we must state unequivocally that the publishers of Black Commentator oppose and fear the intentional whitening of the Army's combat ranks. Our fears are grounded in recent historical realities. Volunteer force excludes Blacks When Dr. Martin Luther King was assassinated in April 1968, co-publisher Glen Ford's 82nd Airborne Division was sent to occupy Washington, D.C. At that time, the division's line units were 40 - 60 percent Black; African Americans patrolled the nation's capital. Nearly every Black soldier was familiar with events of the previous year in Newark, New Jersey, where lily-white, suburban National Guardsmen were called in to smother a ghetto rebellion. The Guard drove up and down Springfield Avenue, a major thoroughfare, M-16s blazing away at apartment blocks and Black-owned businesses (all unburned businesses were suspect.) It was a prolonged, racist, military riot, leaving many dead and no one prosecuted. The Black troops of the 82nd were determined that African American civilians would not be abused by white troops in Washington. And no one dared. Fast-forward 27 years. In December 1995, three white soldiers from the same 82nd Airborne Division randomly selected, stalked and executed a Black couple on the streets of Fayetteville, North Carolina, just outside Fort Bragg. Nazi literature was found in the troops' trailer home. In the course of covering the murders, the New York Times discovered that the elite 82nd had become the "whitest" division in the entire Army. Further investigation revealed that 22 soldiers were affiliated with "skinhead" groups, the self-styled "storm troopers" of the Aryan movement. Racists advertised their activities at Fort Bragg, which is also home base to the very, very white Special Forces (Green Berets). In April 1995, 23 year-old paratrooper Robert Hunt rented a billboard at the front gate of the base. "Enough! Let's start taking back America! National Alliance" it shouted for all incoming traffic to see. The National Alliance, whose telephone number was listed on the billboard, is one of the country's most notorious, violent hate groups. Its guru is William Pierce, author of the infamous Turner Diaries, the book that advocates (fictionally) a war of extermination against non-whites and inspired Timothy McVeigh's atrocity in Oklahoma City. Less than 30 years before, such activities would have been unthinkable in the 82nd, or any other Army division. The U.S military is doing something more than just "whitening" its elite units. The National Alliance's billboard message, "Let's start taking back America!" appears to resonate in the ranks, where Blacks can no longer muster enough critical mass to kick ass. Elements of the 82nd are now active on the Afghan-Pakistani border, sowing such terror and anger among the local population that the U.S. Special Forces deride them as "cowboys." An all-volunteer American foreign legion is in the field, acting out white fantasies, fears and malevolence.

#### The Whitening of our mercenary military threatens our survival – a draft solves by universalizing representation in the military.

Ford ’03 – Mutual Black Network news anchor (Glen, “No Draft, No Peace: Rangel and Conyers are right,” The Black Commentator, Issue Number 24 - January 9, accessed 7/4/16, <http://www.blackcommentator.com/24/24_commentary_pr.html>) [Premier]

The draft would cure what ails the 82nd Airborne, counter the military's purposeful exclusion and tracking of potential Black soldiers, and introduce the non-serving classes to the experience of wartime vulnerability - something they can write home about. The U.S. military has done a grave disservice to Black America through its profoundly suspect policies of social engineering. Under the guise of creating a volunteer military that is "representative of America," it has excluded large chunks of Black youth from the possibility of service, packed the ranks with the white working class, and left the more prosperous half of the nation to go about its business. A draft military would be forced to accept the Black youths that the all-volunteer force so enthusiastically rejects: dropouts (about half of Black youth of both sexes in many cities), low testers (disproportionately Black), and previous offenders (astronomical proportions). We know what civilian path these young people are walking. We also know that the nation cares not one whit about their safety on the streets, or in the prisons. The all-volunteer military also washes their hands of them, not for fear that they will die in too large numbers if inducted, but in dread of a return to the days of the ghetto soldier. We will be frank. Black Commentator is not concerned that African American representation in the combat services will increase under universal service. That is to be expected. Blacks under arms are not the root cause of the disconnect between the American people and the consequences of U.S. foreign policy. The absence of upper income whites from representation in the armed services is the political cancer that threatens planetary survival. American class-plus-race privilege has become a menace to humanity. For Black America, lack of access to the military is the far greater problem. Let us not become confused by hypocrites who claim to care about Black youth mortality.

#### African-Americans are underrepresented in the volunteer military—a professional military deliberately whitens the military by rejecting dropouts, former convicts, and bad SAT scores – a Draft would restore communal consensus

Ford ’03 – Mutual Black Network news anchor (Glen, “No Draft, No Peace: Rangel and Conyers are right,” The Black Commentator, Issue Number 24 - January 9, accessed 7/4/16, <http://www.blackcommentator.com/24/24_commentary_pr.html>) [Premier]

In fact, the 1970s Pentagon blamed the collapse of the Vietnam army on the massive draft- and poverty-driven infusion of assertive ghetto youth. Infantry outfits were often majority-African American, especially in elite, airborne units. When Blacks rebelled, command and control evaporated; for military purposes, the unit ceased to exist. Rebellion - active and bloody, or passive and smoke-enshrouded - was common. This is the open secret of Vietnam. The generals vowed never to repeat the Vietnam manpower mistake. Over decades and at huge national expense, the Pentagon gradually whitened the combat specialties, attracting and retaining the prize demographic: white high school graduates. By rejecting dropouts, volunteers with low standardized test scores, and persons with minor criminal records, the Pentagon succeeded in dramatically shrinking the potential pool of Black enlistees. One side effect of this variety of "selective service" is that African American soldiers are, on average, better educated than their white counterparts and, therefore, more suited to the support specialties. Blacks make up 20 percent of the military, but they are much scarcer on "the line." Minorities comprise 37 percent of all servicemen and women. "If you take a look at the distribution of minorities by military specialty, you will find that it's not blacks who are going to die in combat. It's whites and Hispanics," said Heritage Foundation military analyst Larry Wortzel, a retired colonel. "That's who's in infantry and armor. Blacks are underrepresented in infantry and armor. They're clustered in support services." The rightwing think-tanker intended to undermine Reps. Rangel's and Conyers' argument for universal service. He failed, since their brief for the draft is not based on fine-tuning racial numbers, but on deeper issues of social responsibility, citizenship, and forging a true national consensus on questions of peace and war.

#### Professionalization of the military perpetuates gross injustice – racist soldiers terrorize black citizens, which entrenches homicide and mass incarceration

Ford ’03 – Mutual Black Network news anchor (Glen, “No Draft, No Peace: Rangel and Conyers are right,” The Black Commentator, Issue Number 24 - January 9, accessed 7/4/16, <http://www.blackcommentator.com/24/24_commentary_pr.html>) [Premier]

The statistics are stark. 7,264 African Americans were killed during the course of the Vietnam War (total death toll: 58,193). The mortality figure averages to about 1,000 a year, only slightly higher than the number of Black juveniles (under 18) murdered every year in the U.S. Homicide is the leading cause of death among Black juveniles. The mortality rates get higher after the kids reach selective service registration age. They are more likely to die of mayhem as civilians than in a war scenario. Fewer than 300,000 African Americans are in the military. More than three times that many reside in prison, the grossest racial disproportion on America's public record. Many of these incarcerated men and women would have made fine paratroopers, who would never have tolerated the posting of racist billboards at the entrance to Fort Bragg or skinhead activity in the barracks. Relatively few, however, would have been acceptable to the volunteer armed forces, based on the life profiles that brought them to prison. Black representation in the armed forces is a red herring. The social and political obscenity lies in the absence of soldiers from the comfortable classes. The Posse Comitatus Act forbidding the use of federal troops as police has been repeatedly sidestepped during civil disorders, as late as 1992 in Los Angeles. The wild "cowboys" of the 82nd Airborne Division are certain to show up in a city near you when George Bush feels it convenient to declare a terror-related national emergency. On the streets, race will matter. African Americans cannot and should not feel secure under the guns of the volunteer military. Unlike Washington, 1968, the brothers will not be numerous enough to contain white mischief.

#### A draft is key to end Imperial Militarism – a professional military isolated from society is key to enforce an Empire - diverse citizen soldiers would prevent the ideology of “permanent war”

Ford ’03 – Mutual Black Network news anchor (Glen, “No Draft, No Peace: Rangel and Conyers are right,” The Black Commentator, Issue Number 24 - January 9, accessed 7/4/16, <http://www.blackcommentator.com/24/24_commentary_pr.html>) [Premier]

The Pentagon believes it has the war machine it needs to wage two major and several minor conflicts simultaneously. They want no part of a draft force, because citizen soldiers are anathema to an imperial military. Generals seldom share such thoughts with the public, but War Party civilians like Rep. John McHugh (R-NY), of the House Armed Services Committee, are familiar with how the brass feel about a draft. "My read at this time is that there is not a lot of enthusiasm or support for it, either within the civilian community or perhaps most importantly within the military services themselves.'' Rep. McHugh chairs the military personnel subcommittee, so he knows what kinds of soldiers the generals prefer. Universal service is at the top of the Pentagon's list - of things it does not want. Citizen soldiers hobble the empire. That was the military's Vietnam lesson. Anti-war protesters, although absolutely essential on the domestic political front, were of little concern to the men who moved brigades and divisions across the landscape of Vietnam. Their problem was the citizen soldier who, they discovered, refused to act or be treated like foreign legionnaires. No sooner had Rangel and Conyers spoken, than the Associated Press relayed the military's ready response: "The Pentagon opposes a return to the draft. The all-volunteer force has provided a military 'that is experienced, smart, disciplined and representative of America,' the Defense Department said in a statement." Not entirely true, of course. As Rep. Rangel pointed out, of the members of Congress who voted for Bush's war against Iraq, only one has a child in the enlisted ranks. A few other congressional children are officers. The scarcity of uniforms is reflective of the classes from which the Congress is drawn. What the generals really mean is that today's military is whiter than the Vietnam-era ranks, is largely disconnected from important sectors of civilian society, and will do as it is told without political or moral qualms. The very utility of this force encourages its use. The same qualities that recommend the volunteer force to war planners, also make endless aggression thinkable. Bush's Permanent War envisions multiple military engagements at any given time, anywhere on the globe, until the entire planet submits to an American-imposed order. (See "Permanent War, Permanent National Emergency," October 17.) Such a strategy is inconceivable under a citizen soldier - universal service - regime, which is why a recall of the draft is anathema to the War Party. Permanent War requires the political acquiescence of broad sections of the middle and upper middle classes. Immunity from conscription guarantees a high level of acceptance of the current rulers' global military ambitions.

#### Military recruiting targets low-income youth

**Reinhardt, 2006 – Professor of Political Economy at Princeton** [Uwe E., November 4, 2006, Kerry Trips Over an Economic Truth, The Washington Post, July 5, 2016, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/11/03/AR2006110301372.html>] [Premier]

On the other hand, it is well known that to fill the ranks of enlisted soldiers, sailors and Marines, the Pentagon draws heavily on the bottom half of the nation's income distribution, favoring in its hunt for recruits schools in low-income neighborhoods. Certainly few if any of Kerry's elitist critics on the right, all of them self-professed patriots, have served their country in uniform, let alone in battle; nor have many of their offspring. One must wonder, for example, how many high officials in the administration have sons or daughters in the fray in Iraq or Afghanistan, how many members of Congress and how many of the ever-hawkish talking heads on Fox News. And, as far as I know, no young member of the wider Bush family is serving our country in the military or has done so in recent years. None of this excuses what Kerry said. But it does point up the hypocrisy rampant among his critics, who have waxed almost hysterical over his remark. I do not recall these same critics, including President Bush, lapsing into similarly righteous hysteria when Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld only three years ago flippantly insulted legions of World War II and Vietnam draftees by labeling such soldiers of "no value."

#### A draft relieves the burden borne by the permanent military class – sharing the responsibility can prevent sacrificing one class of society

**Rangel 2014 – New York Representative** [Charles Rangel, Rangel: It’s Time for a War Tax and a Reinstated Draft, Sept. 19, 2014, Time, July 5th, 2016, <http://time.com/3403976/rangel-draft-tax/>] [Premier]

While I am optimistic about our Commander-in-Chief’s strategy to defeat the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, I voted against the Continuing Appropriations Resolution 2015 that would grant the President the authority to provide funds to train and arm Syrian rebels against the enemy. I opposed the amendment because I strongly believe amassing additional debt to go to war should involve all of America debating the matter. That is why I have called for levying a war tax in addition to bringing back the military draft. Both the war surcharge and conscription will give everyone in America a real stake in any decision on going to war, and compel the public to think twice before they make a commitment to send their loved ones into harm’s way. As a Korean War veteran, I know the plight of war. Our military is the best in the world, but war is unpredictable and chaotic. In the event that the conflict in Iraq and Syria necessitates American troops on the ground, everyone should share the sacrifices instead of the small few who are already carrying that burden. For a decade I have been calling for the reinstatement of the draft because our military personnel and their families bear a tremendous cost each time we send them to fight. Since 2001, nearly 7,000 soldiers have paid for these wars with their lives. More than 52,000 have been wounded, many narrowly saved by the miracle of modern medicine. The 3.3 million military households have become a virtual military class who are unfairly shouldering the brunt of war. Many men and women in uniform serve multiple tours, as many as 10, and 25 percent of America’s active duty military personnel suffer from Post-traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD). It is unacceptable that on average 22 veterans die by suicide every day. If war is truly necessary, we should all come together in defense of our nation, not just one percent of America. In addition to the significant number of precious lives lost in Iraq and Afghanistan, we have accumulated too much debt to finance these wars. The United States has borrowed almost $2 trillion to fund our military engagements on foreign soil. It is estimated that the total cost would be close to $6 trillion; we continue to pay a heavy toll for these conflicts. Each dollar spent on war is a dollar not spent on education, energy, housing, or healthcare. We cannot afford to tread this same path when we are slashing domestic programs that are the lifelines for so many Americans. I will soon introduce a bill that will impose war tax to ensure that we do not have to choose between further gutting the social safety net and adding to the $17.7 trillion of national debt.

#### Draft boards won’t be racist – boards are more diverse now

**Jelinek, 2006 – Associated Press Writer** [Pauline, , U.S. does not have a military draft, but thousands sit on draft boards just in case, April 20, 2006, accessed July 4, 2016, LN] [Premier]

Training has taught board members to expect a range of claims "students who want to finish college ... ministers ... people that don't believe in fighting," said board member Helen Obernagel, 45, of New Athens, Illinois. "We're here so that they don't have to go scrambling around looking for people qualified to determine who's eligible and who isn't," said Cohen, a 66-year-old retired firefighter who is one of America's 10,300 local board members. There are also several hundred appeals boards above the local boards. Board members are young, old, of different races, incomes dentists, secretaries, maintenance men and real estate agents. There are long lists of volunteers for the unpaid positions, which are filled through nomination by each state's governor. Officials say diversity on the boards would make any new draft the most equitable ever. And draft boards could have more work than ever.

### Unemployment

#### National service solves youth unemployment

Khazei and Brown 03; Alan Khazei (an American social entrepreneur. He is the founder and chief executive officer of Be the Change, Inc., a Boston-based group dedicated to building national coalitions of non-profit organizations and citizens to enact legislation on issues such as poverty and education. Previously, Khazei served as chief executive officer of City Year, an AmeriCorps national service program engaging 17- to 24-year-olds in a year of service in one of 23 U.S. cities and in Johannesburg, South Africa. Khazei co-founded City Year with Michael Brown, his friend and roommate at Harvard College and Harvard Law School) and Michael Brown (co-founder and current Chief Executive Officer of City Year Inc. City Year is an education-focused organization founded in 1988 dedicated to helping students and schools succeed. City Year partners with public schools in 26 urban, high-poverty communities across the U.S. and through international affiliates in the U.K. and Johannesburg, South Africa). NEW PATHWAYS TO CIVIC RENEWAL. Shaping the Future of American Youth: Youth Policy in the 21st Century. American Youth Policy Forum. 2003 [Premier]

Investments in National Service programs such as AmeriCorps, VISTA, YouthBuild, and other youth corps programs **deserve serious consideration as part of a national strategy to tackle unemployment**, provide anti-poverty services, and strengthen our economy. These programs can prepare young adults for long-term employment opportunities in the public and private sector. National service programs create full-time positions that are—in most cases—jointly paid for by public and private resources. These entry-level public service positions pay a poverty-level living allowance or slightly more, and they come with health-care benefits, sometimes child-care benefits, and the opportunity for Segal AmeriCorps Education Awards, which help recipients pay for higher education, educational training, or student loans. National service programs are not designed as long-term career positions, but these national service jobs have historically helped boost job creation by providing opportunities for difficult-to-employ youth and recent college graduates, while also building nonprofit organizations’ capacity to continue this important social service. Youth corps An estimated 1.4 million to 5.2 million youth are out-of-work and out-of-school, facing a desperate future. Youth corps are designed for this population, enabling youth to earn a General Educational Development high school equivalency certificate or a high school diploma while acquiring jobs skills training through service. The most common service projects are in conservation, urban construction, and human services, with a growing emphasis on “green jobs.” YouthBuild is an example of a youth corps model that focuses on secondary education. YouthBuild members rebuild their lives while rebuilding low-income housing. Participants are 16 to 24 years of age and face multiple challenges. Most fared poorly in school and other programs that failed to provide a supportive climate for learning and development. **Joining the program brings them into a community of caring adults and youth committed to each other’s success while improving the conditions in their neighborhoods.** And upon graduation form the program, they become members of a supportive alumni network for a lifetime. Youth corps programs work, demonstrating employment and earnings gains as well as reduced arrest and teen pregnancy rates. YouthBuild, in particular, boasts these successes: • More than 50 percent completion of GED or high school diploma requirements. • **Seventy-six percent are placed in jobs or go on to higher education**. • Fifteen percent enroll in community in community or four-year colleges. • Within seven years after graduation, 75 percent were either in post-secondary education or in jobs with an average wage of $10 an hour. Youth corps are supported by a variety of public and private funds, including the YouthBuild program in the Department of Labor, and AmeriCorps. Youth corps access more than a dozen other federal funding streams as well as state, local, and private funds. Yet most of these are small—in the range of $25,000 to $50,000—which causes program directors to spend excessive time cobbling together resources from multiple sources. The lack of a substantial, stable funding base limits substantial growth and increases

#### Youth unemployment high now

Boteach et al 09 Melissa Boteach (Melissa Boteach is the Vice President of the Poverty to Prosperity Program at American Progress. In this capacity, she oversees American Progress’ poverty policy development and analysis, as well as its advocacy and outreach work. Boteach served as the policy lead on The Shriver Report: A Woman’s Nation Pushes Back from the Brink, a book and multimedia platform by Maria Shriver and the Center for American Progress about the one in three women living in or on the brink of poverty and the public, private, and personal solutions to help the nation push back. Under her tenure, CAP’s Poverty team has launched its annual report tracking progress to cut poverty in half in 10 years, its TalkPoverty.org blog and website, and the Our American Story project, a network of people working to expand economic opportunity through the power of their personal stories. Prior to joining American Progress, Boteach worked as a senior policy associate and the poverty campaign coordinator at the Jewish Council for Public Affairs, or JCPA, where she designed, spearheaded, and implemented JCPA’s national anti-poverty campaign, which has been launched in more than 50 U.S. cities. A Harry S. Truman and George J. Mitchell scholar, Boteach earned a master’s degree in public policy from The George Washington University with a concentration in budget and public finance, as well as a master’s degree in equality studies from University College Dublin. She also graduated summa cum laude from the University of Maryland with degrees in government and Spanish. Boteach has appeared on MSNBC, Fox News, and C-SPAN; has been a guest on several radio shows; and is frequently cited in English and Spanish print and online media. She was named as one of Forbes magazine’s 30 under 30 for law and policy in 2011), Joy Moses (For over a decade, Joy Moses has been working for non-profits on issues impacting low-income individuals and families. Beginning her career with an emphasis on improving K-12 educational opportunities, she later transitioned into a focus on general poverty alleviation. Her work now spans multiple issue areas. She has been engaged in research and analysis, offered trainings and technical assistance, lobbied and provided information to federal-level policymakers, and supported class action litigation efforts. ), and Shirley Sagawa (Shirley Sagawa is a Visiting Senior Fellow at American Progress. A national expert on children and youth policy, Shirley Sagawa has been called a “founding mother of the modern service movement” for her work on national service. Her new book, The American Way to Change, highlights ways that volunteer and national service is an important but underutilized strategy to solve problems in American communities. Sagawa served as a presidential appointee in both the first Bush and Clinton administrations. As deputy chief of staff to First Lady Hillary Clinton, she advised the first lady on domestic policy and organized three White House conferences, including the first-ever White House Conference on Philanthropy. As special assistant to the president for domestic policy, Sagawa was instrumental to the drafting and passage of legislation creating the Corporation for National Service. After being confirmed by the Senate as the corporation’s first managing director, she led the development of new service programs for adults and students, including AmeriCorps. She also directed strategic planning for this new government corporation. Sagawa was the founding executive director of the Learning First Alliance, a partnership of national education associations. She has served as the chief counsel for youth policy for the Senate Labor Committee, where she was responsible for child care, early childhood, and national service policy. She was responsible for drafting the National and Community Service Act of 1990, as well as early childhood legislation. She has also served as senior counsel to the National Women’s Law Center as an expert on children and youth, education, and military family issues. Sagawa’s previous book The Charismatic Organization: Eight Ways to Grow a Nonprofit that Builds Buzz, Delights Donors, and Energizes Employees (with co-author Deborah Jospin, Jossey-Bass) describes how successful nonprofits use social capital to broaden their reach and deepen their impact. An earlier work, Common Interest, Common Good: Creating Value through Business and Social Sector Partnerships (with co-author Eli Segal, Harvard Business School Press) describes how business and social sector organizations can collaborate for mutual gain. Shirley Sagawa was named a “Woman to Watch in the 21st Century” by Newsweek magazine and one of the “Most Influential Working Mothers in America” by Working Mother magazine. She blogs regularly for The Huffington Post. Shirley Sagawa is the co-founder of sagawa/jospin, a consulting firm that provides strategic counsel to nonprofits working in the fields of civic engagement, youth, philanthropy, education, and law. Her work includes developing, with New Profit, a leading venture philanthropy organization, a national policy agenda for social entrepreneurs. She currently serves on the boards of directors of the National Women’s Law Center, City Year, and Pyramid Atlantic. Sagawa graduated magna cum laude from Smith College. She holds an M.Sc. in public policy from the London School of Economics and is a cum laude graduate of Harvard Law School, where she was notes editor of the Harvard Law Review). National Service and Youth Unemployment. Center for American Progress. November 16, 2009 [Premier]

Youth are experiencing the greatest challenges finding work in the current job market. Rates of unemployment are directly related to age—the younger you are, the less likely you are to have a job. Consider the statistics for unemployment by age in October 2009, the most recent available. **Adults age 18 to 19 have the highest rate of unemployment**, at 25.6 percent, and the rate decreases with every older age group (see table). Youth with less education are experiencing more difficulty finding a job than those with more. The unemployment rate for youth 16-24 who haven’t finished high school stands today at more than 30 percent. And unemployment adds to the financial pressure of having to pay back student loan debt for those youth who have obtained a college education, which averages about $22,700. A significant number of young veterans are sadly also finding scarce employment opportunities. Iraq War veterans, who are younger as a group than veterans of other wars, recorded an unemployment rate of 11.6 percent in October, which is higher than veterans of previous wars and more than the national average of 10.2 percent. And this unemployment data does not include the growing number of young people—219,000 in the 16-to-24 age range—who have become discouraged and given up on their job search efforts. Young people who initially cannot find a job often suffer consequences that follow them long after a recession ends. The reason: Time spent not developing work experience makes young workers less competitive for future job opportunities. Indeed, lifetime earnings are diminished with each missed year of work equating to 2 percent to 3 percent less earnings each year thereafter. A study of college students who graduated during the 1982 recession found that they were still earning less 8-10 years later than students who had graduated into a strong economy.

#### National service programs good—laundry list of benefits

Boteach et al 09 Melissa Boteach (Melissa Boteach is the Vice President of the Poverty to Prosperity Program at American Progress. In this capacity, she oversees American Progress’ poverty policy development and analysis, as well as its advocacy and outreach work. Boteach served as the policy lead on The Shriver Report: A Woman’s Nation Pushes Back from the Brink, a book and multimedia platform by Maria Shriver and the Center for American Progress about the one in three women living in or on the brink of poverty and the public, private, and personal solutions to help the nation push back. Under her tenure, CAP’s Poverty team has launched its annual report tracking progress to cut poverty in half in 10 years, its TalkPoverty.org blog and website, and the Our American Story project, a network of people working to expand economic opportunity through the power of their personal stories. Prior to joining American Progress, Boteach worked as a senior policy associate and the poverty campaign coordinator at the Jewish Council for Public Affairs, or JCPA, where she designed, spearheaded, and implemented JCPA’s national anti-poverty campaign, which has been launched in more than 50 U.S. cities. A Harry S. Truman and George J. Mitchell scholar, Boteach earned a master’s degree in public policy from The George Washington University with a concentration in budget and public finance, as well as a master’s degree in equality studies from University College Dublin. She also graduated summa cum laude from the University of Maryland with degrees in government and Spanish. Boteach has appeared on MSNBC, Fox News, and C-SPAN; has been a guest on several radio shows; and is frequently cited in English and Spanish print and online media. She was named as one of Forbes magazine’s 30 under 30 for law and policy in 2011), Joy Moses (For over a decade, Joy Moses has been working for non-profits on issues impacting low-income individuals and families. Beginning her career with an emphasis on improving K-12 educational opportunities, she later transitioned into a focus on general poverty alleviation. Her work now spans multiple issue areas. She has been engaged in research and analysis, offered trainings and technical assistance, lobbied and provided information to federal-level policymakers, and supported class action litigation efforts. ), and Shirley Sagawa (Shirley Sagawa is a Visiting Senior Fellow at American Progress. A national expert on children and youth policy, Shirley Sagawa has been called a “founding mother of the modern service movement” for her work on national service. Her new book, The American Way to Change, highlights ways that volunteer and national service is an important but underutilized strategy to solve problems in American communities. Sagawa served as a presidential appointee in both the first Bush and Clinton administrations. As deputy chief of staff to First Lady Hillary Clinton, she advised the first lady on domestic policy and organized three White House conferences, including the first-ever White House Conference on Philanthropy. As special assistant to the president for domestic policy, Sagawa was instrumental to the drafting and passage of legislation creating the Corporation for National Service. After being confirmed by the Senate as the corporation’s first managing director, she led the development of new service programs for adults and students, including AmeriCorps. She also directed strategic planning for this new government corporation. Sagawa was the founding executive director of the Learning First Alliance, a partnership of national education associations. She has served as the chief counsel for youth policy for the Senate Labor Committee, where she was responsible for child care, early childhood, and national service policy. She was responsible for drafting the National and Community Service Act of 1990, as well as early childhood legislation. She has also served as senior counsel to the National Women’s Law Center as an expert on children and youth, education, and military family issues. Sagawa’s previous book The Charismatic Organization: Eight Ways to Grow a Nonprofit that Builds Buzz, Delights Donors, and Energizes Employees (with co-author Deborah Jospin, Jossey-Bass) describes how successful nonprofits use social capital to broaden their reach and deepen their impact. An earlier work, Common Interest, Common Good: Creating Value through Business and Social Sector Partnerships (with co-author Eli Segal, Harvard Business School Press) describes how business and social sector organizations can collaborate for mutual gain. Shirley Sagawa was named a “Woman to Watch in the 21st Century” by Newsweek magazine and one of the “Most Influential Working Mothers in America” by Working Mother magazine. She blogs regularly for The Huffington Post. Shirley Sagawa is the co-founder of sagawa/jospin, a consulting firm that provides strategic counsel to nonprofits working in the fields of civic engagement, youth, philanthropy, education, and law. Her work includes developing, with New Profit, a leading venture philanthropy organization, a national policy agenda for social entrepreneurs. She currently serves on the boards of directors of the National Women’s Law Center, City Year, and Pyramid Atlantic. Sagawa graduated magna cum laude from Smith College. She holds an M.Sc. in public policy from the London School of Economics and is a cum laude graduate of Harvard Law School, where she was notes editor of the Harvard Law Review). National Service and Youth Unemployment. Center for American Progress. November 16, 2009 [Premier]

Rising youth unemployment coincides with severe troubles for those organizations and agencies that provide assistance to poor and low-income Americans. The most recent Census data confirms what everyone seems to know—poverty is on the rise. In 2008, 39.8 million people—13.2 percent of the population—were living in poverty. A proposed alternative measure suggests even greater actual hardship with one in six Americans living in poverty. Using the official definition of poverty and adding in the near poor leads to a total of 53.8 million people who may be seeking assistance from the nation’s non-profits and relevant government agencies. Current and projected unemployment rates suggest rising poverty over the next several years. The Economic Policy Institute estimates that the U.S. poverty rate will reach 14.7 percent in 2009, and that more than one in four children in the United States (26.6 percent) will be poor by 2010. These trends are not expected to reverse any time soon. Isabel Sawhill of the Brookings Institute predicts that without intervening action, poverty will not return to its 2007 levels for another decade. Yet nonprofit organizations’ ability to respond to the growing need is now severely crimped by state and local government budget shortfalls, declining foundation funds, and a dip in individual charitable giving. Forty-eight states and 91 percent of cities are experiencing fiscal year 2010 budget challenges that affect public services and government grants to non-profits serving low-income residents. Sixty-two percent of surveyed grant makers said earlier this year that they expect their giving to decline in 2009, with nearly half (48 percent) anticipating a 10 percent or more dip in grant awards. Individual giving has historically decreased by an average of 3.9 percent in inflation-adjusted terms during years marked by recessions lasting eight months or more. The upshot: The long and painful Great Recession means there is an increasing need for poverty services at a time when there are decreasing resources for government and nonprofit organization that provide these services. National service and funded youth workers can play a role in addressing these disparities. National service: A three-fold return on investment Investments in National Service programs such as AmeriCorps, VISTA, YouthBuild, and other youth corps programs deserve serious consideration as part of a national strategy to tackle unemployment, provide anti-poverty services, and strengthen our economy. These programs can prepare young adults for long-term employment opportunities in the public and private sector. National service programs create full-time positions that are—in most cases—jointly paid for by public and private resources. These entry-level public service positions pay a poverty-level living allowance or slightly more, and they come with health-care benefits, sometimes child-care benefits, and the opportunity for Segal AmeriCorps Education Awards, which help recipients pay for higher education, educational training, or student loans. National service programs are not designed as long-term career positions, but these national service jobs have historically helped boost job creation by providing opportunities for difficult-to-employ youth and recent college graduates, while also building nonprofit organizations’ capacity to continue this important social service. Youth corps An estimated 1.4 million to 5.2 million youth are out-of-work and out-of-school, facing a desperate future. Youth corps are designed for this population, enabling youth to earn a General Educational Development high school equivalency certificate or a high school diploma while acquiring jobs skills training through service. The most common service projects are in conservation, urban construction, and human services, with a growing emphasis on “green jobs.” YouthBuild is an example of a youth corps model that focuses on secondary education. YouthBuild members rebuild their lives while rebuilding low-income housing. Participants are 16 to 24 years of age and face multiple challenges. Most fared poorly in school and other programs that failed to provide a supportive climate for learning and development. Joining the program brings them into a community of caring adults and youth committed to each other’s success while improving the conditions in their neighborhoods. And upon graduation form the program, they become members of a supportive alumni network for a lifetime. Youth corps programs work, demonstrating employment and earnings gains as well as reduced arrest and teen pregnancy rates. YouthBuild, in particular, boasts these successes: More than 50 percent completion of GED or high school diploma requirements. Seventy-six percent are placed in jobs or go on to higher education. Fifteen percent enroll in community in community or four-year colleges. Within seven years after graduation, 75 percent were either in post-secondary education or in jobs with an average wage of $10 an hour. Youth corps are supported by a variety of public and private funds, including the YouthBuild program in the Department of Labor, and AmeriCorps. Youth corps access more than a dozen other federal funding streams as well as state, local, and private funds. Yet most of these are small—in the range of $25,000 to $50,000—which causes program directors to spend excessive time cobbling together resources from multiple sources. The lack of a substantial, stable funding base limits substantial growth and increases the per member costs of corps. The potential for expanding youth corps is great. YouthBuild programs alone turn away 14,000 young people each year due to lack of funding. And more than 1,800 community organizations submitted full applications to the federal government between 1996 and 2006, but three-quarters were turned down due to lack of funding. Other programs don’t fill the gap. New, steady funding would enable the youth corps field to scale dramatically. AmeriCorps AmeriCorps engages recent college graduates and veterans in public service while also providing substantial funds for youth corps and other program models. All AmeriCorps members receive Segal AmeriCorps Education Awards when they complete their terms of service. These awards can be used to pay back loans or pay for college or graduate school. A majority of AmeriCorps members have at least some college experience, and the program has a strong track record of creating pathways to public service fields that are currently experiencing workforce shortages. As Baby Boomers leave the workforce, the non-profit sector will lose more than 50 percent of its current leadership over the next 10 years, requiring 640,000 new leaders. The federal government needs to hire more than 270,000 workers for “mission-critical” jobs over the next three years, according to the results of a government-wide survey. At least 23 percent of the public health workforce—nearly 110,000 workers—will be eligible to retire during the next presidential term. And by 2020, we will need an additional 250,000 public health workers. The employment opportunities are an excellent match for recent college graduates who may be at risk of long-term underemployment. What’s more, AmeriCorps does much more than provide temporary employment. Research shows that alumni are more engaged in their communities and feel more empowered and are likely to take action to seek improvements. And AmeriCorps graduates were substantially more likely to go into public service careers than a comparison group in one study. Accelerated investment in AmeriCorps pays dividends in providing short-term employment and in launching young adults into public service careers that might otherwise experience substantial shortages. Volunteers in Service to America VISTA participants—about half of whom have some college experience or a college degree— build the capacity of non-profit agencies while receiving a poverty-level living allowance, health and childcare benefits, and Segal AmeriCorps Education Awards. VISTAs help nonprofits raise funds, develop new programs, build community partnerships, and recruit and manage volunteers. In short, they could greatly increase nonprofit organizations’ capacity to serve low-income people affected by the economic downturn as well as the long-term poor. VISTA projects are intended to be sustainable after the term of service, and they often lead to the creation of new jobs in the nonprofit sector as well as the engagement of large numbers of volunteers to deliver services to low-income communities. For example: YearUp. VISTAs have supported the expansion of YearUp, an innovative job training program for urban youth that prepares and places youth in IT positions that pay $15 an hour.

#### Draft increases Access to education – connections made in the military help after being discharged

Aisen, 16 – US Navy officer (Joshua, Universal service in military would benefit the nation, 05 June 2016, Knoxville News Sentinel, <http://www.knoxnews.com/opinion/columnists/universal-service-in-military-would-benefit-the-nation-343a1694-091e-3ebd-e053-0100007f98b8-381807431.html> Accessed 05 July 2016) [Premier]

Another real and immediate benefit of military service is the opportunity to meet mentors and build networks that would otherwise not be available. Need a letter of recommendation for your college application? Now you know people who have seen you overcome difficult challenges and show real leadership. If someone finishes high school and knows exactly what they want to do with their lives, great. If not, then they'll get a chance to see some options.

### Virtues

#### Draft fosters virtues like discipline and confidence – basic military training is effective

Aisen, 16 – US Navy officer (Joshua, Universal service in military would benefit the nation, 05 June 2016, Knoxville News Sentinel, <http://www.knoxnews.com/opinion/columnists/universal-service-in-military-would-benefit-the-nation-343a1694-091e-3ebd-e053-0100007f98b8-381807431.html> Accessed 05 July 2016) [Premier]

I read and hear constant complaints about soft, coddled American millennials with rooms full of participation trophies and helicopter parents smoothing their paths for them. Though I strongly disagree with this stereotype, even a brief stint of military service — just the completion of basic training, or "boot camp," for example — would help prepare young people to better face the challenges of adulthood. They would have to learn to stand up for themselves, to work with others and to persevere in the face of adversity. They would learn discipline, responsibility and teamwork that will serve them well throughout life and benefit our nation as a whole when these young adults enter the workforce.

### Volunteering

#### Volunteering low now

Khazei and Brown 03; Alan Khazei (an American social entrepreneur. He is the founder and chief executive officer of Be the Change, Inc., a Boston-based group dedicated to building national coalitions of non-profit organizations and citizens to enact legislation on issues such as poverty and education. Previously, Khazei served as chief executive officer of City Year, an AmeriCorps national service program engaging 17- to 24-year-olds in a year of service in one of 23 U.S. cities and in Johannesburg, South Africa. Khazei co-founded City Year with Michael Brown, his friend and roommate at Harvard College and Harvard Law School) and Michael Brown (co-founder and current Chief Executive Officer of City Year Inc. City Year is an education-focused organization founded in 1988 dedicated to helping students and schools succeed. City Year partners with public schools in 26 urban, high-poverty communities across the U.S. and through international affiliates in the U.K. and Johannesburg, South Africa). NEW PATHWAYS TO CIVIC RENEWAL. Shaping the Future of American Youth: Youth Policy in the 21st Century. American Youth Policy Forum. 2003 [Premier]

Full-time national service does two things that transform communities: it meets needs and it makes citizens. Although America’s youth are volunteering in record numbers, they **are not becoming what most would consider engaged citizens**. Researchers have found that more than half of 15-25-year-olds are completely disengaged from civic life.4 Harvard University’s Institute of Politics found that while 69 percent of college students do volunteer community service, only 27 percent are involved in a government, political, or issues organization.5 Part of the problem may be that, due to competing priorities in our schools, **civics classes are fading** from American public education. However, when civics is taught in schools, it tends to emphasize the importance of the rights of citizens rather than their responsibilities. Furthermore, it tends to focus on the positive steps we have taken towards creating a just society, often **ignoring the harsh realities of our social problems.**6

#### Aff teaches civics and empowers our youth

Khazei and Brown 03; Alan Khazei (an American social entrepreneur. He is the founder and chief executive officer of Be the Change, Inc., a Boston-based group dedicated to building national coalitions of non-profit organizations and citizens to enact legislation on issues such as poverty and education. Previously, Khazei served as chief executive officer of City Year, an AmeriCorps national service program engaging 17- to 24-year-olds in a year of service in one of 23 U.S. cities and in Johannesburg, South Africa. Khazei co-founded City Year with Michael Brown, his friend and roommate at Harvard College and Harvard Law School) and Michael Brown (co-founder and current Chief Executive Officer of City Year Inc. City Year is an education-focused organization founded in 1988 dedicated to helping students and schools succeed. City Year partners with public schools in 26 urban, high-poverty communities across the U.S. and through international affiliates in the U.K. and Johannesburg, South Africa). NEW PATHWAYS TO CIVIC RENEWAL. Shaping the Future of American Youth: Youth Policy in the 21st Century. American Youth Policy Forum. 2003 [Premier]

The experience of serving full-time, however, brings those realities into full focus and propels people to act. **You can hardly brush away the crisis in our public schools if you tutor students for a year in an overcrowded classroom,** where the teacher needs assistance, there are few books, and the children are disengaged. Longitudinal studies of City Year alumni show that **89 percent are likely to volunteer regularly for a nonprofit community organization and 84 percent are likely to lead others in service**.7 Independent Sector recently surveyed over 4,000 adults and found that “the level of youth engagement is a powerful predictor of several adult behaviors: the propensity to volunteer, the propensity to give, and the amount one gives.”8 Furthermore, the study found that the children of volunteers are more likely to volunteer as they grow older, creating an ongoing family commitment.9 The evidence definitely makes a direct correlation between serving in a meaningful way and becoming a life-long engaged citizen. **Isn’t that what civics is supposed to teach**? We propose that a year of full-time national service be the civics class of the 21st century. This would be the time when young people not only learn about the nation’s principles of freedom and democracy but also are empowered to act upon those principles and do work that ensures a more just society for all. As they serve, young people also learn about their own potential. Their service reveals the talents, experience, and knowledge they have to offer to society. Independent Sector’s study concluded that “by becoming involved in service, young people gain the sense that they are not powerless and that their contributions can make a real difference. Young people learn that they can improve individual lives, including their own; shape organizational programs; **and change policies** at the local, state, and national levels.”10

#### Plan brings individuals of various racial groups together

Khazei and Brown 03; Alan Khazei (an American social entrepreneur. He is the founder and chief executive officer of Be the Change, Inc., a Boston-based group dedicated to building national coalitions of non-profit organizations and citizens to enact legislation on issues such as poverty and education. Previously, Khazei served as chief executive officer of City Year, an AmeriCorps national service program engaging 17- to 24-year-olds in a year of service in one of 23 U.S. cities and in Johannesburg, South Africa. Khazei co-founded City Year with Michael Brown, his friend and roommate at Harvard College and Harvard Law School) and Michael Brown (co-founder and current Chief Executive Officer of City Year Inc. City Year is an education-focused organization founded in 1988 dedicated to helping students and schools succeed. City Year partners with public schools in 26 urban, high-poverty communities across the U.S. and through international affiliates in the U.K. and Johannesburg, South Africa). NEW PATHWAYS TO CIVIC RENEWAL. Shaping the Future of American Youth: Youth Policy in the 21st Century. American Youth Policy Forum. 2003 [Premier]

Complete the Civil Rights Movement, uniting Americans from all backgrounds for a common purpose. The Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s may have ended discrimination under the law, but it still prevails in attitudes and practices in many aspects of society. Changing beliefs **only comes when people have the experience of working with others from different backgrounds toward a shared goal**. The future of our nation, which will have no majority race/ethnic group by 2050, depends on our ability to embrace America’s diversity.13 Yet, hate crimes in 2002 increased more than 20 percent over the previous year; of the incidents, 45 percent were motivated by racial prejudice, 22 percent were driven by a bias toward an ethnicity/national origin, about 19 percent were motivated by religious intolerance, and more than 14 percent by sexual-orientation bias.14 **Bringing national service to scale could unite Americans from all backgrounds and break down the social barriers that divide us**. City Year corps members, for example, are a microcosm of America: African American, Asian, Caucasian, and Hispanic; city and suburb; male and female; some who are working on their GEDs and some who graduated from Ivy League schools. Almost all (**91 percent) of City Year corps members report that they developed friendships with people from different races** or ethnicities during their service year. All of our corps **members serve on teams with shared goals and work through divisive issues together. If this were a common experience of our young people, we would have a different America.** We would recognize that in our increasingly interdependent Shaping the Future of American Youth: Youth Policy in the 21st Century 21 world, America’s diversity is our greatest strength as well as our greatest challenge.

## Plan

### Draft

#### Thus the plan: the United States federal government should pass the Universal National Service Act as proposed by Rep. Rangel, making registration for national military service compulsory in the United States with strictly limited exemptions for those unable to enter the military.

Rangel, 03 – US representative of New York’s 13th Congressional district (Charles, Symposium - Q: Is restoring universal military conscription in the United States a good idea? YES: Those who call for war against Iraq should be willing to put their own sons and daughters in harm's way. Insight on the News, 4 Feb 2003, [http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_m1571/is\_4\_19/ai\_97450991 Accessed 4 July 2016](http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1571/is_4_19/ai_97450991%20Accessed%204%20July%202016)) [Premier]

The following is a partial transcript of Rep. Rangel's statements at a Capitol Hill press conference on Jan. 7 as published by Reuters: As many of you know, I have introduced a bill that will require mandatory military and national service for all of our young people, without exceptions for college or graduate courses, with the exception of allowing youngsters to finish high school at a given age. The president of the United States will have the discretion to determine the number of people who will be necessary for the military, and those who because of impairments or disabilities cannot serve in the military will be required to perform other national services at our borders, in our schools, in our seaports and in our airports.

## Case Blocks

### AT Exemptions Harm Solvency

#### Rangel draft would strictly limit exemptions and allow civilian alternatives

Thompson, 07 - Pulitzer Prize-winning reporter (Mark, Would National Service Be Better Than the Draft? TIME, 30 Aug 2007, [http://content.time.com/time/specials/2007/article/0,28804,1657256\_1657626\_1656898,00.html](http://content.time.com/time/specials/2007/article/0%2C28804%2C1657256_1657626_1656898%2C00.html) Accessed 5 July 2016) [Premier]

Now chairman of the ways and means committee, Rangel unveiled a retooled version of his original bill — which lost in the full House, 402-to-2 shortly before the 2004 election — in January. "My bill requires that, during wartime, all legal residents of the U.S. between the ages of 18 and 42 would be subject to a military draft, with the number determined by the President," he said then. "No deferments would be allowed beyond the completion of high school, up to age 20, except for conscientious objectors or those with health problems. A permanent provision of the bill mandates that those not needed by the military be required to perform two years of civilian service in our sea and airports, schools, hospitals, and other facilities."

### AT Military Readiness High

#### Quality military recruitment is unsustainable in the status quo – small budget and a better economy will hurt recruitment.

Reuters ’14 [“Military turns down 80 percent of applicants as armed forces shrink”, Reuters, May 15, 2014, <https://www.rt.com/usa/158992-military-80-percent-rejection-rate/>, July 6, 2016] [Premier]

"A weak economy in recent years, coupled with the talented and adequately resourced recruiting force produced the highest quality recruits in Air Force history," Brig. Gen. Gina Grosso, the director of force management policy for the Air Force, told the House Armed Services Committee in January. "However, we recognize this trend will be unsustainable as the economy continues to improve and competition to draw recruits from the small, qualified talent pool, who are alarmingly less inclined to choose military service as a career, increases dramatically." Now the military is competing with the civilian sector for quality candidates, and they are forced to use the recruiting budgets they never needed to before - right as Congress seeks to cut those budgets. “All this belt-tightening has caused the Department of Defense to chase after the same successful, highly motivated high school graduates that everyone else is chasing,” Mike Byrd, a retired Army lieutenant colonel and an instructor for a Junior ROTC program in Independence, Mo. told the Star.

