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### Uniqueness

#### Military cuts coming now

Nissypoo 1-4-13, (Dion Nissenbaum, Journalist at the Wallstreet Journal, *Defense firms Seek alternative as U.S. Cuts Military spending*, The Wallstreet Journal, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887323291704578199902312480268.html?mod=googlenews_wsj>)

Over the past three years, she says, Pittsburgh-based RTI's defense work has been cut in half, falling to 20% of the company's revenue from 40%.¶ Faced with more defense cuts on the horizon, RTI is part of a broader shift by defense companies, large and small, looking for ways to contend with lost business. Some of them are diversifying. Others are shedding unprofitable segments, closing plants or laying off workers. Many are looking to increase sales on the international market.¶ "What we're about to go through happens once every 20 to 30 years in the industry, and it requires different thinking and behavior to succeed," says Erich Fischer, a partner at[consulting firm](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887323291704578199902312480268.html?mod=googlenews_wsj) Booz & Co.¶ The challenge stems from the Obama administration's attempts to move from a post-Sept. 11, 2001, "war on terrorism" mind-set to a post-Afghanistan-war period. That shifting worldview has led to an agreement with Congress to cut $487 billion from the defense budget over the next 10 years.¶ Even if U.S. lawmakers avert $500 billion in additional cuts over the next decade that were put on hold by this week's fiscal-cliff agreement, the Pentagon is expected to face additional reductions in any deal to cope with a fragile economy and massive[debt](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887323291704578199902312480268.html?mod=googlenews_wsj). Meanwhile, the U.S. is preparing to end major combat operations in Afghanistan, wrapping up more than a decade of ground operations in South Asia and the Mideast.

### Scenario 1: Soft Power

#### Military spending trades of with soft power

Korb 12, (Lawrence Korb, Senior Fellow at the Center for American Progress and a Senior Adviser to the Center for Defense Information. He was formerly Director of National Security Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations in New York, 3-22-12, *New Ryan Plan Hurts U.S. Foreign Policy*, “Center for American Progress”, <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/security/news/2012/03/22/11311/new-ryan-plan-hurts-u-s-foreign-policy/>)

When House Budget Committee Chairman Paul Ryan (R-WI) put together his “Path to Prosperity,” he should have remembered the advice that former Secretary of Defense Robert Gates and former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Adm. Michael Mullen gave Congress and the country about the balance between spending for defense, development, and diplomacy.¶ In 2007 when the defense budget, excluding war costs, was slightly less than [$500 billion](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/02/04/AR2006020401179.html), and the development and diplomacy budget was only [$36 billion](http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1199)—a ratio of about 13-to-1—Gates[called for an increase](http://articles.latimes.com/2007/nov/27/nation/na-gates27) in the State Department budget. Gates’s reasoning was that the country needed to focus its energies beyond “the guns and steel of the military.”¶ About three years later, Mullen argued that “U.S. foreign policy is still too dominated by the military.” In May 2010 when the Senate Budget Committee reduced the State Department FY 2011 budget request by [$4 billion](http://thecable.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2010/04/22/senate_budget_committee_cuts_foreign_aid_request_despite_pleas_from_everybody_invol), Mullen criticized the reduction in two separate [letters](http://thecable.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2010/05/24/mullen_goes_to_bat_for_state_department_budget) to the speaker and majority leader. Mullen wrote, “Diplomatic programs are critical to our long-term security.”¶ Partly as a result of Gates’s and Mullen’s efforts, the Obama administration reduced the ratio of defense spending to [development and diplomacy spending](http://voices.washingtonpost.com/44/2011/02/budget-2012-state-departmentus.html) to 11-to-1 by FY 2012. But according to Josh Rogin of *The Cable*, Rep. Ryan’s [new](http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/security/news/2012/03/22/11311/new-ryan-plan-hurts-u-s-foreign-policy/) budget [slashes the international affairs budget](http://thecable.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/03/20/ryan_budget_contains_huge_cuts_for_diplomacy_and_development) from $47.8 billion in FY 2012 to $38.3 billion by FY 2015, a reduction of $9.5 billion or about 20 percent in nominal terms over the next three years.

#### Soft Power is key to building the international coalitions necessary to solve global problems, such as economic competitiveness, terrorism, war, proliferation, disease, human trafficking, and drugs

Kurlantzick, Scholar, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, ‘05 ¶ [Joshua,;visiting scholar in the Carnegie Endowment’s China Program and a fellow at the USC School of Public Diplomacy ¶ and the Pacific Council on International Policy; previously foreign editor at The New Republic; “The Decline of American ¶ Soft Power,” December 2005, Current History, Vol. 104, Issue 686; pg. 419, proquest, accessed 07/10/07]

A broad decline in soft power has many practical implications. These include the drain in foreign talent coming to the ¶ United States, the potential backlash against American companies, the growing attractiveness of China and Europe, and the ¶ possibility that anti-US sentiment will make it easier for terrorist groups to recruit. In addition, with a decline in soft power, ¶ Washington is simply less able to persuade others. In the run-up to the Iraq War, the Bush administration could not convince ¶ Turkey, a longtime US ally, to play a major staging role, in part because America's image in Turkey was so poor. During the ¶ war itself, the United States has failed to obtain significant participation from all but a handful of major nations, again in part ¶ because of America's negative image in countries ranging from India to Germany. In attempts to persuade North Korea to ¶ abandon its nuclear weapons, Washington has had to allow China to play a central role, partly because few Asian states view ¶ the United States as a neutral, legitimate broker in the talks. Instead, Washington must increasingly resort to the other ¶ option Nye discusses-force, or the threat of force. With foreign governments and publics suspicious of American policy, the ¶ White House has been unable to lead a multinational effort to halt Iran's nuclear program, and instead has had to resort to ¶ threatening sanctions at the United Nations or even the possibility of strikes against Iran. With America's image declining in ¶ nations like Thailand and Pakistan, it is harder for leaders in these countries to openly embrace counterterrorism cooperation¶ with the United States, so Washington resorts to quiet arm-twisting and