#### The Quality of recruits will eventually decline – skills are declining

**Wagner ’16 —Navy Reserve officer** and is a student at the Naval War College and Vice President with ScoutComms, an award-winning veteran-owned benefit corporation that helps for-profit and not-for-profit organizations effectively work with veterans and military families [Brian, “The Military Could Soon Face Increased Recruiting Challenges”, Task & Purpose, February 18, 2016, <http://taskandpurpose.com/the-military-could-soon-face-increased-recruiting-challenges/>, July 6, 2016] [Premier]

While CNA found that the military’s enlisted non-prior service recruits in 2014 were better educated than comparable civilians, it projects an eventual decline in recruit quality that cannot solely be blamed on the improving economy and shrinking military budget. CNA highlights a trend that has been discussed ad nauseam in recent years, reporting that the population of potential new recruits in the United States, ages 17-24, have “become increasingly unqualified for military service.” A recent DoD study on this age cohort, cited by CNA, found that “only 13 percent of youth would qualify [for recruitment] without a waiver, be available [i.e. not enrolled in college] and qualified to enlist without a waiver.” This prediction is troubling, as the military depends on these non-prior service applicants to fill most of its active-duty positions. Prior-service applicants only account for an average of 1–2% of new active-duty enlisted personnel across the services in recent fiscal years. Prior service accessions play a much bigger role in the Reserves, where they comprise over 40% of total enlisted accessions each year. That is unsurprising, though, as the Reserves are generally less dependent on the 17–24 age cohort.

### AT Not Feasible – Too Extreme

#### The draft is easy to implement – all of the infrastructure for it is already in place, it is just unused.

**Jelinek, 2006 – Associated Press Writer** [Pauline, , U.S. does not have a military draft, but thousands sit on draft boards just in case, April 20, 2006, accessed July 4, 2016, LN] [Premier]

U.S. does not have a military draft, but thousands sit on draft boards just in case The United States hasn't had a military draft for more than 30 years, but it still has draft boards comprised of nearly 11,000 people training for a crisis that may never come. "It's not hard at all. There's nothing to it," deadpans Michael Cohen, a Selective Service System board member from Highland Park, Illinois. That could change if there is a national crisis and if the government decides the crisis requires a return to the draft that ended 33 years ago. Officials say they don't expect to restart conscription public sentiment is heavily against it but should they, draft boards could face their biggest work load in history as they help decide who gets drafted and who doesn't. Until then, a draft board member's main chore is training. At half-day annual sessions, they keep up on rules for granting postponements, deferments, exemptions and conscientious objector status. They also learn how to hold meetings, judge evidence and elicit testimony. Then, as boards have done since the system was created in 1980, they wait. "It's a ghost of a job," said board member James Stephen Brophy of Burke, Virginia. And a ghost of its former self. Before the draft ended in 1973, some people demonstrated outside of draft board offices and burned their draft cards to protest U.S. involvement in the Vietnam War. Many Americans from that era still remember the names of board members who judged their cases. Today, most people don't know the boards exist. An agency independent of the Defense Department, the Selective Service System trains board members and plans alternative national service for objectors, but its main task is keeping an updated registry of males aged 18-25 now some 16 million people from which to supply untrained draftees that would supplement the professional all-volunteer armed forces.

### AT Tech Renders Soldiers Obsolete

#### The changing nature of combat won’t make a draft irrelevant – all draftees will have a role in modern warfare.

Barno and Bensahel, 16 – retired US lieutenant general & Scholar @ American University (David and Nora, Nonresident Senior Fellows at the Atlantic Council, WHY WE STILL NEED THE DRAFT, 23 Feb 2016, War on the Rocks, <http://warontherocks.com/2016/02/why-we-still-need-the-draft/> Accessed 6 July 2016) [Premier]

Wars are way too complicated today for anyone but long-serving professionals. Draftees will be useless or worse, disruptive. Conscription in the future could look very different than the draft calls of Vietnam or Korea, which were designed to provide more infantrymen for the fight. The changing shape of future wars may require conscripting the nation’s best experts at code writing, hacking, and cyber security to rapidly build a world-class cadre of cyber warriors. There might be an immediate need to put financial experts and market analysts into uniform to help protect the nation from potentially disruptive economic warfare. Or the military might need to mobilize social media gurus who can help understand and then undercut the insidious messaging of highly sophisticated adversaries aiming to inflame and radicalize populations at home and abroad. These targeted conscripts might also be drafted to be reservists, splitting time between uniformed and civilian jobs and leveraging skills from both. This 21st-century, cutting-edge human capital is unlikely to be found in today’s military — yet may prove crucial in a future major war.

## Off-Case Blocks

### AT CP – Incentives

#### Incentives cannot solve troop shortages – qualified recruits have dried up and choose college

Glastris, 03- editor in chief of The Washington Monthly [Paul First draft: the battle to create universal national service has just started Here's how it can be won., Washington Monthly, Mar 1, 2003, <[http://www.thefreelibrary.com/First+draft 3A+the+battle+to+create+universal+national+service+has+just...-a098829847](http://www.thefreelibrary.com/First%2Bdraft%203A%2Bthe%2Bbattle%2Bto%2Bcreate%2Buniversal%2Bnational%2Bservice%2Bhas%2Bjust...-a098829847)>, July 4, 2016] [Premier]

Defenders of the all-volunteer force believe the military can solve these overstretch problems the way it fixed earlier problems: recruit more troops with higher pay and better benefits. Yet with each passing year this is getting harder and harder to achieve. With the higher level of skill needed in today's high-tech military, recruiters are loath to hire many high school dropouts. But high school graduates increasingly prefer to go on to college rather than the military: 70 percent entered college in 2000 within a year after graduating, up from 57 percent in 1987, a trend that will almost certainly continue.

### AT CP – Non-Combatant Only

#### The non-combatant draft fails – even noncombatant roles require effective training and skills

Wetherbee ’07 –fellow at Center for the Study of the Presidency and Congress (Michael A., “Closing the Civil-Military Gap,” accessed 7/5/16, <http://cspc.nonprofitsoapbox.com/storage/documents/Vater/Wetherbee.pdf>) [Premier]

Other scholars who suggest the implementation of some sort of draft are Charles Mokos and Paul Glastis. They suggest that the draft should be for noncombatant soldiers, who could address the internal security threats posed by the War on Terror.lii They argue that some of the jobs required by the war on terror, such as “patrolling neighborhoods, arresting troublemakers, being first responders in natural disasters, intervening in disputes with a minimum of force—don’t require as many special skills as do some complex front-line combat job.”liii They are correct in recognizing that these types of duties require different skills than those needed of front line soldiers. They are wrong, however, in asserting that this type of position would not require as many special skills, because in many cases dealing with humans non-violently will be a much more difficult task.

### AT CP – Non-Military Options

#### Non-Military options increase spending and cause political manipulation

Lacey, 03 – US Army Reserve officer (James, Symposium - Q: Is restoring universal military conscription in the United States a good idea? NO: The modern military needs a smaller force of highly motivated, trained professionals, not a horde of draftees. Insight on the News, 4 Feb 2003, http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_m1571/is\_4\_19/ai\_97450991 Accessed 4 July 2016) [Premier]

Some make the argument that if the military cannot use all of the draftees then they should be enlisted into some other form of national service. Has anyone thought about the size of the bureaucracy that would have to be created to mobilize, train, deploy, feed, house and monitor several million 18-year-olds every year? You would need a second army dedicated to doing nothing but keeping track of teen-agers. Besides, what rational being believes that the federal government is the best organization for putting our youth to useful work? In no time at all our children will become pawns for whatever is the political flavor of the day.

#### The counterplan doesn’t solve the case – if there is a civilian option, then politicians will still be able to vote for war and keep their kids safe.

Thompson, 07 - Pulitzer Prize-winning reporter (Mark, Would National Service Be Better Than the Draft? TIME, 30 Aug 2007, [http://content.time.com/time/specials/2007/article/0,28804,1657256\_1657626\_1656898,00.html](http://content.time.com/time/specials/2007/article/0%2C28804%2C1657256_1657626_1656898%2C00.html) Accessed 5 July 2016) [Premier]

Lawrence Korb, who served as the Pentagon's personnel chief during the Reagan administration, also endorses the idea. "National service is great — I think everyone ought to do something for their country," he says. But he adds it shouldn't be thought of as a fix for the military. "The all-volunteer force is not in trouble — the all-volunteer Army is in trouble," he says. And he doesn't embrace Moskos' notion that salting the force with draftees would make going to war more difficult. "If there had been national service, including the Army, on the eve of the war —remember, on the eve of the war, 60 percent of the American people thought Saddam had weapons of mass destruction." If military service is merely one option among many for national service, Korb isn't convinced it would affect what wars the nation chooses to fight. "The only thing that acts as a brake is when you force people to go into the military," says Korb, a Navy veteran, "particularly the ground forces."

### AT DA – CMR

#### The civil military gap outweighs the risk to civil military relations – if the gap is too wide, then crises in relations cannot be contained.

Wetherbee ’07 –fellow at Center for the Study of the Presidency and Congress (Michael A., “Closing the Civil-Military Gap,” accessed 7/5/16, <http://cspc.nonprofitsoapbox.com/storage/documents/Vater/Wetherbee.pdf>) [Premier]

The gap is perceived by Joseph Collins and Ole Holsti, as they note in their article, Civil-Military Relations: How Wide is the Gap?: “there [is] a growing and dangerous gap between civilian and military perspectives or preference on any number of issues.”vii Mackubin Owens also recognizes the gap in his piece, Rumsfeld, the Generals, and the State of U.S. Civil-Military Relations: “civil-military relations are now unhealthy and out of balance.”viii Finally, Russell Weigley also identifies the Gap and says that there has always been a misunderstanding and distrust between the military and civilian elite, but it has been contained by “the outward faithfulness of both sides, nonetheless, to the constitutional principle of civilian control. During the 1990s that principle has been subjected to greater strain than at any time in the past. Therefore the future of civil-military relations in the United States is uncertain.”i

### AT DA – Politics

#### Winners Win – building support for controversial policies like the draft can mobilize bipartisanship and prove a win for a Democratic president

Glastris, 03- editor in chief of The Washington Monthly [Paul, First draft: the battle to create universal national service has just started Here's how it can be won., Washington Monthly, Mar 1, 2003, <[http://www.thefreelibrary.com/First+draft 3A+the+battle+to+create+universal+national+service+has+just...-a098829847](http://www.thefreelibrary.com/First%2Bdraft%203A%2Bthe%2Bbattle%2Bto%2Bcreate%2Buniversal%2Bnational%2Bservice%2Bhas%2Bjust...-a098829847)>, July 4, 2016] [Premier]

Even a draft such as this, tailored to modern needs, would run into a buzz saw of criticism--from nervous parents, the higher-education lobby, and libertarians of both the left and right who would see it as a form of "slavery." But with polls already showing significant public support for the idea, would it really be impossible to enact? That depends on whether there are politicians, think tanks, and newspaper editorial boards willing to fight for it. Two years ago, the idea that Iraq would be the primary target in the war on terrorism seemed farfetched. Public Support was weak, and the entire national security apparatus, from the Pentagon to the State Department to the intelligence agencies, was against it. Yet a handful of committed neoconservative defense intellectual in and out of government convinced the president, rightly or wrongly, to back the ideal That president's party went on to gain seats in the midterm elections. And as of this writing, 125,000 US. troops are poised to invade. A few clever strategists are beginning to see similar possibilities for the draft. "If you challenge the American people, instead of pandering to them, they will be drawn to the cause, even when they don't agree with every particular," argues Bruce Reed, president of the DLC and a supporter of universal service. President Bush, however, has done far more pandering than challenging. His much-trumpeted plan to expand volunteer national service has vanished without a trace (see "What Ever Happened To National Service?" page 8). Instead of calling on young people to serve in uniform, he has given an already overburdened military more and more missions. And instead of paying for the war as his wartime predecessors did, by raising taxes, he has cut taxes and wants to cut them more. The aim may be to shield current voters from the war's costs. But this is fiscally and militarily irresponsible--and any White House aspirant would be both/patriotic and politically shrewd to point that out. Some conservatives are beginning to understand this vulnerability. At a recent roundtable on universal service sponsored by the nonprofit Grantmaker Forum on Community and National Service, Tod Lindberg, editor of the conservative journal Policy Review (and a draft skeptic), said: "If I were asked to pick a single big issue that I think could galvanize, energize, and return power to the Democratic party, I think national service may well be that issue." Perhaps, then, the draft is not the political loser that most Beltway observers think it is. It just might be something like the opposite: the sleeper issue of 2004, waiting for someone smart and daring enough to grab it.

### AT DA – Readiness

#### Drafts do not reduce military quality – Vietnam is cherrypicked and not representative– history proves

Barno and Bensahel, 16 – retired US lieutenant general & Scholar @ American University (David and Nora, Nonresident Senior Fellows at the Atlantic Council, WHY WE STILL NEED THE DRAFT, 23 Feb 2016, War on the Rocks, <http://warontherocks.com/2016/02/why-we-still-need-the-draft/> Accessed 6 July 2016) [Premier]

Draftees dilute the quality of the force and diminish military effectiveness. This inaccurate perspective is a clear legacy of Vietnam. By the end of that war, the U.S. military was plagued by drug abuse, racial tensions, and serious indiscipline. Many military personnel equate these maladies with conscription — despite the fact that as one of us can personally attest, these problems also plagued much of the first decade of the all-volunteer force. The military’s experience with large draft armies in 1917, 1941 and 1953 further demonstrates that this perspective is simply wrong. Draftees performed remarkably well during those wartime periods, perhaps because they were serving in conflicts widely supported by the American people. We now refer to the draftees who served in World War II as “The Greatest Generation.” There is no reason to expect that would automatically be any different in the future. And even though only 29 percent of those recently surveyed said that the United States should have a military draft, public opinion could shift quickly — especially in the aftermath of an attack on the United States (terrorist or otherwise) that were to kill tens or even hundreds of thousands of Americans (let alone millions).

#### [See Readiness advantage for more]

### AT DA – Spending

#### The draft saves money – taxes to finance a volunteer army are more expensive

Warner, 2001- Professor of Economics, Clemson University [John, with Beth J. Asch, The Record and Prospects of the All-Volunteer Military in the United States The Journal of Economic Perspectives, April <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2696597>, July 7 2016] [Premier]

At low force levels, the volunteer force has lower social cost because the military payroll, and therefore the deadweight loss from taxation to make the payments, is small. As the force grows beyond a certain size, the social cost of a volunteer force exceeds the cost of a draft force of equal size because the deadweight loss on the larger volunteer force payroll exceeds the sum of the excess training costs and opportunity costs of the draft force. The switch point, where a draft force becomes more cost effective, declines as the deadweight loss from taxation increases and as enlistment supply decreases or becomes less elastic. Yet because of potential productivity differences, it is still ambiguous whether a draft force or volunteer force will be more efficient when large forces are required.'0 This line of analysis raises the possibility that a country that has a large military manpower requirement (relative to its population) may find a draft more efficient. Israel is the prime example of such a country. Ross (1994) analyzed a 1983 cross-section of 78 countries and found that the likelihood that a country has a draft is positively related to the relative size of its military. Interestingly, Ross found little 8 See Warner and Asch (1995) for a review of AVF-era studies of the relationship between military experience and productivity. 9 Discussing the situation in which a large force is required relative to population, Friedman (1967, p. 202-203) stated: "And to rely on volunteers under such conditions would then require very high pay in the armed services, and very high burdens on those who do not serve... It might turn out that the implicit tax of forced service is less bad than the alternative taxes that would be used to finance a volunteer army." '0When account is taken of the deadweight loss of taxation, a draft with the hiring of substitutes dominates a volunteer force in terms of social cost. Both systems have produced the same opportunity cost, as discussed in the text, but the draft system with substitutes places the burden of paying for the force on the those who hire substitutes while the volunteer force places the burden on the taxpayer which generates a deadweight loss.

### AT K – Militarism

#### The military is inevitable – the alternative doesn’t reject the US military. If we are going to have a military – a mercenary army is worse because a conscripted military is closer to the mood of the masses which is a democratic check.

Landy, 04 – National Secretary of the League for the Revolutionary Party (Sy, The Leninist Position on Conscription, Proletariat Revolution No 69 Winter 2004, <http://lrp-cofi.org/PR/conscriptionPR69.html> Accessed 6 July 2016) [Premier]

We are for a workers’ militia, an army totally independent of and opposed to the capitalist state. Our policy towards the bourgeois military is to seek to split it, to turn its base against the top, to turn imperialist wars into civil class wars, and out of that conflict forge the workers’ red army. We learned that from Lenin and Trotsky. But it is ABC for Marxists that as long as the working class does not overthrow the bourgeoisie, state power will remain capitalist – and no state can exist without armed power. There is no way, except in pacifist fantasy, to eliminate the bourgeois military as a whole without overthrowing the bourgeois state itself through revolutionary class struggle. Within that context, any campaign against the draft represents a demand on the capitalist state to maintain a professional, mercenary army, since that is its only alternative. That is why we say “ ‘No Draft’ Is No Answer.” A mercenary, “voluntary,” army provides long-term military training to those who choose to be professional soldiers. They are trained as an elite corps of thugs, in many respects effectively a police department that can be used against masses abroad as well as at home. On the other hand, a drafted army is more susceptible to the moods and attitudes of the masses and is more accessible to revolutionary propaganda and agitation. Over time, the class distinctions between the “grunts” and the officer corps in conscripted armies become sharper, and the discontent of the working class ranks accelerates. Further, a drafted army allows all workers to receive essential military training, which is absolutely crucial for the success of socialist revolution. For these reasons, as long as some kind of bourgeois military is unavoidable, revolutionaries prefer a drafted army to a mercenary army. So while we in no way support the bourgeois draft and would never vote for one or call for its resumption, we argue against campaigns that oppose resumption of the draft. We also argue against those who advocate refusing to enter the draft, should it be resumed. As genuine communists have always done, we go with our fellow workers when they are conscripted. We call on all would-be revolutionaries to join us in the military if they are drafted and work within it to win other recruits to the revolutionary cause.

#### The Draft solves militarism – racially diverse citizen soldiers would bring new perspectives to foreign policy and force policy makers to consider the horrible consequences of war by giving them a personal stake in the issue

Ford ’03 – Mutual Black Network news anchor (Glen, “No Draft, No Peace: Rangel and Conyers are right,” The Black Commentator, Issue Number 24 - January 9, accessed 7/4/16, <http://www.blackcommentator.com/24/24_commentary_pr.html>) [Premier]

Congressmen Rangel and Conyers wouldn't put it that way, but they were blunt enough. Said Rangel, in a New Years Eve article: I believe that if those calling for war knew that their children were likely to be required to serve - and to be placed in harm's way - there would be more caution and a greater willingness to work with the international community in dealing with Iraq. A renewed draft will help bring a greater appreciation of the consequences of decisions to go to war. Service in our nation's armed forces is no longer a common experience. A disproportionate number of the poor and members of minority groups make up the enlisted ranks of the military, while the most privileged Americans are underrepresented or absent. We need to return to the tradition of the citizen soldier - with alternative national service required for those who cannot serve because of physical limitations or reasons of conscience. This past Tuesday, children frolicked in the halls and aisles of the U.S. House and Senate, a family-day tradition on the opening of each new Congress. Most of the members gave George Bush a blank check on Iraq, last session. Yet they plan to keep their own children immune from future conscription and insure that the privilege of non-service remains nearly general, a shield against the unpleasantness of war. Deluded, they fail to realize that nothing can truly insulate the congressional children and their playmates from the blowback of wars waged by other Americans. Rather, the delusion guarantees that there will be permanent war, fought by kids they'll never meet, against people they care nothing about - spectacles that will inevitably consume the spectators. Rep. Conyers remarked that his fellow lawmakers might be more concerned about death and destruction abroad "if their own family members and neighbors faced the prospects of serving in the military on the front line.'' That also applies to the bulk of the upper middle classes, who support the War Party while physically opting out of war. Forget moral questions, for a moment. The volunteer Army, which many Seventies-era supporters naively (selfishly?) hoped would purge the nation of militarism, has instead given armchair and soccer mom militarists immunity from direct family and class participation in the deadly games. They are like citizens of Rome, bloodthirsty in their Coliseum seats, yet not a gladiator among them, fatly and flatulently demanding gore and honor! This is what the volunteer military has bestowed on the nation: privileged noncombatant video war-watchers. According to surveys, well-educated white youth are the most grizzly-minded - and least likely to enlist - of them all.

#### The AVF entrenches militarism - eradicating the draft calms angry war sentiments

Sirota, 13- author of The Uprising [David, author of The Uprising, How Dropping the Draft turned America into a Militaristic State, Alternet, May 9 2013, < <http://www.alternet.org/how-dropping-draft-helped-turn-america-militaristic-state>>, July 6 2016] [Premier]

There is, of course, no definitive answer to such a complex question. However, a look back at some lost history shows that today's public acquiescence to militarism was exactly what the government wanted when it ended the draft. That loaded term - "militarism" - was, in fact, a prominent part of the 1970 report by President Nixon's Commission on an All-Volunteer Force. In its findings, the panel worried about "a cycle of anti-militarism" in a nation then questioning America's increasingly martial posture.  Noting that "the draft is a major source of antagonism" toward the growing military-industrial complex, the report praised the fact that "an all-volunteer force offers an obvious opportunity to curb the growth of anti-militaristic sentiment." Nixon's commission did devote some empty rhetoric to downplaying "the fear of increased military aggressiveness or reduced civilian concern" about military actions in the event of an all-volunteer force. But the report's political conclusions were clear: By disconnecting most Americans from the blood-and-guts consequences of war, the end of the draft would "decrease dissent stemming from conscription" and "close one of the channels" of anti-war organizing. Today, such conclusions read like prophecy. Though polls showed that many Americans opposed the Iraq War, that invasion and occupation was historically unprecedented in length and yet never generated the kind of mass protest that earlier shorter wars evoked. Same thing for the Afghanistan War. Same thing for all the forward deployments to far-flung bases and one-off missions.

#### [See the Readiness advantage and Race advantage for more]

### AT NC – Freedom / Kant

#### Turn – the Draft promotes equality – this outweighs any liberty violations because they are inevitable

Bright-Fishbein, 2004 – Writer @ The Brown Daily Herald [Benjamin, Writer @ The Brown Daily Herald and Student at Brown University, The Brown Daily Herald, 11/15/04, <http://www.browndailyherald.com/2004/11/15/the-case-for-a-universal-draft>, Accessed 7/4/16] [Premier]

A draft is the best thing that could happen right now for our country. And to everyone in our liberal community already itching to sink their teeth into my throat, I’ll first remind you that the bill in the House is being proposed by a liberal Democrat from New York. There is no better way to promote equality than through a universal draft. The army is comprised mostly of the poor and working class who have few other options to escape their neighborhoods or obtain education benefits. Does this seem fair? The lower-classes are sacrificing their lives for those fortunate souls who happened to be born in a higher tax bracket. They’re dying for our (supposed) security. Economists would argue that the rich have a free ticket to ride the backs of the poor. They even might suggest taxing the well-off so that the cost of the death of poor soldiers is recovered. But with four more years of Bush on the way, that will never happen. Besides, it is not right that a monetary donation precludes you from service to the nation, even if it’s how the American war factory has worked since its inception. A universal draft would fix this problem with a total integration of the classes. All Americans would share the burden of protecting our country, instead of rationing off the job to those people who don’t have a choice in the matter. Some argue that forced conscription is just as bad as leaving the system the way it is. After all, what’s the point of equality and justice if you’re violating individual rights? To this I say: define “violating.” For example, we can just as easily say that taxes “violate” individual rights: The government takes money away from the people who earned it. But the idea is that society gets that money back in the form of services provided by the government. The same is true of the draft: Young men and women sacrifice their time, and in some cases, their lives, so that we are all better off. Yes, a universal draft may violate individual rights of a few, but it does so in order that everyone else might benefit. Here’s the situation: Either way, there’s going to be injustice. We have a choice: We can be unjust and weak without it, or we can be unjust and strong by universalizing it.

#### Nonunique - The AVF does not treat people as free and equal – economic coercion is as illegitimate as government coercion

Mehr, 2008 – British journalist with multiple publications [Nathaniel, Nathaniel Mehr is a leftwing British journalist whose has written for several publications including The Morning Star newspaper and Tribune magazine and Red Pepper, Conscription Is The Antidote To Militarism And Imperialism, London Progressive Journal, March 28 2008, <http://londonprogressivejournal.com/article/96/conscription-is-the-antidote-to-militarism-and-imperialism>, Accessed July 6th 2016] [Premier]

There is some degree of squeamishness about the idea of a compulsory national service. It is important to consider, however, that such voluntarism as is provided by the current system is largely fictive, as the overwhelming force of economic compulsion ensures a high quota of working class recruits to whom most alternative paths towards well-paid and secure employment have been cut off. A return to national service would confer some significant benefits, providing a positive educational function in matters of discipline and teamwork.

#### No Link – Libertarianism accepts a Minimal State to secure basic liberties – compulsory service is that minimal state - equivalent to taxes, schooling and jury duty.

Gobry ’13 – lecturer at HEC Paris business school (Pascal-Emmanuel, “The Libertarian Case for National Military Service,” Cato Unbound, 9/9, accessed 7/6/16, <http://www.cato-unbound.org/2013/09/09/pascal-emmanuel-gobry/libertarian-case-national-military-service>) [Premier]

An objection sometimes heard from libertarians about military service is that it is illegitimate, i.e. that military service implies a use of a government power that is not within government’s rights. As we’ve seen, for literally thousands of years, most libertarians would have seen this as backwards: only through military service can men truly secure freedom. But let’s take the argument on its merits and see whether it holds up. What powers of the state do libertarians think are legitimate? Libertarians think the state should provide for the national defense. They think it’s legitimate for a state to have a military. Libertarians think it’s legitimate for the state to use violence to take people’s money. If you don’t think taxation is legitimate, you are an anarchist, not a libertarian. Well, military service is a form of in-kind taxation. Money is time. That’s what it is. When I buy a loaf of bread, I exchange a little bit of my time for a little bit of the baker’s time. Perhaps it’s only legitimate for the state to take our time in the form of money and not in its original form, but we know that it’s not true. We think it’s legitimate for the state to mandate children to be educated for approximately twelve years of their life. Twelve years! Not the one or two years of conscription in most countries. Libertarians are very rightly adamant about defending choice in how and where children may be educated, but few libertarians have a problem with the idea that it should be mandatory to educate children. Some libertarians oppose mandatory schooling, but supporting mandatory schooling is hardly libertarian heresy. And the reason why schooling is mandatory is very much the logic for military service: it was thought in the Enlightenment era that education is a prerequisite for freedom just as soldierdom is. Another instance of mandatory work that libertarians are fine with is jury duty. Libertarians, at least in the Anglophone world, very much like the institution of the trial by jury, and this institution couldn’t endure without jury duty. Even if there were enough volunteers to man all juries, volunteer juries would not be a “jury of one’s peers” due to selection effects. It is the random (and, therefore, mandatory) selection of the members of the jury that is thought, under the institution’s logic, to ensure its neutrality. In other words, libertarians are actually fine with the state taking people’s money and time and work if there is a sufficiently compelling interest. Even under the libertarian worldview, if we think carefully, military service might well be unadvisable, but it is not illegitimate.

#### Conscription is essential to the ideal libertarian nation because a population of trained veterans is impossible to conquer – Switzerland proves

Gobry ’13 – lecturer at HEC Paris business school (Pascal-Emmanuel, “The Libertarian Case for National Military Service,” Cato Unbound, 9/9, accessed 7/6/16, <http://www.cato-unbound.org/2013/09/09/pascal-emmanuel-gobry/libertarian-case-national-military-service>) [Premier]

Let’s think of the ideal libertarian country. It would have an economy based on low taxes and free markets. Its legal system would be tolerant of vices like drugs and prostitution. Its government would be decentralized, with most authority sitting with local communities. Its foreign policy would be scrupulously non-interventionist. Its patriotism–for surely its citizens would be proud to live in such a place–would be low-key instead of jingoistic. Citizens would be armed. We can even fantasize that, in such a country, politics would matter so little that most citizens could not even name the leaders of the government. In reality, such a country exists: it’s Switzerland. Libertarians often hold up Switzerland as an example, and they are right to. Outside of some microstates, Switzerland is easily the richest country on Earth. It has been at peace for almost all its history. It is a shining example of democracy. Switzerland also has mandatory military service. Switzerland’s history shows its freedom is intimately bound up with its centuries-long tradition of military service, just like Switzerland’s prosperity is linked to its low taxes. From the start, all able-bodied men were required not only to hold weapons but to take part in mandatory military exercises and serve in the military. And this is what made Switzerland impregnable. For in Medieval war, where battles could turn on a dime and pressed serfs would flee the field of battle at the first sign of defeat, war-trained free men were the most powerful soldiers. The might of the Duke of Burgundy, in the 15th century the richest and most powerful sovereign of Europe, was broken when he tried to invade Switzerland. His expensive mercenaries were crushed by free men defending their homeland. Just as Switzerland is known for chocolate and yodeling, so too it is known that every man in the country is a trained soldier with a rifle. This has proved a formidable deterrent: even Hitler would not dare mess with that hornet’s nest. There can be little doubt that without military service, what we know as Switzerland would be provinces of less-free countries like France and Germany, just like the once-proud dominions of Savoy and Bavaria. Without military service, Switzerland would not be free.

#### Military service must be a libertarian civic duty—failure to serve disrespects the foundations of our freedom and the necessity to expand it

Gobry ’13 – lecturer at HEC Paris business school (Pascal-Emmanuel, “The Libertarian Case for National Military Service,” Cato Unbound, 9/9, accessed 7/6/16, <http://www.cato-unbound.org/2013/09/09/pascal-emmanuel-gobry/libertarian-case-national-military-service>) [Premier]

Today more people than at any point in history live in freedom. Yes, the freedom in countries like the United States, or the UK, or France is not perfect. Yes, American police forces overreach, yes, the drug war is atrocious, yes, the taxes are too high. But on balance Americans are more free than the citizens of all the nations of the past, and most, if not all, nations today. Free to say whatever they want, free to vote for whomever they want, free to start a school or a business. For all that the work of freedom in America is yet to be done, America is a very free country, and this is something American libertarians should ponder. Because–sorry for the cliché–freedom isn’t free. This freedom that we enjoy was bequeathed to us. It was built by others, who left us to continue their work. They were our forefathers, whether literal or spiritual. And because they built this freedom, we get to enjoy it, and stand on their shoulders. Forefathers who marched and agitated and invented and built–and forefathers who fought and died. This kind of talk makes libertarians instinctually recoil, but they shouldn’t. If you live in a country that is a prosperous democracy, don’t you owe at least a little bit of a debt of gratitude to those who came before to build it? It is often said that libertarianism is an ideology of avarice and egocentrism. That to be a libertarian is to be only considered with oneself, and to have no sympathy for others. I know very well that that’s not true. But if libertarianism gets this bad rap, it might be in part because it too often lacks a certain feeling of gratitude. Gratitude for all the freedoms that we do have, despite those that we don’t have. Milton Friedman supported President Reagan’s military buildup not because he suddenly became enamored with government spending or the military-industrial complex, but because he recognized that the greatest threat to freedom in the world in the 1980s was the Soviet Union, and its greatest ally was American strength. Our governments are very often enemies of freedom, but freedom also has enemies from without. It is a stubborn, sad fact of human life on this Earth that for any country that is free, that freedom was built by ancestors and is ultimately secured by force of arms. And in turn, we owe these ancestors to serve their memory and to serve our future generations by protecting and expanding this freedom. And this sort of citizenship, which is the right one, could have a requirement of military service. For in a country of free citizens, military service need not be an institution of unjust oppression. It can be a pillar of freedom.

#### Compulsory service ensures the conditions Necessary for freedom – a nation isn’t free if it is reliant on mercenaries for defense – a conscripted army will not enforce tyranny – empirically proven.

Gobry ’13 – lecturer at HEC Paris business school (Pascal-Emmanuel, “The Libertarian Case for National Military Service,” Cato Unbound, 9/9, accessed 7/6/16, <http://www.cato-unbound.org/2013/09/09/pascal-emmanuel-gobry/libertarian-case-national-military-service>) [Premier]

Today most libertarians view military service as the antithesis of freedom. If nothing else, this view is strikingly ahistorical. Up until late in the 20th century, it was seen as self-evident that freedom is ultimately secured by force of arms, and that private citizens’ duty to freedom was to be able to defend that freedom. Standing, professional armies were seen as the tool of tyrants, and people understood that a professional army that can repel a foreign invasion can also oppress a free, unarmed people, while an army of free men is not so easily led on an endeavor of oppression. Ultimately, men are not truly free if they must rely on some other group of people for their defense. In the civil realm, this is well understood by libertarians. Libertarians understand perfectly that men have a natural right to self-defense, and that to entrust only the police with the means to keep order is to give the state a tool for tyranny. A free man must be able to take his defense in his own hands. In ancient Athens, one reason why only free men could vote was because only they could afford the expensive armament of the hoplite. Free men were soldiers and soldiers were free men. Athenian freedom created the greatest flowering of civilization in the ancient world. Athenian citizen-soldiers, superior to kings’ slave armies, built and protected what was essentially the world’s first free-trade area, creating the prosperity that enabled Archimedes to invent, Sophocles to write, Phidias to sculpt and Socrates to midwife philosophy. Medieval monarchs would never allow a conscript military, despite its superiority, as they understood that bearing arms was the privilege of the free man, and to let all men do it, as opposed to an aristocracy of warriors, would quickly undermine their power. This coeval link between free citizenship and military service did not just exist in the ancient world: the American republic was also founded on it. In the contemporary American political context, liberals and conservatives squabble over the meaning of the Militia Clause of the Second Amendment. Conservatives think the Clause is essentially decoration, and does not limit an individual right to bear arms. Liberals think the Clause means a right to bear arms can only be exercised within the context of militias (plural), i.e. organized civil defense bodies. But they’re both wrong—and, nowadays, neither side would probably like to acknowledge what the Second Amendment really says. For in 18th century America, “the militia” (singular) did not refer to any specific organization. Instead it referred to the whole of able-bodied men, presumed ready and willing to bear arms in defense of the nation, as they did in the War of Independence. Under the Founders-era American constitutional system, Congress would maintain a navy to protect trade, and raise an army when the need arose. This army would be powerful and easy to raise since it would come from the militia, that is to say, the community of citizen-soldiers. The Founding Fathers, full of Enlightenment belief in individual freedom, clearly had in mind a system akin to Switzerland or Athens, where citizenship implied soldierdom. As all other freedom-loving peoples up to then, they saw a standing, professional army as the instrument of tyrants like the British king. The Second Amendment was considered important, then, not so much to protect the right to individual self-defense, but much more so to ensure that America would remain a country of citizen-soldiers—that is to say, of free men.

#### Conscientious objector status solves coercion—it ensures personal freedom and is empirically effective in Germany and Israel

Gobry ’13 – lecturer at HEC Paris business school (Pascal-Emmanuel, “The Libertarian Case for National Military Service,” Cato Unbound, 9/9, accessed 7/6/16, <http://www.cato-unbound.org/2013/09/09/pascal-emmanuel-gobry/libertarian-case-national-military-service>) [Premier]

The first is about coercion. Just like mandatory schooling is only legitimate if there are exceptions for people to opt-out, such as by homeschooling, military service would not be legitimate without proper allowances for conscientious objectors. It’s easy to come up with mechanisms that allow conscientious objectors to opt-out from religious service. In Israel, religious students are exempted. In Germany, young people are given the option of military or civil service.

#### A draft wouldn’t force people into violent war zones – most conscripted personnel are in logistics

Gobry ’13 – lecturer at HEC Paris business school (Pascal-Emmanuel, “The Libertarian Case for National Military Service,” Cato Unbound, 9/9, accessed 7/6/16, <http://www.cato-unbound.org/2013/09/09/pascal-emmanuel-gobry/libertarian-case-national-military-service>) [Premier]

Another one is the idea that military service means everyone will have to fight in a war. This is just untrue. In most militaries, frontline infantry are only a small minority of total military personnel, and those are usually picked among volunteers. A modern military requires an enormous apparatus for logistics and support, done by soldiers who are never shot at. Nowadays it’s quite possible, and even easy, to spend an entire military career without ever seeing battle. At the height of the Vietnam War, there were eight support soldiers for each frontline soldier. Even in Israel, a country which is in a perpetual state of low-level warfare, only a minority of conscripts ever see battle. For most people, military service merely involves wearing ugly green and running around in the muck while a guy yells at you.

#### Turn – Libertarianism is exploited to promote empire – the volunteer military has promoted intervention

Mehr, 2008 – British journalist with multiple publications [Nathaniel, Nathaniel Mehr is a leftwing British journalist whose has written for several publications including The Morning Star newspaper and Tribune magazine and Red Pepper, Conscription Is The Antidote To Militarism And Imperialism, London Progressive Journal, March 28 2008, <http://londonprogressivejournal.com/article/96/conscription-is-the-antidote-to-militarism-and-imperialism>, Accessed July 6th 2016] [Premier]

Those analysts who, prior to 2003, warned of a Vietnam-style catastrophe in Iraq, underestimated the scale of the disaster. For the conscripts who served in Vietnam were drawn from all sections of civil society. Integrated into the social life of the country, their disaffection eventually permeated US society and exerted a powerful motive force in the peace movement in that country. The demise of conscription, apparently motivated by decent liberal notions of voluntarism and respect for personal autonomy, has in actual fact been a very positive development from the point of view of imperialism.

### AT T – National Service

#### Counter interpretation – national service just means compulsory and universal service

Lind, 2003 - Senior fellow at the New American Foundation [Michael, United We Serve, ed: Dionne, p. 122] [Premier]

It is necessary to limit the conversation at the outset to compulsory, universal service. All too often enthusiasts for national service confuse the issue by labeling voluntary programs, like AmeriCorps, as examples of “national service”. But the rather marginal AmeriCorps program, in which few Americans participate, should not be confused with genuine national service, conceived of as a universal or nearly universal program. By the same token, the Job Corps, the Peace Corps, and VISTA are not national service programs. Only a tiny minority of Americans of any generation take part. Despite the hopes of the national service lobby, it is unlikely that such small, voluntary programs will ever prove to be the seeds of universal programs, which would necessarily be compulsory. On the contrary, AmeriCorps and similar programs may well prove to be substitutes for genuine national service, not pilot projects for it. If national service is to be meaningful, then it has to be universal; and if it is to be universal, it must be mandatory. It must be based, in other words, on universal conscription—a draft or a comparable mandatory requirement, like jury attendance. National service must impose a duty on citizens, the evasion of which is punishable by fines, imprisonment, or both.

# Negative

## CPs

### CP – CMR

#### Counterplan text: The United States federal government should increase interaction between civilians and career military personnel by

1: facilitating continued education at civilian institutions for military officers

2: providing members with the ability to take a year of unpaid leave

3: offering shorter commitment options to active-duty personnel

#### The counterplan closes the gap—it encourages productive dialogue and exchange between military personnel and civilians and allows for more socioeconomically diverse recruitment

Wetherbee ’07 –fellow at Center for the Study of the Presidency and Congress (Michael A., “Closing the Civil-Military Gap,” accessed 7/5/16, <http://cspc.nonprofitsoapbox.com/storage/documents/Vater/Wetherbee.pdf>) [Premier]

Outside of the cadet and midshipmen realm, there are many other structural steps that can be taken to close the civil-military gap. One possibility is providing more opportunity for military officers to further their education at civilian institutions. Feaver and Kohn argue, “It is essential that the military continue to expose its most promising officers to the civilian world. This must include advanced degrees in residence at civilian universities, particularly for graduates of service academies.”lxxiii Another possibility to close the gap would be to provide career military members the opportunity to take a year of unpaid leave midway through their careers.lxxiv This could be beneficial to both sides of the civil-military gap. On one side, it would give military members an opportunity to take a break from the military lifestyle and reengage with the civilian population. It may also instill in them more creative ideas that they may have been closed off to in the confines of the military. On the other side, it would allow civilians to interact with military members, and build a greater understanding of the military that they otherwise could not do. This program would have little financial implications for the government, and would be a great way to close the civil-military gap. Promoting short-term service is another widely supported structural change to closing the civil military gap. As Lehman and Sicherman suggest, we should “Promote short-term service. The military should target a broader socioeconomic spectrum when recruiting both officers and enlisted personnel. To that end, it should offer shorter commitments to active-duty service and increase opportunities for service members to continue their commitments in the federal reserves or National Guard.”lxxv Steps have already been taken to do this such as the law sponsored by Senators John McCain and Evan Bay, in October of 2003, “that enables volunteers to sign up for fifteen months of service on active duty (after basic and advance training), followed by twenty-four months in the reserves, and then either a period of availability in the nondrilling Individual Ready Reserves or civilian service in the Americorps or the Peace Corps.”lxxvi

#### Turn – some action is good, but closing the gap for a social agenda lets civilian values neuter the military. The counterplan is a better compromise

Wetherbee ’07 –fellow at Center for the Study of the Presidency and Congress (Michael A., “Closing the Civil-Military Gap,” accessed 7/5/16, <http://cspc.nonprofitsoapbox.com/storage/documents/Vater/Wetherbee.pdf>) [Premier]

Thus, there is clearly a civil-military gap in the United States today. Some may argue, however, that this civil-military gap is not only acceptable, but also necessary. To a certain extent, these people are right. John F. Lehman and Harvey Sicherman argue that “We must understand that there will always be a gap between the culture(s) of the military and that of civilian society, and recognize that the preferences of would-be social reformers may have negative effects on the professionalism of the military institution.”xxix Additionally, “an effective military has its own distinctive culture, one that emphasizes honor, courage, and selfsacrifice under a command structure.”xxx They are not alone in this valid assertion. Peter Feaver, a co-editor of Soldiers and Civilians: The Civil-Military Gap and American Nation Security, also recognizes this vital aspect of military culture: “Difference between civilian and military are, of course, necessary and desirable: even in a society based on civil liberty, personal autonomy, and democratic governance, military institutions must subordinate the individual to the group, and personal well-being to the mission accomplishment.”xxxi Finally, Will Marshall, the President of the Progressive Policy institute, also recognizes this vital difference between military and civilian society. He writes, “The U.S. military is the repository for the stern martial virtues of honor, valor, nationalism, discipline, and self-sacrifice. The academy is the wellspring of the postmodern values of personal autonomy, self-expression, cultural diversity, and profound skepticism of authority of any kind.”xxxii There are clearly distinct differences between the military and civilian society, and these differences are vital to an effective military institution. Although a wide gap between the civilian and military world can be dangerous, we must be careful in trying to reduce the gap. If the gap is reduced too much, it would negatively effect the military institution and could compromise national security. Lehman and Sicherman argue that, “Attempts to erase this divide by ‘civilianizing’ the military, or by making the services the focus of social experiments, risk serious harm to efficiency and morale.”xxxiii As a result of this, they believe “Disruptive social innovations, such as allowing women in combat or tolerating openly homosexual personnel, must be evaluated primarily by their effect on readiness, morale, and training.”xxxiv While this is true, and military effectiveness should always be the key concern in creating military policies, there should be room for factoring in social benefits. At the operational level, the only concern can be military effectiveness. At the strategic level, however, some thought should be given to how social changes within the military can affect our national goals. Thus, there needs to be a balance between creating a military that reflects American society and creating an effective military that is not a mirror of American society. As Gregory Foster notes in Civil-Military Gap: What are the ethics, “This sort of gap needs to be managed, but it does not have to be closed. Eliminating the gap might solve the "problem" that the military does not look like society, but it might create a greater one--that the military will look too much like society.”xxxv The civil-military gap is crucial to military effectiveness, and we must be careful to not destroy it. At the same time, it is important to make sure that we don’t let it grow too large.

### CP – Incentives

#### Text: The Department of Defense should substantially increase pay scales for enlisted recruits, improve conditions of on base housing, and increase post service education incentives.

#### Incentives solve military readiness – current threadbare benefits discourage enlistment

Lacey, 03 – US Army Reserve officer (James, Symposium - Q: Is restoring universal military conscription in the United States a good idea? NO: The modern military needs a smaller force of highly motivated, trained professionals, not a horde of draftees. Insight on the News, 4 Feb 2003, http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_m1571/is\_4\_19/ai\_97450991 Accessed 4 July 2016) [Premier]

Now that we are locked in a death struggle with terrorists, facing a war with Iraq and possibly having to confront a belligerent North Korea, there is little doubt that we will have to expand our military. The way to meet the increased manpower requirements is not by instituting a draft or lowering standards. It is by making the military a field that will attract more of the nation's youth. That means increasing pay. It is criminal that young married soldiers have to go on food stamps to feed their families. It also means that soldiers should have better living conditions when they are at their home station. When the active-duty soldiers left Fort Dix, N.J., a number of the barracks were given over to the justice system to be used as prisons. The same barracks that were good enough to house our soldiers required $40 million in improvements before being deemed fit enough to house convicted felons.

#### Voluntary incentives solves military readiness but avoids politics

Thompson, 07 - Pulitzer Prize-winning reporter (Mark, Would National Service Be Better Than the Draft? TIME, 30 Aug 2007, [http://content.time.com/time/specials/2007/article/0,28804,1657256\_1657626\_1656898,00.html](http://content.time.com/time/specials/2007/article/0%2C28804%2C1657256_1657626_1656898%2C00.html) Accessed 5 July 2016) [Premier]

David Segal, another prominent military sociologist, also thinks national service would be a good idea for the country. "The military is opposed to a broad national service system because they assume that they would get the short end of the stick," says Segal, director of the University of Maryland's Center for Research on Military Organization. Pentagon complaints that draftees would dull the military's fighting prowess are bogus, he says. "The distinction we make between combat and combat support doesn't reflect the realities of 21st Century warfare," he says. "We're sending individuals from the Air Force and the Navy to be soldiers." Segal says it is "political suicide" to advocate for a draft amid a war, but says a program of national service would have a better chance because of its non-military options. He argues that it should not be compulsory, but strongly encouraged: college loans and grants might be contingent upon such services, as would public employment and maybe even drivers' licenses. "It should be as minimally coercive as possible," Segal says. "You need to reward it with a carrot rather than punishing non-compliance with a stick."

### CP – Libertarian Exemption

#### Allowing a Libertarian objection exemption solves for most of the case, the Liberty violations in the Neg case, and for government spending.

Ricks, 12 – fellow @ Center for a New American Security (Thomas, Let’s Draft Our Kids, New York Times, 9 July 2012, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/10/opinion/lets-draft-our-kids.html?\_r=1 Accessed 05 July 2016) [Premier]

A revived draft, including both males and females, should include three options for new conscripts coming out of high school. Some could choose 18 months of military service with low pay but excellent post-service benefits, including free college tuition. These conscripts would not be deployed but could perform tasks currently outsourced at great cost to the Pentagon: paperwork, painting barracks, mowing lawns, driving generals around, and generally doing lower-skills tasks so professional soldiers don’t have to. If they want to stay, they could move into the professional force and receive weapons training, higher pay and better benefits. Those who don’t want to serve in the army could perform civilian national service for a slightly longer period and equally low pay — teaching in low-income areas, cleaning parks, rebuilding crumbling infrastructure, or aiding the elderly. After two years, they would receive similar benefits like tuition aid. And libertarians who object to a draft could opt out. Those who declined to help Uncle Sam would in return pledge to ask nothing from him — no Medicare, no subsidized college loans and no mortgage guarantees. Those who want minimal government can have it.

### CP – Non-Combatant

#### A non-combat military and civilian draft would solve for military readiness and expand economic growth by creating jobs, protecting infrastructure and reducing government spending.

Ricks, 12 – fellow @ Center for a New American Security (Thomas, Let’s Draft Our Kids, New York Times, 9 July 2012, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/10/opinion/lets-draft-our-kids.html?\_r=1 Accessed 05 July 2016) [Premier]

A revived draft, including both males and females, should include three options for new conscripts coming out of high school. Some could choose 18 months of military service with low pay but excellent post-service benefits, including free college tuition. These conscripts would not be deployed but could perform tasks currently outsourced at great cost to the Pentagon: paperwork, painting barracks, mowing lawns, driving generals around, and generally doing lower-skills tasks so professional soldiers don’t have to. If they want to stay, they could move into the professional force and receive weapons training, higher pay and better benefits. Those who don’t want to serve in the army could perform civilian national service for a slightly longer period and equally low pay — teaching in low-income areas, cleaning parks, rebuilding crumbling infrastructure, or aiding the elderly. After two years, they would receive similar benefits like tuition aid. And libertarians who object to a draft could opt out. Those who declined to help Uncle Sam would in return pledge to ask nothing from him — no Medicare, no subsidized college loans and no mortgage guarantees. Those who want minimal government can have it. Critics will argue that this is a political non-starter. It may be now. But America has already witnessed far less benign forms of conscription. A new draft that maintains the size and the quality of the current all-volunteer force, saves the government money through civilian national service and frees professional soldiers from performing menial tasks would appeal to many constituencies. Photo Credit Ross MacDonald Others argue that the numbers don’t add up. With an average cohort of about four million 18-year-olds annually, they say, there is simply no place to put all these people. But the government could use this cheap labor in new ways, doing jobs that governments do in other countries but which have been deemed too expensive in this one, like providing universal free day care or delivering meals to elderly shut-ins. And if too many people applied for the 18-month military program, then a lottery system could be devised — the opposite of the 1970s-era system where being selected was hardly desirable. The rest could perform nonmilitary national service. A final objection is the price tag; this program would cost billions of dollars. But it also would save billions, especially if implemented broadly and imaginatively. One reason our relatively small military is hugely expensive is that all of today’s volunteer soldiers are paid well; they often have spouses and children who require housing and medical care. Unmarried conscripts don’t need such a safety net. And much of the labor currently contracted out to the private sector could be performed by 18-year-olds for much less. And we could raise the retirement age for the professional force from 20 to 30 years of service. There is no reason to kick healthy 40-year-olds out of the military and then give them full retirement pay for 40 years. These reforms would greatly reduce both recruiting and pension costs. Similarly, some of the civilian service programs would help save the government money: Taking food to an elderly shut-in might keep that person from having to move into a nursing home. It would be fairly cheap to house conscript soldiers on closed military bases. Housing civilian service members would be more expensive, but imaginative use of existing assets could save money. For example, V.A. hospitals might have space. The pool of cheap labor available to the federal government would broadly lower its current personnel costs and its pension obligations — especially if the law told federal managers to use the civilian service as much as possible, and wherever plausible. The government could also make this cheap labor available to states and cities. Imagine how many local parks could be cleaned and how much could be saved if a few hundred New York City school custodians were 19, energetic and making $15,000 plus room and board, instead of 50, tired and making $106,329, the top base salary for the city’s public school custodians, before overtime. The savings actually might be a way of bringing around the unions representing federal, state and municipal workers, because they understand that there is a huge budget crunch that is going to hit the federal government in a few years. Setting up a new non-career tier of cheap, young labor might be a way of preserving existing jobs for older, more skilled, less mobile union workers.

### CP – Recruiters

#### CP Text: School districts should regulate the presence of military recruiters in accordance with the proposals of Kershner and Harding.

Kershner and Harding 15[Seth Kershner & Scott Harding, “Do Military Recruiters Belong in Schools?”, Education Week, October 27, 2015] [Premier]

**If recruiters are to remain in schools**, **we suggest** public school districts across the United States adopt **the following policies**: • **Districts should require military recruiters to remain in one part of the school only**. In too many instances, they are allowed to roam the hallways in search of students, or often sit with students eating alone in the cafeteria. We think most school officials would balk if a recruiter from another organization expected such access. Military recruiters should be held to that same standard. • **Districts should limit recruitment visits to one per branch of the military per year**. As shown in Connecticut, weekly visits by recruiters to individual schools are common. Students in public settings should not be overexposed to information about just one potential career path. • Restricting **recruiter visits** to schools is important, but to make this policy effective, "visits" **should** be broadly defined to **include any activity** by a military recruiter **in which student contact is made**. This would include not only traditional table set-ups, but also activities like classroom presentations by military personnel. • **Districts should require recruiters to fully disclose the health risks of military service.** Among the more than 800 Texas high school students who told researchers Adam McGlynn and Jessica Lavariega-Monforti that they had had contact with military recruiters, 86 percent said they were never told about the possible risks of military service. At the least, recruiters should be required to tell students that if they join the military, they may end up in combat. • To ensure these rules are followed, **a designated military monitor should be present at all times when recruiters interact with students**. **Such a policy has been successfully implemented in the Seattle public schools**, where the Parent Teacher and Student Association, or PTSA, assigns a parent to monitor the military during school visits by recruiters. Efforts to regulate the presence of recruiters invariably produce strong opposition. The military and veterans' groups claim that such sensible reforms are "anti-military" and undermine the ability to recruit new service members. But advocates, parents, and teachers who wish to protect students should not be intimidated. This is not about being for, or against, the military. It is about **ensuring** that high schools do not become de facto recruiting stations, and that **all young people have equal access to educational opportunities.**

### CP – ROTC

#### Counterplan text: The United States federal government should expand opportunities for ROTC cadets and midshipmen by:

1: supporting the development of summer seminars for them as well as students of elite institutions

2: increasing funding for them to attend regular-year conferences

3: creating a framework for them to attend elite institutions for individual semesters

4: permitting them to take a year off after their sophomore year

5: altering the scholarship system and creating intensive summer training.

#### Counterplan solves—bridges perceived differences and builds quality individual military-civilian relationships

Wetherbee ’07 –fellow at Center for the Study of the Presidency and Congress (Michael A., “Closing the Civil-Military Gap,” accessed 7/5/16, <http://cspc.nonprofitsoapbox.com/storage/documents/Vater/Wetherbee.pdf>) [Premier]

Although adjusting the ROTC program would help to close the civil-military gap, there still will be a field of young officer candidates who would not be affected, Academy cadets and midshipmen. Currently, these cadets and midshipmen are the most segregated from society, and thus pose the biggest threat to a civil-military gap. Despite the restrictive nature of a military academy, there are steps that could be taken to help close this gap. The gap could be addressed by creating multiple week seminars in the summer for cadet and midshipmen as well as students and elite institutions. By having a thorough interaction, both parties could learn about each other and address the perceived differences that they may have. This could provide for a better understanding of each other in the near future, as well as help to build relationships that would help bridge the civil-military gap as both parties progressed in their careers. A similar approach to the problem is providing more funding for military cadets and midshipmen to attend academic and leadership conferences at civilian institutions throughout the academic year. Once again, this would be a small step to address the civil-military gap by allowing individuals to debunk their perceived differences. Another possibility, which may seem radical to some, is sending a handful of military cadets to a top-tier college for a semester. For many it may not seem possible to allow a cadet to miss a semester of their military training; however, there are dozens of cadets at each academy every semester who are sent on exchange to other foreign or domestic service academies. Thus, it would be reasonable to send the top cadets or midshipmen, who could survive with seven rather than eight semesters of military training, to a civilian college for a semester. This would provide cadets with an opportunity to study topics they may not be able to study at their institution, and would allow them to immerse themselves in the civilian population. This could be a great learning experience for both cadets and civilians alike. The final and most practical solution for military cadets and midshipmen, is allowing them to take a year off after their sophomore year before they commit to their academy. This would provide the option for many cadets to take a year off and immerse themselves in the civilian world and share there military experiences. They could spend a year attending a civilian college, working for humanitarian organizations, working a normal job, or traveling. This program would incur no additional cost to the government, and the only mitigating factor would be that some cadets and midshipmen would choose not to return to the Academy. In the long run, however, this would be good for the military, because those cadets or midshipmen who did not return, clearly were not that committed to the military.

#### That closes the gap—attracts more elites to ROTC programs and discourages schools from excluding ROTC cadets

Wetherbee ’07 –fellow at Center for the Study of the Presidency and Congress (Michael A., “Closing the Civil-Military Gap,” accessed 7/5/16, <http://cspc.nonprofitsoapbox.com/storage/documents/Vater/Wetherbee.pdf>) [Premier]

As effective as Kohn’s idea would be in closing the civil-military gap, it would make ROTC highly expensive and thus inefficient. It may be argued that today ROTC is too inexpensive and focused on efficiency, but the correct trajectory probably does not lie as far away as Kohn suggests. Rather, a proper ROTC program must factor in both the ideas of efficiently producing officers, as well as attracting the best and the brightest to the ROTC program. This could be done is by slightly restructuring the current ROTC program, and creating different types of scholarships. This has been done to a certain extent already, but not enough to guarantee that the program attracts the best and the brightest. Thus, for all services there should be a top level scholarship that will be full tuition for any academic intuition, and is valid in any field of studies. Additionally, intensive summer military training should be established for those students, who reaching a ROTC detachment during the academic year, is not feasible. This type of scholarship would attract the most elite members of society, and would prevent top intuitions from claiming that it is not logistically possible for ROTC cadets to attend their schools. Additionally, there should still be a scholarship for technical fields that is good for tuition at any institution. This would provide the military with the expertise necessary to meet high tech requirements, while continuing to close the civil-military gap. Finally, there should be capped scholarships that are good for any major and for certain majors at any academic institution. By restructuring the ROTC program in this manner, it would make the program more logistically difficult as well as more expensive. On the other hand, it would make ROTC more available as well as attractive to the entire nation. Thus, it would have the opportunity to produce better officers who would be more representative of the population as a whole, helping to close the civil-military gap.

#### Turn – some action is good, but closing the gap for a social agenda lets civilian values neuter the military. The counterplan is a better compromise

Wetherbee ’07 –fellow at Center for the Study of the Presidency and Congress (Michael A., “Closing the Civil-Military Gap,” accessed 7/5/16, <http://cspc.nonprofitsoapbox.com/storage/documents/Vater/Wetherbee.pdf>) [Premier]

Thus, there is clearly a civil-military gap in the United States today. Some may argue, however, that this civil-military gap is not only acceptable, but also necessary. To a certain extent, these people are right. John F. Lehman and Harvey Sicherman argue that “We must understand that there will always be a gap between the culture(s) of the military and that of civilian society, and recognize that the preferences of would-be social reformers may have negative effects on the professionalism of the military institution.”xxix Additionally, “an effective military has its own distinctive culture, one that emphasizes honor, courage, and selfsacrifice under a command structure.”xxx They are not alone in this valid assertion. Peter Feaver, a co-editor of Soldiers and Civilians: The Civil-Military Gap and American Nation Security, also recognizes this vital aspect of military culture: “Difference between civilian and military are, of course, necessary and desirable: even in a society based on civil liberty, personal autonomy, and democratic governance, military institutions must subordinate the individual to the group, and personal well-being to the mission accomplishment.”xxxi Finally, Will Marshall, the President of the Progressive Policy institute, also recognizes this vital difference between military and civilian society. He writes, “The U.S. military is the repository for the stern martial virtues of honor, valor, nationalism, discipline, and self-sacrifice. The academy is the wellspring of the postmodern values of personal autonomy, self-expression, cultural diversity, and profound skepticism of authority of any kind.”xxxii There are clearly distinct differences between the military and civilian society, and these differences are vital to an effective military institution. Although a wide gap between the civilian and military world can be dangerous, we must be careful in trying to reduce the gap. If the gap is reduced too much, it would negatively effect the military institution and could compromise national security. Lehman and Sicherman argue that, “Attempts to erase this divide by ‘civilianizing’ the military, or by making the services the focus of social experiments, risk serious harm to efficiency and morale.”xxxiii As a result of this, they believe “Disruptive social innovations, such as allowing women in combat or tolerating openly homosexual personnel, must be evaluated primarily by their effect on readiness, morale, and training.”xxxiv While this is true, and military effectiveness should always be the key concern in creating military policies, there should be room for factoring in social benefits. At the operational level, the only concern can be military effectiveness. At the strategic level, however, some thought should be given to how social changes within the military can affect our national goals. Thus, there needs to be a balance between creating a military that reflects American society and creating an effective military that is not a mirror of American society. As Gregory Foster notes in Civil-Military Gap: What are the ethics, “This sort of gap needs to be managed, but it does not have to be closed. Eliminating the gap might solve the "problem" that the military does not look like society, but it might create a greater one--that the military will look too much like society.”xxxv The civil-military gap is crucial to military effectiveness, and we must be careful to not destroy it. At the same time, it is important to make sure that we don’t let it grow too large.

#### ROTC reform solves the gap —it will combat the increasing academic elite disdain for military involvement

Wetherbee ’07 –fellow at Center for the Study of the Presidency and Congress (Michael A., “Closing the Civil-Military Gap,” accessed 7/5/16, <http://cspc.nonprofitsoapbox.com/storage/documents/Vater/Wetherbee.pdf>) [Premier]

Moving to a medium-sized attack on the problem, the presidency could seek to close the civil-military gap by addressing the ways the ROTC program could be improved. The ROTC program, which used to be a bastion for elite members of society to find military service, has now been banned from many elite academic institutions. For example, “Such top universities as Harvard, Yale, Stanford, University of Chicago, Brown, and Columbia do not even allow ROTC access to campus to present the option of military service and the scholarships to their students.”lix Over the last half century, there has been a remarkable change in attitude towards military service in these institutions. For example, in 1956, only 51 years ago “400 out of 750 in Princeton’s graduating class went into the military.”lx Yet, during the heart of the War on Terror, only nine out of approximately 1,100 graduating seniors from Princeton entered military service, and this was the highest number of any Ivy League school.lxi Similarly, in 1956, 1,100 Stanford students participated in ROTC, while today there are only 29.lxii These numbers are not that surprising considering the all-volunteer military has steadily shifted towards the right, while the elite institutions have moved towards the left. This occurrence has created a hostile environment for ROTC cadets on many campuses, and makes it believable that, “Members of Harvard’s faculty have reportedly yelled out disparaging remarks to a passing ROTC student in uniform.”lxiii ROTC clearly faces many strong obstacles on these campuses, when “many professors on elite campuses want to ban the military, out of dislike for war and opposition to Department of Defense policies.”lxiv

#### The counterplan’s key to the gap—current ROTC system allows the military to deliberately ignore collegiate elites because they’re perceived as “short-timers”

Wetherbee ’07 –fellow at Center for the Study of the Presidency and Congress (Michael A., “Closing the Civil-Military Gap,” accessed 7/5/16, <http://cspc.nonprofitsoapbox.com/storage/documents/Vater/Wetherbee.pdf>) [Premier]

The barriers for the elites in society joining the military are not completely one sided. Although many elite institutions show animosity towards the military, the department of defense shows a lack of willingness to overcome this animosity and recruit at elite institutions. For example, John Lehman, who served as secretary of the navy for President Ronald Reagan, has said he is “frequently asked for help by outstanding students who have gotten a cold shoulder from recruiters; some have been put off for years.”lxvi He asserts that many “Navy recruiters try to deter anyone who won’t make a career commitment to the service at the officer level, including Ivy Leaguers, who are perceived as ‘short timers.’”lxvii He feels that because the Navy is only interested in long term recruits, they are missing out on the elite members of society who would like to serve their country, but have long term ambitions outside of military service. Feaver and Richard Kohn make a similar assertion, noting that “beancounters and ‘culture warriors’ in the Pentagon and congress want to shut down high-cost/low-yield ROTC programs, and punish schools for anti-military attitudes.”lxviii They argue that rather than trying to make ROTC as efficient as possible, it “should be expanded without regard to ‘yield’ until such time as the entire officer accession process can be revised to provide the presence ROTC affords in civilian society.”lxix This is because it must “be recognized that ROTC not only recruits high-quality young officers, but could also create relationships between elite youth and the military.”lxx Today, it seems that the ROTC program is clearly focused on raw yield, rather than recruiting the best possible officer candidates, or improving civil military relations. Currently, the number of ROTC slots is limited, and “Nearly half of all slots are in schools in the South, [and] almost all are allocated to state universities.” It is far easier to get a ROTC scholarship from certain small Christian southern schools than it is to win one of a few slots allocated to Princeton.”lxxi By sending ROTC Cadets to inexpensive states or southern Christian school, this type of a system clearly provides for a high yield of officers, but it does not competitively attract the best and the brightest and it does not provide for a regionally diversified military.

### CP – XO

#### CP Text: Congress will modify the Authorization for Use of Military Force, cut funding for military operations, and increase its oversight powers on the President. Solves warfighting since the President can no longer initiate wars without mass support.

Cohen 12 (Michael, fellow at the Century Foundation, “The Imperial Presidency: Drone Power and Congressional Oversight,” <http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/12194/the-imperial-presidency-drone-power-and-congressional-oversight>) [Premier]

In a sense we are witnessing a perfect storm of executive branch power-grabbing: a broad authorization of military force giving the president wide-ranging discretion to act, combined with a set of tools -- drones, special forces and cyber technology -- that allows him to do so in unprecedented ways. And since few troops are put in harm’s way, there is barely any public scrutiny. Congress has the ability to stop these excesses. On Libya, it possessed the power to turn off the financial spigot and cut off funding, and indeed, there was a tepid effort in the House of Representatives to do so. On the AUMF, Congress could simply repeal it or more realistically modify it to take into account the new battlefields in the war on terror. Finally, it could conduct greater oversight, in particular public hearings, of how the executive branch is utilizing military force. But not only has Congress not taken these steps, in deliberations over the National Defense Authorization Act earlier this year, it tried to expand the AUMF. On the use of drones and targeted killings, Congress has made little effort to demand greater information from the White House and has not held any public hearings on either of these issues. As Micah Zenko recently noted, claims “that congressional oversight of targeted killings exclusively by the intelligence committees in closed sessions is adequate” are “indefensible.”

## DAs

### Adventurism

#### [Also see AT Adventurism]

#### Conscription empirically is associated with more military disputes – by increasing the amount of soldiers, states are incentivized to lash out with newfound power

Poutvaara 09 [Panu Professor of Economics at the University of Munich and Director of the Ifo Center for International Institutional Comparisons and Migration Research, received his doctorate from the University of Helsinki, was Visiting Fellow at Harvard University through Fulbright Program, worked as Research Fellow at CEBR in Denmark, and as professor at the University of Helsinki from 2005 until September 2010; Institute for the Study of Labor; “The Political Economy of Conscription”; September 2009; 8/10/17] [Premier]

Despite the use of conscription in most wars in the 19th and 20th centuries, advocates of conscription sometimes contend that using a military draft breaks militaristic ideologies of societies and limits the inducement for aggressive foreign interventions. By imposing casualties on all groups of society, military adventurism is politically less sustainable and faces greater public resistance with a draft system. Hence, a peace-loving population would opt for military conscription rather than for professional soldiers. Empirically, this “peacemaker” argumentation is questionable. As argued by many opponents of conscription, the draft may actually contribute to a militarization of society. By teaching all (male) citizens how to use weapons and kill, and instilling in them the view that killing for the home country is a patriotic duty, draft fosters processes by which civil societies organize themselves for the production of violence, and thereby increases the likelihood and severity of armed conflicts.14 Between 1800 and 1945, basically all wars in Europe were fought with conscript armies, and democratic countries like the U.S. and France later used conscript military in their colonial wars in Vietnam and Algeria. Analyzing militarized interstate disputes from 1886 to 1992 systematically, Choi and James (2003) find that a military manpower system based on conscripted soldiers is associated with more military disputes than professional or voluntary armies. Based on cross-sectional data from 1980 Anderson et al. (1996) conclude also that “warlike” states are more likely to rely on conscription.

#### Turn - Militarism in US leadership means conscription will be coopted as a way to mobilize quickly

Choi and James 03, SEUNG-WHAN CHOI Norman Paterson School of International Affairs Carleton University, Ottawa PATRICK JAMES Department of Political Science University of Missouri, Columbia. No Professional Soldiers, No Militarized Interstate Disputes? A NEW QUESTION FOR NEO-KANTIANISM. JOURNAL OF CONFLICT RESOLUTION, Vol. 47 No. 6, December 2003 [Premier]

Once military influence in civil-military relations increases, however, a greater propensity for war is likely to follow (Schofield 2000; Feaver 1999; Allison, Carnesale, and Nye 1985; Benjamin and Edinger 1971). Conventional wisdom about bureaucratic politics holds that “where you stand depends on where you sit” (Gray 1975, 86). Because military leaders are what Lasswell (1941) called “specialists on violence,” they have a lower average level of aversion to interstate war than do civilian leaders. Through an examination of civil-military relations in Germany, France, and Russia before World War I, Van Evera (1984) and Snyder (1984) uncover “the cult of the offensive,” in which military leaders are more inclined than civilian leaders to use force. Because conscripted soldiers are well suited for military missions and represent a less expensive means in the shortest possible time, military advice to civilian leaders will be inclined to make use of them for rapid deployment (Chambers 1987, 268). Furthermore, mass mobilization under conscription often is used to change the sta- tus quo or facilitate the launch of a military attack. In this context, conscription can be 9 considered **a driving force behind at least some international conflict**. National leaders are likely to become more interventionist because conscripted soldiers reduce the relative cost of pursuing that option (Beukema 1982, 489; Brigance 1945, 198-99). Mussolini’s Fascist Italy, Hitler’s Nazi Germany, and Tojo and the warlords of Japan took conscription to its extreme end of application. In sum, although conscripted sol- diers represent political fairness for some states throughout history, others adopt it to enhance military effectiveness. But, regardless of their raison d’être, conscripts appear linked to international conflict because of interventionist leaders. Voluntary enlistment, by contrast, is based on individual liberty and market forces rather than personal sacrifice, patriotism, or national security. Volunteers may not always be combat ready in a given era; consider some critical observations about even the U.S. military just two decades ago: “tank gunners who don’t know where to aim their battle sights . . . missile firers who can’t tell the difference between a Soviet and a U.S. fighter plane” (excerpted in Taylor, Olson, and Schrader 1981, 7). Volunteers usually come from the lower socioeconomic classes, and that is unlikely to change; the market recruiting system will not encourage recruitment or retention of military per- sonnel with high levels of education in particular (Kennedy 1982; Arlinghaus 1981). A volunteer system may result from political pressure surrounding an antiwar mood rather than military considerations (Chambers 1987, 262). Furthermore, in postmaterial societies, individual rights and liberties are put before national security. Fewer people are willing to serve or sacrifice themselves for the nation because they do not regard conscription as a legitimate security measure (Rhodes, Heywood, and Wright 1997; Abramson and Inglehart 1995; Mohan 1992; Horeman and Stolwijk 1998; Prasad and Smythe 1968). Thus, political pressure can explain, at least in part, the change from conscription to a voluntary system. In sum, volunteer soldiers appear to provide national leaders with less interventionist opportunities and incentives because of their seemingly lower combat readiness and preparedness. Cross-national empirical studies on manpower systems have been rare. From data on a sample of 143 countries for 1984, White (1989, 780) **finds that “countries that use conscription may be more likely to become involved in wars because they maintain larger armed forces and the cost to the government of getting additional soldiers is reduced by conscription.”** In other words, it appears that conscription reduces the rela- tive costs entailed by pursuit of a military option—the most basic means already are available. Other studies concur. For example, based on data for 78 states for the year 1983, Ross (1994) finds that international disputes may be more likely to occur in the presence of conscripted forces because of their quicker and higher military readi- ness than all-voluntary forces (see also Duindam 1999, 119). On the basis of cross- sectional data for 1980, Anderson, Halcoussis, and Tollison (1996, 199-200) ascertain as well that **“warlike” states are more likely to employ conscription**. These findings do not support Kant’s intuition about conscripted military forces.

#### Turn - Draft increases adventurism – a draft empirically lowers war cost for wealthy who pay less taxes – prefer since my evidence is comparative

Appelbaum, 16 – reporter for New York Times (Binyamin, Economists Against the Draft, New York Times, 6 Feb 2016, <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/02/07/opinion/sunday/economists-against-the-draft.html> Accessed 6 July 2016) [Premier]

The debate about conscription, of course, extends beyond economic efficiency. Proponents have long argued that a draft distributes the burden of military service more fairly. They also see it as a deterrent to military action, since voters fear for the lives of their sons and daughters. The Nixon administration subscribed to this logic. In ending the draft, it hoped to soften opposition to the Vietnam War. For the opposite reason, Representative Charles Rangel, a New York Democrat, has repeatedly sponsored legislation to reinstate a wartime draft — for men and women. “Those making the decision to fight need to feel the burden,” he said last year. But the evidence is at best murky. Military service throughout American history has been borne disproportionately by those at the lower end of the economic ladder, who lack the resources to avoid it. The financial cost of a volunteer army, conversely, falls disproportionately on those who pay the most taxes, and some scholars see evidence that this “price tag” effect is a more significant deterrent. Voters may be more upset about the cost of war than the remote chance that their own children will be drafted. In 1968, James C. Miller III organized a group of graduate students at the University of Virginia to write an influential collection of essays arguing for the end of the draft. He said recently that time had validated their arguments. “I believe that when you have a draft you’re more likely to go to war than if you have to pay for a volunteer army,” said Mr. Miller, an economist who went on to lead the Office of Management and Budget in the Reagan administration. A draft lowers the cost for the wealthy “because the people who are important don’t have their children going off and they’re also not paying as much in taxes.”

#### Turn - A draft causes adventurism – an oversupply of soldiers encourages massive sacrifices – historically proven

Lacey, 03 – US Army Reserve officer (James, Symposium - Q: Is restoring universal military conscription in the United States a good idea? NO: The modern military needs a smaller force of highly motivated, trained professionals, not a horde of draftees. Insight on the News, 4 Feb 2003, http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_m1571/is\_4\_19/ai\_97450991 Accessed 4 July 2016) [Premier]

Actually, the real moral danger of a draft is that it will provide so many troops that there might be a temptation to waste them in useless engagements. This is what history has demonstrated over and over again. The bloody charges into massed rifles during the Civil War could not have been sustained without a draft to replace those slaughtered. In World War I, British Prime Minister David Lloyd George actually began holding back reinforcements so that his generals could not waste their lives in another big-push offensive. During World War II, Gen. George Marshall used to walk the casualty figures into the president every day to remind him that real men were dying on every decision he made. Finally, does anyone think the useless carnage of Vietnam could have continued year after year if we had a volunteer force? At some point the volunteers would have been reduced to a trickle and we would have had to find another solution.

### Crime

#### Empirics confirm three warrants why national service increases crime – it breaks down entry costs to crime, natural barriers, and delays insertion of young into market

Galiani et al 06 [Sebastian, Sebastian Galiani is a Professor of Economics at University of Maryland and Visiting Professor at Universidad de San Andres, Argentina. He is a member of the executive committee of LACEA. In the past, he held positions at Universidad Torcuato Di Tella and Universidad de San Andres in Argentina and was Tinker Visiting Professor at Columbia University and Universidad de Los Andes (Colombia) and visiting Scholar at Stanford and UC Berkeley. He was the chairman of the Network of Inequality and Poverty of LACEA during 2004 and 2005 and a member of its executive committee between 2004 and 2008; **Martín** Antonio **Rossi** is Associate Professor of Economics at Universidad de San Andres and Professor of Economics at Universidad de Buenos Aires. **Ernesto Schargrodsky** received his Ph.D. in Economics from Harvard University in 1998. He is President of the Universidad Torcuato Di Tella in Buenos Aires. “Conscription and Crime”; October 2006; World Bank Policy Research Working Paper; (8/9/17)] [Premier]

The objective of this study is to estimate the causal relationship between mandatory participation in military service and crime. A priori, different hypotheses could predict a positive or negative effect of military service on involvement in criminal behavior. We exploit the random assignment through a draft lottery of young men to conscription in Argentina to identify this causal effect. Our results suggest that participation in military service increased the likelihood of developing a criminal record in adulthood. Additional evidence suggests two particular channels through which this effect could have operated. The significant effect of military service on arms-related crimes suggests that the firearm training received during military service may have reduced the entry costs into crime or the natural barriers to committing violent acts. Moreover, the significant effect of military service on crimes against property and the estimation of the largest effect for individuals that provided two years, rather than one, of military service may imply that military service delayed the insertion of the young into the labor market, affecting their future opportunities. To sum up, our results do not encourage the introduction of military service on anticrime grounds.

#### Conscription increases crime because military service reduces educational prospects, regardless of active duty.

Lindo and Stoecker 2010 — profs of Economics at Univ of Oregon and UC Davis [Drawn into Violence: Evidence on ‘What Makes a Criminal’ from the Vietnam Draft Lotteries, July 2010, http://www.frbsf.org/economic-research/files/DrawnIntoViolence\_Lindo.pdf, July 5, 2016] [Premier]

Like Lochner and Morreti (2004), our results highlight the importance of “nurture” beyond an individual’s immediate circumstances. Also like Lochner and Morreti, we find especially large effects on violence. We find robust evidence that military service increases the probability of incarceration for violent crimes among whites, with point estimates suggesting an impact of 0.27 percentage points.26 Perhaps not surprisingly, our estimates suggest that military service has a much greater impact on criminal behavior than Lochner and Morreti find for education. To put the relative magnitudes into context, our estimates suggest that military service is equivalent a twelveyear reduction in schooling for whites.27 While our estimation strategy only allows us to estimate the effects of military service during the Vietnam Era, there is good reason to expect that our results may be relevant for the modern military as well. Between 14 and 25 percent of veterans returning from Iraq and Afghanistan have problems related to posttraumatic stress disorder. This is quite similar to the estimated 18 to 20 percent of Vietnam veterans exhibiting the same symptoms.28 25 As another robustness check, we have considered the interaction between incarceration for a violent crime and non-Army military service as an outcome. Since nearly all drafted men served in the Army, we should not find significant effects on this outcome. Indeed, we find draft eligibility significantly raises the probability of being a violent offender and an army veteran and has no effect on being a violent offender and a veteran from another branch of service. 26 These findings are broadly consistent with much of the prior literature that has considered military service as a determinant of violent behavior. Most notably similar to our study in terms of the treatment, Rohlfs (2010) finds that combat exposure leads to increases in self-reported violent crimes among both whites and nonwhites.

#### Prefer my Lindo and Stoecker on crime because they were able to verify their results and their study was long term.

Lindo and Stoecker 2010 — profs of Economics at Univ of Oregon and UC Davis [Drawn into Violence: Evidence on ‘What Makes a Criminal’ from the Vietnam Draft Lotteries, July 2010, http://www.frbsf.org/economic-research/files/DrawnIntoViolence\_Lindo.pdf, July 5, 2016] [Premier]

4 Our study offers several advantages over this pioneering study. First, instead of using a cross-cohort differences and differences framework we focus solely on within cohort variation provided by the draft lotteries. Thus, we are able to use non-affected cohorts as a robustness check to verify that our results are not driven by the particular sets of birthdays selected in the drafts. Second, our outcome variable lends itself to a natural interpretation. Specifically, it provides a direct estimate of the effect of draft eligibility on the probability of incarceration in the survey years. Third, we explore longer-run effects and enhance the precision of our estimates by expanding the sample to include inmates incarcerated in 1986 and 1991 in addition to those incarcerated in 1979. Finally, we present a comprehensive exploration of the effects of draft eligibility on crime by separately considering its effects on violent crime, drug-related crime, and property-related crime, and public order crime.

### Readiness

#### the AVF has dramatically increased the readiness of the military - The draft would kill military readiness by reducing retention

Warner, 2001- Professor of Economics, Clemson University [John, with Beth J. Asch, The Record and Prospects of the All-Volunteer Military in the United States The Journal of Economic Perspectives, April <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2696597>, July 7 2016] [Premier]

Enlisted Recruiting and Turnover After estimating the pay raise required to implement an all-volunteer force, Oi (1967a) estimated that the volunteer force would lead to a 30 percent reduction in enlisted force turnover. Turnover was expected to fall because volunteers could be attracted for longer initial tours of duty and because retention would rise as a result of volunteers' stronger taste for the military and of higher levels of pay.'6 Based on an annual average turnover rate of 21 percent in the 1960-65 draft period, Oi's estimate of the reduction in turnover implied a volunteer-force turnover rate of 14.8 percent. This prediction has proven remarkably accurate. In 1973, the last year of the draft, new recruits totaled 406,000, which was 21.1 percent of the enlisted force that year, as shown earlier in Table 1. Turnover has declined considerably since 1973, hovering around 15 percent since the late 1980s. Because accessions only increase when retention falls to maintain a constant force size, the average number of years someone stays in the force can be roughly estimated as the reciprocal of the 16 In addition to pay, the services manage retention through extensive use of reenlistment bonuses that are targeted to occupational areas where the services want to keep personnel. Warner and Asch (1995) review the elasticities of supply with respect to pay and reenlistment bonuses. Similarly, the services manage the separation of personnel through the use of separation pay, retired pay, and the use of up-or-out rules. This content downloaded from 130.166.220.172 on Tue, 05 Jul 2016 21:42:02 UTC All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms 180 Journal of Economic Perspectives accessions as a percent of the force, shown in Table 1. By this measure, years per accession have risen from 4.74 years in 1973 to around 6.5 years since 1988. In other words, the average recruit today has stayed about two years longer than did the average recruit during conscription. The average age of the enlisted force has risen from 25 years to 27.5 years. Between 1974 and 1987, "careerists," personnel with more than four years of experience, rose from 39 to 50 percent of the enlisted force. This growth reflected reduced turnover in a force of constant size. Since 1987, careerists have grown to 54 percent of the enlisted force; this additional growth was mostly due to the downsizing of the early 1990s.17 The 1998 demand for new enlisted personnel was less than 10 percent of the cohort of males turning 18 years old that year, as shown in the final column of Table 1. The annual accession requirement in the coming decade is likely to be around 200,000-210,000, still only 10.5 percent of the 18 year-old male cohort, which is predicted to grow to 2.2 million by 2010. By comparison, in 1973 the draft was taking a number of people equal to 19.8 percent of the cohort of 18 year-old males. Senior military leaders believe that the reduction in turnover and the resulting increase in experience since the inception of the all-volunteer force have improved the productivity of the U.S. military dramatically. Although military productivity is difficult to measure, a number of AVF-era studies reviewed in Warner and Asch (1995) find military readiness measures such as aircraft sortie rates and equipment downtime to be significantly related to personnel experience, particularly in high- tech occupations. Military leaders were therefore very concerned by difficulties in retaining career officers and enlisted personnel that surfaced in 1998-99, when retention rates dipped below levels sufficient to sustain the career forces.18

#### The draft severely reduces military quality – it increases training costs and relies on inexperienced soldiers – troop Quality is key to readiness

Thompson, 07 - Pulitzer Prize-winning reporter (Mark, Would National Service Be Better Than the Draft? TIME, 30 Aug 2007, [http://content.time.com/time/specials/2007/article/0,28804,1657256\_1657626\_1656898,00.html](http://content.time.com/time/specials/2007/article/0%2C28804%2C1657256_1657626_1656898%2C00.html) Accessed 5 July 2016) [Premier]

While most civilian military experts interviewed support the idea of national service, including the military, most retired military officers are on the other side of the argument. (It's worth noting here that the military opposed ending the draft a generation ago, so their opposition needs to be taken with a grain of salt.) They argue that when the draft was last used, the military was largely a low-tech enterprise. But now the inside of an M-1 tank looks more like the bridge of the Starship Enterprise, and takes substantial training to operate effectively. The cost of such training would skyrocket if draftee soldiers had to serve only two-year hitches, meaning greater numbers would have to be trained because of their shorter time in uniform. Even more critical, veterans say, is the ethos of the all-volunteer force, which is difficult to measure but impossible to ignore. National service "is an absolutely bad idea," says Barry McCaffrey, a retired four-star Army general. "My age group learned to love the volunteer military." While McCaffrey says the idea of national service "makes sense in a civic sense" it would lead to lesser-quality soldiers. "We've never had better soldiers in the country's history" than we do now. "They volunteer for the Army, volunteer for combat units, they're high school graduates without felonies, they stay longer," he says, rattling off attributes he fears would shrink with national service. Robert Scales, a retired Army major general, is an Army historian who once commanded the Army War College. "War has become so complex, and so dependent on ground forces, that the idea of drafting soldiers would greatly harm the American military," he says. "First of all, they wouldn’t go into the military goddammit — they'd go into the Army. And if they go into the Army, they're going to go into the combat ops" — infantry, armor, artillery — "because those are the jobs that nobody wants." To Scales, the paradox of resuming any kind of draft is that it would fill those ranks with people who do not want to be there, just as those ranks have become increasingly important. "The critical job in today's military — the jobs that have to be done right — are those close-combat jobs," he says. "So the irony is that in a draft those skills and will and morale and physical fitness — all those things that we most need in the close combat arms — are least likely to be attained."

#### Also, The draft destroys military readiness – forced draftees will resist training, it wastes resources on ineligible conscripts and it ruins unit cohesion.

Thiac, 16 – retired Army Intelligence officer (Michael, This nation does not need the draft, American Thinker, 21 May 2016, <http://www.americanthinker.com/articles/2016/05/this_nation_does_not_need_the_draft.html> Accessed 6 July 2016) [Premier]

Now follow this some more. Army Basic Training is 9-10 weeks. What do you do with the people who “fail,” i.e. are overweight, do not meet standards on physical training tests, “fail” a urinalysis test, etc. Currently we throw them out. How many people will we throw out after we spend the resources to bring them in? Please don’t tell me others, not wanting to be forced to “serve,” will not deliberately do something to be excused. What will you do then? Put them in prison? Send them home? Then you have to get them to Advanced Individual Training, a school that can be two to over twelve months, depending on the specialty. Say for good measure, combining travel and casual status, 3 months Basic, 3 months AIT. That’s half a year. Get them to a new unit, and it takes a few months to get into the swing of things. Next thing you know, Private Snuffy has less than a year left. And he’s counting down days. Because he never wanted to be there and if you give him an order and he refuses, what do you do? Put him in the stockade? Throw him out? Either you keep a disruptive man in a unit, or you throw him out, either way you weaken the outfit. One of the greatest things needed for an effective unit is cohesion. With constant turnaround caused by draftees this will only degrade us. If a draft is implemented for further social engineering, the Pentagon would have to spend a fortune (which we don’t have) to put people in who don’t want to be there, train them and send them out. Such a massive waste of resources would only weaken our nation’s defense. We need a highly trained, professional service.

#### A draft lowers military readiness – limited recruitment is key to quality standards for soldiers

Lacey, 03 – US Army Reserve officer (James, Symposium - Q: Is restoring universal military conscription in the United States a good idea? NO: The modern military needs a smaller force of highly motivated, trained professionals, not a horde of draftees. Insight on the News, 4 Feb 2003, http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_m1571/is\_4\_19/ai\_97450991 Accessed 4 July 2016) [Premier]

True, during the last few years the military has had considerable difficulty meeting its recruiting goals. More than anything this reflects the fact that the military is refusing to compromise on quality. As a former recruiting commander I often lamented how many people we had to interview, physically examine and test just to get one qualified applicant. Throughout my tenure the ratio never fell below 14-to-l, though some other districts did a bit better. If the services lowered their standard even minimally they could enlist their yearly goals by March and close their recruiting offices.

#### The draft kills military readiness by reducing the quality of recruits

Warner, 2001- Professor of Economics, Clemson University [John, with Beth J. Asch, The Record and Prospects of the All-Volunteer Military in the United States The Journal of Economic Perspectives, April <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2696597>, July 7 2016] [Premier]

The draft generated slightly more highly-able recruits than the AVF, but also many more low-scoring recruits. Also, recruit quality would have been higher during the draft if college students and other high-aptitude youth were not allowed to obtain exemptions from the draft. Average AFQT has risen during the AVF.'9 Since higher quality personnel perform better on military-related tasks (Fernandez, 1992; Orvis, Childress and Polich, 1992), the increase in personnel quality has improved the overall productivity of the force. The educational attainment of enlisted accessions has improved remarkably since the inception of the all-volunteer force. In 1973, less than two-thirds of accessions had high school diplomas. High school diploma graduates have com- prised 90 percent or more of accessions since 1984. Since 1991, at least 90 percent of the accessions of every service have had high school diplomas. draft. Average AFQT has risen during the AVF.'9 Since higher quality personnel perform better on military-related tasks (Fernandez, 1992; Orvis, Childress and Polich, 1992), the increase in personnel quality has improved the overall productivity of the force. The educational attainment of enlisted accessions has improved remarkably since the inception of the all-volunteer force. In 1973, less than two-thirds of accessions had high school diplomas. High school diploma graduates have com- prised 90 percent or more of accessions since 1984. Since 1991, at least 90 percent of the accessions of every service have had high school diplomas.

#### Conscription decreases military readiness – it hurts re-enlistment, morale and discipline

Jehn 2008 – former assistant secretary of defense for force management and personnel [ "Conscription." The Concise Encyclopedia of Economics. 2008. Library of Economics and Liberty. 6 July 2016. <http://www.econlib.org/library/Enc/Conscription.html>.] [Premier]

A draft also forces some of the wrong people into the military—people who are more productive in other jobs or who have a strong distaste for military service. That has other serious consequences for the country. A draft, especially one with exemptions, causes wasteful avoidance behavior such as the unwanted schooling, emigration, early marriages, and distorted career choices of the 1950s and 1960s. A draft also weakens the military because the presence of unwilling conscripts increases turnover (conscripts reenlist at lower rates than volunteers), lowers morale, and causes discipline problems. U.S. experience since the end of the draft in 1973 is consistent with the above reasoning. Today’s military personnel are the highest quality in the nation’s history. Recruits are better educated and score higher on enlistment tests than their draft-era counterparts. In 2001, 94 percent of new recruits were high school graduates, compared with about 70 percent in the draft era. More than 99 percent scored average or above on the Armed Forces Qualification Test, compared with 80 percent during the draft era. Because of that and because service members are all volunteers, the military has far fewer discipline problems, greater experience (because of less turnover), and hence more capability. So, for example, discipline rates—nonjudicial punishment and courts-martial—were down from 184 per 1,000 in 1972 to just 64 per 1,000 in 2002. And more than half of today’s force are careerists—people with more than five years’ experience—as compared with only about one-third in the 1950s and 1960s. Based on this experience, almost all U.S. military leaders believe that a return to the draft could only weaken the armed forces. Nor, as mentioned, would a draft reduce the budgetary costs of the military.

#### A draft would hurt military readiness by reducing high skilled recruits who are essential to new forms of military technology.

Warner, 2001- Professor of Economics, Clemson University [John, with Beth J. Asch, The Record and Prospects of the All-Volunteer Military in the United States The Journal of Economic Perspectives, April <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2696597>, July 7 2016] [Premier]

Sustaining the all-volunteer force has without question become more of a challenge to military personnel planners in recent years, as the strong economy and the trend toward college attendance have reduced the pool of young people who seriously consider a military commitment. But the armed forces can meet the challenge without resort to a draft. Asch, Kilburn and Klerman (1999) discuss ways that the military can better tap the market for college-bound youth. Of course, the military could respond to the recent challenges by reducing their recruiting standards for high-quality personnel, just as it raised them in the early 1990s when a recession and the defense drawdown made recruiting unusually easy. However, cutting recruit quality is an option the military leadership refuses to consider, especially given the likely increase in the demand for quality in the future as the military becomes even more oriented to high technology. From an economic standpoint, what levels of personnel quality are efficient for sustaining the military's objective state of readiness is an open question. A recent Defense Science Board (2000) report identified areas of concern with the current military force structure and with certain military personnel manage- ment practices. Central to the report was the need for the Department of Defense to define the roles and missions of the active and reserve forces more clearly and to integrate the reserve forces with the active forces better. Focus on a draft would deflect attention from this and other areas of concern. Final Remarks Economics cannot rule out the possibility of circumstances under which a draft would be more efficient than a volunteer force. But the economic case for continuing the all-volunteer force appears even more compelling today than it was in the early 1970s, when the armed forces demanded a larger fraction of the youth population. Technological changes that reduce the numerical demand for military manpower while raising the relative demand for high-quality personnel will further accentuate the case for the AVF in the years to come. A case in point is a new Navy destroyer that is now on the drawing board. This destroyer will be much more lethal than the current class of Navy destroyers, because of its state-of-the-art technology, but it is being designed to operate with a crew of only 100, compared with a crew of 400 on the current class of destroyers.

#### A Draft would destroy military training – it would overwhelm current infrastructure and training budgets.

Thiac, 16 – retired Army Intelligence officer (Michael, This nation does not need the draft, American Thinker, 21 May 2016, <http://www.americanthinker.com/articles/2016/05/this_nation_does_not_need_the_draft.html> Accessed 6 July 2016) [Premier]

Asking everyone to serve would be a disaster. Assume you put in a draft of “every” high school graduate. Approximately 3.9 million people turn 18 each year in the United States. Say of those, 80% are “fit” for military service (i.e., meet height/weight requirements, no issue with narcotics use, no criminal issues), you are talking of induction of 3.2 million people a year. This is a World War II level of forced public service when we are not at war with major powers. If this is a two-year draft enlistment (what was used in Vietnam, as opposed to “the duration” during WWII), the armed forces will have to in-process and train them. The Army (and the other services) don’t have the facilities to in-process that many men and women right now. Can you imagine the cost of bringing online multiple basic training posts throughout the county? Currently we induct approximately 200K a year across all four branches of service, enlisted and officers. A draft could increase this by more than a factor of 15!

#### The AVF did not cause political support for the military to collapse – any cuts in force levels were due to the end of the cold war.

Warner, 2001- Professor of Economics, Clemson University [John, with Beth J. Asch, The Record and Prospects of the All-Volunteer Military in the United States The Journal of Economic Perspectives, April <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2696597>, July 7 2016] [Premier]

Force Size and Defense Spending Since World War II, Department of Defense planning has been built around a two-war scenario, determining the active and reserve forces capable of simultaneously fighting wars in Europe and Asia. From 1973 until 1990, defense planners called for an active force of around 2.1 million over this period; the active force in fact hovered around this level, as shown in Table 1. Congress consistently sup- ported the active strength levels called for in the military's plans. Despite changes in turnover, experience, and other factors, the all-volunteer force has apparently had little effect on planned strength levels. The active force was downsized dramatically after the collapse of the Soviet Union and by 1998 stood at two-thirds of its pre-1990 level. These reductions came about as a result of changes in the external threat; there is no evidence that the existence of the AVF affected the extent of the downsizing one way or another. As some critics predicted, the reserve forces shrank in the immediate after- math of the Vietnam War from 896,000 in 1973 to 776,000 in 1978, as draft- motivated reservists completed their terms of service and were not replaced by new volunteers. But even as calls for a reserve draft were issued in the early 1980s, reserve manning grew rapidly as personnel leaving active duty associated with reserve units at high rates. Reserve force manning peaked in 1988 at 1.1 million. The reserve forces were downsized along with the active forces, but not by as much, and now at 877,000 are almost the same strength as they were in 1973. Reserve forces now play a larger role in the "total force" concept of military planning than they did during the Cold War era.

#### The AVF did not divert money from military R&D and technology – affordable pay raises were sufficient, and overall personnel costs stayed stable

Warner, 2001- Professor of Economics, Clemson University [John, with Beth J. Asch, The Record and Prospects of the All-Volunteer Military in the United States The Journal of Economic Perspectives, April <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2696597>, July 7 2016] [Premier]

Although some critics of an all-volunteer force predicted that extremely large pay raises would be necessary to implement an all-volunteer force, a number of the economic estimates of the late 1960s turned out to predict quite accurately that a substantial but affordable pay increase would attract the necessary manpower. Oi (1967a, b), Altman and Fechter (1967), and Fisher (1969) all estimated the elasticity of initial enlistment supply to exceed 1.0. These studies estimated the budgetary cost of moving to a volunteer force of 2.65 million active duty personnel to range from about $4 to $7.5 billion, about a 10 to 15 percent increase over the 1965 defense budget. Work by the Gates Commission staff obtained similar estimates of the elasticity of enlistment supply and furthermore showed retention to be very responsive to pay. Research during the AVF has generally reaffirmed these results; Warner and Asch (1995) survey AVF-era research on recruitment and retention. Personnel costs made up 29.9 percent of the military's budget in 1965 and 34.2 percent at the height of the Vietnam War in 1970, as shown in Table 2. To implement the all-volunteer force, Congress raised the entry basic pay of enlisted personnel from $133 per month in 1970 to $326 per month in 1973. After these pay increases and post-Vietnam downsizing, personnel costs rose to about 37 percent of the defense budget in 1975. Since then, personnel costs have declined as a percent of the defense budget and now only make up 27.3 percent. Spending on acquisition and research and development has increased as a portion of the Department of Defense budget, not decreased as critics of the all-volunteer force had predicted. Of course, defense acquisitions and research and development might have increased even faster without an all-volunteer force, but the evidence for this conjecture is weak.

#### A draft would entail unskilled soldiers and deter those considering joining anyway

Chapman 02 [Bruce Chapman, “A Bad Idea Whose Time is Past: The Case Against Universal Service,” Brookings Institute, Fall 2002, <http://www.brookings.edu/research/articles/2002/09/fall-civilsociety-chapman>] [Premier]

Universal service is not needed on military grounds. We eliminated the draft three decades ago in part because the armed services found that they needed relatively fewer recruits to serve longer than conscription provided. As the numbers that were needed shrank, the unfairness of the draft became ever more apparent-and offensive. Youth, ever ingenious, found ways to get deferments, decamp to Canada, make themselves a nuisance to everyone in authority-and make those who did serve feel like chumps. Many of the young people who objected to military service availed themselves of alternative service, but no one seriously believed that most "conscientious objectors" were "shouldering the burden of war" in a way comparable to those fighting in the field. The government took advantage of its free supply of almost unlimited manpower by underpaying its servicemen, thereby losing many recruits who might have chosen a military career. Raising the pay when the volunteer force was introduced changed the incentives and-surprise-eliminated the need for the draft. The all-volunteer force has been a big success. Leaders in today's increasingly sophisticated, highly trained military now are talking of further manpower cuts. They have no interest in short-term soldiers of any kind and give no support to a return to conscription. The idea of using universal service to round up young men and women who, instead of direct military service, could be counted on to guard a "public or private facility," as Litan proposes, is naive. In Litan's plan, youth would be obligated for only a year-slightly less, if AmeriCorps were the model. Philip Gold, a colleague at Discovery Institute and author of the post-September 11 book Against All Terrors: This Nation's Next Defense, points out that "if the object is fighting, a person trained only for a few months is useless. In a noncombat defense position, he would be worse than useless. He would be dangerous."

### Politics

#### Mandatory national service is historically unpopular

Dione 02 [E.J. Dione Jr, Washington Post columnist, “United We Serve?: The Debate over National Service,” Brookings Institute, Fall 2002, http://www.brookings.edu/research/articles/2002/09/fall-civilsociety-dionne] [Premier]

Yet how firm is our belief in service? There is no prospect anytime soon that we will return to a military draft—and our own military is skeptical that a draft would work. The number of politicians who support compulsory national service—the case for it is made powerfully in this issue by Robert Litan—is small. President Clinton succeeded in pushing his AmeriCorps program through Congress, building on the ideas of Will Marshall and others at the Democratic Leadership Council who sought to reward young people with stipends and scholarships for giving time to their country. But many Republicans denounced the idea as "paid volunteerism. Representative Dick Armey, the Texas Republican, described it as "a welfare program for aspiring yuppies" that would displace "private charity with government-managed, well-paid social activism, based on the elitist assumption that community service is not now taking place." And in truth, many Americans doubt that they or their fellow citizens actually "owe" anything to a country whose main business they see as preserving individual liberty, personal as well as economic. In a free society, liberty is a right owed to all, worthy and unworthy alike. Finally, Americans differ widely over which kinds of national service are genuinely valuable. Many who honor military service are skeptical of voluntarism that might look like, in Armey's terms, "social activism." Supporters of work among the poor are often dubious of military service. Most Americans honor both forms of devotion to country, and we have included here powerful testimonials to the varieties of civic dedication. But in our public arguments, the skeptical voices are often the loudest.

#### A draft would cost political capital because it’s seen as extreme

Wetherbee ’07 –fellow at Center for the Study of the Presidency and Congress (Michael A., “Closing the Civil-Military Gap,” accessed 7/5/16, <http://cspc.nonprofitsoapbox.com/storage/documents/Vater/Wetherbee.pdf>) [Premier]

Creating a draft in the United States would close the civil-military gap that exists today. By providing non-military options, such as the Peace Corps or Americorps, it could provide even conscientious objectors the character-building benefits of public service. Implementing a draft, however, seems to be attacking a small problem with a disproportionate amount of force. While a new type of draft would be effective, it would face much opposition. It is a good notion, but not politically feasible. Thus, the idea of a draft should not be given much presidential consideration in addressing the problem of the civil-military gap.

#### The plan is very controversial – all politicians oppose it and polls prove that it is unpopular with the public

Turn 03 [Paul, First draft: the battle to create universal national service has just started Here's how it can be won., Washington Monthly, Mar 1, 2003, <[http://www.thefreelibrary.com/First+draft 3A+the+battle+to+create+universal+national+service+has+just...-a098829847](http://www.thefreelibrary.com/First%2Bdraft%203A%2Bthe%2Bbattle%2Bto%2Bcreate%2Buniversal%2Bnational%2Bservice%2Bhas%2Bjust...-a098829847)>, July 4, 2016] [Premier]

About the only thing both sides agreed on is that politically, a draft just isn't going to happen. In a taking-the-temperature-of-Washington sort of way, this is unquestionably true. The president, his cabinet, the Pentagon brass, and leading members of Congress remain adamantly opposed to conscription. Though a handful of lawmakers have signed on to Rangel's bill, established opinion has written off the measure as noble-but doomed. A headline from a Buffalo News editorial summed up the mood: "Even if Conscription Stands No Chance, the Idea Poses Food for Thought." But if the chance of universal service was measured by what the American people actually think, a different picture might emerge. In late January, a Newsweek poll found that 14 percent of Americans favored and 38 percent would consider reinstating the draft; only 45 percent would refuse to consider the idea at all. As it happens, that poll did not describe the kind of draft that Rep. Rangel has proposed, one in which young people would be able to choose either military or civilian service. The only poll I know to pose that question was conducted in November 2001 by the centrist Democratic Leadership Council (DLC), and found that 6.0 percent of Americans favored a draft that offered a choice between military or civilian service

#### The draft is unpopular with the public – it is seen as inequitable

Warner, 2001- Professor of Economics, Clemson University [John, with Beth J. Asch, The Record and Prospects of the All-Volunteer Military in the United States The Journal of Economic Perspectives, April <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2696597>, July 7 2016] [Premier]

The all-volunteer force is also a sustainable institution in the sense that the electorate would probably see some additional spending as a cheap price to pay to avoid a return to conscription. Indeed, a draft would surely be perceived as less equitable today than it was at the time it was abolished. Recall that in 1973 the armed forces' demand for new recruits was about one-fifth of the cohort of males turning 18 years old each year; now it is only about one-tenth.

### Spending

#### A draft would be cost prohibitive

Chapman 02, Chapman, Bruce. “A Bad Idea Whose Time is Past: The Case Against Universal Service.” Brookings Institute. Fall 2002. <http://www.brookings.edu/research/articles/2002/09/fall-civilsociety-chapman> [Premier]

**The cost of universal service would be prohibitive.** Direct **costs would include those for** assembling, sorting (and sorting out), **allocating**, and training several **million youth in an unending manpower convoy**. Indirect costs include clothing and providing initial medical attention, insurance, the law enforcement associated with such large numbers (no small expense in the army, even with presumably higher discipline), housing, and the periodic "leave" arrangements. The $20,000 per involuntary volunteer estimated by Litan is too low. **The** more **realistic total figure would be** more like $27,000 to **$30,000 [per volunteer]**. First, the federal cost for a full-time AmeriCorps member is about $16,000, according to AmeriCorps officials. And that, recall, is for an average 10-month stint, so add another $3,000 or so for a 12-month term of service. (The $10,000 figure cited by Litan appears to average the cost of part-time volunteers with that of full-time volunteers.) Giving the involuntary volunteers the AmeriCorps education benefit of some $4,000 brings the total to about $23,000 of **federal contribution** for the full-time, one-year participant, which, with local or private match, **will easily reach a total cost of some $30,000**. Few unskilled young people just out of school make that in private employment! Because organized compulsion costs more than real volunteering, however, **the indirect expenses for governments would be still greater. Chief** among these **are the hidden financial costs of universal national service to the economy in the form of forgone labo**r. **That** problem plagued the old draft and **would be more acute now**. The United States has suffered a labor shortage for most of the past two decades, with the dearth of educated and trained labor especially serious. Yet universal service advocates want to pluck out of the employment ranks some 4 million people a year and apply a command-and-control approach to their optimal use. How can we even calculate the waste? Litan says that in 1995 the GAO "positively evaluated" a cost-benefit study of three AmeriCorps programs that found them to produce quantifiable monetary benefits of $1.68 to $2.58 for every dollar invested. But Litan overstates the GAO's "positive evaluation" of the private study's findings. The GAO study merely analyzes the methodology of the private study based on the assumptions that are baked into it. These assumptions (of future benefits and their dollar values) are inherently "problematic," based as they are on "projected data." And neither the GAO nor the private study whose methodology it checked says anything about the applicability of the private study to some universal service program. Inferring GAO endorsement for some putative financial benefits from a national service scheme—let alone a program of compulsory national service—is not good economics. By contrast, a recent review of the literature and evidence of government spending by William Niskanen, former chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisors (under Ronald Reagan), concluded that "the marginal cost of government spending and taxes in the United States may be about $2.75 per additional dollar of tax revenue." As the late Nobel economist Frederick Hayek said, "There is only one problem with socialism. It does not work." **The cost of universal service for one year would** not **be** $80 billion, with certain additional economic benefits, as Litan would have it, but roughly **$120 billion, with considerable additional losses to the economy** as a whole.

#### The plan spends billions – new personnel would be expensive

Lacey, 03 – US Army Reserve officer (James, Symposium - Q: Is restoring universal military conscription in the United States a good idea? NO: The modern military needs a smaller force of highly motivated, trained professionals, not a horde of draftees. Insight on the News, 4 Feb 2003, http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_m1571/is\_4\_19/ai\_97450991 Accessed 4 July 2016) [Premier]

Furthermore, those who are calling for a draft fail to recognize that war has changed dramatically in the last three decades. A high-technology force conducting incredibly rapid operations requires well-trained professionals, not short-term draftees. An army of draftees would be little more than cannon fodder for any advanced force to chew up. If we require every able-bodied male to serve 18 months to two years after he turns 18, then we are talking about inducting more than 1.5 million draftees a year. This is more than enough troops for 100 Army divisions, hundreds of air wings and a 1,000-ship Navy. Equipping and training that force to the same standard as our current military would cost in the area of $3 trillion--and another $1 trillion a year to maintain it. Leading these divisions will require a cadre of long-term professional officers and sergeants that dwarfs the size of our current military. Encouraging this many draftees to re-enlist would wipe out any savings in personnel costs that a draft supposedly would provide.

#### Plan increases spending - Government officials underestimate the cost of draftees’ labor, causing them to over-spend on national defense – AVF solves.

**Jehn, 2008 – VP for Government Programs at Cray Inc**. [Christopher, Vice president for government programs at Cray Inc. He served as the assistant secretary of defense for force management and personnel from 1989 to 1993, and was assistant director for national security of the Congressional Budget Office from 1998 to 2001, The concise Encyclopedia of Economics: Conscription, Economics Library, July 5, 2016, <http://www.econlib.org/library/Enc/Conscription.html>] [Premier]

Every time a draft has been imposed, the result has been lower military pay. But even in the unlikely event that military pay is not reduced, a draft would force some unwilling people to serve in order to achieve “representativeness” or “equity.” In recent years, for example, some have advocated a return to conscription because today’s AVF supposedly has too few college graduates or too many African Americans. How to decide which of today’s volunteers to turn away is never addressed. The unwilling conscripts who replace the willing volunteers would bear a tax that no one bears in an AVF. And because these conscripts do not necessarily perform better than the volunteers they displace, this tax yields no “revenue.” Because the conscripts are part of society, the tax they pay is simply a waste to the country as a whole. And some who are qualified and would like to enlist are denied and forced into jobs for which they are less well suited or that offer less opportunity. A draft also encourages the government to misuse resources. Because draftees and other junior personnel seem cheaper than they actually are, the government may “buy” more national defense than it should, and will certainly use people, especially high-skilled individuals and junior personnel, in greater numbers than is efficient. This means that a given amount of national defense is more costly to the country than it need be.

#### The Draft increases defense spending by billions - the total force must be larger and draftees have shorter enlistment periods

**Jehn, 2008 – VP for Government Programs at Cray Inc**. [Christopher, Vice president for government programs at Cray Inc. He served as the assistant secretary of defense for force management and personnel from 1989 to 1993, and was assistant director for national security of the Congressional Budget Office from 1998 to 2001, The concise Encyclopedia of Economics: Conscription, Economics Library, July 5, 2016, <http://www.econlib.org/library/Enc/Conscription.html>] [Premier]

In 1988, for example, the U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) studied the effects of reinstituting conscription and concluded that an equally effective force under a draft would be more costly, even in a narrow budget sense, than the existing force. With a draft, a larger total force would be needed because draftees serve a shorter initial enlistment period than today’s volunteers. Therefore, a larger fraction of the force would be involved in overhead activities such as training, supervising less-experienced personnel, and traveling to a first assignment. The GAO estimated that these activities would add more than four billion dollars per year (in 2003 dollars) to the defense budget.

### Wage Deflation

#### The volunteer army is the most economically efficient use of labor – enlisters are those with low opportunity costs of entering the service, so enlistment raises their wages.

**Reinhardt, 2006 – Professor of Political Economy at Princeton** [Uwe E., November 4, 2006, Kerry Trips Over an Economic Truth, The Washington Post, July 5, 2016, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/11/03/AR2006110301372.html>] [Premier]

Here, for example, is how University of Rochester economics professor Steven E. Landsburg made the case for the volunteer army in his textbook "Price Theory and Applications." Under a military draft, he writes, "the Selective Service Board will draft young people who are potentially brilliant brain surgeons, inventors and economists -- young people with high opportunity costs of entering the service -- and will leave undrafted some young people with much lower opportunity costs. The social loss is avoided under a voluntary system, in which precisely those with the lowest costs will volunteer." Only slightly more crudely put, the central idea underlying this theorem of what economists call "social welfare economics" is that if a nation must use human bodies to stop bullets and shrapnel, it ought to use relatively "low-cost" bodies -- that is, predominantly those who would otherwise not have produced much gross domestic product, the main component of what economists call "social opportunity costs." On this rationale, economists certify the all-volunteer army as efficient and thus good.

#### Conscription reduces future wage prospects – it interrupts education at the most critical time for developing human capital

Hubers and Webbink ’15 - the School of Economics at the Tinbergen Institute [The long-term effects of military conscription on educational attainment and wages, IZA Journal of Labor Economics, December 2015, <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s40172-015-0026-4>, July 5, 2016] [Premier]

In sum, previous empirical studies suggests that military service, both in peace time as in war time, has either no effect or a negative effect on future earnings. The negative effects might result from the effect of conscription on human capital. Conscription might diminish individual returns on human capital, which in turn affects the future wages of a recruit (Lau et al. 2004; Poutvaara and Wagener 2007; Poutvaara and Wagener 2011). Young men are typically called for military service during a period of their lives that would otherwise be devoted to learning or gaining work experience. In addition, human capital accumulated before the draft might depreciate during military service. If military service causes a break in the educational career, it is likely that more time will be needed for completion of tertiary education and might therefore reduce the probability of enrolment and completion of tertiary education. On the other hand, the conscription system in the Netherlands gave recruits the opportunity to postpone their military service duties until they finished their tertiary education. In practice, this often led to a full exemption as a recruit older than 26 was considered too old to serve in the military (Hoffenaar and Schoenmaker 1994). Draft-avoidance behaviour may therefore just as well have led to an increase in enrolment in tertiary education in the Netherlands.

#### Collapsing wages fuel deflation – this undermines the economy by lowering purchasing power, savings and investment, risking a double dip

**Cooper, 2012** [Michael – Staff writer 6/19/2012 New York Times: Underpaid, underemployed and barely making ends meet. Access Date June 19, 2012 <http://today.msnbc.msn.com/id/47872983/ns/business-us_business/#.T-DitI64LzI> [Premier]

Throughout the Great Recession and the not-so-great recovery, the most commonly discussed measure of misery has been unemployment. But many middle-class and working-class people who are fortunate enough to have work are struggling as well, which is why Sherry Woods, a 59-year-old van driver from Atlanta, found herself standing in line at a jobs fair this month, with her résumé tucked inside a Bible. She opened it occasionally to reread a favorite verse from Philippians: “And my God will meet all your needs according to the riches of his glory in Christ.” Ms. Woods’s current job has not been meeting her needs. When she began driving a passenger van last year, she earned $9 an hour and worked 40 hours a week. Then her wage was cut to $8 an hour, and her hours were drastically scaled back. Last month she earned just $233. So Ms. Woods, who said that she had been threatened with eviction for missing rent payments and had been postponing an appointment with the eye doctor because she lacks insurance, has been looking for another, better job. It has not been easy. “I’m looking for something else, anything else,” she said. “More hours. Better pay. Actual benefits.” These are anxious days for American workers. Many, like Ms. Woods, are underemployed. Others find pay that is simply not keeping up with their expenses: adjusted for inflation, the median hourly wage was lower in 2011 than it was a decade earlier, according to data from a forthcoming book by the Economic Policy Institute, “The State of Working America, 12th Edition.” Good benefits are harder to come by, and people are staying longer in jobs that they want to leave, afraid that they will not be able to find something better. Only 2.1 million people quit their jobs in March, down from the 2.9 million people who quit in December 2007, the first month of the recession. “Unfortunately, the wage problems brought on by the recession pile on top of a three-decade stagnation of wages for low- and middle-wage workers,” said Lawrence Mishel, the president of the Economic Policy Institute, a research group in Washington that studies the labor market. “In the aftermath of the financial crisis, there has been persistent high unemployment as households reduced debt and scaled back purchases. The consequence for wages has been substantially slower growth across the board, including white-collar and college-educated workers.” Now, with the economy shaping up as the central issue of the presidential election, both President Obama and Mitt Romney have been relentlessly trying to make the case that their policies would bring prosperity back. The unease of voters is striking: in a New York Times/CBS News poll in April, half of the respondents said they thought the next generation of Americans would be worse off, while only about a quarter said it would have a better future. And household wealth is dropping. The Federal Reserve reported last week that the economic crisis left the median American family in 2010 with no more wealth than in the early 1990s, wiping away two decades of gains. With stocks too risky for many small investors and savings accounts paying little interest, building up a nest egg is a challenge even for those who can afford to sock away some of their money.

#### The Draft would reduce military wages – to keep spending levels, recruit pay levels would need to be cut in half

Warner, 2001- Professor of Economics, Clemson University [John, with Beth J. Asch, The Record and Prospects of the All-Volunteer Military in the United States The Journal of Economic Perspectives, April <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2696597>, July 7 2016] [Premier]

It is interesting to speculate on what a draft would look like if it were to be reinstated. Absent any reductions in the current recruiting effort or in pay and other incentives, a draft for the purpose of meeting the services' strength targets would involve conscripting fewer than 10,000 youth per year-and perhaps drafting no one at all some years. If a draft was to involve meaningful numbers of youth, it would need to be accompanied by a substantial reduction in first-term enlisted pay. For example, a 50 percent basic pay reduction for the first two years of service would restore junior enlisted pay to the relative level prevailing in the 1960s. This pay cut would reduce voluntary supply by about 27 percent. It would also raise the demand for new recruits by about 40 percent because of higher turnover. As a result of these factors, the armed forces would need to conscript about 120,000 youth each year to meet current strength requirements. If a draft involving this number of conscripts were limited to 18 year-old males, each male youth would have only about a 6 percent chance of being drafted. Imposition of the conscription tax on such a limited number of youth would seem rather egregious, and probably not politically acceptable, given the decline in the defense burden and the rise in incomes that taxpayers have recently enjoyed. A draft accompanied by a 50 percent basic pay reduction for the first two years of service would have little impact on the defense budget-and could even possibly increase it.

#### The draft harms the economy by harming human capital and earning potential.

Hubers and Webbink ’15 - the School of Economics at the Tinbergen Institute [The long-term effects of military conscription on educational attainment and wages, IZA Journal of Labor Economics, December 2015, <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s40172-015-0026-4>, July 5, 2016] [Premier]

Many countries have a military draft that compels large populations of young men to spend a substantial period of time in military service. Conscripts typically have to serve in the army in a period of their life in which decisions on human capital investments are taken. A compulsory military draft might harm investments in human capital and reduce life time earnings. A number of recent studies have investigated the effect of military service on educational attainment or the effect on wages. Remarkably, these studies do not provide a consistent picture of the effects of military service. For instance, military service seems to decrease educational attainment in the UK (Buonanno 2006) and Italy (Cipollone and Rosolia 2007)1 but increase completion of tertiary education in Germany (Bauer et al. 2014), France (Maurin and Xenogiani 2007) and in the US (Card and Lemieux 2001) because of draft avoidance behaviours. In addition, military service seems to reduce wages in the US (Angrist 1990; Angrist and Krueger 1994) and in the Netherlands (Imbens and van der Klaauw 1995), but in Germany (Bauer et al. 2012), there is no effect on wages. In the US, the negative effects seem to fade away over time (Angrist et al. 2011). Moreover, the importance of education as a mediating channel for the long run effects on earnings remains unclear (Bauer et al. 2012). This paper aims to provide new evidence by investigating the long term effects of military conscription on educational attainment and wages in the Netherlands. Investigating the effects of military conscription is difficult because those that have served might differ from those that have not served. Despite the fact that military conscription was compulsory for all men in the Netherlands, only 40 per cent of each birth cohort actually served in the military. Those who were recruited were selected from a larger population and the various decisions made in this selection process are unobserved. This might induce selection bias if we compare the outcomes of those who served in the military with the outcomes of those that did not serve in the military. To address this selection problem, we exploit a policy change that created a major difference in conscription between birth cohorts. In 1979, the age that Dutch young men were called for military service was lowered from 20 to 19. The direct consequence of this policy change was that a whole birth cohort was exempted from military service. We identify the causal effect of military service by comparing the long term outcomes of this exempted birth cohort with the outcomes of those born in the adjacent years. This local comparison enables us to generate two types of estimates. First, reduced form estimates of the difference between the exempted cohort and the adjacent cohorts that received the regular treatment of conscription provide a direct estimate of the societal costs of a system of conscription. The societal costs might consist of a lower educated population with a lower earnings capacity. Second, instrumental variable estimates show the effect of conscription for males that actually served in the army. These estimates for the com- pliers provide insight into the private costs of conscription. This approach is related to earlier work by Imbens and van der Klaauw (1995). They introduced an instrumental vari- able approach that exploits all variation in conscription between fourteen birth cohorts for obtaining estimates of the short term wage effects for conscripts. We also apply their approach for testing the robustness of our main results on the long term effects of conscription on three education outcomes and wages using micro-level data from 1997 to 2002. Moreover, data on educational attainment and earnings of women enable us to perform a placebo test about the influence of other time related confounding factors. This paper contributes to the recent literature on the effects of military service. First, by exploiting variation in conscription that is transparent and arguably exogenous in a local approach, we are able to obtain estimates of both the societal and private costs of a system of compulsory military service. Second, we are able to trace the effects of conscription on investment in human capital. In particular, we are able to investigate the effects of military conscription on completion of university education. We find that the system of compulsory military service decreases the proportion of university graduates by 1.5 percentage points from a baseline of 12.3 per cent. In addition, being a conscript reduces the probability of obtaining a university degree by almost four percentage points. Third, we investigate the long term effects of conscription on the average societal wages and the wages of conscripts. We find that the system of military service reduces average societal wages by 1.5 per cent. In addition, conscripts lose approximately four per cent of their wages by serving in the military. This suggests that the negative effects of military service are long-lasting. Finally, we investigate to what extent the wage costs of conscription can be explained by the decrease in investment in human capital. We find that the effect of conscription on educational attainment does not fully explain the wage reduction. This suggests that conscription also reduces individual earnings capacity through channels other than a reduction in human capital.

#### The draft harms wages because it is a capital tax - any previous economic study is flawed

Knapp, 73 - Assistant Professor of Economics @ UT Austin [Charles, Assistant Professor of Economics, University of Texas at Austin, A HUMAN CAPITAL APPROACH TO THE BURDEN OF THE MILITARY DRAFT, January 1973, JSTOR, 07/05/16] [Premier]

The purpose of this article is to estimate the size of the human capital burden which would be produced under alternative conscription schemes. The military draft is conceived of as a tax on both the present and the future earnings of draftees.' The discounted value of this tax is interpreted as a human capital burden; that is, a burden which alters the stock of human capital of inductees from what it would have been in the absence of the draft. Two major inadequacies in earlier economic analysis of conscription motivate this study. First, while it has recently been recognized that the conscription tax should include both earnings forgone while in the service (the usual definition) and discounted future income differences attributable to induction, empirical estimation of the conscription tax using this extend- ed concept has thus far been unsatisfactory. That these future income differences exist is a hypothesis subject to testing. To assume that the differences exist, and to further assume that the differences, always work to the disadvantage of the draftee, could lead to seriously biased estimates of the conscription tax.2 In addition to the lack of empirical rigor in previous estimations of the conscription tax, it is perhaps more serious that these analyses have failed to compare the conscription tax resulting from alternative induction systems. Comparison of the draft with alternative manpower procurement systems has centered on the volunteer military, where the conscription tax is zero. Although the elimination of the draft may be desirable on normative grounds, it is also recognized that the government must be willing to allocate the funds necessary if a volunteer service is the alternative. Since the possibility exists that there may again be some conscription system, a comparison should be made of the conscription tax under the draft as we have known it and the conscription tax under alternative manpower procurement schemes.

#### The draft does not help conscripts economically – it reduces educational achievement and potential wages – new studies prove.

Hubers and Webbink ’15 - the School of Economics at the Tinbergen Institute [The long-term effects of military conscription on educational attainment and wages, IZA Journal of Labor Economics, December 2015, <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s40172-015-0026-4>, July 5, 2016] [Premier]

8 Conclusions This paper investigated the long-term effect of military conscription on educational attainment and wages by exploiting a policy change that exempted a complete birth cohort from military service. We compare the educational outcomes and earnings of the exempted cohort with the outcomes of men from adjacent cohorts. This local approach yields estimates of the societal costs of a system of military conscription and estimates of the private costs for individuals that had to serve in the military. Our approach is related to previous work by Imbens and van der Klaauw (1995), who investigated the effects of conscription on wages of conscripts until 1990. We find that the system of compulsory military service decreases the proportion of university graduates by 1.5 percentage points from a baseline of 12.3 per cent. In addition, being a conscript reduces the probability of obtaining a university degree by almost four percentage points. Our estimates also show that the system of military service reduces average societal wages by 1.5 per cent. The private costs for conscripts are higher; they lose approximately 3 to 4 per cent of their wages by serving in the military. The fact that the average man in our sample served in the army almost 18 years before suggests that the negative effects of military service are long-lasting. Finally, we find that the effect of conscription on educational attainment does not fully explain the wage reduction. This suggests that conscription also reduces individual earnings capacity through channels other than a reduction in human capital. This study provides a new piece of evidence about the hidden costs of conscription. Our estimates show that military conscription has long term negative consequences for completion of university education and for individual earnings. This implies that the costs of conscription are substantial, both at the societal level and at the individual level. Moreover, the private costs of conscription seem to be long-lasting.

## Ks

### Capitalism

#### Draftees are controlled and sorted by class, putting lower class soldiers in the most expendable positions and creating a violent classism via a class hierarchy within the military. Draft resistance solves by sparking discussion

Hasbrouk, 16 - member of the War Resisters League (Edward, Draft Resistance and the Politics of Identity and Status, updated 2016 (from We Have Not been Moved: Resisting Racism and Militarism in 21st Century America, ed. Elizabeth Betita Martínez, Mandy Carter, Matt Meyer, 1 Sept 2012, <https://hasbrouck.org/draft/draft-identity-status.pdf> Accessed 6 July 2016) [Premier]

Throughout history and around the world, class has played a key role in who is chosen for what roles in the making of war. The dilemma of sovereign or state has always been that those of the lowest class status, who might be deemed most expendable and thus most suited for front-line combat roles, are often those least trusted not to turn the guns around. The standard solution to this problem has been a complex class-based hierarchy of assignment of military roles, in and out of uniform, that mirrors the class structure of the larger society. For feudal nobility, the grant from the monarch of a fiefdom of authority and revenue was conditioned on agreement to be on call to fight, at the king’s command, whomever the king declared to be his enemy -- at the knight’s own expense, furnishing his own arms and equipment. The peasantry below them was subject to compulsory call-up for corvée labor, which might serve military purposes but didn’t involve combat or carrying arms (or the risk of mutiny that might entail). At the bottom of the hierarchy, galley slaves were forced into some of the most dangerous jobs on the field of battle, but allowed neither weapons to defend themselves (whether against the “enemy” or their overseers) nor much opportunity to rebel or escape. In such a context, subjection to conscription or other forced labor in the service of war could be either an attribute of privileged class status or a symptom of inferior class status, depending on which group you are talking about. The same is true, if less obviously, in the modern world. From the perspective of modern war-makers, military conscription is best understood as merely one component in a scientific scheme for the mobilization and optimal allocation of human resources for war. In the USA, the infamous 1965 Selective Service System memo entitled “Channeling” made explicit that the function of the SSS was not solely to select certain people for induction into uniformed military “service”. Rather, the deferments, exemptions, and procedures were a deliberate system of carrots and sticks that would channel each young man into making his maximum contribution to the war effort and the other goals defined by the government, whether that could be done in or out of uniform. The Channeling memo was widely reprinted by the alternative press and as a draft resistance recruiting tool. It made clear those who avoided induction by pursuing exempt or deferred occupations were not escaping the draft system but complying with its intent that they “serve” the military-industrial complex and the government in other ways that those institutions perceived to be more valuable and more appropriate to their class. That realization led more of those people to choose draft resistance instead, even when that entailed renouncing student, occupational, or other deferments or exemptions. The leaked Channeling memo had more impact than almost any other involuntarily disclosed government policy document of the period. It's impact was exceeded only by that of the Pentagon Papers, and that of the documents revealing the existence of the Cointelpro program which were “liberated” by the anonymous heroes of the “Citizens Commission to Investigate the FBI” and published by the WRL and draft-resistance-associated WIN Magazine after mainstream media outlets to which they were sent declined to reprint or report them.3 Class has always been one of the great taboos of US political and social discourse. The 1960's and 1970's were a period of greatly expanded exploration of dissident ideas, when class was one of the largest factors in who was, and who wasn’t, being sent to die in Vietnam. Class remained, however, a largely sub rosa issue even within the counterculture. So it’s noteworthy that it was the classism of the draft, as exposed by the Channeling memo, that prompted one of the most open and widespread discussions of class in the USA -- in both mainstream and alternative media and culture -- of that era. Now a less overtly militarist government channeling is carried out in the USA through a new channeling mechanism largely developed since the early 1980's -- shortly after the draft ceased to play such a channeling role -- when student aid shifted abruptly from primarily grants to primarily loans.

#### The alternative must come first – changing class consciousness allows the draft to turn an imperialist war into a class war, and finally break down capitalism

Landy, 04 – National Secretary of the League for the Revolutionary Party (Sy, The Leninist Position on Conscription, Proletariat Revolution No 69 Winter 2004, <http://lrp-cofi.org/PR/conscriptionPR69.html> Accessed 6 July 2016) [Premier]

As the world crisis develops, sooner or later there will be a growing movement towards war between the advanced imperialist powers. Already the Pentagon is saying it needs more soldiers and longer tours of duty in Iraq. This points to an inevitable intensification in the militarization of the masses. Today the American bourgeoisie prefers a makeshift voluntary professional-hybrid army incorporating highly trained specialists employing advanced technology. The core of the army is the professional mercenaries, the “lifers.” However, the increased imperialist ventures abroad have already compelled the state to recruit a broader range of volunteers. It has already had to supplement regular army troops with reservists and national guard forces. The military recruitment policies were deliberately designed to attract young workers who were looking not to fight abroad but to gain skills and move upward within the civilian work force. Given the recent high unemployment, this has been temporarily successful. But as Iraq demonstrates, the broadening of the army’s base has already resulted in a significant rise in discontent within the ranks. So there is little interest now in a far broader army that would be obtained through a renewed draft. But the time will come when the ruling class will be forced to turn to a drafted mass army, because expanded wars, conquest and occupation require massive numbers of troops. This is why these issues are extremely important for workers to consider now, even though there is no draft on the horizon at the moment. The key to building a working-class anti-war movement is to link opposition to a given war to defense of the working class. Pacifism and draft resistance are strategies that have always been rejected by the working class in practice. Proletarian communists advocate that revolutionary workers go to war with their class brothers and sisters and take the only possible course for defending our class: as Lenin stressed, we must turn the imperialist war into a class war. To this end, revolutionaries help their fellow soldiers understand the class nature of the army and the imperialist nature of the war. When tactically possible, we raise, for example, the demand that the officers should be chosen by the soldiers themselves, so that workers are not turned into cannon fodder by racist, incompetent and anti-working-class officers. We fight for full political and union rights for soldiers. We oppose class privileges for bourgeois youth: no student deferments, no special officers’ academies, no ROTC. We show that military training and arms are essential tools for building a workers’ militia at home that can defend strikes and working-class communities against cops, scabs, thugs and fascists – and can be turned into a weapon for proletarian revolution and the end to imperialist wars.

#### The affirmative only mobilizes the anti-draft movement, which was irrelevant to ending the Vietnam war. Only a class struggle can end imperialist wars.

Landy, 04 – National Secretary of the League for the Revolutionary Party (Sy, The Leninist Position on Conscription, Proletariat Revolution No 69 Winter 2004, <http://lrp-cofi.org/PR/conscriptionPR69.html> Accessed 6 July 2016) [Premier]

The Anti-Vietnam War Movement The rest of Hall’s argument consists of painting the anti-war movement of the 1960’s and early 1970’s as if the anti-draft actions were the height of the movement’s militancy and most conscious anti-imperialism. He falls into calling the anti-war movement the “anti-draft movement” and glorifies the tendency to focus on middle-class anti-authority issues. And he totally ignores the fact that because of its class leadership it was incapable of mobilizing the industrial working class, the only force in the U.S. that can end all imperialist wars. Citing the trend towards greater militancy among youthful demonstrators, Hall claims that opposition to the draft was the key. It is true that the movement often focused on the draft as a symbol of the war and that many advocated and practiced draft resistance. But the defining character of the anti-war movement remained its opposition to the war itself, not just to the draft. And the increased militancy Hall associates with the anti-draft momentum did not have the revolutionary content Hall imagines. Let us put the anti-war movement in its context. The force that really compelled the U.S. to pull out of the war was the massive struggle of the Vietnamese people against imperialism. At home, the ruling class faced powerful ghetto revolts and, by the 1970’s, a plunging economy and massive industrial wildcat strike wave. In relative isolation from these upheavals, the middle-class-led anti-war movement played a role, but not the decisive one. Further, by politically limiting its goals to those acceptable to the liberal bourgeois Democratic Party officials, the anti-war demonstrators allowed the ruling class to get out of a losing and damaging war with the imperialist system left limping but essentially intact. We are paying the price for that today, Hall’s retrospective celebration aside.

#### The anti war or anti draft struggle cannot end imperialism – only the anti—capitalist struggle can because it unites workers and classes.

Landy, 04 – National Secretary of the League for the Revolutionary Party (Sy, The Leninist Position on Conscription, Proletariat Revolution No 69 Winter 2004, <http://lrp-cofi.org/PR/conscriptionPR69.html> Accessed 6 July 2016) [Premier]

When the anti-war movement focused on the draft as the main issue, it was weakened politically. Aiming at the draft re-enforced the barrier between the middle-class anti-war activists and the workers, who as the war dragged on shed their illusions in the imperialist cause. Most working-class youth who were drafted saw no other option. In the beginning of the war, patriotism spurred their acceptance. That soon wore off as reality set in, but young workers saw no alternative. The draft protesters were often seen by working-class draftees and their families as incomprehensibly naive or spoiled and cowardly rich brats. Those who concentrated on draft dodging deepened the gap. The anti-draft program pointed to no way out, had no content relevant to workers and was therefore not revolutionary. As the war went on, working-class opposition to the war became more and more massive. It was greater among Black workers but also grew rapidly among white workers. But it did not translate into significantly greater identification with the anti-war protests for the reasons given. The growing confrontationism in the anti-war movement did indeed reflect increased radical sentiments. Unfortunately, since there was no decisive class schism within the struggle, the greater militancy and confrontations on the street, which Hall regards as pro-revolutionary, were motivated by increasing frustration and desperation. The war went on and on, while the big protest demonstrations, featuring endless empty speeches by liberal politicians, led nowhere. But the street clashes were no threat to imperialism either, even though they were more satisfying than passive parades. Contradictory though it may sound, the anti-draft activists who furiously confronted cops in the streets were fundamentally enraged pacifists caught in another dead end. Industrial Workers Were Key What could have shaken the imperialist state would have been massive industrial strikes against the war and a conscious struggle against the war within the army. The latter did occur, as we described in our article, Vietnam: the ‘Working-Class War’, in PR 45. As for industrial action, that too occurred and had an important impact, but it did not match the anti-imperialist potential inherent in the working-class explosion that was being generated at the time.

#### The aff’s localization is embedded in a shift to a neoliberal governmentality

Carpenter 11, Sara Carpenter; PhD in Adult Education and Counselling psychology; University of Ontario; 2011; “THEORIZING PRAXIS IN CITIZENSHIP LEARNING: CIVIC ENGAGEMENT AND THE DEMOCRATIC MANAGEMENT OF INEQUALITY IN AMERICORPS;” [Premier]

There have also been attempts to explain the kind of preference for the local that appears in AmeriCorps through the literature on governmentality and the shift from welfare state formations to neo-liberal forms of organization. This literature sees the local as an expression of the diffusion of the state in late capitalism (Dean, 1999; Jordan, et al, 2005; Larner, 2000). Working from the Foucauldian concept of ‗governmentality,‘ these theorists explain the emphasis on the local as part of the overall neo-liberal reorganization of political life (Jessop, 2007). This position sees the political emphasis on the local as paradoxically related to the economic strategy of the local, which is embodied in policies that promote ―new entrepreneurial approaches to local economic development as well as diverse programs of institutional restructuring intended to enhance labor market flexibility, territorial competitiveness, and placespecific locational assets‖ (Brenner & Theodore, 2002 p. 341). The political domains associated with this shift from Fordist-Keynesian state arrangements are debated as a fundamental reorganization of the state or simply a different expression of state power (Newman, 2010). Further, theorists continue to conflict as to whether this diffusion of state power leaves opportunities for resistance or not. Evidence suggests that the emphasis on local democracy may be primarily discursive (Abelson, et al, 2003; Blakely, 2010; Blaug, 2002) and raises the further problem of the relation between democratic processes and ensuring democratic outcomes (Pratchett, 2004). An important thing to remember here is the relation of state, citizen, and democracy that emerges in the ‗local.‘ If citizens myopically focus on the local terrain, then they could have more power over their local domain, but they could also have less power over regional, federal, and international levels of organization. They could have more access to particular systems and centers of power, but less impact on the ways in which those systems relate to one another and to macro-level processes. They could grow more connected locally and more disconnected translocally. Local struggles could transform an understanding of the state into an emphasis on local organization, without dismantling or transforming existing state apparatuses, leaving them to do their work in their existing, hegemonic forms. Each of these risks associated with too much emphasis on the local comes with a corollary risk associated with too much emphasis on the global or universal. John Holst (2007) argues that critical adult educators have critiqued the emphasis on the local within our own field by arguing that the vision of economic globalization and neo-liberalism, which drives this emphasis, takes a liberal and ultimately defeatist TINA perspective on the expansion of global capitalism. Critical educators have critiqued this local focus within the field for having an underdeveloped relation with the global. At the same time Holst argues that critical educators have not countered with a strong theorization of the local/global dialectical relation that demonstrates why such a myopic focus is dangerous. I think that the experience of AmeriCorps, from the perspective of institutional ethnography, is instructive in this regard.

### Gender

#### The draft reinforces patriarchal ageist assumptions about paternal domination of youths’ bodies.

Hasbrouk, 16 - member of the War Resisters League (Edward, Draft Resistance and the Politics of Identity and Status, updated 2016 (from We Have Not been Moved: Resisting Racism and Militarism in 21st Century America, ed. Elizabeth Betita Martínez, Mandy Carter, Matt Meyer, 1 Sept 2012, <https://hasbrouck.org/draft/draft-identity-status.pdf> Accessed 6 July 2016) [Premier]

The most universal selection criterion for conscription is age, to the extent that symbols of conscription (such as draft registration or the issuance of a draft card) have often become key political coming-of-age rituals and totems. Draft resistance, as the deliberate rejection of submission to military service -- one of, and often the most important, prerequisites of adult political and legal status -- is thus correctly and literally regarded as “childish”. It’s a renunciation of adult status by those who have attained the age of eligibility for its privileges. Draft resisters are commonly dismissed as “having issues” with their parents, especially their fathers. To those who see the claims of the state through the Selective Service System to authority over their newly-adult bodies as resting on the same patriarchal ageist basis as their parents’ prior claims over their bodies as children, that’s precisely the point. The “Solomon Amendments” in the USA, which impose lifetime ineligibility for Federal government jobs and funding for education on those who don’t register for the draft by age 26, can be seen as formal legal expression of this permanent “sub-adult” status of draft resisters. The focus of the draft on just one or a few year-of-birth cohorts at a time, and the extremity of the burden it thus imposes on the basis of age, makes it one of the most overt expressions of ageism in government policy. As Phil Ochs famously sang, the reason why “I ain't marching any more” was the insight that, “It's always the old who lead us to the war; it's always the young who fall”. In such circumstances, it’s natural that awareness of the injustice of the draft has been central to consciousness-raising among young people about ageism, and that draft resisters have been in the forefront of many other struggles for youth liberation.

#### The 1AC’s logic of securitization/surveillance enables violence against womxn and misdiagnoses global threats, which turns case. McRobie 13

Heather McRobie [novelist, journalist, and former co-editor of openDemocracy 50.50. She has written for Al Jazeera, the Guardian, the New Statesman, and Foreign Policy, amongst others. She researches and lectures on public policy at the Higher School of Economics in Moscow, and previously studied at the University of Oxford, University of Bologna and University of Sarajevo]. From the war on terror to austerity: a lost decade for women and human rights. OpenDemocracy. May 31, 2013. https://www.opendemocracy.net/5050/heather-mcrobie/from-war-on-terror-to-austerity-lost-decade-for-women-and-human-rights [Premier]

A recurring theme at the [Nobel Women’s Initiative conference](http://nobelwomensinitiative.org/2013/05/announcing-moving-beyond-militarism-war-an-international-conference/?ref=18&ref=26198) in Belfast has been a reflection on the last decade in terms of its global impact on women and human rights. A picture emerged of a period wherein the excuse of ‘**war on terror’ as a justificatory narrative for exclusivist identities, state violence and violence against women gave way to official austerity narratives that, in their own way, entrench inequalities and disempower women.** Central to the decade was the elevation of the sanctity of the nation state’s security or perceived security, often – paradoxically – at the expense of both its citizens and those outside its borders. Several speakers reflected on the ‘war on terror’ period in terms of its interrelated assault on human rights and women. The human rights violations and mass violation of human dignity enacted under the guise of the ‘war on terror’ runs from arbitrary detention to drone-strikes, from Guantanamo to Yemen to the encroachment of the rights of ‘citizens’ in the homelands that those who instigated the ‘war on terror’ were claiming to ‘protect’. The attack on women was similarly wide-sweeping: from the neo-colonial appropriation of the discourse of ‘women’s rights’ – toothless and sanitised in its neo-con costume – as an empty vessel to further the cause of militarism in Afghanistan and Iraq, to the ossification of rigid binary gender roles in the ‘homeland’ of America; rapes were committed by occupying soldiers at sites of invasion while in countries such as Yemen and Pakistan women’s lives were eroded [by the chaos in their lives caused by the ‘war on terror’.](http://www.cam.ac.uk/research/news/the-war-on-terror-is-a-war-on-women) Amina Mama, Director of the Women and Gender Studies programme at UC Davis, spoke at the conference about how the process of militarisation works in tandem with the **construct**ion **and reinforce**ment of **rigid**, exclusivist **gender roles, creating matrixes of power**-structures **in favour of** [**the nation state and military**](http://www.opendemocracy.net/5050/amina-mama/challenging-militarized-masculinities) **and against alternative, non-hierarchical ways of being**. **The** [**epidemic levels of sexual assault**](http://www.opendemocracy.net/5050/heather-mcrobie/women-in-us-military-%E2%80%93-uncomfortable-power) **within the US military itself** – while due to its own complex set of causes – in some sense **plays out this dynamic in microcosm**, in the **interlocking of patriarchy and militarism that is central to the dominant conception of Western statecraft.** Similarly, **there is a parallel between ‘us and them’ narratives constructed in the racist discourse of official ‘war on terror’ framings and the ossification of** rigid and regressive **gender roles that characterised the ‘war on terror’, from the neo-colonial justifications for military invasion under the guise of ‘protecting women’ to the rigidity of gender roles in the ‘homeland’ espoused by the same** Republican-Party-**mind-set** that so enthusiastically rallied for overseas wars. As Susan Faludi and others have outlined, just as the ‘war on terror’ drew on imperial tropes to enact its overseas wars**, women at home were further marginalised from power under the logic of** [**the emergency-state of a country at war.**](http://www.guardian.co.uk/books/2008/mar/22/politics)Madeleine Rees of the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom mentioned the levels of military spending in the last decade, and the dynamics of [arms sales worldwide](http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org/news/latest-news/7596-un-member-states-adopt-first-ever-arms-trade-treaty) as a human rights and feminist concern. The cost of the ‘war on terror’ was an estimated $3.2 billion to $4 billion for Americans, a figure that excludes both the economic cost on the invaded countries and the human toll of (by a very conservative estimate) 137,000 civilians killed and 7.8 million refugees from Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan. The toll of a decade’s worth of wars, and the [debts incurred](http://www.truth-out.org/speakout/item/14966-is-the-war-on-terror-worth-the-price) as a result, were a significant factor in the economic crisis that dominated the later part of this lost decade. The ‘lost decade’ was lost in many fronts, and these losses continue. It is worth noting here that, while the ‘war on terror’ may have been a construct of the Bush-Blair era its legacies are potent and alive in our current realities well into the second term of the Obama administration, from [drone strikes](http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/map_of_the_week/2013/02/map_drone_strikes_in_pakistan_under_obama_bush.html) to the 2012 [National Defense Authorisation Act](http://abcnews.go.com/blogs/politics/2011/12/with-reservations-obama-signs-act-to-allow-detention-of-citizens/) which stitched Bush-era indefinite detention into American domestic law. Meanwhile Guantanamo, one of the icons of Bush-Blair ‘war on terror’, remains open [so many Obama-promises](http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2013/mar/06/obama-promise-close-guantanamo-worse) later. Yet if the high years of the ‘war on terror’ played out as a Rubik’s cube of militarism, militaristic gender roles and the corrosion of human rights and dignity, **the segue from the ‘war on terror’ era to** what could be characterised as **the post-2008 ‘austerity’ era did little** to loosen this knot, whilst layering upon it its own injustices. Madeleine Rees made the point, during the conference, that austerity should be conceptualised as a ‘war on the poor’. **Under the guise of saving the nation state, measures are brought in that entrench inequalities** – this has played out in the re**moval of citizens’ rights to access vital services as social safety-nets** are corroded, compounding the difficulties caused by mass employment and underemployment. In addition to this strain, [**austerity has been gendered**](http://www.opendemocracy.net/5050/heather-mcrobie/when-austerity-sounds-like-backlash-gender-and-economic-crisis)**. Governments** such as the British government have utilised the emergency-mode of ‘austerity’ to **focus** its **cuts on those who are least invested in** by their ideology. The strain of the recession means there has been **an increase in** [**domestic violence**](http://www.opendemocracy.net/5050/heather-mcrobie/austerity-and-domestic-violence-mapping-damage) from [Britain](http://www.guardian.co.uk/society/2013/mar/07/domestic-violence-figures-citizens-advice) to Spain to [Greece](http://www.opendemocracy.net/dawn-foster/from-heart-attacks-to-maternal-care-human-cost-of-austerity-in-greece), just **as domestic violence shelters are closing – those who are caught in dangerous and abusive situations are now less likely to have the financial means to leave their partners.** Layered on top of this, the re-emergence of right-wing and conservative national governments since 2008 have furthered blocked women’s interests, as **cuts have fallen disproportionately on services and benefits vital for women’s safety and development**. A report by the [European Women’s Lobby](http://www.gwi-boell.de/web/europe-price-austerity-women-gender-europe-4730.html) found women’s organisations are struggling throughout the region as a direct result of the recession and austerity. This increase of domestic violence, loss of services and benefits for women, and the curtailing of women’s organisations comes in addition to the general impact of the post-2008 recession: deterioration of working conditions and employment, underemployment for women as [temping agencies capitalise](http://www.opendemocracy.net/5050/heather-mcrobie/precariat-and-mad-men-secretaries-temping-under-tory-government) on their diminished opportunities, and public sector cuts, a sector in which women were the majority of workers. Globally, the impact of austerity has been gendered just as poverty is gendered – this is the intersection of the austerity as a ‘war on the poor’ and austerity as a ‘war on women’. **The** [**‘feminisation of poverty’**](http://www.opendemocracy.net/5050/kate-donald/feminisation-of-poverty-and-myth-of-welfare-queen), which was a pressing concern before 2008, **has been deepened** by the ‘austerity’ era, firstly through the economic crisis itself and secondly as governments and international organisations have structured their cuts in ways that disproportionately hurt women and other structurally disadvantaged groups. Yet in these austere times, **as women** and the poor **shoulder the weight of the economic crisis**, one sector, at least, seems safe -- **military spending** in the western world **continues** at **its ‘war on terror’** scale **while spending on vital services and benefits is decimated, blind to the fact that ‘war on terror’ military spending was a** [**key factor**](http://www.opendemocracy.net/openeconomy/tony-curzon-price/fear-and-loathing-and-economic-crisis) **in triggering the 2008 economic crisis**. **Military spending has barely been encroached upon by austerity measures** in the United States and [Europe](http://www.opendemocracy.net/frank-slijper/austerity-in-europe-tighten-military-belt), when compared to the impact of the economic crisis and austerity on citizens’ quality of life. Yet the argument deployed that military and arms are – for all their other faults – at least good job creators in times of high unemployment, has been debunked by a University of Massachusetts [study](http://www.peri.umass.edu/fileadmin/pdf/other_publication_types/PERI_IPS_WAND_study.pdf) showing that **defence spending creates the proportionally smallest number of jobs.** Governments continue to militarise, and militarise societies, as **citizens at home and abroad suffer** the **economic hardship** brought about by the crisis. The disconnect between military spending and the impact of austerity on citizens is often jarring: **Greece, whose crippling economic crisis has taken a painful toll on its citizens,** [**in 2012**](http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2012/mar/21/greece-austerity-measures-military-spending) **spent the most on arms in the EU as a percentage of GDP. This is the combined heritage of the last decade: austerity-crippled citizens, a series of devastating wars, attacks and drone strikes, with increased homelessness and unemployment as governments focus their spending on new weapons. It is a toxic environment for** human rights, **women’s rights**, and social justice. The thread that follows from the ‘war on terror’ through to ‘austerity’ is the lack of value placed on human life and dignity. Neither militarism nor neo-liberalism place human life and dignity at their centre, yet both work with ease with the modalities of patriarchy. If this ‘lost decade’ can be divided into the ‘war on terror’ (militarism) and the ‘economic crisis’ (neo-liberalism), we can see how both encroached on women and human rights within their frameworks by working in tandem with patriarchal structures: the ‘war on terror’s militarised masculinity and assault on human rights abroad combined with its corrosion of the gains of feminism in the ‘homelands’, and the economic crisis and austerity through its privileging of the market over human values, in a climate where services from health to education to domestic violence provisions are cut but military budgets remain almost untouched. Speaking at the Nobel Women’s Initiative, academic Valerie Hudson made the point that ‘**there is a ‘war on women’ underneath all other wars’,** a line of argument that **encompasses the much of the misguided and violent nature of the ‘war on terror’ to ‘austerity’ eras**. The phrase ‘war on women’ gained widespread media currency during the last Presidential election in the USA, primarily as a way to characterise US Republicans’ [attacks on women’s rights](http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2012/nov/07/women-fought-gop-2012-waronwomen), particularly their [reproductive rights](http://www.nytimes.com/2012/01/09/opinion/republicans-versus-reproductive-rights.html?_r=0). In this wider context of this ‘lost decade’ analysis, from the ‘war on terror’ to ‘austerity’, it highlights how the thread of gender inequality, as well as the assault on human rights and social justice, links the two poles of the era. The ‘lost decade’ was not only ‘lost’ in terms of the lives and potential of those caught in the wars, militarism, state-sponsored xenophobia, encroachment on human rights and loss of the gains of women’s movements. This grim marriage of **patriarchy, militarism and neo-liberalism also prevented an adequate response to the urgent and complex global crises of our time, most notably climate change**. **The urgent need to address climate change has suffered neglect at the hands of the bodies who are doing most of contribute to this global disaster, whilst narratives of ‘war on terror’** and militarism **distract from this core global concern.** That tackling climate change has fallen by the wayside during the ‘lost decade’ is a global disaster in its own right; it also has gendered dimensions. **Women are the primary food producers who are being pushed to work on more barren land as climate change ravages landscapes, while women and children face additional difficulties as refugees** [**as a result of climate change**](http://www.dw.de/climate-change-refugees-lack-legal-protection/a-16555126)**.** If this has been a lost decade for women and human rights, the urgent question now is how we prevent another ‘lost decade’ whilst mitigating against the worst of the impacts of this matrix of militarism, patriarchy and neo-liberalism that mushroomed in the 2000s. Amina Mama spoke at the Nobel Women’s Initiative of practicalities of the moment, of **plac**ing ***women’s security at the heart of human security, moving ‘security’ from a militaristic conception to a feminist conception that centralises human values***. More broadly, the task ahead to prevent another ‘lost decade’ is to resist the matrix of militarism, unfettered neo-liberalism and patriarchy as it manifests in the current realities of our ‘austerity’ era.

### Militarism

#### Rangel’s call for a draft reinforces the hegemonic ruling class – it perfects the militarism of the state.

Landy, 04 – National Secretary of the League for the Revolutionary Party (Sy, The Leninist Position on Conscription, Proletariat Revolution No 69 Winter 2004, <http://lrp-cofi.org/PR/conscriptionPR69.html> Accessed 6 July 2016) [Premier]

Hall’s accusation that we support the Conyers/Rangel proposal is thoroughly dishonest. In the PR 66 article that Hall attacks, we clearly described the real motivation for the Conyers/Rangel proposal: “In reality, like other ‘anti-war’ Democratic politicians, Rangel wants to carry out imperialist policies with a better cover.” We pointed out that Congressman Rangel tried to out-tough Bush on the need for a strong military; we quoted him as saying, “The administration has yet to address the question of whether our military is of sufficient strength and size to meet present and future commitments.” We can add that Rangel claimed that those who rule will be more careful about launching wars if their children are to be drafted. That is sheer demagogy. Bourgeois drafts do not mean universal conscription: they allow millions of exemptions, officer posts and alternate service channels for ruling-class and often middle-class youth. These escapes are not available to young workers, especially those of color. Our propaganda has always exposed this fact. So much for our “acceptance” of Rangel’s call for a draft!

#### The Draft increases militarism – it would give Congress a blank check for intervention from increased forces

Jahnkow, 02- part of the Committee Opposed to the Military and the Draft [Rick, part of the Committee Opposed to the Military and the Draft, For those who believe we need a Draft, COMD, Sept 2002, <<http://www.comdsd.org/article_archive/BelieveDraft.htm>>, July 6 2016] [Premier]

We also hear it from liberals, and even a few leftists, who are under the impression that conscription would be doing a big favor for disadvantaged youths or would lessen the chances of war by spreading the burden for maintaining our bloated military establishment and overly aggressive foreign policy to more middle-class people. They even make the argument, sometimes, that we need a draft to keep us from drifting toward Prussian militarism and a Hitler-type dictatorship. These aren't new arguments. Some of them were used to successfully convince people to keep the draft that was begun during WWII, even though the people of this country had historically been suspicious of conscription and previously had only allowed drafts briefly during the Civil War and WWI. Many of these arguments were also used in the early 1970s to try to keep the draft going as we began to pull out of the war in Southeast Asia. By then, however, Vietnam had brought back the traditional understanding that conscription exploits those who are politically and economically disadvantaged and makes it easier for governments to wage illegitimate wars. Unfortunately, the memory of this lesson is not as fresh as it once was, and there are both liberals and conservatives who are now taking advantage of the post-9/11 climate of fear to make people think that a draft would be good for the nation. Right now, our military doesn't really require conscription to maintain its current force levels, and the Pentagon has found that using its well-funded recruiting campaign and expanded outreach to schools can influence young people in a way that would be impossible with a draft (threatening people with jail if they don't enter the military is hardly an effective way to win the hearts and minds of younger generations). However, if the war hawks in this country continue to have their way, there will be more pressure to enlarge the armed forces beyond what can be supported with voluntary enlistments, and the voices calling for conscription will get much louder than they presently are. This is a good time, therefore, to review some of the key issues that should be considered: 1. There are those who claim that conscription is needed for national defense. However, it takes months to move people through the draft classification system, the induction process and military training, so it has no usefulness for meeting short-term emergencies. (The Reserves and National Guard are designed to play that role.) The draft's main military value is to provide a steady stream of draftees for a long, drawn-out war or when the size of military commitments is so large that the force level can't be maintained with only enlistments. With a draft, the government doesn't have to rely on people voluntarily stepping forward to fill the military's ranks, so it can maintain a larger force size and pursue the kind of unpopular military adventurism that led to more than 10 years of U.S. warfare in Southeast Asia. Not having a draft doesn't guarantee the U.S. won't wage illegitimate wars, but it creates more pressure on the government to justify its actions than if we gave the president the blank check he would have with conscription. Imagine what that would be like with a commander-in-chief like George Bush II.

#### The alternative is to reject the militarist mindset. Only critical resistance to imperialism can end militarism – The plan makes the alternative impossible - A draft increases militarism – it indoctrinates those it brings in the military and spreads it throughout society.

Jahnkow, 02- part of the Committee Opposed to the Military and the Draft [Rick, part of the Committee Opposed to the Military and the Draft, For those who believe we need a Draft, COMD, Sept 2002, <<http://www.comdsd.org/article_archive/BelieveDraft.htm>>, July 6 2016] [Premier]

If the U.S. government had the power to send EVERYONE off to kill and/or be killed in its wars of intervention, it would be a form of equality - but it would be equality of the grave. Instead, we should demand that NO one be drafted, and NO one be recruited to fight for the economic and political exploitation of the rest of the world by the U.S. We have wars because people have been brought up with a predominant value system that encourages people to solve disagreements with violence. The general population is indoctrinated in this value system from an early age, and our culture and governmental institutions reinforce it. Military training is the extreme form of pro-war indoctrination, which is why people like Napoleon, Hitler and the militarists of today have wanted to universally subject young people to conscription. The draft is a quick and effective way to indoctrinate more people and then send them back to civilian society to spread the authoritarian value system they have learned. The Pentagon was forced to give up the draft at the end of Vietnam, but it has been been increasingly insinuating itself in institutions of socialization to continue the process of militarization. If we brought back the draft, it wouldn't remove the military from our schools or culture, it would just make it easier to put more people through the militarization process. We'd end up repeating the post-WWII cycle that led to decades of reactionary politics and an obedient population that was willing to give the Pentagon anything it wanted. Practicing effective self-government and democracy requires that we instill in individuals a propensity for critical, creative thinking and a willingness to challenge the "chain of command" when institutions are not serving their needs. Bringing back the draft is the opposite of what we should do to achieve those goals.

#### A draft increases militarism – it indoctrinates those it brings in the military and spreads it throughout society. Only critical resistance to imperialism can end militarism

Jahnkow, 02- part of the Committee Opposed to the Military and the Draft [Rick, part of the Committee Opposed to the Military and the Draft, For those who believe we need a Draft, COMD, Sept 2002, <<http://www.comdsd.org/article_archive/BelieveDraft.htm>>, July 6 2016] [Premier]

If the U.S. government had the power to send EVERYONE off to kill and/or be killed in its wars of intervention, it would be a form of equality - but it would be equality of the grave. Instead, we should demand that NO one be drafted, and NO one be recruited to fight for the economic and political exploitation of the rest of the world by the U.S. We have wars because people have been brought up with a predominant value system that encourages people to solve disagreements with violence. The general population is indoctrinated in this value system from an early age, and our culture and governmental institutions reinforce it. Military training is the extreme form of pro-war indoctrination, which is why people like Napoleon, Hitler and the militarists of today have wanted to universally subject young people to conscription. The draft is a quick and effective way to indoctrinate more people and then send them back to civilian society to spread the authoritarian value system they have learned. The Pentagon was forced to give up the draft at the end of Vietnam, but it has been been increasingly insinuating itself in institutions of socialization to continue the process of militarization. If we brought back the draft, it wouldn't remove the military from our schools or culture, it would just make it easier to put more people through the militarization process. We'd end up repeating the post-WWII cycle that led to decades of reactionary politics and an obedient population that was willing to give the Pentagon anything it wanted. Practicing effective self-government and democracy requires that we instill in individuals a propensity for critical, creative thinking and a willingness to challenge the "chain of command" when institutions are not serving their needs. Bringing back the draft is the opposite of what we should do to achieve those goals.

#### The draft increases the use of the military overseas – a draft empirically lowers war cost for wealthy who pay less taxes – prefer since my evidence is comparative

Appelbaum, 16 – reporter for New York Times (Binyamin, Economists Against the Draft, New York Times, 6 Feb 2016, <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/02/07/opinion/sunday/economists-against-the-draft.html> Accessed 6 July 2016) [Premier]

The debate about conscription, of course, extends beyond economic efficiency. Proponents have long argued that a draft distributes the burden of military service more fairly. They also see it as a deterrent to military action, since voters fear for the lives of their sons and daughters. The Nixon administration subscribed to this logic. In ending the draft, it hoped to soften opposition to the Vietnam War. For the opposite reason, Representative Charles Rangel, a New York Democrat, has repeatedly sponsored legislation to reinstate a wartime draft — for men and women. “Those making the decision to fight need to feel the burden,” he said last year. But the evidence is at best murky. Military service throughout American history has been borne disproportionately by those at the lower end of the economic ladder, who lack the resources to avoid it. The financial cost of a volunteer army, conversely, falls disproportionately on those who pay the most taxes, and some scholars see evidence that this “price tag” effect is a more significant deterrent. Voters may be more upset about the cost of war than the remote chance that their own children will be drafted. In 1968, James C. Miller III organized a group of graduate students at the University of Virginia to write an influential collection of essays arguing for the end of the draft. He said recently that time had validated their arguments. “I believe that when you have a draft you’re more likely to go to war than if you have to pay for a volunteer army,” said Mr. Miller, an economist who went on to lead the Office of Management and Budget in the Reagan administration. A draft lowers the cost for the wealthy “because the people who are important don’t have their children going off and they’re also not paying as much in taxes.”

#### A draft causes Militarism – an oversupply of soldiers encourages the military to see soldiers as expendable – historically proven

Lacey, 03 – US Army Reserve officer (James, Symposium - Q: Is restoring universal military conscription in the United States a good idea? NO: The modern military needs a smaller force of highly motivated, trained professionals, not a horde of draftees. Insight on the News, 4 Feb 2003, http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_m1571/is\_4\_19/ai\_97450991 Accessed 4 July 2016) [Premier]

Actually, the real moral danger of a draft is that it will provide so many troops that there might be a temptation to waste them in useless engagements. This is what history has demonstrated over and over again. The bloody charges into massed rifles during the Civil War could not have been sustained without a draft to replace those slaughtered. In World War I, British Prime Minister David Lloyd George actually began holding back reinforcements so that his generals could not waste their lives in another big-push offensive. During World War II, Gen. George Marshall used to walk the casualty figures into the president every day to remind him that real men were dying on every decision he made. Finally, does anyone think the useless carnage of Vietnam could have continued year after year if we had a volunteer force? At some point the volunteers would have been reduced to a trickle and we would have had to find another solution.

#### The Draft increases militarism – it would give Congress a blank check for intervention from increased forces

Jahnkow, 02- part of the Committee Opposed to the Military and the Draft [Rick, part of the Committee Opposed to the Military and the Draft, For those who believe we need a Draft, COMD, Sept 2002, <<http://www.comdsd.org/article_archive/BelieveDraft.htm>>, July 6 2016] [Premier]

We also hear it from liberals, and even a few leftists, who are under the impression that conscription would be doing a big favor for disadvantaged youths or would lessen the chances of war by spreading the burden for maintaining our bloated military establishment and overly aggressive foreign policy to more middle-class people. They even make the argument, sometimes, that we need a draft to keep us from drifting toward Prussian militarism and a Hitler-type dictatorship. These aren't new arguments. Some of them were used to successfully convince people to keep the draft that was begun during WWII, even though the people of this country had historically been suspicious of conscription and previously had only allowed drafts briefly during the Civil War and WWI. Many of these arguments were also used in the early 1970s to try to keep the draft going as we began to pull out of the war in Southeast Asia. By then, however, Vietnam had brought back the traditional understanding that conscription exploits those who are politically and economically disadvantaged and makes it easier for governments to wage illegitimate wars. Unfortunately, the memory of this lesson is not as fresh as it once was, and there are both liberals and conservatives who are now taking advantage of the post-9/11 climate of fear to make people think that a draft would be good for the nation. Right now, our military doesn't really require conscription to maintain its current force levels, and the Pentagon has found that using its well-funded recruiting campaign and expanded outreach to schools can influence young people in a way that would be impossible with a draft (threatening people with jail if they don't enter the military is hardly an effective way to win the hearts and minds of younger generations). However, if the war hawks in this country continue to have their way, there will be more pressure to enlarge the armed forces beyond what can be supported with voluntary enlistments, and the voices calling for conscription will get much louder than they presently are. This is a good time, therefore, to review some of the key issues that should be considered: 1. There are those who claim that conscription is needed for national defense. However, it takes months to move people through the draft classification system, the induction process and military training, so it has no usefulness for meeting short-term emergencies. (The Reserves and National Guard are designed to play that role.) The draft's main military value is to provide a steady stream of draftees for a long, drawn-out war or when the size of military commitments is so large that the force level can't be maintained with only enlistments. With a draft, the government doesn't have to rely on people voluntarily stepping forward to fill the military's ranks, so it can maintain a larger force size and pursue the kind of unpopular military adventurism that led to more than 10 years of U.S. warfare in Southeast Asia. Not having a draft doesn't guarantee the U.S. won't wage illegitimate wars, but it creates more pressure on the government to justify its actions than if we gave the president the blank check he would have with conscription. Imagine what that would be like with a commander-in-chief like George Bush II.

#### The alternative solves the racism advantage – draft resistance builds coalitions that share common anti-racism ideologies

Hasbrouk, 16 - member of the War Resisters League (Edward, Draft Resistance and the Politics of Identity and Status, updated 2016 (from We Have Not been Moved: Resisting Racism and Militarism in 21st Century America, ed. Elizabeth Betita Martínez, Mandy Carter, Matt Meyer, 1 Sept 2012, <https://hasbrouck.org/draft/draft-identity-status.pdf> Accessed 6 July 2016) [Premier]

In part because of greater access to the media by white people than people of color, the draft resistance movement has often been perceived as a movement of white people. (Muhammed Ali excepted.) But as an organized movement, draft resistance in the USA has long been multi-racial and often explicitly anti-racist. That’s partly due to the explicit anti-racism of the Communist and Gandhian ideologies and some of the religions (including Islam and Quakerism) that have been central to the values of some draft resisters. Perhaps more importantly, the particularly deep bonds of camaraderie felt by draft resisters across ideological, generational, and other lines -- fostered by a sense of shared action, shared risk-taking, and in prison shared suffering, and leading to a sense of “The Resistance” as a community more than as an organization -- have been a powerful counterpoise among draft resisters to the racism of the larger society. For example, it was draft resisters’ insistence on fraternizing across racial lines within their group, as long ago as World War II, even within prisons and against official prohibitions and punishments, that initiated the process of official desegregation of the Federal prison system.

#### Draft Resistance isn’t an example of white privilege – the alternative organizes cross racial groups to protest imperialism and racism in wars. The affirmative evidence assumes Draft Dodgers, not Resisters

Hasbrouk, 16 - member of the War Resisters League (Edward, Draft Resistance and the Politics of Identity and Status, updated 2016 (from We Have Not been Moved: Resisting Racism and Militarism in 21st Century America, ed. Elizabeth Betita Martínez, Mandy Carter, Matt Meyer, 1 Sept 2012, <https://hasbrouck.org/draft/draft-identity-status.pdf> Accessed 6 July 2016) [Premier]

Hawkish mainstream media typically equate draft resisters with “draft dodgers”, and presume that most opponents of the draft are privileged white college students. Even many progressives have been misled by this into a recent revisionist interpretation of draft resistance as an implicitly racist movement for the preservation of white skin privilege. If draft resisters are mainly just trying to avoid the risks of combat while people of color are economically coerced to “volunteer”, the antidraft movement is partially to blame for the racist poverty draft.

Such a view ignores the reality that, while many people have, indeed, “evaded” the draft whenever it has been in operation, draft resistance has almost never been the most effective way for an individual to avoid being drafted. Additional motives much be taken into account to explain why people have chosen resistance, with its greater personal risks and costs, rather than more effective methods (from a purely selfish perspective, if that were their sole goal) of reducing the likelihood of personally being drafted. Not all but some black and white draft resisters alike, both in the USA and other settlercolonial countries in particular, have framed their motives for draft resistance in terms of opposition to racism and imperialism and/or an unwillingness to participate personally in racist and imperialist wars, occupations, and invasions. Draft resistance among white people in such places has been, at times, one of the most visible forms of white antiracist organizing. In the same vein, draft resistance and war tax resistance have long been (including repeatedly in the USA during a succession of imperial military ventures abroad) key forms of organizing against imperialism within the privileged populations of the imperial powers. Henry David Thoreau’s and Mark Twain's opposition to the Spanish-American War and to taxes for it, it should be remembered, was not pacifist but anti-racist and anti-imperialist. To the extent that wars are being fought to impose, expand, or perpetuate racist social, economic, and political structures, opting out of war by opting out of military conscription, even in ways that might be seen as “dodging” rather than confronting or resisting the draft, can be and often has been considered an inherently anti-racist act. That’s been particularly true in Israel, as it used to be in South Africa. In both cases, draft resistance is or was directed primarily or exclusively at racial apartheid and territorial expansionism rather than at war or the draft in general.

#### The anti-draft movement can expand far beyond anti-militarism – it is about challenging the intersections of oppression implied in National Service and imperial wars.

Hasbrouk, 16 - member of the War Resisters League (Edward, Draft Resistance and the Politics of Identity and Status, updated 2016 (from We Have Not been Moved: Resisting Racism and Militarism in 21st Century America, ed. Elizabeth Betita Martínez, Mandy Carter, Matt Meyer, 1 Sept 2012, <https://hasbrouck.org/draft/draft-identity-status.pdf> Accessed 6 July 2016) [Premier]

The most famous draft resister in American (or world?) history, Muhammed Ali, represented his refusal to submit to induction into the US military in terms of his submission to Allah and his understanding of Islam. What non-Muslims mostly heard and responded to, however -- regardless of whether the quote is apocryphal1 -- was the explanation for his draft resistance variously attributed to the heavyweight boxing champion and/or to SNCC or other civil rights activists: “No Vietcong ever called me nigger.” This was an explicitly anti-racist and anti-imperialist sentiment, but notably not an antiwar, much less a pacifist, one. More than anything else, it framed draft resistance in terms of identity politics. To the world, it was a statement of self-emancipation: The world’s best fighter wouldn’t fight for “the Man” or the American empire (or their gods), but would instead make his own choices of what was worth fighting for (and what to believe in). As such, it epitomized victory in the struggle of colonized people and people of color to cast off internalized oppression. Despite such historical examples, resistance to military conscription, in the USA and around the world, is typically assumed to be motivated primarily by opposition either to war in general or to a particular war for which soldiers are being drafted in that place and at that time. On the basis of this assumption, draft resistance movements are typically analyzed ideologically in the context primarily of pacifism, and organizationally in the context of antiwar movements. There is substantial factual and historical basis for these assumptions. While draft resisters and their motives have usually been quite diverse, the basis of unity for most draft resistance movements and organizations has been opposition to a particular war. And with notable exceptions both religious (Jehovah’s Witnesses and the traditional peace churches) and secular (the War Resisters International, the War Resisters League in the USA, other Gandhian pacifists, and some other libertarians and anarchists), draft resistance has rarely been able to maintain a sustained large-scale visibility or organizational expression in what is seen as “peacetime”. But as the case of Muhammed Ali makes clear, looking at draft resistance solely in relation to war and antiwar activism leaves important gaps in our understanding of the sources of draft resistance, and of its relationship to other issues and movements. Draft resistance has ideological elements, of course. But it also has connections to the politics of identity and status, in terms of age, gender, sexual preference, race, class, caste, citizenship, and nationality. Military conscription isn’t just about forcing people to fight. It also involves the enforcement of choices about who is conscripted to fight, and against whom they are conscripted to fight.

#### The Draft would not change militarism– This answers all of their warrants – it won’t change military decision making, it won’t increase anti-war movements or protests in the military, and it won’t convince Congress to bring the military home.

Jahnkow, 02- part of the Committee Opposed to the Military and the Draft [Rick, part of the Committee Opposed to the Military and the Draft, For those who believe we need a Draft, COMD, Sept 2002, <<http://www.comdsd.org/article_archive/BelieveDraft.htm>>, July 6 2016] [Premier]

3. Contrary to some people's claim, a draft would not protect us from the dangerous influence of a professional military class. By nature, the military is not a democratic organization, and with or without conscription it is the officer corps and politicians who set and control policy, not the lower ranks. Lower-ranking military members take a great risk in defying orders; even merely questioning them can bring reprisals that have much greater consequences than those faced by employees with civilian jobs. If the draft were a protection from totalitarianism and dictatorship, then conscription would not have been relied upon as it was by past totalitarian governments in Spain, Russia, China, various Latin American countries, Prussia/Germany and Japan. 4. The argument that a draft will keep us out of illegitimate wars because draftees would be more likely to resist them is often heard, but it ignores some important facts: · Draftees are picked young and have the least understanding of the political policies for which their lives may be sacrificed. · They are the most obedient of troops because, above all, they want to get out of the military, and they know that if they stay out of trouble, they only have to wait a couple of years. Volunteers, on the other hand, are in for a longer term and have much more at stake. · A historical fact that has been forgotten even by many liberals is that most of the organized resistance to the Vietnam War within the armed forces - like the Concerned Officers Movement and Movement for a Democratic Military - came largely from volunteers, not draftees. A draft was in place prior to the Vietnam War, yet it took more than 10 years of body bags coming home before resistance and general opposition grew strong enough to finally force an end to the war. If the draft was supposed to be an obstacle to illegitimate war, it didn't do a very good job with that conflict. 5. Some people believe that the problem with the Vietnam draft was that it disproportionately affected non-white and low-income people. They say a draft that includes more middle-class, white people would be more just and would cause greater reluctance to go to war. There are several problems with this argument: Once a U.S. president sends people into combat and body bags start coming home, it becomes very difficult, politically, to retreat; those who are intent on making war know that no politician will ever want to be the one who says that U.S. soldiers died in vain. This means that if a president wants to launch military action, he can do so with confidence that both Congress and the public will back him, at least initially. Draftees would not provide a braking effect until after there are great losses and probably years of stalemate (Vietnam is a prime example). · The U.S. government has learned that the key to avoiding the kind of civilian and military resistance that occurred with Vietnam is to keep the U.S. casualty count, length of battle, and media coverage down to a minimum. That's why the Pentagon has shifted to fighting wars more with massive air bombardment, missile attacks and native client forces on the ground. Having conscription would not be a reason to change this strategy, so spreading the burden of war with a draft would still not create the potential opposition that some people predict.

#### The draft will fail to solve militarism – empirical examples prove that the military industrial complex will commit to long unpopular wars despite the draft.

Baldwin, 2013 – Writer @ C4SS [Martin, Would Conscription Curb US Militarism? Thom Hartmann Thinks So, <https://c4ss.org/content/17405>, Accessed July 7th 2016] [Premier]

“There are a thousand hacking at the branches of evil to one who is striking at the root…” -Henry David Thoreau Walden (1854) Do you ever get the feeling that progressives have run out of ideas? This thought crossed my mind when I read Thom Hartmann’s “The Draft: A War-Killer” on Truthout. Hartmann advocates reinstatement of conscription in a “new and improved form.” He proclaims that the military industrial complex “would finally be held in check if we were to re-instate a draft.” Hartmann seems oblivious to the fact that the military industrial complex grew and prospered with a draft in place. The hook for Hartmann’s piece is the upcoming tenth anniversary of the US invasion of Iraq. “Would we still be in Iraq today,” he asks, “or even have gone to war with Iraq — if there was a military draft in this country?” He claims that the war in Iraq has lasted longer than other major US wars where a draft was in place, such as the Civil War, World War I, World War II, Korea and Vietnam. Right away, Hartmann runs into problems. The Vietnam war is generally described as having been fought from 1965 to 1975, so it lasted at least as long as Iraq has. And in actuality the US was involved in Vietnam for years before that. Hartmann further argues from several flawed premises. For instance, he claims that conscription is “a great leveler,” ensuring that people from all backgrounds share in the sacrifice. But that claim contradicts much of what we now know about the Civil War (in which two out of three Union draftees were hired “substitutes”) and about Vietnam, the last war in which conscription was used. Former US Vice-President Dick Cheney received five draft deferments while flunking out of Yale, struggling through six years of college and impregnating his wife (in the nick of time, it turned out). Shotgun Dick famously told the Washington Post, “I had other priorities in the 60s than military service.” Cheney’s running mate, former US President George W. Bush (son of George H.W. and grandson of Prescott) protected the America South from a Viet Cong invasion while serving with (and apparently deserting from) Air National Guard Units in Texas and Alabama. Fellow Republican (and 2012 GOP presidential nominee) Mitt Romney, son of Governor George Romney of Michigan, was granted deferments first as a student and then to serve as a Mormon missionary in France. To be bi-partisan, I should add that former US President Bill Clinton also received student deferments. To his credit, Clinton did express moral objections to the war, unlike Cheney, Bush and Romney. In a letter to an Arkansas ROTC Colonel, Clinton stated, “no government really rooted in limited, parliamentary democracy should have the power to make its citizens fight and kill and die in a war they may oppose, a war which even possibly may be wrong, a war which, in any case, does not involve immediately the peace and freedom of the nation.” Did you catch that Thom? But Hartmann is undaunted by the experience of Vietnam. He thunders, “history shows that when we have a draft, our lawmakers are less enthusiastic to start wars, and more enthusiastic to end them quickly.” Where is the evidence for this claim? The government’s actions during Vietnam clearly undermine this notion, but let’s talk about World War I as well. According to historian James W. Lowen, people may believe that President Woodrow Wilson took the US into World War I reluctantly. There was a draft, after all! But this is hard to swallow, since Wilson was a serial interventionist. Under Wilson, the US armed forces “intervened in Latin America more often than at any other time in our history” (Lies My Teacher Told Me, p.16). Wilson’s administration also actively aided the “White” side in the Russian Civil War. And how did Wilson react to those, like Emma Goldman, who agitated against conscription during these years? With swift repression, of course. Surely Hartmann is aware of all this. But he imagines that we will get it right this time around: “As part of a draft, we should be asking young Americans to give 1 or 2 years of their life to serve their country, not just in the military, but also, alternatively, in civilian programs like Americorps, to volunteer in hospitals and schools, or to care for our nation’s elderly and disabled people.” But the government would not be “asking” young Americans to do anything. That’s not how conscription works. If young Americans resisted Thom Hartmann’s draft, like their forebears did during Vietnam and World War I, the government would turn to force as it has done before. Hartmann and progressives like him misunderstand the nature of the state, which makes them naive and potentially dangerous.

#### A Draft will not solve militarism – politicians will still vote for war and keep their children in non-combat roles

Lacey, 03 – US Army Reserve officer (James, Symposium - Q: Is restoring universal military conscription in the United States a good idea? NO: The modern military needs a smaller force of highly motivated, trained professionals, not a horde of draftees. Insight on the News, 4 Feb 2003, http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_m1571/is\_4\_19/ai\_97450991 Accessed 4 July 2016) [Premier]

Rangel also makes the point that if there were a draft that made no special allowance for the sons of the rich and powerful we would be a lot slower to rush into war. He says that if senators and congressmen knew that their own children were on the firing line they would pause to think long and hard before voting to commit them anywhere. This sounds good in theory, but it does not pass the reality test. Even if the sons of the powerful do enter the military they easily will be able to find jobs well away from any potential danger--as did the young Al Gore, a well-behind-the-lines journalist. There may be some like the Kennedys or the Roosevelts who insist on being at the point of danger, but all those who want to stay in the rear easily will be able to do so.

#### The draft won’t solve militarism – it sacrifices too many people in a vain attempt to outrage the public, which empirically fails

Steigerwald, 2013 – journalist [Lucy, journalist at multiple newspapers, Stop Suggesting Conscription As the Fix for American Militarism, May 09, 2013, <http://antiwar.com/blog/2013/05/09/the-draft-doesnt-end-war/>, Accessed July 6 2016] [Premier]

The idea that the draft would stop perpetual war is tempting to consider for a minute. After all, wasn’t it that sword of Damocles hanging over every middle class kid that finally made Americans say enough was enough during Vietnam? Isn’t it worth a try? No. Because you don’t end mass-murder by enslaving enough people to maybe, eventually, piss off the masses. War drones, for all their horrors, are at least not hundreds of thousands of enslaved men forced to fight. Piloting drones requires training. Most aspects of warfare now require much more training than in Vietnam days. This is one reason the draft is no longer popular among government. Nor is it popular among respondents to Gallup polls. Sirota’s short piece is not as obviously offensive as Rangel’s alarming February comments about going into the military screaming and coming out saluting the flag. But it’s nasty and sneaky and scary all the same. He’s too timid to say “Let’s Draft Our Kids” as Ricks did in The New York Times last year. Some want a draft — or “national service” — because they believe that 18-year-olds belong to the country, not themselves. Those national greatness morons — or just people who think terrorists are that powerful — are more similar to Sirota than he might think, and they’re more honest. Sirota ends his piece with: Well-meaning people can certainly disagree about whether a modern-day draft is a good idea or not (and it may not be). But 40 years into the all-volunteer experiment, it is clear that ending conscription was as much about giving citizens the liberty to abstain from as about quashing popular opposition to martial decisions. By design, it weakened our democratic connection to the armed forces, a connection that is the only proven safeguard against unbridled militarism. Experiment. The implication that not enslaving men aged 19-26 is a fluke, tried, and now to be discarded. Never mind Richard Nixon, or the military, or anyone else’s motives in lifting the threat of military service off of the general population in order to make war “an abstraction.” Consider the definition of the draft — the mandate that you serve the government in the most servile fashion. You are more directly the hand of the state than in any other job. And you may die. In Vietnam, 30 percent of the men killed were drafted (around 17,000 people). Countless men also signed up knowing they were going to be forced into the armed forces, in order to pick the least loathsome choice of branch. To say nothing of 2 million Vietnamese killed during the war, look how many American men were sacrificed and how many — men and women, if Rangel had his way — would it take next time in order to stop the next war? Ostensibly Sirota’s motivations for wanting a draft are good; the end of the worst thing in the world. But they’re twisted. Instead of starving the beast of militarism he wants to shove a few thousand people down its throat until it (hopefully) chokes. Would it work? It’s possible. But it didn’t work during the Civil War, World War I, World War II, Korea, or Vietnam. Or, it didn’t work in time for scores upon scores of thousand of men. What about them? Isn’t preventing their enslavement and slaughter also a part of opposing war? If people suggesting a return to conscription are serious about ending war and all its miseries, they will stop spinning their wheels on bullshit columns like Sirota’s; stop coyly suggesting unpopular plans that make them sound grave and determined; and they will start opposing war, period.

#### Affirmative authors reinforce the nationalist myth of obedience to the sovereign. Their author believes that patriotism is an Objective truth, and seeks to censor debate questioning that patriotism. Here are his own words.

Wetherbee ’07 –fellow at Center for the Study of the Presidency and Congress (Michael A., “Closing the Civil-Military Gap,” accessed 7/5/16, <http://cspc.nonprofitsoapbox.com/storage/documents/Vater/Wetherbee.pdf>) [Premier]

It is frightening that the concept of national service and patriotism have become subjective truths, with only some people believing that they are a valuable and important thing.lxxxv Although debate over whether people should have to serve their country is healthy, debate of whether they should even consider the idea is not. The idea that patriotism and national service is good is not a subjective truth, and it should not be open to debate. Therefore, it should be presented by the President to the American people in such a manner. All Americans should feel a small urge to serve their country in some way and pay back for the good fortune they have been granted. As Roth-Douquet and Schaeffer profess, “it should become socially desirable to first pay your dues before moving from high school into college or from college to career.”lxxxvi

### Race

#### Their historical analysis papers over the way in which black bodies are criminalized once drafted

Maycock 01, Maycock, James. “War within war.” The Guardian. September 14, 2001. [Premier]

**Military justice in Vietnam was** also rarely **racially** **impartial. Black servicemen were** frequently **sentenced to longer terms than** their **white counterparts** and, once inside a military prison, black Muslim inmates were refused copies of the Koran. During this period, one black marine pointed out, "The Corps says it treats all men just one way - as a marine. What it actually has done is treat everybody like a white marine." But, most disturbingly, **black Americans were dying at a disproportionate rate and this only inflamed their indignation**, as one black private remonstrated: "You should see for yourself how the black man is being treated over here and the way we are dying. When it comes to rank, we are left out. **When it comes to** special **privileges, we are left out. When it comes to** patrols, **operations** and so forth, **we are first**." Their predicament was aggravated by a weakening in the chain of command. **Many** of the very young, naive **white officers were incapable of diffusing** the **racial tension and**, at times, white privates **informed their superior black officers**, including Allen Thomas, **that they "weren't going to take orders from a [negro]** nigger".

## NCs

### Constitutionality

#### Mandatory civilian service is unconstitutional

Somin 07 Ilya Somin; Professor of Law at George Mason University, focusing on constitutional law; Vokolh; 24 September 2007; “Does Mandatory National Service Violate the Thirteenth Amendment?” [Premier]

Many commenters on my earlier posts about forced labor programs have expressed interest in the question of whether or not mandatory "national service" programs violate **the Thirteenth Amendment**. I think that the answer is pretty clearly "yes," at least if you take the text of the Constitution seriously. The text of **Section 1 of the Amendment is as follows: Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.** Note that **the Amendment forbids not only "slavery" but also "involuntary servitude,"** a provision deliberately inserted to prevent state governments from, in effect, reenslaving blacks by imposing "temporary" forced labor systems. **Mandatory national service, which would require young people to do government-mandated work for a period of 1-2 years** (depending on the proposal in question) **is** pretty **clearly involuntary servitude** under any reasonable definition of the word. In the Peonage Cases (which David Bernstein and I discuss in [this article](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=620781)), **the Supreme Court used the ban on involuntary servitude to strike down forced labor laws that were significantly less restrictive than most mandatory national service proposals would be** (peonage laws applied for shorter periods of time, and only to workers who had previously signed a voluntary labor contract with their employers). Note also that **there is** only **one exception** to the ban on involuntary servitude: "**punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted.**" **That** strongly **suggests** **that there aren't any other**, unlisted **exceptions**. **The presence of the word "except"** at the start of the sentence exempting criminal punishment **strongly suggests that this exemption is supposed to be exclusive, not just an illustration of other types of forced labor that are also permitted.**

#### a draft would disrespect our founders—they rejected government incursion into all realms of life—the rejection of European society prove

Kuznicki ’13 – research fellow at Cato (Jason, “There Is No Libertarian Case for National Military Service,” 9/11, accessed 7/6/16, <http://www.cato-unbound.org/2013/09/09/there-is-no-libertarian-case-national-military-service>) [Premier]

Gobry further argues that we owe a debt of gratitude: Our ancestors gave their lives, and here we sit, fat and happy. Do we not have a Burkean contract, binding the dead, the living, and those yet to be born? Shall we not honor that contract? Maybe. Yet even the living can’t agree on national service priorities, and things just get worse when we turn to the dead, who often favored unworkable, foolish, and downright horrifying causes. We can’t serve the past like that. But we also can’t discharge a debt of gratitude merely by doing whatever we were going to do anyway. So what kind of service shall there be? Perhaps we can ask the American founders. What would they say about forcing young people to serve the federal government, both in war and in peace? What would they think if we punished our young people for refusing to don a uniform and protect a foreign country? Suppose we said that we did it in gratitude to them? No. Virtually all of the founders’ political efforts worked to lessen the exactions of government. They rejected Europe’s heavy taxes, press gangs, corvée labor, and feudal obligations. The founders looked forward to a time when no one had to perform national service. As John Adams wrote, I must study Politicks and War that my sons may have liberty to study Mathematicks and Philosophy. My sons ought to study Mathematicks and Philosophy, Geography, natural History, Naval Architecture, navigation, Commerce and Agriculture, in order to give their Children a right to study Painting, Poetry, Musick, Architecture, Statuary, Tapestry and Porcelaine. Our nation points away from politics and war—and toward science, industry, and art. National service should only be for times as dire as Adams’s own. Even then, there is an overwhelming case that it can and should still be voluntary. Adams’s old rival Thomas Jefferson was blunter: “The earth belongs in usufruct to the living… the dead have neither powers nor rights over it.” Raise Jefferson from the dead, ask him about national service, and he might say “Don’t ask me. I’m dead.” But if we really insisted, he might say that we should serve by minding our own business and by imposing on no one else. That’s a debt I’d be happy to pay.

### Freedom / Libertarianism

#### Conscription is coercive

Ripstein 09, Arthur; Ripstein; Professor of Law and Philosophy at the University of Toronto, associate editor of Philosophy and Public Affairs; Harvard University Press; 2009; “Force and Freedom: Kant’s Legal and Political Philosophy” [Premier]

The German Constitutional Court addressed a related question of whether the constitution could authorize the minister of the interior to order a hijacked airliner to be shot down if it was in danger of being used as a missile against a populated area.65 The court held that such a law con- flicted with the right of the passengers on the plane to human dignity, that legal system’s correlate of the innate right of humanity.66 The passengers cannot be used to save the people in the building. The court explicitly considered the possibility that they would consent to being killed in such circumstances, particularly if, since the plane is being used as a missile, their death is all but certain. They rejected that form of reasoning, even on the assumption that all of its premises are true. These premises may or may not be factually satisfied, and the minister of the interior may or may not be in a good position to assure himself that they are. The court’s grounds for rejecting the reasoning do not depend on disputing the fac- tual premises, however, but on the claim that the state is not entitled to make such a decision. The court is equally adamant in its rejection of the suggestion that the passengers would have agreed to it if they had been asked; the fact that it would be sensible for them to consent does not mean that they have consented. Their right to human dignity means that they cannot be conscripted into the project of the Ministry of the Interior any more than they can be conscripted into the project of the hijacker. The court concedes that matters might be different if the legal order itself were in danger. In cases of a defensive war, citizens can be conscripted into public purposes, the most familiar example of which is military service. Although death of civilians on a large scale is one of the familiar horrors of modern war, the mere possibility of such a death is not equivalent to the danger to rightful condition posed by war. As a result, **even if war could justify conscription**, including conscription to things with a signifi- cant risk of death, **citizens could not consent to empower the state to use its citizens in this way to prevent a crime from happening**. The German Constitutional Court’s reasoning reflects the underlying Kantian thought that the state’s obligation to uphold a rightful condition and protect its citizens **is unconditional**, not simply because of some fond- ness for rules, but rather because the use of force is merely unilateral un-less its authorization could proceed from an omnilateral will. People could only give themselves laws consistent with their innate right of hu-manity. As a result, **the numbers cannot matter. If the state cannot order a person to stand in the path of a bullet that endangers an innocent person, it cannot order that person to stand in the path of a bullet that endangers many people**. And if the state cannot order a person to do so, then it cannot exempt itself from such a prohibition in the case of a person who is likely to die anyway. The people give themselves laws not for their advan- tage, but for their independence, which they cannot trade against any- thing. On the Kantian view, the fundamental test of any law is whether all could consent to it given their inner duty of rightful honor, or, what comes to the same thing, their obligation to take responsibility for their own lives. You couldn’t agree to a law that suspended that obligation, even if you expected material gain, because the state is never a tool for pursuing private purposes.

#### The Draft devastates libertarian limits on government

Steigerwald, 2013 – journalist [Lucy, journalist at multiple newspapers, Stop Suggesting Conscription As the Fix for American Militarism, May 09, 2013, <http://antiwar.com/blog/2013/05/09/the-draft-doesnt-end-war/>, Accessed July 6 2016] [Premier]

Some want a draft — or “national service” — because they believe that 18-year-olds belong to the country, not themselves. Those national greatness morons — or just people who think terrorists are that powerful — are more similar to Sirota than he might think, and they’re more honest. Sirota ends his piece with: Well-meaning people can certainly disagree about whether a modern-day draft is a good idea or not (and it may not be). But 40 years into the all-volunteer experiment, it is clear that ending conscription was as much about giving citizens the liberty to abstain from as about quashing popular opposition to martial decisions. By design, it weakened our democratic connection to the armed forces, a connection that is the only proven safeguard against unbridled militarism. Experiment. The implication that not enslaving men aged 19-26 is a fluke, tried, and now to be discarded. Never mind Richard Nixon, or the military, or anyone else’s motives in lifting the threat of military service off of the general population in order to make war “an abstraction.” Consider the definition of the draft — the mandate that you serve the government in the most servile fashion. You are more directly the hand of the state than in any other job. And you may die. In Vietnam, 30 percent of the men killed were drafted (around 17,000 people). Countless men also signed up knowing they were going to be forced into the armed forces, in order to pick the least loathsome choice of branch. To say nothing of 2 million Vietnamese killed during the war, look how many American men were sacrificed and how many — men and women, if Rangel had his way — would it take next time in order to stop the next war? Ostensibly Sirota’s motivations for wanting a draft are good; the end of the worst thing in the world. But they’re twisted. Instead of starving the beast of militarism he wants to shove a few thousand people down its throat until it (hopefully) chokes. Would it work? It’s possible. But it didn’t work during the Civil War, World War I, World War II, Korea, or Vietnam. Or, it didn’t work in time for scores upon scores of thousand of men. What about them? Isn’t preventing their enslavement and slaughter also a part of opposing war? If people suggesting a return to conscription are serious about ending war and all its miseries, they will stop spinning their wheels on bullshit columns like Sirota’s; stop coyly suggesting unpopular plans that make them sound grave and determined; and they will start opposing war, period.

#### The Draft destroys personal autonomy by dehumanizing conscripts – modern liberty emphasizes voluntary commerce not violent coercion.

Kuznicki ’13 – research fellow at Cato (Jason, “There Is No Libertarian Case for National Military Service,” 9/11, accessed 7/6/16, <http://www.cato-unbound.org/2013/09/09/there-is-no-libertarian-case-national-military-service>) [Premier]

If I had to identify the moment when the classical republican tradition finally met its match, it would be with Benjamin Constant’s 1819 essay “The Liberty of the Ancients Compared with that of the Moderns.” Constant observed that when the ancients wrote of liberty, they meant something like an obligation to participate actively in government. In the ancient sense, one could have “liberty” even when the government was conquering, enslaving, slaughtering, and extorting—whatever, just so long as you weren’t on the pointy end of the stick. Constant demurred at this obvious instance of self-dealing. So do I. To us, liberty means something like running one’s own affairs, under the orderly and lawful watch of a representative government. We moderns use commerce, not conquest, to get what we want. As Constant wrote: War and commerce are only two different means of achieving the same end, that of getting what one wants… [Commerce] is an attempt to conquer, by mutual agreement, what one can no longer hope to obtain through violence… War is all impulse; commerce, calculation. Hence it follows that an age must come in which commerce replaces war. We have reached this age. The classical republicans were wrong. We libertarians know better, because commerce is morally superior to war. On that note, I must take Gobry to task for citing Milton Friedman without discussing how Friedman was instrumental in ending America’s military draft and implementing an all-volunteer force. As Friedman recalled, Like almost all military men who testified [before Congress], [General William Westmoreland] testified against a volunteer armed force… he made the statement that he did not want to command an army of mercenaries. I stopped him and said, “General, would you rather command an army of slaves?” He drew himself up and said, “I don’t like to hear our patriotic draftees referred to as slaves.” I replied, “I don’t like to hear our patriotic volunteers referred to as mercenaries… If they are mercenaries, then I, sir, am a mercenary professor, and you, sir, are a mercenary general; we are served by mercenary physicians, we use a mercenary lawyer, and we get our meat from a mercenary butcher.” Modern liberty means commerce, and we are justly proud to be mercenaries: Commerce is fairer, kinder, more civilized, and more reliable than war. A society that fosters commerce will of course persuade volunteers to defend it. And thus, as Friedman argued, we should use markets for defense, just as we do for so many other things.

#### The Draft severely violates equal respect for each person –

**Somin 2013 – Professor of law at George Mason** [Ilya Somin, author of Democracy and Political Ignorance: Why Smaller Government is Smarter, January 26, 2013, The Volokh Conspiracy, July 5, 2016, <http://volokh.com/2013/01/26/charles-rangels-case-for-conscription/>] [Premier]

Most of all, Rangel doesn’t take seriously the moral costs of the draft. Subjecting millions of people to two years of forced labor is a severe infringement of liberty that can only be justified, if at all, by some truly enormous good that cannot be achieved by less draconian means. As I have explained elsewhere, I am not opposed to the draft under all conceivable conditions. If, for example, having a draft were the only way to avoid getting conquered by an enemy that would impose a totalitarian state on us, I would support it. The draft is a great evil. Still, there can potentially be situations where it is the only way to stave off an even greater one. But the arguments advanced by Rangel and other modern draft supporters don’t even come close to meeting the burden of proof needed to justify such massive coercion. UPDATE: A point I made in an earlier post on conscription is relevant here as well: Many people resist the comparison between conscription and other forms of forced labor because they see military service as providing a great good that is essential to our society. But military service is far from unique in that regard. Historically, slaves and forced laborers often performed work that was vital to the social order. The entire economy of the antebellum South depended on crops produced by slaves. So too with ancient Rome, Russia in the era of serfdom, and so on. The key point to realize is that this work, however noble and necessary, can be performed by free laborers. Thus, the use of forced labor to carry it out is still unjust. The same goes for military service. Both the United States and other liberal democracies can field more than adequate military forces without conscription. Indeed, they can create better armies without it than with it.

#### Voluntary enlistment is good, but coercing others into pursuing that end is not

Thomas 2011 - Director of Progams at The Atlas Society. [William R April 29 Free Minds and Free Militaries <http://atlassociety.org/commentary/commentary-blog/4684-free-minds-and-free-militaries>] [Premier]

A military draft is repugnant to the moral foundations of a "flowering-tree" society, one based in respect for human beings as ends in themselves. Our most basic right, morally and politically, is the right to life. A law that compels an innocent person into harm's way not only violates that political right, it tramples morally on the respect that each of us deserves as a rational, independent being who can bear the burdens of personal responsibility and moral choice. Ultimately, individuals in a free society must take responsibility for maintaining and defending their freedom. But each must choose, as an individual, when and how to do so. A draft is a policy for oppressive regimes that cannot be bothered to justify their need for troops to their citizens. With a volunteer military we know, if nothing else, that no one is being sent into harm's way who does not choose it. And with a volunteer military we know that each soldier is being properly compensated for his service, both by the standards of the marketplace and, most crucially, by his own lights. When military service is subject to choice, we know that in any grave crisis the government will need to demonstrate to each and every potential soldier the justice and necessity of its cause. The volunteer military is the linchpin of our national respect for the plurality that makes up our unity, the signal policy of a free people. But as long as that ideal of individualism is not well respected or fully understood, politicians and pundits will keep trying to score points by supporting coercive forms of social unity, and those who love freedom will need to remain vigilant.

#### Their arguments for the draft rely on Collectivist mindsets and Slavery —focus on collective identity directly trades off with affirmation of autonomy and individuality

Thomas 2011 - Director of Programs at The Atlas Society. [William R April 29 Free Minds and Free Militaries <http://atlassociety.org/commentary/commentary-blog/4684-free-minds-and-free-militaries>] [Premier]

Our volunteer military works well, and the public knows it. Since the early 1980s, polls have consistently shown that a substantial majority of Americans oppose any return to a draft. So it isn't the popularity of a draft that elicits proposals like Rangel's. Being pro-draft doesn't earn anyone political mileage, but it is a way to score moral points. What the draft advocates want to cash in on is an assumption about what it means to be a good citizen. We, the citizens, are a collective, they assume, a body politic—and they want us to march in step. The advocates of the draft see citizenship as membership in a kind of over-being: Society or the Country. To be fully part of Society one must take part in government and its functions, because it is through government and its functions that the societal will is formed and expressed, and the State is where societal action takes place. The classic metaphor for this view is the fasces, the bound staves that symbolized the unity of the Roman people and the power of the state. The fasces were used as a symbol of the republican state in France and the United States, but were used most prominently by the Italian Fascist regime of Mussolini, which embraced the symbol, its name, and its philosophical essence: collectivism. Of course, the soft-pedaled ideologies of the twenty- first-century West do not baldly advance the brute totalitarianism of a Mussolini. They stir in a respect for democracy, admix the whole concoction with pragmatism and self-contradiction. Still, the collectivist ideal exerts its inertia on contemporary thought. We can see this quite clearly in some of the right-wing advocates of the draft. Northwestern University sociologist Charles Moskos, writing with Washington Monthly editor-in-chief Paul Glastris in that magazine (November 2001), has proposed a return to the draft in the form of a practical response to the demands of the "war on terrorism." But like Rangel's proposal, the real purpose of the Moskos/Glastris draft is social unity. What a draft it is! It would take in both women and men as part of a broad national-service requirement, and draftees would do social work in the broadest sense, having the option of serving as "volunteers" on community projects or working as homeland security guards, in addition to traditional military service. At least it can be said for Moskos and Glastris that they have taken their views to their logical conclusion. Commenting in these pages on a more modest scheme for government funding of "volunteerism" ("You Will Volunteer," June 2002), Edward Hudgins has pointed out that compelling donations through taxation destroys genuine benevolence, replacing it with resentment. Coercing the youth of the country, through a draft, to labor in soup kitchens and subsidized-housing projects, would replace generosity with serfdom, completing this substitution of slavery for freedom. But for advocates like Moskos, as for left-wing pundit Robin Gerber (who at the time proposed a parallel scheme in the Christian Science Monitor), it offers a way to bring a new generation together in a unified great purpose and inculcate the values of citizenship in them. If implemented without exceptions, it would "bring the country together" by forcing young people "to bunk with others of very different backgrounds and races." Moskos even proposes that by wasting a couple of years in a course of life they would not have chosen—doing low-skill, low-income social work that satisfies a bureaucracy rather than the marketplace—the draftees will learn the skills they need to flourish in life. Thus will the youth be bound together into a bundle of staves, one that is wielded by the will of the state. In place of the dead, bound rods of the fasces, we might do better to think of the ideal society as an open stand of flowering trees. Bees pollinate the flowers and the flowers, in turn, may feed the bees, but each organism lives by its own lights. A forester may be needed, from time to time, to keep an eye out for blight, but the trees are independent living things in their own right. This image of the citizens as independent, diverse individuals is one way of reading the motto of the Great Seal of the United States: E pluribus unum ("out of many, one"). A civilized society, as Ayn Rand noted, is one that respects our individuality and our natural freedom to live as we choose. Society is multi-dimensional, consisting of all the strands of culture and mutual intercourse, from business and trade to art, spirituality, and love. Government is a necessary institution, to be sure, and it has a proper role of providing law and securing our freedom. But by no means is government the sum of what we are. Nor does making the law somehow unify us into a single organism.

#### The draft functions as a tax – military volunteers are forced to pay for expansion to include draftees

Jehn 2008 – former assistant secretary of defense for force management and personnel [ "Conscription." The Concise Encyclopedia of Economics. 2008. Library of Economics and Liberty. 6 July 2016. <http://www.econlib.org/library/Enc/Conscription.html>.] [Premier]

Before the United States abolished the draft in 1973, some of its supporters argued that an all-volunteer force (AVF) would be too expensive because the military would have to pay much higher wages to attract enlistees. But the draft does not really reduce the cost of national defense. It merely shifts part of the cost from the general public to junior military personnel (career personnel are not typically drafted). This tax is especially regressive because it falls on low-paid junior personnel, who are least able to pay. Moreover, not just draftees pay the tax; so do those who still volunteer despite the lower pay. In other words, the draft is a tax on military service, the very act of patriotism that a draft is sometimes said to encourage. The President’s Commission on an All-Volunteer Force estimated that the draft tax during the Vietnam War was more than eight billion dollars per year in 2003 dollars.

#### The draft violates liberty because it confiscates labor and higher civilian pay

Jahnkow, 02- part of the Committee Opposed to the Military and the Draft [Rick, part of the Committee Opposed to the Military and the Draft, For those who believe we need a Draft, COMD, Sept 2002, <<http://www.comdsd.org/article_archive/BelieveDraft.htm>>, July 6 2016] [Premier]

2. Conscription is an unfair tax. Any government can provide staffing for public services two basic ways: it can pay people to do the necessary work, or confiscate their labor and order them to do it. A draft is confiscation that forces individuals to give up their freedom and some of the higher civilian income they could have earned while in the military. Because of the higher turnover of drafted military personnel, training becomes more expensive and the government is forced to set wages low for both draftees and professional volunteers, so all military members - but especially the draftees - pay a severe personal tax, and the true cost of the military is not shared equally by all.

#### The Draft severely violates liberty interests – it is a form of slavery

**Somin 2013 – Professor of law at George Mason** [Ilya Somin, author of Democracy and Political Ignorance: Why Smaller Government is Smarter, January 26, 2013, The Volokh Conspiracy, July 5, 2016, <http://volokh.com/2013/01/26/charles-rangels-case-for-conscription/>] [Premier]

Most of all, Rangel doesn’t take seriously the moral costs of the draft. Subjecting millions of people to two years of forced labor is a severe infringement of liberty that can only be justified, if at all, by some truly enormous good that cannot be achieved by less draconian means. As I have explained elsewhere, I am not opposed to the draft under all conceivable conditions. If, for example, having a draft were the only way to avoid getting conquered by an enemy that would impose a totalitarian state on us, I would support it. The draft is a great evil. Still, there can potentially be situations where it is the only way to stave off an even greater one. But the arguments advanced by Rangel and other modern draft supporters don’t even come close to meeting the burden of proof needed to justify such massive coercion. UPDATE: A point I made in an earlier post on conscription is relevant here as well: Many people resist the comparison between conscription and other forms of forced labor because they see military service as providing a great good that is essential to our society. But military service is far from unique in that regard. Historically, slaves and forced laborers often performed work that was vital to the social order. The entire economy of the antebellum South depended on crops produced by slaves. So too with ancient Rome, Russia in the era of serfdom, and so on. The key point to realize is that this work, however noble and necessary, can be performed by free laborers. Thus, the use of forced labor to carry it out is still unjust. The same goes for military service. Both the United States and other liberal democracies can field more than adequate military forces without conscription. Indeed, they can create better armies without it than with it.

#### Taxes do not justify conscription – taxes Do violate libertarian ideals, and there is no moral certainty that taxes or conscription produce security for free nations.

Kuznicki ’13 – research fellow at Cato (Jason, “There Is No Libertarian Case for National Military Service,” 9/11, accessed 7/6/16, <http://www.cato-unbound.org/2013/09/09/there-is-no-libertarian-case-national-military-service>) [Premier]

Gobry writes that only anarchists disapprove of taxation. Here again, I disagree. Some strong, widely shared moral intuitions tell me that taxation is wrong. Yet without a least a little taxation, it seems that even worse things would come to pass. It’s as if we were all in a lifeboat, and survial means throwing overboard our precious but heavy artworks: It makes sense in context, but it’s nothing we’re proud of. That’s what taxation is like. Can we do without it? I don’t know. But it would be pretty embarrassing if we’d chucked the Rodin bronzes—and we never noticed that the lifeboat wasn’t properly inflated. So let’s not get complacent about taxation. We know taxation is evil, but we only presume that it’s necessary. And what about taxation in kind? Gobry is correct that conscription is a form of in-kind taxation. He errs in concluding that conscription is thus equally permissible. On the contrary, taxation in kind is always worse: Money taxes at least let us earn the money in any lawful way we choose. We can often abstain from taxed products. If we’re saving up to pay the tax, we can pick which luxuries to forego. That’s an important, though small, residuum of liberty. That remaining liberty vanishes under any kind of conscription. As F.A. Hayek wrote: [A]n economic gain or economic loss is merely a gain or a loss where it is still in our power to decide which of our needs or desires shall be affected… So long as we can freely dispose over our income and all our possessions, economic loss will always deprive us only of what we regard as the least important of the desires we were able to satisfy. If I must take one or the other, I pick taxes. Alas.

#### Modern imperial conscription destroys Libertarian ideals – their authors mistake militias for standing armies and republicanism for a Libertarian minimal state.

Kuznicki ’13 – research fellow at Cato (Jason, “There Is No Libertarian Case for National Military Service,” 9/11, accessed 7/6/16, <http://www.cato-unbound.org/2013/09/09/there-is-no-libertarian-case-national-military-service>) [Premier]

Once upon a time, the militia held a place of honor in the classical republican tradition. Classical republicanism was a body of political thought stretching back to antiquity and revived in the Renaissance. It talked a lot about liberty, and it emphasized the virtue of independent city-states, while disdaining empires. Classical republicans held that militias—or navies—were the military form of a free people. From Tacitus down to the commonwealthman tradition in England, all agreed: Militias were honorable, and mercenaries were for tyrants. Now, classical republicanism is interesting—I wrote my master’s thesis about it—but ultimately we libertarians are not classical republicans. To us, classical republicans are like intellectual great-grandfathers: There’s a family resemblance, but we very often disagree. Thus it’s wrong to say, as Gobry does, that libertarians have supported the militia “for literally thousands of years.” Only our relatives did. Militias may have been militarily effective, though George Washington disagreed. And in the English Civil War, neither side used them much. Tellingly, even the Roundheads betrayed their pro-militia rhetoric to create the highly effective New Model Army—a full-time nation-wide fighting force. Partly as a result of this development, and partly through the growth of the centralizing state, no one alive today can join an old-style militia. Such militias included all the able-bodied free men of a community. They demanded service only in times of violence. The demand was often loosely enforced, if at all, and—this is key—the central government did not fully control the militia. The king could call out the militia, but militias could also turn out on their own for emergencies. Sometimes, as in the American Revolution, militias directly defied the king. In an age when the public-private distinction was often obscured, militias were in the middle, and they shaded toward the private. If militias sound dangerous to the state, that’s because they were. The closest thing we have to a militia nowadays—independent, well-armed, open to all, and dangerous to states—might be something like Anonymous or Wikileaks. Both fail to be militias chiefly because they don’t bear literal arms. But the old-time militia was already growing moribund by the American Revolution; as an institution, it was arguably dead by the Militia Acts of 1792: Slapping the name “militia” on a centralized, federally conscripted force does not make it so. And what the U.S. government runs today is certainly not a militia. It’s a standing army. Worse, it’s imperial in scope. Conscripting everyone will not revive the militia of old. It will only grow the empire. The leadership will remain professional. The already colossal institution will grow even bigger. The central government will remain firmly in charge. The positive public choice effects on our foreign policy are speculative at best. And my younger brother, who lives in Ohio, will find it exceptionally implausible that he must go to South Korea, Afghanistan, Germany, Egypt, Japan, Honduras, Greenland, or Kyrgyzstan—to defend his neighborhood, his home, and his family. The militiamen of Lexington and Concord would never see themselves in this. In short: The militia wasn’t too bad. Then the state came along and killed it. Demanding that we serve the state in the militia’s place is perverse.

### Quaker Coercion

#### [Could be used as part of a Levinas argument, religious freedoms, or general Kant/freedom NC]

#### Quakers, even with their protests against the military, are forced to serve in the service to some extent which violates their beliefs in non-violence

Dyson 16 [Michael. "The Quakers on the Draft Further Views on the Subject." *The NY Times*. The Foreign Review, 2016. Web. 8 July 2016] [Premier]

At the [**Religious Society of Friends**](http://www.newstimes.com/search/?action=search&channel=news&inlineLink=1&searchindex=gsa&query=%22Religious+Society+of+Friends%22) (Quakers), we take turns teaching First Day School for the small children and teenagers who attend our meeting. Over the course of several Sundays when I was teaching the teenagers, we had discussions about military recruitment in high school, and our position as conscientious objectors. When our meeting committed to writing a Forum on Faith column, I asked our First Day School teenage students if they would be willing to contribute to the column based on these discussions, and they agreed. These are their words. "As a citizen, I have the right to represent a point of view. That's central to our democracy - the right to dissent, the right to provide a different point of view that's out in the open, in the full view of the American people." - Rep. [**Barbara Lee**](http://www.newstimes.com/search/?action=search&channel=news&inlineLink=1&searchindex=gsa&query=%22Barbara+Lee%22) , D-Calif., who cast the only dissenting vote in Congress' rush to endorse Bush's use-of-force resolution. While many religions embrace pacifism as a crucial component in the spiritual lives of their practitioners, Quakers are one of the few religious groups to shun any and all forms of violence, in practice as well as in theory. This nonviolent testimony has led to political recognition; as one of several purely pacifist religions, Quakers are exempt from military duty involving the killing of others but must still serve the military forces in other capacities. In a world where violence and fear are often used as means of persuasion, [George Fox](http://www.newstimes.com/search/?action=search&channel=news&inlineLink=1&searchindex=gsa&query=%22George+Fox%22) , the founder of Quakerism, faced extreme opposition to his pacifist testimony. The Quaker Peace Testimony has been honed and developed over the years to become perhaps the most important component of our Quaker belief system. Integral at the heart of Quakerism is the concept that the light of God is in everyone. The light unites all human beings as brothers and sisters in God. Killing or harming another human being would harm the light within them as well as the light within the killer. Killing thus becomes a contradiction in terms; to kill one person is to kill us all. Quakers, then, do not protest the draft, military recruitment in schools or the use of violence to solve problems because we are cowards or because we do not love our country. Rather, we [quakers] love our fellow human beings too much to see them suffer; to harm man is to harm God, and this we will not do. As a U.S. citizen I have the right to question our government if I feel that it is making the wrong decisions. Quakers have often challenged authority when it violates their beliefs. Quakers believe that violence in any form is not an option. This forces people to find other ways of dealing with problems besides killing. I feel that we had no right to invade Iraq and kill thousands of innocent people. The government gave many reasons for attacking Iraq, but I believe there is no justification for killing another human being.

### Virtue

#### Compulsory national service undermines American character

Spalding 10 [Matthew, *director of the B. Kenneth Simon Center for American Studies at the Heritage Foundation Matthew Spalding is associate vice president and dean of educational programs for Hillsdale College in Washington, D.C. He oversees the operations of the Kirby Center and the various academic and educational programs of Hillsdale in the nation’s capital.,* “Compulsory national service undermines American character”, 10/19/10, [https://www.usnews.com/opinion/articles/2010/10/19/compulsory-national-service-would-undermine-the-american-character#](https://www.usnews.com/opinion/articles/2010/10/19/compulsory-national-service-would-undermine-the-american-character)] [Premier]

Americans have always exhibited a strong sense of compassion toward their neighbors and those less fortunate. Volunteerism, what Alexis de Tocqueville called our "spirit of association," is in the national DNA. Policymakers have long recognized the importance of citizen engagement and philanthropic volunteerism to a thriving civil society. But government should not attempt to compel its citizens to engage in these worthwhile endeavors. Its proper role is merely to energize a culture of personal commitment to those in need as a way of strengthening the natural grounds of citizenship and community. The goal of citizen service should be to protect and strengthen civil society. Tocqueville observed that one of American society's great virtues is its tendency to create local voluntary associations to meet the most important needs of the people. Other nations handled these needs through and by government; but in the United States, private individuals of all ages, conditions, and dispositions formed associations. "I have often admired the extreme skill with which the inhabitants of the United States succeed in proposing a common object to the exertions of a great many men, and in getting them voluntarily to pursue it," Tocqueville wrote in *Democracy in America*. "What political power could ever carry on the vast multitude of lesser undertakings which American citizens perform every day, with the assistance of the principle of association?" He added, "The more [government] stands in the place of associations, the more will individuals, losing the notion of combining together, require its assistance."The traditional associations of civil society—families, schools, churches, and voluntary organizations—sustain social order and public morality, moderate individualism and materialism, and cultivate personal character. The concept of national service is altogether different. Government programs, like AmeriCorps, do not encourage sacrificial giving of time and resources, which has the character-forming effect of teaching compassionate responsibility. Instead, they suggest that "volunteerism" could just as well mean a paid job with benefits—or worse, a mandatory obligation. Such government-directed "volunteerism," by encouraging individuals and associations to look to the state as the provider of assistance, belittles authentic volunteerism, the process by which individuals choose without economic benefit to help their neighbor. It also threatens the independence of the private associations that have always been the engine of moral and social reform in America.The American way. The call to service is best answered not by government, but by the citizens in voluntary associations, local communities, and private organizations that are at the heart of American charity. Last year alone, 63.4 million Americans volunteered, well exceeding the 500,000 involved in national service. Total private giving is estimated to exceed $300 billion a year, with individuals accounting for 75 percent of that, overwhelming the Corporation for National and Community Service's budget of just under $1 billion. One organization, the Knights of Columbus, made charitable contributions of over $150 million and generated some 70 million volunteer service hours. The depth of private American charity and the vast potential to expand these great activities ought to be highlighted and strongly encouraged. These private voluntary organizations thrive today precisely because their work is privately organized, highly decentralized, and directly focused on community needs and local conditions. At a time when Americans are volunteering in unprecedented numbers (and ways), policymakers should reject the model of government-centered national service, which undermines the American character and threatens to weaken private associations. The better course is to bolster the call to service by encouraging a true and voluntary citizen service that is consistent with principles of self-government, is harmonious with a vibrant civil society, and promotes a service agenda based on personal responsibility, independent citizenship, and civic volunteerism.

#### Turn – military service desensitizes draftees to violence, not virtuous

Lindo and Stoecker 2010 — profs of Economics at Univ of Oregon and UC Davis [Drawn into Violence: Evidence on ‘What Makes a Criminal’ from the Vietnam Draft Lotteries, July 2010, http://www.frbsf.org/economic-research/files/DrawnIntoViolence\_Lindo.pdf, July 5, 2016] [Premier]

Our study also speaks to the costs of military engagements. Any discussion about the benefits of military engagements must include a discussion of the true social costs of military service. It is widely acknowledged that, in addition to direct costs incurred during conflict, costs continue to accrue after a conflict as military service can lead to post-traumatic stress disorder and other long-term health problems. This paper, which analyzes impacts on crime, can be thought of as exploring another such long-term cost. While the discipline involved with military training could make veterans less likely to commit crimes, there are several reasons that military service might increase criminality. Perhaps most importantly, the military trains soldiers to be “ready to react within a split- second of any provocative activity and [to shut down] emotions” (Slone and Friedman 2008) in addition to desensitizing them to violence and familiarizing them with weapons. These types of behaviors, which are crucial to survival in a combat zone, can lead to problems after a soldier returns to civilian life.2 In addition to the training, events in the combat zone can have lasting psychological effects in the form of post traumatic stress disorder. Service in the Vietnam War also might increase crime because it precluded labor market experience thus reducing wages (Angrist 1990; Abadie (2002); Angrist and Chen 2008) or because it was associated with high rates of opiate use (Robins, Davis, and Goodwin 1974).

## On Case

### AT Advantages from Proposing the Bill

#### Non-unique, Rangel is still proposing universal draft legislation

**Matishak 2015 – Defense Reporter** [Martin Matishak, Rangel: Reinstate the draft, March 19, 2015, The Hill, July 5, 2016, <http://thehill.com/policy/defense/236365-rangel-renews-call-for-war-tax-national-draft>] [Premier]

Rangel has been introducing draft legislation during every Congress since 2003, when the United States began its military operations in Iraq. He has been in the House of Representatives since 1971. His new Draft Act opens the draft to women and requires all people between the ages of 18 to 25 to register for the Selective Service System. Further, the act calls for the reinstatement of the draft lottery, to be used whenever there is an Authorization for the Use of Military Force or a declaration of war is in effect. He is also calling for a war tax act that will require revenue increases to pay for current and war funding. This time around, Rangel's bills come while the Obama administration is trying to sell its use of force authorization against the Islamic State, a measure that appears to be on hold. "I have long called for reinstating the military draft, simply because I believe strongly that a national decision to go to war must also include a broad commitment to share its burdens," said Rangel, an Army veteran. "I feel the same about paying for wars. Those making the decision to fight need to feel the burden — not just our future generations as we've done with Iraq and Afghanistan."

### AT Adventurism / Militarism

#### [Also see the Adventurism DA]

#### The plan cannot solve adventurism – it keeps a civilian option, which prevents changing politicians attitudes.

Thompson, 07 - Pulitzer Prize-winning reporter (Mark, Would National Service Be Better Than the Draft? TIME, 30 Aug 2007, [http://content.time.com/time/specials/2007/article/0,28804,1657256\_1657626\_1656898,00.html](http://content.time.com/time/specials/2007/article/0%2C28804%2C1657256_1657626_1656898%2C00.html) Accessed 5 July 2016) [Premier]

Lawrence Korb, who served as the Pentagon's personnel chief during the Reagan administration, also endorses the idea. "National service is great — I think everyone ought to do something for their country," he says. But he adds it shouldn't be thought of as a fix for the military. "The all-volunteer force is not in trouble — the all-volunteer Army is in trouble," he says. And he doesn't embrace Moskos' notion that salting the force with draftees would make going to war more difficult. "If there had been national service, including the Army, on the eve of the war —remember, on the eve of the war, 60 percent of the American people thought Saddam had weapons of mass destruction." If military service is merely one option among many for national service, Korb isn't convinced it would affect what wars the nation chooses to fight. "The only thing that acts as a brake is when you force people to go into the military," says Korb, a Navy veteran, "particularly the ground forces."

#### The Draft won’t stop adventurism – it would give Congress a blank check for intervention from increased forces – Vietnam proves that the burden will still be unequal.

Jahnkow, 02- part of the Committee Opposed to the Military and the Draft [Rick, part of the Committee Opposed to the Military and the Draft, For those who believe we need a Draft, COMD, Sept 2002, <<http://www.comdsd.org/article_archive/BelieveDraft.htm>>, July 6 2016] [Premier]

We also hear it from liberals, and even a few leftists, who are under the impression that conscription would be doing a big favor for disadvantaged youths or would lessen the chances of war by spreading the burden for maintaining our bloated military establishment and overly aggressive foreign policy to more middle-class people. They even make the argument, sometimes, that we need a draft to keep us from drifting toward Prussian militarism and a Hitler-type dictatorship. These aren't new arguments. Some of them were used to successfully convince people to keep the draft that was begun during WWII, even though the people of this country had historically been suspicious of conscription and previously had only allowed drafts briefly during the Civil War and WWI. Many of these arguments were also used in the early 1970s to try to keep the draft going as we began to pull out of the war in Southeast Asia. By then, however, Vietnam had brought back the traditional understanding that conscription exploits those who are politically and economically disadvantaged and makes it easier for governments to wage illegitimate wars. Unfortunately, the memory of this lesson is not as fresh as it once was, and there are both liberals and conservatives who are now taking advantage of the post-9/11 climate of fear to make people think that a draft would be good for the nation. Right now, our military doesn't really require conscription to maintain its current force levels, and the Pentagon has found that using its well-funded recruiting campaign and expanded outreach to schools can influence young people in a way that would be impossible with a draft (threatening people with jail if they don't enter the military is hardly an effective way to win the hearts and minds of younger generations). However, if the war hawks in this country continue to have their way, there will be more pressure to enlarge the armed forces beyond what can be supported with voluntary enlistments, and the voices calling for conscription will get much louder than they presently are. This is a good time, therefore, to review some of the key issues that should be considered: 1. There are those who claim that conscription is needed for national defense. However, it takes months to move people through the draft classification system, the induction process and military training, so it has no usefulness for meeting short-term emergencies. (The Reserves and National Guard are designed to play that role.) The draft's main military value is to provide a steady stream of draftees for a long, drawn-out war or when the size of military commitments is so large that the force level can't be maintained with only enlistments. With a draft, the government doesn't have to rely on people voluntarily stepping forward to fill the military's ranks, so it can maintain a larger force size and pursue the kind of unpopular military adventurism that led to more than 10 years of U.S. warfare in Southeast Asia. Not having a draft doesn't guarantee the U.S. won't wage illegitimate wars, but it creates more pressure on the government to justify its actions than if we gave the president the blank check he would have with conscription. Imagine what that would be like with a commander-in-chief like George Bush II.

#### The draft would not change militaristic adventurism – This answers all of their warrants – it won’t change military decision making, increase anti-war movements or protests in the military, and won’t convince Congress to stop wars.

Jahnkow, 02 - part of the Committee Opposed to the Military and the Draft [Rick, part of the Committee Opposed to the Military and the Draft, For those who believe we need a Draft, COMD, Sept 2002, <<http://www.comdsd.org/article_archive/BelieveDraft.htm>>, July 6 2016] [Premier]

3. Contrary to some people's claim, a draft would not protect us from the dangerous influence of a professional military class. By nature, the military is not a democratic organization, and with or without conscription it is the officer corps and politicians who set and control policy, not the lower ranks. Lower-ranking military members take a great risk in defying orders; even merely questioning them can bring reprisals that have much greater consequences than those faced by employees with civilian jobs. If the draft were a protection from totalitarianism and dictatorship, then conscription would not have been relied upon as it was by past totalitarian governments in Spain, Russia, China, various Latin American countries, Prussia/Germany and Japan. 4. The argument that a draft will keep us out of illegitimate wars because draftees would be more likely to resist them is often heard, but it ignores some important facts: · Draftees are picked young and have the least understanding of the political policies for which their lives may be sacrificed. · They are the most obedient of troops because, above all, they want to get out of the military, and they know that if they stay out of trouble, they only have to wait a couple of years. Volunteers, on the other hand, are in for a longer term and have much more at stake. · A historical fact that has been forgotten even by many liberals is that most of the organized resistance to the Vietnam War within the armed forces - like the Concerned Officers Movement and Movement for a Democratic Military - came largely from volunteers, not draftees. A draft was in place prior to the Vietnam War, yet it took more than 10 years of body bags coming home before resistance and general opposition grew strong enough to finally force an end to the war. If the draft was supposed to be an obstacle to illegitimate war, it didn't do a very good job with that conflict. 5. Some people believe that the problem with the Vietnam draft was that it disproportionately affected non-white and low-income people. They say a draft that includes more middle-class, white people would be more just and would cause greater reluctance to go to war. There are several problems with this argument: Once a U.S. president sends people into combat and body bags start coming home, it becomes very difficult, politically, to retreat; those who are intent on making war know that no politician will ever want to be the one who says that U.S. soldiers died in vain. This means that if a president wants to launch military action, he can do so with confidence that both Congress and the public will back him, at least initially. Draftees would not provide a braking effect until after there are great losses and probably years of stalemate (Vietnam is a prime example). · The U.S. government has learned that the key to avoiding the kind of civilian and military resistance that occurred with Vietnam is to keep the U.S. casualty count, length of battle, and media coverage down to a minimum. That's why the Pentagon has shifted to fighting wars more with massive air bombardment, missile attacks and native client forces on the ground. Having conscription would not be a reason to change this strategy, so spreading the burden of war with a draft would still not create the potential opposition that some people predict.

#### The Draft won’t solve adventurism – aff authors ignore that the historical evidence does not support the affirmative claim

**Somin 2013 – Professor of law at George Mason** [Ilya Somin, author of Democracy and Political Ignorance: Why Smaller Government is Smarter, January 26, 2013, The Volokh Conspiracy, July 5, 2016, <http://volokh.com/2013/01/26/charles-rangels-case-for-conscription/>] [Premier]

Rangel’s view that the public would be more reluctant go to war with a draftee military is also questionable. During the Vietnam War, young men eligible for the draft actually supported the war at higher rates than other demographic groups. Today, veterans support the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan at higher rates than the general public, and post-9/11 veterans who actually served in combat are more supportive than those who didn’t. The evidence is not completely one-sided. Some recent experimental data suggests that a draft might reduce public support for war after all. Overall, however, we don’t yet have enough evidence to show that the impact of the draft on public support for war is an exception to the general rule that there is little causal connection between public opinion on political issues and narrow self-interest. Even if the establishment of a draft would make the public less willing to go to war, it is not clear that this would be an improvement. One can certainly point to cases where public opinion was too willing to fight. But there are also plenty of examples of the opposite problem, such as the period leading up to World War II, or the period right before 9/11, when both the public and political elites were too slow to act against the threat posed by radical Islamist terrorism. Finally, Rangel simply ignores all the major downsides of the draft, such as its tendency to reduce the quality of the military, its economic inefficiency, and the incentive it creates for governments to squander lives.

#### The AVF doesn’t increase adventurism – politicians are already hesitant to send volunteer soldiers into high body count interventions.

Thomas 2011 - Director of Progams at The Atlas Society. [William R April 29 Free Minds and Free Militaries <http://atlassociety.org/commentary/commentary-blog/4684-free-minds-and-free-militaries>] [Premier]

Nor would reviving the draft obviously do anything to promote peace (except perhaps by degrading the U.S. military and making it less able to effectively fight wars). Far from blithely sending the hoi polloi into harm's way, the pols have no intention of supporting high-body-count foreign adventures. This was not changed by the 9/11 terrorist attacks. The "war on terrorism" has broadened the public's perception of needful military action, but opinion polls consistently show that support for combat falls sharply when projected casualties mount into the thousands. Indeed, the very willingness of U.S. politicians to support military action in such places as Iraq relies heavily on their confidence that not many U.S. casualties are likely—and what else could they imagine after the United States's high-tech, walkover victories in the Gulf War, Kosovo, and Afghanistan. The truth is, the wars currently in view bear directly on the security of Americans in America but nevertheless are not expected to kill many American soldiers. Allied fatalities in the Gulf War amounted approximately 250 of the roughly 500,000 military personnel deployed. Projecting that rate into the future may be wrong, but it reflects the current conventional wisdom.

#### The draft will fail to solve adventurism – empirical examples prove that the military industrial complex will commit to long unpopular wars despite the draft.

Baldwin, 2013 – Writer @ C4SS [Martin, Would Conscription Curb US Militarism? Thom Hartmann Thinks So, <https://c4ss.org/content/17405>, Accessed July 7th 2016] [Premier]

“There are a thousand hacking at the branches of evil to one who is striking at the root…” -Henry David Thoreau Walden (1854) Do you ever get the feeling that progressives have run out of ideas? This thought crossed my mind when I read Thom Hartmann’s “The Draft: A War-Killer” on Truthout. Hartmann advocates reinstatement of conscription in a “new and improved form.” He proclaims that the military industrial complex “would finally be held in check if we were to re-instate a draft.” Hartmann seems oblivious to the fact that the military industrial complex grew and prospered with a draft in place. The hook for Hartmann’s piece is the upcoming tenth anniversary of the US invasion of Iraq. “Would we still be in Iraq today,” he asks, “or even have gone to war with Iraq — if there was a military draft in this country?” He claims that the war in Iraq has lasted longer than other major US wars where a draft was in place, such as the Civil War, World War I, World War II, Korea and Vietnam. Right away, Hartmann runs into problems. The Vietnam war is generally described as having been fought from 1965 to 1975, so it lasted at least as long as Iraq has. And in actuality the US was involved in Vietnam for years before that. Hartmann further argues from several flawed premises. For instance, he claims that conscription is “a great leveler,” ensuring that people from all backgrounds share in the sacrifice. But that claim contradicts much of what we now know about the Civil War (in which two out of three Union draftees were hired “substitutes”) and about Vietnam, the last war in which conscription was used. Former US Vice-President Dick Cheney received five draft deferments while flunking out of Yale, struggling through six years of college and impregnating his wife (in the nick of time, it turned out). Shotgun Dick famously told the Washington Post, “I had other priorities in the 60s than military service.” Cheney’s running mate, former US President George W. Bush (son of George H.W. and grandson of Prescott) protected the America South from a Viet Cong invasion while serving with (and apparently deserting from) Air National Guard Units in Texas and Alabama. Fellow Republican (and 2012 GOP presidential nominee) Mitt Romney, son of Governor George Romney of Michigan, was granted deferments first as a student and then to serve as a Mormon missionary in France. To be bi-partisan, I should add that former US President Bill Clinton also received student deferments. To his credit, Clinton did express moral objections to the war, unlike Cheney, Bush and Romney. In a letter to an Arkansas ROTC Colonel, Clinton stated, “no government really rooted in limited, parliamentary democracy should have the power to make its citizens fight and kill and die in a war they may oppose, a war which even possibly may be wrong, a war which, in any case, does not involve immediately the peace and freedom of the nation.” Did you catch that Thom? But Hartmann is undaunted by the experience of Vietnam. He thunders, “history shows that when we have a draft, our lawmakers are less enthusiastic to start wars, and more enthusiastic to end them quickly.” Where is the evidence for this claim? The government’s actions during Vietnam clearly undermine this notion, but let’s talk about World War I as well. According to historian James W. Lowen, people may believe that President Woodrow Wilson took the US into World War I reluctantly. There was a draft, after all! But this is hard to swallow, since Wilson was a serial interventionist. Under Wilson, the US armed forces “intervened in Latin America more often than at any other time in our history” (Lies My Teacher Told Me, p.16). Wilson’s administration also actively aided the “White” side in the Russian Civil War. And how did Wilson react to those, like Emma Goldman, who agitated against conscription during these years? With swift repression, of course. Surely Hartmann is aware of all this. But he imagines that we will get it right this time around: “As part of a draft, we should be asking young Americans to give 1 or 2 years of their life to serve their country, not just in the military, but also, alternatively, in civilian programs like Americorps, to volunteer in hospitals and schools, or to care for our nation’s elderly and disabled people.” But the government would not be “asking” young Americans to do anything. That’s not how conscription works. If young Americans resisted Thom Hartmann’s draft, like their forebears did during Vietnam and World War I, the government would turn to force as it has done before. Hartmann and progressives like him misunderstand the nature of the state, which makes them naive and potentially dangerous.

#### A Draft will not solve intervention – politicians will still vote for war and keep their children in non-combat roles

Lacey, 03 – US Army Reserve officer (James, Symposium - Q: Is restoring universal military conscription in the United States a good idea? NO: The modern military needs a smaller force of highly motivated, trained professionals, not a horde of draftees. Insight on the News, 4 Feb 2003, http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_m1571/is\_4\_19/ai\_97450991 Accessed 4 July 2016) [Premier]

Rangel also makes the point that if there were a draft that made no special allowance for the sons of the rich and powerful we would be a lot slower to rush into war. He says that if senators and congressmen knew that their own children were on the firing line they would pause to think long and hard before voting to commit them anywhere. This sounds good in theory, but it does not pass the reality test. Even if the sons of the powerful do enter the military they easily will be able to find jobs well away from any potential danger--as did the young Al Gore, a well-behind-the-lines journalist. There may be some like the Kennedys or the Roosevelts who insist on being at the point of danger, but all those who want to stay in the rear easily will be able to do so.

#### The draft won’t solve militaristic interventionism– it sacrifices too many people in a vain attempt to outrage the public, which empirically fails

Steigerwald, 2013 – journalist [Lucy, journalist at multiple newspapers, Stop Suggesting Conscription As the Fix for American Militarism, May 09, 2013, <http://antiwar.com/blog/2013/05/09/the-draft-doesnt-end-war/>, Accessed July 6 2016] [Premier]

The idea that the draft would stop perpetual war is tempting to consider for a minute. After all, wasn’t it that sword of Damocles hanging over every middle class kid that finally made Americans say enough was enough during Vietnam? Isn’t it worth a try? No. Because you don’t end mass-murder by enslaving enough people to maybe, eventually, piss off the masses. War drones, for all their horrors, are at least not hundreds of thousands of enslaved men forced to fight. Piloting drones requires training. Most aspects of warfare now require much more training than in Vietnam days. This is one reason the draft is no longer popular among government. Nor is it popular among respondents to Gallup polls. Sirota’s short piece is not as obviously offensive as Rangel’s alarming February comments about going into the military screaming and coming out saluting the flag. But it’s nasty and sneaky and scary all the same. He’s too timid to say “Let’s Draft Our Kids” as Ricks did in The New York Times last year. Some want a draft — or “national service” — because they believe that 18-year-olds belong to the country, not themselves. Those national greatness morons — or just people who think terrorists are that powerful — are more similar to Sirota than he might think, and they’re more honest. Sirota ends his piece with: Well-meaning people can certainly disagree about whether a modern-day draft is a good idea or not (and it may not be). But 40 years into the all-volunteer experiment, it is clear that ending conscription was as much about giving citizens the liberty to abstain from as about quashing popular opposition to martial decisions. By design, it weakened our democratic connection to the armed forces, a connection that is the only proven safeguard against unbridled militarism. Experiment. The implication that not enslaving men aged 19-26 is a fluke, tried, and now to be discarded. Never mind Richard Nixon, or the military, or anyone else’s motives in lifting the threat of military service off of the general population in order to make war “an abstraction.” Consider the definition of the draft — the mandate that you serve the government in the most servile fashion. You are more directly the hand of the state than in any other job. And you may die. In Vietnam, 30 percent of the men killed were drafted (around 17,000 people). Countless men also signed up knowing they were going to be forced into the armed forces, in order to pick the least loathsome choice of branch. To say nothing of 2 million Vietnamese killed during the war, look how many American men were sacrificed and how many — men and women, if Rangel had his way — would it take next time in order to stop the next war? Ostensibly Sirota’s motivations for wanting a draft are good; the end of the worst thing in the world. But they’re twisted. Instead of starving the beast of militarism he wants to shove a few thousand people down its throat until it (hopefully) chokes. Would it work? It’s possible. But it didn’t work during the Civil War, World War I, World War II, Korea, or Vietnam. Or, it didn’t work in time for scores upon scores of thousand of men. What about them? Isn’t preventing their enslavement and slaughter also a part of opposing war? If people suggesting a return to conscription are serious about ending war and all its miseries, they will stop spinning their wheels on bullshit columns like Sirota’s; stop coyly suggesting unpopular plans that make them sound grave and determined; and they will start opposing war, period.

### AT Civil-Military Gap

#### Turn - Closing the civil-military gap results in increased defense spending

Lee 10, Byeonggu Lee; PhD of Political Science at University of Kansas; University of Kansas; 2010; “CIVIL-MILITARY GAP AND MILITARY EFFECTIVENESS: THE IMPACT OF IDEOLOGY AND MILITARY EXPERIENCE GAP ON DEFENSE SPENDING IN THE UNITED STATES, 1952-2000;” [Premier]

Gelpi and Feaver’s study provide further insight into this phenomenon.273 They found that the proportion of military veterans in the House and Cabinet has a positive relationship with the size of military force used in interstate conflicts in the United States. They argued that the preference of military veterans for a larger military force to be employed in military conflicts derives from the preference for a decisive military victory. If this is true, it may be that under the condition of increased external threats, political institutions with a higher percentage of military veterans are likely to increase defense spending in an effort to seek a decisive victory.

#### Compulsory military service won’t solve the civil military gap – it is unprecedented in peacetime, is utterly infeasible and won’t change elite opinions.

Noonan ’13 – director of the Program on National Security at the Foreign Policy Research Institute (Michael P., “Serving or Servicing the Civil-Military Divide?,” US News, 5/31, accessed 7/5/16, <http://www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/world-report/2013/05/31/two-ways-to-bridge-the-civilian-military-divide>) [Premier]

But are these views correct? Would a draft or national service bridge the civil-military gap? Emotively, perhaps. Military service – and presumably universal national service – would bring together young men and women of myriad backgrounds and experiences from all over the country together. Their shared collective experience would probably create a lot of understanding and mutual respect across various groups. It would also help to spread the burden of service in times of war, particularly in periods like the mid-'00s when the services were having trouble filling enlistment quotas. But what about in times of peace? The nation has only had one period when there was conscription during peacetime (1953-1965). However, that was a much different era than todays: there was a real, capable existential threat in the form of the Soviet Union that likely wouldn't allow for a quick mobilization of the reserves and National Guard. And, practically speaking there is about a zero percent chance of Congress authorizing conscription, particularly when the services don't want it. This also leaves aside the question of equity. According to the CIA's World Factbook in the United States 2,161,727 males and 2,055,685 females turn 16 every year. If one accepts then that similar numbers of men and women turn 18 every year then those numbers are hard to absorb in any form of national service unless something truly catastrophic was to happen. And even if there were a lottery system then issues would surely arise even if no deferrals were allowed. [ See a collection of political cartoons on women in combat.] Last, if this is about ensuring that "elites" serve, there are no current prohibitions from their serving today. In fact, one might argue that one could turn this issue on its head if the Ivies, "little Ivies" and "public Ivies" told incoming classes of students that they would not be admitted into their first year classes if they hadn't served for a year or two in military or national service. This probably has less than a zero percent chance of happening.

#### Plan cannot solve for the gap – it is too wide, due to technology and military mission creep – ending the draft was only One of the proximate causes.

Noonan ’13 – director of the Program on National Security at the Foreign Policy Research Institute (Michael P., “Serving or Servicing the Civil-Military Divide?,” US News, 5/31, accessed 7/5/16, <http://www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/world-report/2013/05/31/two-ways-to-bridge-the-civilian-military-divide>) [Premier]

This week the nation celebrated the Memorial Day holiday. Major League Baseball teams even wore special Marine Corps desert camouflage caps and uniforms – as they will also likely wear for the 4th of July and September 11th – for games that day. Many announcers that day, and other fellow citizens, however, conflated Memorial Day – a day to honor those that have made the ultimate sacrifice in uniformed service to their country – with Veterans Day, which honors those who have served in uniform. Now this may seem like hair splitting to some, but there is a big difference in the purposes for these holidays and this confusion, or sometimes-awkward exclamations of "thank you for your service," is symptomatic of one, however small, fracture in the civil-military divide that exists in the United States in 2013. Two op-eds in major newspapers of opinion and record this week have sought to address this civil-military divide. Retired Army lieutenant general and former U.S. Ambassador to Afghanistan Karl Eikenberry and Stanford historian David M. Kennedy in the New York Times argued that three factors have led to this chasm in relations between society and its military: first the end of the draft in 1973, second "technology has helped insulate civilians from the military" by making small numbers of service members increasingly more lethal than their more numerous predecessors, and third "the military's role has expanded far beyond the traditional battlefield" – particularly in areas related to counterinsurgency and cyber activities. In their words, "Together, these developments present a disturbingly novel spectacle: a maximally powerful force operating with a minimum of citizen engagement and comprehension." [ See a collection of political cartoons on defense spending.] For Eikenberry and Kennedy, The modern force presents presidents with a moral hazard, making it easier for them to resort to arms with little concern for the economic consequences or political accountability. Meanwhile, Americans are happy to thank the volunteer soldiers who make it possible for them not to serve, and deem it is somehow unpatriotic to call their armed forces to task when things go awry.

#### Turn - Draft destroys civil military relations – Military leaders oppose the plan

Lacey, 03 – US Army Reserve officer (James, Symposium - Q: Is restoring universal military conscription in the United States a good idea? NO: The modern military needs a smaller force of highly motivated, trained professionals, not a horde of draftees. Insight on the News, 4 Feb 2003, http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_m1571/is\_4\_19/ai\_97450991 Accessed 4 July 2016) [Premier]

The best reason for not calling for a draft is that no member of the combined Joint Chiefs of Staff is asking for one. These are the men responsible for protecting our country and ensuring that our armed forces are fully prepared to meet any potential enemy. It is a trust that these men take very seriously. As junior officers all of them faced combat on the front lines in Vietnam. They are therefore intimately acquainted with the kind of army that can, result from a draft. Most of them swore that the mistakes that led to the debacle in Vietnam would not be repeated on their watch. One of those mistakes was the draft. If the Joint Chiefs do not want a draft, there had better be a good reason to force one on them.

#### Banning DADT solved the civil military gap

Wetherbee ’07 –fellow at Center for the Study of the Presidency and Congress (Michael A., “Closing the Civil-Military Gap,” accessed 7/5/16, <http://cspc.nonprofitsoapbox.com/storage/documents/Vater/Wetherbee.pdf>) [Premier]

From the office of the presidency, there are many steps that could be taken to close the civil-military gap. These steps range from large changes such as reinstituting the draft, to small changes such asking the nations elite to serve, recreating a sense of patriotic duty that was once a part of the fabric of our country. In between these extremes, lies the possibility of restructuring aspects of the military institution to promote social contact between military members and society, including the elite society. Finally, outside of this spectrum lies a change that could happen with a simple vote in congress, and it would have sweeping effects, although it would face fierce opposition. This change is the removal of the “Don’t ask, Don’t Tell” policy, allowing homosexuals to serve openly in the military. It may be argued that this change would compromise military effectiveness in order to make the military look too much like society. Recent studies by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, John Shalikashvili, when the “Don’t ask, Don’t Tell” policy was enacted, however, show that allowing gay military members to serve openly would not decrease military effectiveness.

#### The Draft would kill Civil Military Relations – the military is adamantly opposed to it

Ford ’03 – Mutual Black Network news anchor (Glen, “No Draft, No Peace: Rangel and Conyers are right,” The Black Commentator, Issue Number 24 - January 9, accessed 7/4/16, <http://www.blackcommentator.com/24/24_commentary_pr.html>) [Premier]

Universal service is at the top of the Pentagon's list - of things it does not want. Citizen soldiers hobble the empire. That was the military's Vietnam lesson. Anti-war protesters, although absolutely essential on the domestic political front, were of little concern to the men who moved brigades and divisions across the landscape of Vietnam. Their problem was the citizen soldier who, they discovered, refused to act or be treated like foreign legionnaires. No sooner had Rangel and Conyers spoken, than the Associated Press relayed the military's ready response: "The Pentagon opposes a return to the draft. The all-volunteer force has provided a military 'that is experienced, smart, disciplined and representative of America,' the Defense Department said in a statement."

#### Plan cannot close the gap – distain for service in the military is too culturally engrained.

Wetherbee ’07 –fellow at Center for the Study of the Presidency and Congress (Michael A., “Closing the Civil-Military Gap,” accessed 7/5/16, <http://cspc.nonprofitsoapbox.com/storage/documents/Vater/Wetherbee.pdf>) [Premier]

It seems patriotic duty has diminished in America, and “a lot has changed since the days when our political, business, and academic leaders encouraged, even expected, their children to serve, as a part of the rousing-up process and as something that many American Males just did, with the full support of their loved ones.”lxxx It seems today that “our leaders have become shy of talking about the common duties of citizenship, shy of even using a word like duty.” lxxxi It is not as if the public has lost a great deal of respect and admiration for military service, it is simply that the “respect and admiration for the military no longer translates into a propensity to join.”lxxxii Whereas in the past, most people in the country had personal connections to someone who served in the military, and were inspired to follow in their footsteps, today these personal connections have become rare.lxxxiii Additionally, it seems that people are even offended with the proposition of them or their children serving in the military. As Roth-Douquet and Schaeffer write, “Many parents apparently find it unbearably onerous that their children might be asked to even consider serving their country, even though their children not only may refuse the phone call, but of course, are under no obligation to join.”lxxxiv The fact that it has become onerous to be confronted with the idea of military service is a poor reflection of American society. It is one thing to say that military service should be a personal choice, but it is entirely different to say that being exposed to the idea of military service should also be a personal choice. It is frightening that the concept of national service and patriotism have become subjective truths, with only some people believing that they are a valuable and important thing.lxxxv

#### Banning DADT should have solved the Gap

Wetherbee ’07 –fellow at Center for the Study of the Presidency and Congress (Michael A., “Closing the Civil-Military Gap,” accessed 7/5/16, <http://cspc.nonprofitsoapbox.com/storage/documents/Vater/Wetherbee.pdf>) [Premier]

 While all of these changes would be effective in closing the civil-military gap, there is one change that could be made with a mere vote in congress and would have a significant effect. This would be removing the “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” policy, which was the result of Clinton’s failure to allow homosexuals to serve openly in the military. When Clinton tried to lift the ban on gays in the military in 1993, he faced heavy opposition because there was a “longstanding view that homosexuality was incompatible with service, letting people who were openly gay serve would lower morale, harm recruitment and undermine unit cohesion.” xci

### AT Econ / Spending

#### [Also see the DA Link – Spending]

#### The draft doesn’t save money – it is an inefficient use of workers and expands costs more than it saves money

Appelbaum, 16 – reporter for New York Times (Binyamin, Economists Against the Draft, New York Times, 6 Feb 2016, <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/02/07/opinion/sunday/economists-against-the-draft.html> Accessed 6 July 2016) [Premier]

Economists actually played a key role in the Nixon administration’s decision to end the draft in 1973. The draft ended because people hated the Vietnam War, but economists provided the intellectual justification. A recent history describes it as the only issue on which the conservative economist Milton Friedman and the liberal economist John Kenneth Galbraith ever agreed. The basic argument was that the market for soldiers should work like any other labor market. Let the government decide how many people it needs, and let it pay for their labor. A draft, by contrast, captures people who would prefer to be doing something else and forces them to bear the cost of national defense disproportionately by working for a submarket wage. That impact would be even greater today with so many more women in the work force. Volunteer soldiers are more expensive because they need to be paid market rates. But volunteer armies require fewer soldiers, so taxpayers don’t save much money with a draft. Studies show that volunteers tend to work harder and serve longer, reducing training costs, and that performance improves with experience.

#### The draft doesn’t reduce the cost of national defense – it just transfers the cost to the military personnel who can least afford it.

**Jehn, 2008 – VP for Government Programs at Cray Inc**. [Christopher, Vice president for government programs at Cray Inc. He served as the assistant secretary of defense for force management and personnel from 1989 to 1993, and was assistant director for national security of the Congressional Budget Office from 1998 to 2001, The concise Encyclopedia of Economics: Conscription, Economics Library, July 5, 2016, <http://www.econlib.org/library/Enc/Conscription.html>] [Premier]

Most nations, including the United States, have used military drafts at various times. Regardless of one’s views on military or defense policy, a draft has many economic aspects that are inherently unfair (and inefficient) and unacceptable to most economists. Hence, the question of whether to have a draft is really a question of whether any expected benefits outweigh those inequities. A military draft forces people to serve in the military—something they would not necessarily choose to do. With a draft in place, the military can pay lower wages than it would take to attract a force of willing volunteers of the same size, skills, and quality. This reduction in pay is properly viewed as a tax on military personnel. The amount of the tax is simply the difference between actual pay and the pay necessary to induce individuals to serve voluntarily. If, for example, pay would have to be twenty thousand dollars per year to attract sufficient volunteers, but these volunteers are instead drafted at twelve thousand dollars per year, the draftees each pay a tax of eight thousand dollars per year. Before the United States abolished the draft in 1973, some of its supporters argued that an all-volunteer force (AVF) would be too expensive because the military would have to pay much higher wages to attract enlistees. But the draft does not really reduce the cost of national defense. It merely shifts part of the cost from the general public to junior military personnel (career personnel are not typically drafted). This tax is especially regressive because it falls on low-paid junior personnel, who are least able to pay. Moreover, not just draftees pay the tax; so do those who still volunteer despite the lower pay. In other words, the draft is a tax on military service, the very act of patriotism that a draft is sometimes said to encourage. The President’s Commission on an All-Volunteer Force estimated that the draft tax during the Vietnam War was more than eight billion dollars per year in 2003 dollars.

### AT Race

#### Their historical analysis papers over the way in which black bodies are criminalized once drafted

Maycock 01 Maycock, James. “War within war.” The Guardian. September 14, 2001. [Premier]

**Military justice in Vietnam was** also rarely **racially** **impartial. Black servicemen were** frequently **sentenced to longer terms than** their **white counterparts** and, once inside a military prison, black Muslim inmates were refused copies of the Koran. During this period, one black marine pointed out, "The Corps says it treats all men just one way - as a marine. What it actually has done is treat everybody like a white marine." But, most disturbingly, **black Americans were dying at a disproportionate rate and this only inflamed their indignation**, as one black private remonstrated: "You should see for yourself how the black man is being treated over here and the way we are dying. When it comes to rank, we are left out. **When it comes to** special **privileges, we are left out. When it comes to** patrols, **operations** and so forth, **we are first**." Their predicament was aggravated by a weakening in the chain of command. **Many** of the very young, naive **white officers were incapable of diffusing** the **racial tension and**, at times, white privates **informed their superior black officers**, including Allen Thomas, **that they "weren't going to take orders from a [negro]** nigger".

#### The draft would not solve discrimination – not all eligible people are drafted – the rich would exploit the selection process

Lacey, 03 – US Army Reserve officer (James, Symposium - Q: Is restoring universal military conscription in the United States a good idea? NO: The modern military needs a smaller force of highly motivated, trained professionals, not a horde of draftees. Insight on the News, 4 Feb 2003, http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_m1571/is\_4\_19/ai\_97450991 Accessed 4 July 2016) [Premier]

Of course, no one is going to bankrupt the nation to build a military 10 times larger than what we currently need. This means that less than one in five of the eligible draftees would be needed or called. Given that only a proportion of the eligible males would be called, anyone who thinks that the draft will remain a fair cross section of our society is living in a dream world. More likely the military would become even less representative of society as the rich and middle class would do whatever they had to in order to avoid contact with the "undesirable elements" who would be caught up in a draft. At present, recruiters seeking the highest-quality volunteers turn these undesirables away.

#### The volunteer military is not a Poverty Draft – empirical studies prove there is no recruitment bias.

Lacey, 03 – US Army Reserve officer (James, Symposium - Q: Is restoring universal military conscription in the United States a good idea? NO: The modern military needs a smaller force of highly motivated, trained professionals, not a horde of draftees. Insight on the News, 4 Feb 2003, http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_m1571/is\_4\_19/ai\_97450991 Accessed 4 July 2016) [Premier]

That still leaves open the question of whether our military is composed mostly of economic refugees. The evidence says no. Virtually every member of the armed forces has a high-school diploma, in contrast to 79 percent of the comparable youth population. Practically all new recruits place in the top three intellect categories (as measured by the Armed Forces Qualification Test), versus 69 percent of their civilian counterparts. New soldiers also read at a higher level than their civilian counterparts. A thorough study by Columbia University's Sue Berryman concluded that enlistees "do not come from the more marginal groups on any of four dimensions: family socioeconomic status, measured verbal and quantitative abilities, educational achievement and work orientation." Overall, both the rich and the poor are somewhat underrepresented in our armed forces. Rather, the U.S. military closely reflects the makeup of our large middle class.

#### A New draft would replicate the discrimination from Vietnam through deferments – even with civilian options people would be forced into the military

Thompson, 07 - Pulitzer Prize-winning reporter (Mark, Would National Service Be Better Than the Draft? TIME, 30 Aug 2007, [http://content.time.com/time/specials/2007/article/0,28804,1657256\_1657626\_1656898,00.html](http://content.time.com/time/specials/2007/article/0%2C28804%2C1657256_1657626_1656898%2C00.html) Accessed 5 July 2016) [Premier]

But much of this debate remains fuzzy: if there were a national-service requirement, might some be forced into the military against their will if all the civilian options were already filled? The Air Force, Marines and Navy haven't had much trouble filling their ranks, so would draftees all be funneled into the Army — and more specifically, into the blood-and-mud ground combat units? Beyond such concerns, military officers say, there plainly aren't sufficient jobs — or sufficient money — to employ the entire cohort (as of July 1, there were 4.3 million American 18-year-olds, and 4.4 million American 17-year-olds, according to the Census Bureau). So just as draft deferments poisoned the Vietnam-era draft, how would a new national-service program fairly choose among those eligible (the draft lottery, used for awhile at the end of the Vietnam war to select those who had to serve, has been replaced by state lotteries seeking to fund social programs on the backs of those least able to afford it. Perhaps it could be brought back to life, along with the draft). Would women be included, or exempt? Why include them when current law bars them from the combat forces most in need of personnel?

#### A draft won’t solve inequality – there will still be unequal sacrifices because only a small group would ever see combat

**Somin 2013 – Professor of law at George Mason** [Ilya Somin, author of Democracy and Political Ignorance: Why Smaller Government is Smarter, January 26, 2013, The Volokh Conspiracy, July 5, 2016, <http://volokh.com/2013/01/26/charles-rangels-case-for-conscription/>] [Premier]

Rangel’s equality argument for the draft is dubious. If we reinstate the draft, it would still be true that only a small percentage of Americans would ever actually serve in combat during wartime and take the risk of “making the ultimate sacrifice.” Even during World War II, only about 16 million Americans served in the armed forces out of a population of 132 million in 1940. And only a minority of the 16 million served in combat positions. Under Rangel’s proposal, the burden of combat duty would still fall on a very small fraction of the population: those unlucky enough to be between the ages of 18 and 25 whenever a war happens to occur. The big difference is that the small group that bears the burden will be selected by force rather than choice. Coerced inequality is no improvement over inequality created by voluntary choice. At least in the latter case, the government has a strong incentive to adequately compensate service members for the risks they take, if only because they would face manpower shortages otherwise. Unequal risk of death is partially offset by extra pay and benefits and by the attractions of military life to those who find it appealing. Draftees get far less in the way of compensation for the inequality imposed on them.

#### A draft won’t solve inequality in the military – the elite will still avoid the draft or be placed in non-combat roles.

Jahnkow, 02- part of the Committee Opposed to the Military and the Draft [Rick, part of the Committee Opposed to the Military and the Draft, For those who believe we need a Draft, COMD, Sept 2002, <<http://www.comdsd.org/article_archive/BelieveDraft.htm>>, July 6 2016] [Premier]

· We will always have a ground combat force that is disproportionately poorer and non-white. Even with a draft, people with privilege would be more able to get the medical deferments and conscientious objector status that would keep them out of uniform, and if they failed to stay out of the military, their education would put them disproportionately into noncombat jobs. The most important thing that we can do today to address racial and class imbalance in the military is to demand a more equitable economy and an improved, demilitarized educational system, while also working to shrink the war budget. The logic that we need a draft so that more members of a particular group can be killed or placed at risk in order to bring home to the public that war is wrong has serious ethical implications. Aside from being a form of hostage-taking, it's like saying people should become drug users to learn about the harmful consequences of using drugs, or that we should support another nuclear arms race, because more people would feel the threat of annihilation and that would then lead to the elimination of war - or at least nuclear weapons (though that clearly didn't happen after the 1980s nuclear arms race).

#### The volunteer military does not harm minorities— Black overrepresentation is voluntary – it is the result of a colorblind meritocracy

Thomas 2011 - Director of Progams at The Atlas Society. [William R April 29 Free Minds and Free Militaries <http://atlassociety.org/commentary/commentary-blog/4684-free-minds-and-free-militaries>] [Premier]

One of the proposals was put forward by Congressman Charles Rangel (Democrat of New York) on the op-ed page of the New York Times (December 31, 2002) and seconded later the same week by Congressman John Conyers Jr. (Democrat of Michigan). Conyers and Rangel claim that the voluntary military institutionalizes a kind of racism by putting minorities disproportionately in harm's way. Further, they charge, it exempts the children of the elite from the dangers of war, allowing American political leaders to make war without concern for the human cost. Reviving the draft, in their view, would strike blows both for greater equality and for the cause of peace. The Arguments RefutedThis proposal has not been well received, despite following on the heels of a similar Republican bill from 2001. As former defense secretary Caspar Weinberger pointed out in a Wall Street Journal op-ed (January 10, 2003), no minority group is facing disproportionate risk. In the case of Latinos this is obvious, because Latinos make up only about 10 percent of Department of Defense enlistees, while taking up a rather larger proportion of the military-age population. Blacks, on the other hand, are disproportionately represented in the armed forces, forming about 20 percent of enlistees, compared with a 13 percent share of the military-age population. But this disproportion is largely accounted for by the higher number of blacks who choose the military, and particularly the Army, as a long-term career. Indeed, that they do so is a tribute to the attractiveness of the military's aggressively color-blind meritocracy. Since most of these careerists work in "rear-echelon" tasks such as logistics, it turns out that as a proportion of United States combat troops, blacks make up about the same share as they do of the relevant population at large. So much for the issue of racism.

#### Military recruitment does not target minorities or the poor – new reports prove. Even Rangel admits.

Thompson, 07 - Pulitzer Prize-winning reporter (Mark, Would National Service Be Better Than the Draft? TIME, 30 Aug 2007, [http://content.time.com/time/specials/2007/article/0,28804,1657256\_1657626\_1656898,00.html](http://content.time.com/time/specials/2007/article/0%2C28804%2C1657256_1657626_1656898%2C00.html) Accessed 5 July 2016) [Premier]

Many in the military brush off Rangel's call because they think it is more of an anti-war proposal cloaked in civic-responsibility garb. They particularly disliked his original claim that minorities are over-represented in the all-volunteer military (after it became clear that was not the case, Rangel shifted his argument to focus on how the military's current makeup allegedly relies heavily on the poor. In a June report, the Congressional Budget Office said the scant available data on socio-economic status of the families of military members "suggest that individuals from all income groups are represented roughly proportionately in the enlisted ranks of the AVF.")

#### Minorities do not disproportionately die in combat – the ratios are close and reflect societies proportions

Warner, 2001- Professor of Economics, Clemson University [John, with Beth J. Asch, The Record and Prospects of the All-Volunteer Military in the United States The Journal of Economic Perspectives, April <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2696597>, July 7 2016] [Premier]

Are blacks disproportionately assigned to war-fighting skills and therefore more exposed to the risk of injury or death than whites, as some critics have charged? In 1998, 16 percent of black males were assigned to infantry, gun crews, and seamanship specialties while 20 percent of white males were. On the other hand, blacks are more likely to serve in the military and are overrepresented in war-fighting skills in terms of the overall population. Blacks in war-fighting skills were 0.53 percent of the overall black male population age 20-44 while white personnel made up 0.37 percent of the white male population. But in terms of the overall population and in terms of the military population, blacks were overrepresented in support and administrative positions where black personnel held 26 percent of these jobs while only 12 percent of whites did. Again, whether these racial differences in occupational assignment should be a matter of concern is a matter of judgement.

#### The military does not discriminate against minorities. Minorities do not die in combat disproportionately

Lacey, 03 – US Army Reserve officer (James, Symposium - Q: Is restoring universal military conscription in the United States a good idea? NO: The modern military needs a smaller force of highly motivated, trained professionals, not a horde of draftees. Insight on the News, 4 Feb 2003, http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_m1571/is\_4\_19/ai\_97450991 Accessed 4 July 2016) [Premier]

Disproportionate military losses among minorities is a myth that began in the Vietnam era and is a total fabrication. Minorities did not die in Vietnam or in any conflict thereafter in any greater numbers than they are represented in the population. And, with the exception of 1966, the exact opposite has been the case. Blacks made up 12 percent of the deaths in Vietnam, 13.1 percent of the U.S. population and almost 11 percent of our troops in Vietnam. Whites (including Hispanics) made up 86.4 percent of those who served in Vietnam and 88 percent of those who died there. The highest rate of black deaths in Vietnam was 16.3 percent (in 1966)--and almost all of those killed that year were volunteers for elite units, not reluctant draftees. During the Persian Gulf War, blacks made up 12 percent of the U.S. population, 24.5 percent of the military personnel deployed to the gulf and 15 percent of the total casualties. Whites made up 66 percent of the U.S. forces in the theater and 78 percent of the casualties. Today, blacks make up 19.6 percent of the military (26.7 percent of the Army). But they are unlikely to become casualties in anywhere near those percentages. If the war is fought as it was in Afghanistan, any losses will be overwhelmingly Caucasian. Pilots are mostly white, and blacks make up less than 4 percent of the Special Forces units. Even in a conventional assault, black casualties will be considerably less than their enlistment rate because today's front-line combat force is composed mostly of whites. As is well-documented, whites tend to sign up for adventure; blacks tend to enlist to gain job skills, so fewer wind up in the combat battalions.

### AT Readiness

#### Congress can manipulate exemptions—you don’t get access to less war—it only gives them the incentive for more war

Hovannisian 06 Does America need a draft to win the war on terror? By Garin K. Hovannisian NOVEMBER 29, 2006. CSM. <http://www.csmonitor.com/2006/1129/p09s02-coop.html>. [Premier]

"[Had] members of Congress and the administration thought that their kids from their communities would be placed in harm's way," they would have rejected the war, Rangel says. But in the same breath, ostensibly to make the idea more palatable, he admits that **draftees could opt out of the bloody streets and register at "our seaports**, our airports, in schools, [and] in hospitals" instead. So, **had Bush's daughters been forced to read Dr. Seuss to kindergartners, maybe their father wouldn't have been so quick to the trigger. That logic seems** suddenly less glamorous – indeed, **almost tragic** – considering that both women are already meeting the draft's standards; Jenna Bush is an intern at UNICEF and Barbara Bush volunteers with African AIDS patients. But **even if the draft forced old Washington's young aristocrats to share symbolically in a national burden, it would relieve their warmongering parents of an even heavier burden: the job to prove and advocate a case for war. If wars are manufactured by rich white men, then an all-volunteer force at least gives poor black[s] men the choice not to buy in**. In spite of its intents, **the draft would exempt the hawks among the administration from public accountability**. Instead of being a check on the conscience of policymakers, **the draft will remove every public obstacle from, and grant every public resource to**, the cause of **war**.

#### Turn - Inexperienced soldiers kill readiness—they haven’t accepted the risks and are thus more likely to back down

Allenby and Hagerott 14, Brad Allenby, Mark Hagerott. Universal Conscription as Technology Policy. Winter 2014. Issues in Science and Technology. <http://issues.org/30-2/brad/> [Premier]

And indeed there is an obvious political benefit in eliminating conscription in favor of **volunteer forces**, where those who serve, and often their families as well, **have knowingly accepted the risk of going to war**. In contrast, universal **conscription means that everyone** of a certain age **could potentially serve** in the military, so that **warfighters are drawn from a broad cross-section of society**, widely spreading the risks associated with military activity and **thus making decisions about the deployment of forces much more contentious**. Moreover, **it is far easier to manage an all-volunteer force: Draftees in a country such as the United States are opinionated, stubborn, cantankerous**, questioning, and difficult to lead [as one of us (Allenby) learned first hand as an Army officer during the Vietnam War period]. As Robert Goldich, a noted expert on conscription has observed, “. . . **draftees did not internalize the norms and psychology** of the career force; but rather accepted them, externally and reluctantly, and adapted as best they could. Today, broadly uniform attitudes permeate the entire force, from private to full general.” Is this monolithic culture, unchallenged by the draftee, a good thing in the long run? Others argue that class and regional differences in a melting-pot culture such as that of the United States become far deeper and more difficult to manage when universal service, one of the few arenas in which citizens are mixed without regard to their differences, is eliminated. Moreover, civilian leaders who have not served are necessarily not as intimately familiar with the culture, operations, strengths, and weaknesses of military institutions. And the separateness is there: As journalist Dana Milibank noted in a recent op-ed in the Washington Post, only 86 members of the House, and 17 senators, served in the military, a rate of only 19%, the lowest since World War II (the high, in contrast, was 77% in 1977–1978).

#### Conscripted soldiers are unenthusiastic—kills readiness—also kills nations morale

Baboulias 15 Baboulias, Yiannis. Journalist. “It would be a terrible idea to bring back National Service, and here's why.” The Telegraph. May 18, 2015. [Premier]

The other option is to get your military service over with when you are 18. But is this a good idea? **Appealing as it may sound to those who despair** of today's feckless **youth, does any nation** really **want thousands of unenthusiastic conscripted teenagers into its army**? Wouldn't a smaller, professional and capable body be preferable? The **time when countries maintained hundreds of thousands of foot soldiers was a terrible one**, and thankfully over.

#### Turn - The draft severely reduces military quality – it increases training costs and relies on inexperienced soldiers – troop Quality is key to readiness

Thompson, 07 - Pulitzer Prize-winning reporter (Mark, Would National Service Be Better Than the Draft? TIME, 30 Aug 2007, [http://content.time.com/time/specials/2007/article/0,28804,1657256\_1657626\_1656898,00.html](http://content.time.com/time/specials/2007/article/0%2C28804%2C1657256_1657626_1656898%2C00.html) Accessed 5 July 2016) [Premier]

While most civilian military experts interviewed support the idea of national service, including the military, most retired military officers are on the other side of the argument. (It's worth noting here that the military opposed ending the draft a generation ago, so their opposition needs to be taken with a grain of salt.) They argue that when the draft was last used, the military was largely a low-tech enterprise. But now the inside of an M-1 tank looks more like the bridge of the Starship Enterprise, and takes substantial training to operate effectively. The cost of such training would skyrocket if draftee soldiers had to serve only two-year hitches, meaning greater numbers would have to be trained because of their shorter time in uniform. Even more critical, veterans say, is the ethos of the all-volunteer force, which is difficult to measure but impossible to ignore. National service "is an absolutely bad idea," says Barry McCaffrey, a retired four-star Army general. "My age group learned to love the volunteer military." While McCaffrey says the idea of national service "makes sense in a civic sense" it would lead to lesser-quality soldiers. "We've never had better soldiers in the country's history" than we do now. "They volunteer for the Army, volunteer for combat units, they're high school graduates without felonies, they stay longer," he says, rattling off attributes he fears would shrink with national service. Robert Scales, a retired Army major general, is an Army historian who once commanded the Army War College. "War has become so complex, and so dependent on ground forces, that the idea of drafting soldiers would greatly harm the American military," he says. "First of all, they wouldn’t go into the military goddammit — they'd go into the Army. And if they go into the Army, they're going to go into the combat ops" — infantry, armor, artillery — "because those are the jobs that nobody wants." To Scales, the paradox of resuming any kind of draft is that it would fill those ranks with people who do not want to be there, just as those ranks have become increasingly important. "The critical job in today's military — the jobs that have to be done right — are those close-combat jobs," he says. "So the irony is that in a draft those skills and will and morale and physical fitness — all those things that we most need in the close combat arms — are least likely to be attained."

#### No Readiness crisis - Recruitment high in status quo – we reduced troop levels and have a slow economy

**Kurtz ’13—MBA at Columbia Business School and CNNMoney reporter** [Annalyn, “Getting into the military is getting tougher”, CNN Money, May 15, 2013, <http://money.cnn.com/2013/05/15/news/economy/military-recruiting/>, June 6, 2016] [Premier]

Those waivers were needed to hit enrollment targets. The Army fell short of its recruiting goal by about 7,000 people in 2005, but like the other military branches, it has had a surplus of recruits every year since then. "Before 2009, we would probably be able to give you an example of a young man or young woman who got in with a simple possession of marijuana charge," Herrera said. "They would not get a waiver these days." Related story: Defense Department trims furlough days to 11 Over the last couple years, the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marines have enlisted their highest-quality recruits since at least 1973, when the military discontinued the draft. Now a whopping 99% of recruits have a high-school diploma -- an all-time high. Even candidates with GEDs are often turned away and encouraged to complete at least 15 college credits before re-applying. There are roughly two applicants for every slot the military is trying to fill. Two key factors are driving the trend. First, the military is recruiting fewer active-duty soldiers overall, as it reduces troop levels in both Iraq and Afghanistan. In fiscal 2012, the military enlisted about 155,000 new recruits, the smallest cohort on record in the post-World War II period. Top military officials also credit the sluggish job market for their hiring success. A slow economy "makes recruiting less challenging, and operates to the advantage of those who are hiring, including the U.S. military," Acting Under Secretary of Defense Jessica Wright said last month in a prepared statement before the Senate Armed Forces Committee.

#### Turn - The draft destroys military readiness – forced draftees will resist training, it wastes resources on ineligible conscripts and it ruins unit cohesion.

Thiac, 16 – retired Army Intelligence officer (Michael, This nation does not need the draft, American Thinker, 21 May 2016, <http://www.americanthinker.com/articles/2016/05/this_nation_does_not_need_the_draft.html> Accessed 6 July 2016) [Premier]

Now follow this some more. Army Basic Training is 9-10 weeks. What do you do with the people who “fail,” i.e. are overweight, do not meet standards on physical training tests, “fail” a urinalysis test, etc. Currently we throw them out. How many people will we throw out after we spend the resources to bring them in? Please don’t tell me others, not wanting to be forced to “serve,” will not deliberately do something to be excused. What will you do then? Put them in prison? Send them home? Then you have to get them to Advanced Individual Training, a school that can be two to over twelve months, depending on the specialty. Say for good measure, combining travel and casual status, 3 months Basic, 3 months AIT. That’s half a year. Get them to a new unit, and it takes a few months to get into the swing of things. Next thing you know, Private Snuffy has less than a year left. And he’s counting down days. Because he never wanted to be there and if you give him an order and he refuses, what do you do? Put him in the stockade? Throw him out? Either you keep a disruptive man in a unit, or you throw him out, either way you weaken the outfit. One of the greatest things needed for an effective unit is cohesion. With constant turnaround caused by draftees this will only degrade us. If a draft is implemented for further social engineering, the Pentagon would have to spend a fortune (which we don’t have) to put people in who don’t want to be there, train them and send them out. Such a massive waste of resources would only weaken our nation’s defense. We need a highly trained, professional service.

#### Turn - Conscription decreases military readiness – it hurts re-enlistment, morale and discipline

Jehn 2008 – former assistant secretary of defense for force management and personnel [ "Conscription." The Concise Encyclopedia of Economics. 2008. Library of Economics and Liberty. 6 July 2016. <http://www.econlib.org/library/Enc/Conscription.html>.] [Premier]

A draft also forces some of the wrong people into the military—people who are more productive in other jobs or who have a strong distaste for military service. That has other serious consequences for the country. A draft, especially one with exemptions, causes wasteful avoidance behavior such as the unwanted schooling, emigration, early marriages, and distorted career choices of the 1950s and 1960s. A draft also weakens the military because the presence of unwilling conscripts increases turnover (conscripts reenlist at lower rates than volunteers), lowers morale, and causes discipline problems. U.S. experience since the end of the draft in 1973 is consistent with the above reasoning. Today’s military personnel are the highest quality in the nation’s history. Recruits are better educated and score higher on enlistment tests than their draft-era counterparts. In 2001, 94 percent of new recruits were high school graduates, compared with about 70 percent in the draft era. More than 99 percent scored average or above on the Armed Forces Qualification Test, compared with 80 percent during the draft era. Because of that and because service members are all volunteers, the military has far fewer discipline problems, greater experience (because of less turnover), and hence more capability. So, for example, discipline rates—nonjudicial punishment and courts-martial—were down from 184 per 1,000 in 1972 to just 64 per 1,000 in 2002. And more than half of today’s force are careerists—people with more than five years’ experience—as compared with only about one-third in the 1950s and 1960s. Based on this experience, almost all U.S. military leaders believe that a return to the draft could only weaken the armed forces. Nor, as mentioned, would a draft reduce the budgetary costs of the military.

#### Turn – The draft would kill military readiness by reducing retention – the AVF dramatically reduced turnover

Warner, 2001- Professor of Economics, Clemson University [John, with Beth J. Asch, The Record and Prospects of the All-Volunteer Military in the United States The Journal of Economic Perspectives, April <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2696597>, July 7 2016] [Premier]

Enlisted Recruiting and Turnover After estimating the pay raise required to implement an all-volunteer force, Oi (1967a) estimated that the volunteer force would lead to a 30 percent reduction in enlisted force turnover. Turnover was expected to fall because volunteers could be attracted for longer initial tours of duty and because retention would rise as a result of volunteers' stronger taste for the military and of higher levels of pay.'6 Based on an annual average turnover rate of 21 percent in the 1960-65 draft period, Oi's estimate of the reduction in turnover implied a volunteer-force turnover rate of 14.8 percent. This prediction has proven remarkably accurate. In 1973, the last year of the draft, new recruits totaled 406,000, which was 21.1 percent of the enlisted force that year, as shown earlier in Table 1. Turnover has declined considerably since 1973, hovering around 15 percent since the late 1980s. Because accessions only increase when retention falls to maintain a constant force size, the average number of years someone stays in the force can be roughly estimated as the reciprocal of the 16 In addition to pay, the services manage retention through extensive use of reenlistment bonuses that are targeted to occupational areas where the services want to keep personnel. Warner and Asch (1995) review the elasticities of supply with respect to pay and reenlistment bonuses. Similarly, the services manage the separation of personnel through the use of separation pay, retired pay, and the use of up-or-out rules. This content downloaded from 130.166.220.172 on Tue, 05 Jul 2016 21:42:02 UTC All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms 180 Journal of Economic Perspectives accessions as a percent of the force, shown in Table 1. By this measure, years per accession have risen from 4.74 years in 1973 to around 6.5 years since 1988. In other words, the average recruit today has stayed about two years longer than did the average recruit during conscription. The average age of the enlisted force has risen from 25 years to 27.5 years. Between 1974 and 1987, "careerists," personnel with more than four years of experience, rose from 39 to 50 percent of the enlisted force. This growth reflected reduced turnover in a force of constant size. Since 1987, careerists have grown to 54 percent of the enlisted force; this additional growth was mostly due to the downsizing of the early 1990s.17 The 1998 demand for new enlisted personnel was less than 10 percent of the cohort of males turning 18 years old that year, as shown in the final column of Table 1. The annual accession requirement in the coming decade is likely to be around 200,000-210,000, still only 10.5 percent of the 18 year-old male cohort, which is predicted to grow to 2.2 million by 2010. By comparison, in 1973 the draft was taking a number of people equal to 19.8 percent of the cohort of 18 year-old males. Senior military leaders believe that the reduction in turnover and the resulting increase in experience since the inception of the all-volunteer force have improved the productivity of the U.S. military dramatically. Although military productivity is difficult to measure, a number of AVF-era studies reviewed in Warner and Asch (1995) find military readiness measures such as aircraft sortie rates and equipment downtime to be significantly related to personnel experience, particularly in high- tech occupations. Military leaders were therefore very concerned by difficulties in retaining career officers and enlisted personnel that surfaced in 1998-99, when retention rates dipped below levels sufficient to sustain the career forces.18

#### Military recruitment maintains high standards now for skilled recruits.

**Kurtz ’13—MBA at Columbia Business School and CNN Money reporter** [Annalyn, “Getting into the military is getting tougher”, CNN Money, May 15, 2013, <http://money.cnn.com/2013/05/15/news/economy/military-recruiting/>, June 6, 2016] [Premier]

Just like private-sector employers, the military is seeking higher-skilled recruits these days. It's no longer enough to be a patriotic, able-bodied young person. A high-school diploma, above-average score on the military entrance exams, and a clean slate -- free from prior drug use or criminal conduct -- are practically required now. Thanks to high youth unemployment and the drawdown from both Iraq and Afghanistan, Uncle Sam can afford to be a bit pickier. "There's a lot more competition," said Herrera, who signed up himself 13 years ago. "There are not many opportunities out there, but the Army provides employment and stability, and that makes it an attractive option." The Pentagon estimates that only one in four of today's youth are fit for military service. More than 20% of high-school students fail to graduate. Obesity and other medical conditions disqualify about 35% of candidates. Prior drug and alcohol involvement disqualify another 19%, and criminal records disqualify 5%.

#### The military will meet its goal of quality recruits in coming years despite challenges.

**Tice ‘16—Senior writer at ArmyTimes** [Jim, “Army recruiting market tightens but service expects to make 2016 goal, ArmyTimes, February 23, 2016, http://www.armytimes.com/story/military/careers/army/2016/02/23/army-recruiting-market-tightens-but-service-expects-make-2016-goal/80624982/, July 6, 2016] [Premier]

The Army expects to make its recruiting goal of 62,000 soldiers annually in 2016 and 2017, but recruiters will face “significant challenges due to lower entry pools and a more competitive recruiting environment,” according to budget materials submitted to Congress in early February. While the Army achieved its active component accessions mission of 59,000 soldiers for fiscal 2015, it began the annual recruiting campaign with only 16,500 young people under contract, the smallest delayed entry pool in seven years. The entry pool for fiscal 2016 was even smaller, with only 15,207 people committed to future enlistment on Oct. 1. As of mid-February, the year-to-date enlistment total for the Regular Army stood at 21,004 soldiers, which is one-third of the annual requirement, according to statistics provided by Recruiting Command. “Improving economic conditions, reduced incentives and tightened policy restrictions are proving to be significant challenges to meeting mission goals,” the Army cautioned it its budget submission. Despite those challenges, the quality of the incoming cohorts has been high, with 98 percent of the recruits having earned a traditional high school diploma. In a further measure of quality, more than 60 percent of non-prior-service young people who enlisted in 2015 scored in the 50th percentile or higher of the Armed Forces Qualification Test, which is a measure of recruit aptitude.

#### Turn - A draft lowers military readiness – limited recruitment is key to quality standards for soldiers

Lacey, 03 – US Army Reserve officer (James, Symposium - Q: Is restoring universal military conscription in the United States a good idea? NO: The modern military needs a smaller force of highly motivated, trained professionals, not a horde of draftees. Insight on the News, 4 Feb 2003, http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_m1571/is\_4\_19/ai\_97450991 Accessed 4 July 2016) [Premier]

True, during the last few years the military has had considerable difficulty meeting its recruiting goals. More than anything this reflects the fact that the military is refusing to compromise on quality. As a former recruiting commander I often lamented how many people we had to interview, physically examine and test just to get one qualified applicant. Throughout my tenure the ratio never fell below 14-to-l, though some other districts did a bit better. If the services lowered their standard even minimally they could enlist their yearly goals by March and close their recruiting offices.

#### Turn – the draft kills military readiness by reducing the quality of recruits

Warner, 2001- Professor of Economics, Clemson University [John, with Beth J. Asch, The Record and Prospects of the All-Volunteer Military in the United States The Journal of Economic Perspectives, April <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2696597>, July 7 2016] [Premier]

The draft generated slightly more highly-able recruits than the AVF, but also many more low-scoring recruits. Also, recruit quality would have been higher during the draft if college students and other high-aptitude youth were not allowed to obtain exemptions from the draft. Average AFQT has risen during the AVF.'9 Since higher quality personnel perform better on military-related tasks (Fernandez, 1992; Orvis, Childress and Polich, 1992), the increase in personnel quality has improved the overall productivity of the force. The educational attainment of enlisted accessions has improved remarkably since the inception of the all-volunteer force. In 1973, less than two-thirds of accessions had high school diplomas. High school diploma graduates have com- prised 90 percent or more of accessions since 1984. Since 1991, at least 90 percent of the accessions of every service have had high school diplomas. draft. Average AFQT has risen during the AVF.'9 Since higher quality personnel perform better on military-related tasks (Fernandez, 1992; Orvis, Childress and Polich, 1992), the increase in personnel quality has improved the overall productivity of the force. The educational attainment of enlisted accessions has improved remarkably since the inception of the all-volunteer force. In 1973, less than two-thirds of accessions had high school diplomas. High school diploma graduates have com- prised 90 percent or more of accessions since 1984. Since 1991, at least 90 percent of the accessions of every service have had high school diplomas.

#### Turn - A Draft would destroy military training – it would overwhelm current infrastructure and training budgets.

Thiac, 16 – retired Army Intelligence officer (Michael, This nation does not need the draft, American Thinker, 21 May 2016, <http://www.americanthinker.com/articles/2016/05/this_nation_does_not_need_the_draft.html> Accessed 6 July 2016) [Premier]

Asking everyone to serve would be a disaster. Assume you put in a draft of “every” high school graduate. Approximately 3.9 million people turn 18 each year in the United States. Say of those, 80% are “fit” for military service (i.e., meet height/weight requirements, no issue with narcotics use, no criminal issues), you are talking of induction of 3.2 million people a year. This is a World War II level of forced public service when we are not at war with major powers. If this is a two-year draft enlistment (what was used in Vietnam, as opposed to “the duration” during WWII), the armed forces will have to in-process and train them. The Army (and the other services) don’t have the facilities to in-process that many men and women right now. Can you imagine the cost of bringing online multiple basic training posts throughout the county? Currently we induct approximately 200K a year across all four branches of service, enlisted and officers. A draft could increase this by more than a factor of 15!

#### Turn – A draft would hurt military readiness by reducing high skilled recruits who are essential to new forms of military technology.

Warner, 2001- Professor of Economics, Clemson University [John, with Beth J. Asch, The Record and Prospects of the All-Volunteer Military in the United States The Journal of Economic Perspectives, April <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2696597>, July 7 2016] [Premier]

Sustaining the all-volunteer force has without question become more of a challenge to military personnel planners in recent years, as the strong economy and the trend toward college attendance have reduced the pool of young people who seriously consider a military commitment. But the armed forces can meet the challenge without resort to a draft. Asch, Kilburn and Klerman (1999) discuss ways that the military can better tap the market for college-bound youth. Of course, the military could respond to the recent challenges by reducing their recruiting standards for high-quality personnel, just as it raised them in the early 1990s when a recession and the defense drawdown made recruiting unusually easy. However, cutting recruit quality is an option the military leadership refuses to consider, especially given the likely increase in the demand for quality in the future as the military becomes even more oriented to high technology. From an economic standpoint, what levels of personnel quality are efficient for sustaining the military's objective state of readiness is an open question. A recent Defense Science Board (2000) report identified areas of concern with the current military force structure and with certain military personnel manage- ment practices. Central to the report was the need for the Department of Defense to define the roles and missions of the active and reserve forces more clearly and to integrate the reserve forces with the active forces better. Focus on a draft would deflect attention from this and other areas of concern. Final Remarks Economics cannot rule out the possibility of circumstances under which a draft would be more efficient than a volunteer force. But the economic case for continuing the all-volunteer force appears even more compelling today than it was in the early 1970s, when the armed forces demanded a larger fraction of the youth population. Technological changes that reduce the numerical demand for military manpower while raising the relative demand for high-quality personnel will further accentuate the case for the AVF in the years to come. A case in point is a new Navy destroyer that is now on the drawing board. This destroyer will be much more lethal than the current class of Navy destroyers, because of its state-of-the-art technology, but it is being designed to operate with a crew of only 100, compared with a crew of 400 on the current class of destroyers.

#### Trump budget increases readiness – solves the aff

Carlson 17 [Stephen, writer for UPI and HuffPost, “*Trump military budget proposal aims to increase readiness*”, 5/24/17, UPI, <https://www.upi.com/Trump-military-budget-proposal-aims-to-increase-readiness/9851495654835/>] [Premier]

May 24 (UPI) -- President [Donald Trump](https://www.upi.com/topic/Donald_Trump/)'s [2018 federal budget proposal](https://www.upi.com/Top_News/US/2017/05/23/Trumps-full-41T-budget-seeks-more-border-immigration-money/9221495545987/) includes a $52.7 billion increase in funds for the military over his administration's 2017 request. Trump [is requesting $574.5 billion](https://www.defense.gov/News/Article/Article/1190399/defense-budget-request-seeks-to-balance-current-future-needs/) for the Department of Defense for 2018, in addition to another $64.6 billion requested for overseas contingency operations. The planned budget would increase the size of the U.S. military by 56,000 if it passed by Congress. The additional funding is meant for readiness, procurement of new systems, and overseas operations and deployments, Department of Defense officials said of the proposal. "The intent is for the 2018 budget request is to be the next step in rebuilding the U.S. armed force," John P. Roth, acting comptroller at the Department of Defense, [said in a press release](https://www.defense.gov/News/Article/Article/1191151/official-budget-request-allows-dod-to-get-ready-balanced-more-lethal/). The number of total active duty members is set at 1,314,000, with the Army remaining at 476,000, while Navy strength would increase by 1,408 to 327,000, the [Marine Corps](https://www.upi.com/topic/Marine_Corps/) would grow by 574 to 185,000 and the Air Force would grow 3,975 to 325,100. Reserve forces would also grow by 2,085 to a strength of 815,900, bringing the total size of the military to 2,129,900. Expected pay rises are 2.1% for military and 1.9% for civilian personnel. The largest portion of the proposed bill will be directed towards maintenance and operational expenditures in the amount of $223.3 billion. Personnel costs come to $141.6 billion with procurement expectations set at $115 billion. Research and engineering and military construction spending would be $82.7 billion and $11.9 billion respectively. Officials have claimed the Budget Control Act of 2011 has had a serious impact on military readiness, and the current budget is meant to make up for long-term shortfalls in training, maintenance, procurement, and overall readiness. It includes 19 Army unit training rotations along with 61 Apache attack helicopters and 41 Blackhawk utility helicopter. It accounts for increased flight time for Naval aviation. The Marine Corps would also receive increased funding for procurement, modernization and training. Special Operations Command would be awarded a funding boost, with the bill paying for 70 F-35 [Lightning II](https://www.upi.com/topic/F-35_Lightning_II/) Joint Strike Fighters at a cost of $10.8 billion. The budget also provides $5.5 billion for Navy procurement of 2 Virginia-class submarines, $4 billion for two [Arleigh Burke](https://www.upi.com/topic/Arleigh_Burke/)-class destroyers, $1.2 billion for a Littoral Combat Ship, and $4.6 billion the Ford-class carrier program. The budget also includes funding for 2,275 joint light tactical vehicles and plans for additional base closures by 2021.

#### Status Quo solves—Trump military budget hike solves hard power; it’s popular in congress.

Taylor et al 17 [Jessica Taylor, Danielle Kurtzleben, Scott Horsley; Jessica Taylor is the lead digital political reporter for NPR. Based in Washington, D.C., she covers the 2016 elections and national politics for NPR digital. Before joining NPR in May 2015, Taylor was the campaign editor for *The Hill*newspaper where she oversaw the newspaper's 2014 midterm coverage, managed a team of political reporters and wrote her own biweekly column. Danielle Kurtzleben is a political reporter assigned to NPR's Washington Desk. In her current role, she writes for npr.org's [It's All Politics](http://www.npr.org/sections/itsallpolitics/) blog, focusing on data visualizations. In the run-up to the 2016 election, she will be using numbers to tell stories that go far beyond polling, putting policies into context and illustrating how they affect voters. Before joining NPR in 2015, Kurtzleben spent a year as a correspondent for Vox.com. As part of the site's original reporting team, she covered economics and business news. Scott Horsley is a White House correspondent for NPR News. He reports on the policy and politics of the Trump Administration. Horsley took up the White House beat in 2009 after serving as a San Diego-based business correspondent for NPR where he covered fast food, gasoline prices, and the California electricity crunch of 2000. He reported from the Pentagon during the early phases of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.; “Trump Unveils ‘Hard Power’ Budget That Boosts Military Spending, 3/16/17, NPR, <http://www.npr.org/2017/03/16/520305293/trump-to-unveil-hard-power-budget-that-boosts-military-spending>] [Premier]

The Trump administration's [new budget blueprint](http://www.npr.org/2017/03/16/520379061/read-president-trumps-budget-blueprint) aims to quantify the president's nationalistic agenda in dollars and cents. The plan, released Thursday morning, calls for significant increases in military and border-security spending, along with corresponding cuts in many other parts of the government. The blueprint was designed to "send a message to our allies and our potential adversaries that this is a strong-power administration," Office of Management and Budget Director Mick Mulvaney explained on Wednesday as he previewed the document in a briefing with reporters. It also sends a clear message domestically: This administration is willing to make drastic, controversial cuts to fund that "strong-power" message. That includes slashing spending on foreign aid and the environment, as well as long-standing programs aimed at boosting the arts and humanities, as well as the fortunes of the most vulnerable Americans. The question now is how much the Republican-controlled Congress will go along with that vision. Like any White House budget, Trump's blueprint is more of a political document than an accurate predictor of government spending. Congress controls the purse strings and lawmakers may have very different priorities. As a statement of presidential intention, though, the blueprint is crystal clear. "This is the America First budget," said Mulvaney Wednesday. "In fact, we wrote it using the president's own words. We went through his speeches. We went through articles that have been written about his policies ... and we turned those policies into numbers." "There's no question this is a hard-power budget," Mulvaney also said Wednesday. "It is not a soft-power budget. This is a hard-power budget. And that was done intentionally." Trump wants lawmakers to boost military spending in the coming fiscal year by 10 percent, or $54 billion. Rather than raise taxes or increase the deficit, the president is calling for equivalent cuts in other areas. Foreign aid would be especially hard hit, with the State Department's budget cut by about 28 percent. Alongside Defense, the agencies for which the White House proposes spending increases are almost entirely military- and national security-related. The Department of Homeland Security would see a hike in funding of 6.8 percent, as would the Department of Veterans Affairs (5.9 percent) and the National Nuclear Security Administration (11.3 percent). "The president ran [his campaign] saying he would spend less money overseas and more money back home," Mulvaney said Wednesday. "When you go to implement that policy, you go to things like foreign aid, and those get reduced." Critics argue the administration's single-minded focus on hard power is short-sighted, and could ultimately be detrimental to national security. They point to past comments from Defense Secretary James Mattis, a retired Marine general, who [once told lawmakers](http://foreignpolicy.com/2013/03/06/brass-tone-down-the-ask-for-foreign-aid/), "If you don't fund the State Department fully, then I need to buy more ammunition, ultimately." The White House blueprint does not address major safety net programs such as Social Security and Medicare, which the president has promised to protect. But Trump is calling for sharp cuts in discretionary spending, including the Environmental Protection Agency. The administration is proposing cutting the EPA's budget by 31 percent, from $8.3 billion in fiscal year 2017 to $5.7 billion in fiscal year 2018. That's the largest cut among all Cabinet departments and major agencies. The budget says that slash in funding is necessary "to ease the burden of unnecessary Federal regulations that impose significant costs for workers and consumers without justifiable environmental benefits." Instead of carrying out many of its current functions, the agency would "primarily support States and Tribes in their important role protecting air, land, and water in the 21st Century," the document adds. The EPA's new administrator, Scott Pruitt, is a longtime critic of what he sees as the agency's activist agenda. He and the president have both promised to scale back environmental regulation, including efforts to curb carbon pollution and promote alternative energy. Last week, Pruitt reiterated his doubts that carbon emissions are a primary contributor to climate change. That puts him at odds with the overwhelming scientific consensus. Climate research at NASA could also take a hit under Trump's budget. The plan would reduce overall spending at NASA by around 1 percent, Mulvaney said, but would increase spending on space exploration, which Trump supports. "We're not spending money on this anymore. We consider that a waste of your money," Mulvaney said about climate change research as he took questions from White House reporters at Thursday's afternoon press briefing. In addition, funding for the National Institutes of Health would fall by 18 percent, or $5.8 billion. That cut involves "a major reorganization of NIH's Institutes and Centers," including closing some of those centers, "to help focus resources on the highest priority research." In a [speech to a joint session of Congress](http://www.npr.org/2017/02/28/516717981/watch-live-trump-addresses-joint-session-of-congress) last month, Trump promised to bring renewed hope and opportunity to what he called "our neglected inner cities." The Department of Housing and Urban Development will not be the vehicle for that effort, though. "We've spent a lot of money on housing and urban development over the last decades without a lot to show for it," Mulvaney said Wednesday. He added that Trump prefers to invest in cities' infrastructure and school choice. "Nobody's going to get kicked out of their houses," Mulvaney told reporters Thursday afternoon, reiterating that many of the HUD cuts were related to infrastructure and would be addressed in the massive infrastructure plan the president wants to implement. The president's plan calls for a 6 percent increase in spending by the Department of Homeland Security, including $2.6 billion to begin work on a planned border wall. The White House is also asking Congress to devote $1.5 billion to the wall in the current fiscal year, which ends Sept. 30. Trump claimed throughout the campaign that he would get Mexico to pay for the wall, but Mulvaney said Thursday afternoon that, "as to the source of funds, that's up to the president, the Treasury and the State Department" and wouldn't commit to getting the funds from Mexico. Leading Democrats on Capitol Hill slammed Trump's budget blueprint as wrongheaded. "President Trump is not making anyone more secure with a budget that hollows out our economy and endangers working families," House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi, of California, [said in a statement](https://pelosi.house.gov/news/press-releases/pelosi-statement-on-president-trump-s-fy2018-budget-blueprint), adding, "The budget is a statement of values, and President Trump has shown he does not value the future of children and working families." The Senate's top Democrat was more direct: "Democrats in Congress will emphatically oppose these cuts & urge our Republican colleagues to reject them as well," Sen. Charles Schumer, of New York, said [on Twitter](https://twitter.com/SenSchumer/status/842363976176553985). The two Republican Hill leaders were supportive of the blueprint but both signaled a long process lay ahead. "I welcome the president's blueprint for next year's budget, which turns the page from the last eight years," House Speaker Paul Ryan, of Wisconsin, [said in a statement](http://www.speaker.gov/press-release/statement-president-trump-s-budget-blueprint), adding that he looked forward to "reviewing this with the Appropriations Committee and our entire conference." Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell, of Kentucky, said he "pleased to see an increased focus on our national security and veterans budgets," calling them "positive steps in the right direction," [according to](http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/mcconnell-trumps-defense-budget-step-in-right-direction/article/2617572) the Washington Examiner. But McConnell added he looked forward "to reviewing this and the full budget when it is released later this spring."Among all the proposed spending hikes and cuts, some areas would see spending cuts of 100 percent. The administration wants to [eliminate the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities](http://www.npr.org/2017/03/16/520401246/trumps-budget-plan-cuts-funding-for-arts-humanities-and-public-media). Together, the two groups receive about $300 million annually.

### AT Political Participation

#### Turn - Drafts create a brainwashing effect that make individuals complacent with military propaganda

Joo 15 Joo, Hyo Sun, (grad student at U Chicago with expertise in International Security and Arms Control, International Relations), "South Korean Men and the Military: The Influence of Conscription on the Political Behavior of South Korean Males" (2015). CMC Senior Theses. Paper 1048 [Premier]

Such is the overview of the jung-hoon program and its functions. Our observations show that the military has created a range of institutions and cultures that it is aimed at 1) **rendering recruits’ minds accessible through displacement and previously accepted channels like popular media**, 2) weaving in military values into the daily lives of the recruits through a total replacement of recruits’ previous lifestyles, and 3) constructing a shared identity through the enemy figure of North Korea. The highly developed nature of these methods attest to the level of incompatibility that exists between military values and civilian values among recruits, especially because conscription does not allow for selection based upon aptitude or sympathy with military values. By recreating a social and cultural experience, the military is essentially mimicking the process through which individuals have formed their own values as civilians. Indeed, due to the large gap between civilian values and the military’s expectations of soldiers, the resulting transition is often highly stressful for recruits. This of course is exacerbated by the violence, the displacement, and other tactics previously mentioned as key mental aspects of training. An indicative proxy expression of the high level of incompatibility and the potency of manipulative training in the Korean military is suicide, which helps put the sheer level of stress received by recruits into perspective. If a military has a higher need for indoctrination, especially under circumstances where violence is justified, we hypothesize that the level of suicide will be higher for conscripted militaries. To that end, South Korean military suicide rates, and its civilian counterpart, are compared against that of the United States. Comparing the percentage of suicides among total deaths in the military in South Korea and the U.S., one can find that suicide is responsible for a significantly larger number of deaths in the military under the South Korean model. In the U.S., suicide occupied 14.2 percent of the total number of deaths in the military on average from 2004 to 2010.52 During the same period, the same figure for South Korea was 59.8 percent.53

### AT Unemployment / Econ

#### The draft doesn’t help teens educationally – economically, they’d be better off going to school than working a low-skill military position.

**Dolan 2012 – Economist** [Ed Dolan, The Illusory Economic Benefits of Bringing Back the Draft, Econo Monitor, July 12th, 2012, July 5th, <http://www.economonitor.com/dolanecon/2012/07/12/the-illusory-economic-benefits-of-bringing-back-the-draft/>] [Premier]

Some would be unemployed. (The unemployment rate for people aged 16 to 19 years is currently 23.7 percent, although it is usually a little lower than that.) On the face of it, it might seem that there would be no opportunity cost to conscripting an unemployed teenager, but that is not necessarily true. Some of them might very well be doing something useful with their time, like mowing their parents’ lawns or delivering meals to their grandparents. Even for the unemployed, then, there is some opportunity cost. Another group of teenage conscripts would otherwise be working at unskilled, minimum wage jobs. The opportunity cost of conscripting them would be the cost of replacing them in their former positions. There would be zero economic gain to moving them from one low-productivity job to another. A third group of conscripted teenagers would be taken away from jobs that pay more than the minimum wage, say, construction or factory jobs. The opportunity cost of putting them into national service would be the difference between their productivity in their civilian jobs and their productivity in national service. That could be substantial. The greatest opportunity cost, though, would come from conscripting those teenagers who would otherwise be going to college. Something like two-thirds of all high school graduates go to college, and about half of them end up getting four-year degrees. The opportunity cost of national service, for them, would be an 18-month delay in going to college, and hence, an 18-month delay in beginning their post-college careers. Their post-college jobs, even for those with less than a bachelor’s degree, would in almost all cases pay more than minimum wage, in some cases a lot more. What the national service obligation would do, then, is shift a year and a half of each college-bound conscript’s labor from high-productivity post-college work to low-productivity lawn mowing or park cleaning. When all the different kinds of opportunity costs are considered, it would be reasonable to suppose that the costs of national service would at least double, to something like $60 per hour. Instead of a pool of cheap labor, the program would, in reality, be an extremely costly way to mow the grass.

#### Turn – Conscription reduces future wage prospects – it interrupts education at the most critical time for developing human capital

Hubers and Webbink ’15 - the School of Economics at the Tinbergen Institute [The long-term effects of military conscription on educational attainment and wages, IZA Journal of Labor Economics, December 2015, <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s40172-015-0026-4>, July 5, 2016] [Premier]

In sum, previous empirical studies suggests that military service, both in peace time as in war time, has either no effect or a negative effect on future earnings. The negative effects might result from the effect of conscription on human capital. Conscription might diminish individual returns on human capital, which in turn affects the future wages of a recruit (Lau et al. 2004; Poutvaara and Wagener 2007; Poutvaara and Wagener 2011). Young men are typically called for military service during a period of their lives that would otherwise be devoted to learning or gaining work experience. In addition, human capital accumulated before the draft might depreciate during military service. If military service causes a break in the educational career, it is likely that more time will be needed for completion of tertiary education and might therefore reduce the probability of enrolment and completion of tertiary education. On the other hand, the conscription system in the Netherlands gave recruits the opportunity to postpone their military service duties until they finished their tertiary education. In practice, this often led to a full exemption as a recruit older than 26 was considered too old to serve in the military (Hoffenaar and Schoenmaker 1994). Draft-avoidance behaviour may therefore just as well have led to an increase in enrolment in tertiary education in the Netherlands.

#### Turn - The draft devastates the economy - it would ravage the civilian work force and drive up military costs.

**McDruid, 2015 – Web Writer** [Bring Back the Military Draft? Your Thoughts, The Atlantic, July 5, 2016, <http://www.theatlantic.com/national/archive/2015/05/military-draft/394133/>] [Premier]

Maybe two million people would be taken out of the work force—that's a big hit to the economy. We'd have to pay them too, because we can't have slave labor. So run up more government deficits or taxes as you run up the flag. Add in training costs, food, uniforms, ammunition, and you have a tidy sum that would be better spent educating them in useful matters. And, perhaps the worst: If we have a bigger military, then we might be pressured to use it more. Why not send troops to Syria? We're paying for them anyway. We'd end up mired in more wars, not fewer.

#### The volunteer army is the most economically efficient use of labor – enlisters are those with low opportunity costs of entering the service.

**Reinhardt, 2006 – Professor of Political Economy at Princeton** [Uwe E., November 4, 2006, Kerry Trips Over an Economic Truth, The Washington Post, July 5, 2016, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/11/03/AR2006110301372.html>] [Premier]

Here, for example, is how University of Rochester economics professor Steven E. Landsburg made the case for the volunteer army in his textbook "Price Theory and Applications." Under a military draft, he writes, "the Selective Service Board will draft young people who are potentially brilliant brain surgeons, inventors and economists -- young people with high opportunity costs of entering the service -- and will leave undrafted some young people with much lower opportunity costs. The social loss is avoided under a voluntary system, in which precisely those with the lowest costs will volunteer." Only slightly more crudely put, the central idea underlying this theorem of what economists call "social welfare economics" is that if a nation must use human bodies to stop bullets and shrapnel, it ought to use relatively "low-cost" bodies -- that is, predominantly those who would otherwise not have produced much gross domestic product, the main component of what economists call "social opportunity costs." On this rationale, economists certify the all-volunteer army as efficient and thus good.

#### The draft does not help conscripts economically – it reduces educational achievement and potential wages – new studies prove.

Hubers and Webbink ’15 - the School of Economics at the Tinbergen Institute [The long-term effects of military conscription on educational attainment and wages, IZA Journal of Labor Economics, December 2015, <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s40172-015-0026-4>, July 5, 2016] [Premier]

8 Conclusions This paper investigated the long-term effect of military conscription on educational attainment and wages by exploiting a policy change that exempted a complete birth cohort from military service. We compare the educational outcomes and earnings of the exempted cohort with the outcomes of men from adjacent cohorts. This local approach yields estimates of the societal costs of a system of military conscription and estimates of the private costs for individuals that had to serve in the military. Our approach is related to previous work by Imbens and van der Klaauw (1995), who investigated the effects of conscription on wages of conscripts until 1990. We find that the system of compulsory military service decreases the proportion of university graduates by 1.5 percentage points from a baseline of 12.3 per cent. In addition, being a conscript reduces the probability of obtaining a university degree by almost four percentage points. Our estimates also show that the system of military service reduces average societal wages by 1.5 per cent. The private costs for conscripts are higher; they lose approximately 3 to 4 per cent of their wages by serving in the military. The fact that the average man in our sample served in the army almost 18 years before suggests that the negative effects of military service are long-lasting. Finally, we find that the effect of conscription on educational attainment does not fully explain the wage reduction. This suggests that conscription also reduces individual earnings capacity through channels other than a reduction in human capital. This study provides a new piece of evidence about the hidden costs of conscription. Our estimates show that military conscription has long term negative consequences for completion of university education and for individual earnings. This implies that the costs of conscription are substantial, both at the societal level and at the individual level. Moreover, the private costs of conscription seem to be long-lasting.

#### Turn - The draft harms the economy by harming human capital and earning potential.

Hubers and Webbink ’15 - the School of Economics at the Tinbergen Institute [The long-term effects of military conscription on educational attainment and wages, IZA Journal of Labor Economics, December 2015, <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s40172-015-0026-4>, July 5, 2016] [Premier]

Many countries have a military draft that compels large populations of young men to spend a substantial period of time in military service. Conscripts typically have to serve in the army in a period of their life in which decisions on human capital investments are taken. A compulsory military draft might harm investments in human capital and reduce life time earnings. A number of recent studies have investigated the effect of military service on educational attainment or the effect on wages. Remarkably, these studies do not provide a consistent picture of the effects of military service. For instance, military service seems to decrease educational attainment in the UK (Buonanno 2006) and Italy (Cipollone and Rosolia 2007)1 but increase completion of tertiary education in Germany (Bauer et al. 2014), France (Maurin and Xenogiani 2007) and in the US (Card and Lemieux 2001) because of draft avoidance behaviours. In addition, military service seems to reduce wages in the US (Angrist 1990; Angrist and Krueger 1994) and in the Netherlands (Imbens and van der Klaauw 1995), but in Germany (Bauer et al. 2012), there is no effect on wages. In the US, the negative effects seem to fade away over time (Angrist et al. 2011). Moreover, the importance of education as a mediating channel for the long run effects on earnings remains unclear (Bauer et al. 2012). This paper aims to provide new evidence by investigating the long term effects of military conscription on educational attainment and wages in the Netherlands. Investigating the effects of military conscription is difficult because those that have served might differ from those that have not served. Despite the fact that military conscription was compulsory for all men in the Netherlands, only 40 per cent of each birth cohort actually served in the military. Those who were recruited were selected from a larger population and the various decisions made in this selection process are unobserved. This might induce selection bias if we compare the outcomes of those who served in the military with the outcomes of those that did not serve in the military. To address this selection problem, we exploit a policy change that created a major difference in conscription between birth cohorts. In 1979, the age that Dutch young men were called for military service was lowered from 20 to 19. The direct consequence of this policy change was that a whole birth cohort was exempted from military service. We identify the causal effect of military service by comparing the long term outcomes of this exempted birth cohort with the outcomes of those born in the adjacent years. This local comparison enables us to generate two types of estimates. First, reduced form estimates of the difference between the exempted cohort and the adjacent cohorts that received the regular treatment of conscription provide a direct estimate of the societal costs of a system of conscription. The societal costs might consist of a lower educated population with a lower earnings capacity. Second, instrumental variable estimates show the effect of conscription for males that actually served in the army. These estimates for the com- pliers provide insight into the private costs of conscription. This approach is related to earlier work by Imbens and van der Klaauw (1995). They introduced an instrumental vari- able approach that exploits all variation in conscription between fourteen birth cohorts for obtaining estimates of the short term wage effects for conscripts. We also apply their approach for testing the robustness of our main results on the long term effects of conscription on three education outcomes and wages using micro-level data from 1997 to 2002. Moreover, data on educational attainment and earnings of women enable us to perform a placebo test about the influence of other time related confounding factors. This paper contributes to the recent literature on the effects of military service. First, by exploiting variation in conscription that is transparent and arguably exogenous in a local approach, we are able to obtain estimates of both the societal and private costs of a system of compulsory military service. Second, we are able to trace the effects of conscription on investment in human capital. In particular, we are able to investigate the effects of military conscription on completion of university education. We find that the system of compulsory military service decreases the proportion of university graduates by 1.5 percentage points from a baseline of 12.3 per cent. In addition, being a conscript reduces the probability of obtaining a university degree by almost four percentage points. Third, we investigate the long term effects of conscription on the average societal wages and the wages of conscripts. We find that the system of military service reduces average societal wages by 1.5 per cent. In addition, conscripts lose approximately four per cent of their wages by serving in the military. This suggests that the negative effects of military service are long-lasting. Finally, we investigate to what extent the wage costs of conscription can be explained by the decrease in investment in human capital. We find that the effect of conscription on educational attainment does not fully explain the wage reduction. This suggests that conscription also reduces individual earnings capacity through channels other than a reduction in human capital.

#### Universal compulsory national service kills the economy – there is just no way around the consensus of economists

**Dolan 2012 – Economist** [Ed Dolan, The Illusory Economic Benefits of Bringing Back the Draft, Econo Monitor, July 12th, 2012, July 5th, <http://www.economonitor.com/dolanecon/2012/07/12/the-illusory-economic-benefits-of-bringing-back-the-draft/>] [Premier]

The bottom line: If there is a case to be made for universal, compulsory national service, whether military or civilian, it must be made on grounds other than economics. War is very costly, both in economic terms and in lives lost. Civilian national service, even if less hazardous to life, is not much less costly in economic terms. The best way to minimize the economic burden of both is to make the costs as transparent as possible, not to hide them through an implicit tax on teenagers. No one should casually vote to take even 18 months from the life of a young citizen, let alone ask them to risk their life in combat, under the illusion that doing so is a clever way to save money.

#### Military service does not help youth economically – empirically it doesn’t increase college admission or employment

The Common Struggle 2003. [The Poverty Draft: Recruiting The Working Class To The Frontlines, Libertarian Communist Federation, 03/29/2003 <http://nefac.net/node/313>, 7/4/2016] [Premier]

Recruiters are relentlessly using marketing strategies to woo low income youths with little prospects for education and good jobs into the armed forces. Painting the Army as a kind of job training and vocational school, and simultaneously as a financial aid institution, recruiters get youths in high school to sign up to the DEP (Deferred Enlistment Program). When young people try and back out of enlisting, recruiters often lie and tell them it is impossible or illegal to drop out. In fact, the military isn't a generous financial aid institution, and it isn't concerned with helping pay for school. Two-thirds of all recruits never get any college funding from the military. Only 15% graduated with a four year degree. 65% of recruits who pay the required $1200 into the Montgomery GI Bill never get a dime in return. In terms of job opportunities, to join the army is actually more detrimental to job prospects. Veterans actually earn less than non-veterans: the average post-Vietnam War-era veteran will earn between 11% and 19% less than non-veterans from comparable class backgrounds. Over 50,000 unemployed veterans are on the waiting list for the military's "retraining" program. The Veterans Administration estimates that 1/3 of homeless people are vets. The evidence on rates of return to training and the probability of finding a job in one's chosen occupation, strongly suggests that, all else being equal, young people should look to sources of training other than the military if they wish to optimize their careers.

#### The draft with the option of non-combatant roles would be a financial nightmare – wages, housing, and other amenities drive up costs.

**Dolan 2012 – Economist** [Ed Dolan, The Illusory Economic Benefits of Bringing Back the Draft, Econo Monitor, July 12th, 2012, July 5th, <http://www.economonitor.com/dolanecon/2012/07/12/the-illusory-economic-benefits-of-bringing-back-the-draft/>] [Premier]

Writing in Tuesday’s New York Times, Thomas E. Ricks makes a plea for reinstating the draft. His argument is largely based on supposed economic benefits that I find questionable. Here is why. Ricks’ proposal would expand the draft beyond the military to make it a form of near-universal national service. Under his plan, combat units would continue to be filled by volunteers who would receive full military training, pay, and benefits, much as they do now. In addition, Ricks would add two new categories of service. One new category would consist of uniformed conscripts who would not be deployed, but would instead do paperwork, mow lawns, paint barracks, and drive generals around. They would receive no weapons training. The Washington Post’s Richard Cohen envisions a stirring movie, “Top Broom,” about the exploits of these valiant troops. The other new category would be a civilian corps for young people who did not want to serve in uniform. These conscripts, who would have a slightly longer term of service, would teach in low income areas, clean parks, rebuild crumbling infrastructure, or aid the elderly. The concept is similar to that of AmeriCorps, except for an element of compulsion. The compulsion would not be absolute. There would be an exemption for libertarians who object on principle to the idea of forced labor. However, those seeking the exemption would not get a free ride; they would have to forgo future claims on Medicare, mortgage guarantees, and other government benefits. Both categories of noncombatant conscripts would receive minimal pay (Ricks suggests $15,000 per year), housing, and, one supposes, although Ricks does not mention it, healthcare coverage, while in service. At the end of their term, they would receive “excellent post-service benefits, including free college tuition.” To Ricks, this makes great economic sense. True, it would cost billions, but, he says, it would also save billions. Much of the labor that the military currently contracts out to the private sector could, he says, be performed by conscripted 18-year-olds for much less. What a bargain! Really? I’m not sure Ricks has much grasp of basic economics. The whole idea looks far more costly to me than he makes it out to be. First, the direct costs would not be as low as he seems to think. True, the pay, at $15,000 a year, is little more than the minimum wage, but that’s just the start. Housing is not going to be free. He talks about putting people in barracks on closed military bases and in spare rooms in VA hospitals, but those may not be handy to where the grass needs to be mowed or the meals-on-wheels delivered. Even if they are, they require maintenance, heat, and other utilities. I can easily imagine that even the most Spartan barrack accommodations might cost $250 a month. Throw in another $250 a month for health insurance, and the cost for 18 months of national service is up to $31,500. Contributions to social security and Medicare would add another $1,500 or so. Then there are the costs of those “excellent post-service benefits, including free college tuition.” OK, let’s be stingy. Assume that “free college tuition” means only bare tuition and fees at an in-state public university. Collegedata.com calculates those at $8,244 per year, or $32,976 for a four-year program. (Tuition and fees, by the way, are only about one-third of the cost of attending a state university. Since conscripts would not be able to save much from their minimal pay, they would still be on the hook for student loans or family support to make up the difference.) Let’s not even adjust tuition and fees for inflation, even though college costs have been rising much faster than the cost of living in general. Even so, the college benefits put the total cost of 18 months of national service up to roughly $66,000.

#### The draft can never be both financially and socially efficient. Only drafting people of lower socio-economic status may be financially efficient, but the social cost is high.

**Thoma, 2006 --- Professor of Economics University of Oregon** [Mark, November 04, 2006, The Economics of a Volunteer Army, Economist View, July 5, 2016, <http://economistsview.typepad.com/economistsview/2006/11/the_economics_o.html>] [Premier]

On this rationale, economists certify the all-volunteer army as efficient and thus good. Economists do not define efficient as good or bad. Given a particular measure of equity, an efficient outcome might be quite "bad." But that is not the main point I want to make. Let me use economics to take this a step further because the argument presented above misses an important market failure, one known as "moral hazard" that can lead to inefficient outcomes. There are also other potential inefficiencies, as noted below, including a distorted selection of recruits brought about by a divergence between personal and social costs of entering military service. It is well-known that when the costs of an action do not fall on the agent making a decision, then the tendency will be to take on excessive risk. If a bank manager owns only a small part of the bank he or she manages and thus stands to lose very little if the bank fails, then there is an incentive to use deposits to make risky investments with big potential payoffs, or at least increase the number of risky investment in the bank's portfolio. If the risky investments pay off, the owner wins big, but if they lose, it's someone else's money (and, up to $100,000, the government covers the losses through FDIC, so the depositors don't generally lose either). A solution to this problem is capital requirements that force the owner/manager to share the costs of failure -- make the owner put up a large sum of money that will be lost if the bank fails. If those who are in power are divorced, for the most part, from those who pay the costs of war, than a similar moral hazard problem exists, one for which there is no equivalent of FDIC. If those in power do not stand to lose as much as those doing the fighting, then there is reason to worry that risks might be taken that would be foregone if the costs were shared across the groups in society more equitably. If the children of the powerful are just as exposed to the risks of war as everyone else, then this is less of a worry. There are other potential inefficiencies over and above the potential for excessive risk due to the presence of moral hazard. There is an argument for efficiency during war -- it would be sub-optimal to have ship captains and pilots as infantry, to have medics driving tanks and computer experts cooking dinner in the mess tent. We want resources allocated to their best use and that argument extends to the use of resources for military and non-military purposes. But if the son of a rich person is less likely to be exposed to the risks of war than the son of a poor person with equal abilities and equal value to society, then there is reason to question both the equity and efficiency of the selection process as well as worry about the potential for moral hazard as described above. Just because the military uses its resources efficiently by allocating each to its highest valued use does not mean the set of resources it has available is selected efficiently. It is possible for the set of recruits to be sub-optimal, i.e. for the recruit selection process to be biased for or against selecting from particular groups, yet have the military use the recruits it gets as efficiently as possible. For example, one problem is a potential divergence between personal and social opportunity cost. The uneducated, untalented child a wealthy person may have a very low social cost -- very low cost of military service in terms of foregone GDP -- yet face a very high personal opportunity cost due to their wealth. This person will not choose to volunteer even though it is socially optimal for them to volunteer ahead of a more talented and socially valuable poor person with a lower personal opportunity cost. If we are going to use "social cost" to define efficiency, then we need to be sure the selection process is faithful to this principle.

### AT Volunteering

#### Turn - The aff decreases long term volunteering

Yang 17 Wei Yang; Economics Department, College of Business and Public Administration, University of North Dakota; Routledge Taylor and Francis; “Does ‘compulsory volunteering’ affect subsequent behavior? Evidence from a natural experiment in Canada” 10 May 2016; [Premier]

This paper attempts to investigate the interaction between individuals’ volunteer participation from adolescents to early adulthood and a ‘compulsory volunteerism’ policy. We study a provincial compulsory volunteer policy for HS students in Ontario, Canada. Using a large longitudinal sample that focuses on adolescents and young adults, we find that those who were not directly affected by the policy were less likely to volunteer after the introduction of the policy, with **a crowd-out effect estimated to be about −6.45%** on the extensive margin. It arguably offsets the compliance effect during HS (6.0%). **For volunteer participation after HS completion, the results show that those affected by the policy volunteered about 5% less than they otherwise would have after HS completion,** and that **this effect is mostly concentrated on students who did not have intention to go to university** when asked at age 15. Helms (2013) estimates that a Maryland state-wide mandated community service program had little effect on volunteering by Grade 12. Our findings for the Ontario province-wide program are consistent with these results. In addition, with our more extensive longitudinal sample, we also study volunteering after HS is completed. Our finding **of a decrease in volunteer participation right after HS is consistent with a number of theories, including intertemporal substitution** or that external incentives crowd-out intrinsic motivation (Frey 1997). In any case, our evidence supports the conclusion that ‘compulsory volunteerism’ does not increase altruism.

# Miscellany

## Actor / Agent

### Normal Means - Congress

#### Only Congress can do the plan – without Congressional support, executive action would expand presidential authority too much

Thompson, 07 - Pulitzer Prize-winning reporter (Mark, Would National Service Be Better Than the Draft? TIME, 30 Aug 2007, [http://content.time.com/time/specials/2007/article/0,28804,1657256\_1657626\_1656898,00.html](http://content.time.com/time/specials/2007/article/0%2C28804%2C1657256_1657626_1656898%2C00.html) Accessed 5 July 2016) [Premier]

Casey's qualification — "at least within the Army" — is significant. For while his view is shared by Robert Gates, the current defense secretary, it runs counter to the recommendation of the first Secretary Gates. At his confirmation hearing last December, Bob Gates called the Army's personnel woes "a transitory problem" that didn't warrant renewed conscription. Yet Thomas Gates, who served as defense secretary from 1959 to 1961, chaired a commission created by President Nixon in 1970 to consider doing away with the draft. While the panel recommended doing away with conscription — just as Nixon wanted — it also called on the nation to maintain a "standby draft" that would resume if there were "an emergency requiring a major increase in force over an extended period," which certainly fits today's sitrep. The commission pointedly noted that the draft's resurrection should be ordered by Congress, and not the President. "If a consensus sufficient to induce Congress to activate the draft cannot be mustered," it said, "the President would see the depth of national division before, rather than after, committing U.S. military power."

### Normal Means – Executive

#### The executive is normal means for the actor – the president must lead the push for a draft

Wetherbee ’07 –fellow at Center for the Study of the Presidency and Congress (Michael A., “Closing the Civil-Military Gap,” accessed 7/5/16, <http://cspc.nonprofitsoapbox.com/storage/documents/Vater/Wetherbee.pdf>) [Premier]

 From the office of the presidency, there are many steps that could be taken to close the civil-military gap. These steps range from large changes such as reinstituting the draft, to small changes such asking the nations elite to serve, recreating a sense of patriotic duty that was once a part of the fabric of our country. In between these extremes, lies the possibility of restructuring aspects of the military institution to promote social contact between military members and society, including the elite society. Finally, outside of this spectrum lies a change that could happen with a simple vote in congress, and it would have sweeping effects, although it would face fierce opposition. This change is the removal of the “Don’t ask, Don’t Tell” policy, allowing homosexuals to serve openly in the military. It may be argued that this change would compromise military effectiveness in order to make the military look too much like society. Recent studies by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, John Shalikashvili, when the “Don’t ask, Don’t Tell” policy was enacted, however, show that allowing gay military members to serve openly would not decrease military effectiveness. The presidential driven change that would have the most dramatic affect on closing the civil-military gap would be a reinstatement of the draft.

## Exemptions

#### Normal means for the Universal draft would include very limited exemptions with nonmilitary alternatives – the Rangel Bill proves

**Rangel, 03 – US representative of New York’s 13th Congressional district** (Charles, Symposium - Q: Is restoring universal military conscription in the United States a good idea? YES: Those who call for war against Iraq should be willing to put their own sons and daughters in harm's way. Insight on the News, 4 Feb 2003, <http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1571/is_4_19/ai_97450991> Accessed 4 July 2016) [Premier]

The following is a partial transcript of Rep. Rangel's statements at a Capitol Hill press conference on Jan. 7 as published by Reuters: As many of you know, I have introduced a bill that will require mandatory military and national service for all of our young people, without exceptions for college or graduate courses, with the exception of allowing youngsters to finish high school at a given age. The president of the United States will have the discretion to determine the number of people who will be necessary for the military, and those who because of impairments or disabilities cannot serve in the military will be required to perform other national services at our borders, in our schools, in our seaports and in our airports.

#### A universal, compulsory draft would offer civilian options.

Glastris, 03- editor in chief of The Washington Monthly [Paul, First draft: the battle to create universal national service has just started Here's how it can be won., Washington Monthly, Mar 1, 2003, <[http://www.thefreelibrary.com/First+draft 3A+the+battle+to+create+universal+national+service+has+just...-a098829847](http://www.thefreelibrary.com/First%2Bdraft%203A%2Bthe%2Bbattle%2Bto%2Bcreate%2Buniversal%2Bnational%2Bservice%2Bhas%2Bjust...-a098829847)>, July 4, 2016] [Premier]

A 21st-century draft ought to be crafted in a way that would help fix the weaknesses of today's all-volunteer force without undermining its strengths. Such a draft should provide what the military most needs: smart, college-quality recruits, funneled toward the peacekeeping roles that are an increasingly unavoidable part of war but that put a special strain on the combat-oriented all-volunteer force. It should also help shore up homeland defense and ease the burden on reservists. Finally, a draft to fit the times should strengthen the growing, bipartisan national service movement by providing young people the option of serving their country in a civilian capacity through programs like AmeriCorps. It's not hard to imagine how such a draft might be structured. Every year, the federal government spends tens of billions of dollars subsidizing university education, from student loans to research grants. In the words of military sociologist Charles Moskos, "We've created a G.I. Bill without the G.I." Why not pass a law that says that no four-year college or university can accept a student unless and until that student completes a 12-month to two-year term of service? No lotteries, no deferments. Such a measure would build on existing law; colleges are already required to assure that incoming students have registered with the Selective Service. It would funnel about a million young people a year into service, and would offer them something all Americans today demand: choice. They could choose to fulfill their obligation in the military, in homeland defense (guarding nuclear power plants, for instance), or in an array of national service programs--tutoring disadvantaged children, building low-income homes, or cleaning up after natural disasters. Most would no doubt select the least-risky option available. But others would choose the military, especially if such duty offered a significantly larger G.I.-Bill-type college grant. If only 10 percent chose the military option, the armed services would gain 100,000 fresh recruits a year, with aptitude test scores as high or higher than normal enlistees. And they would be motivated, having chosen the military over other forms of service.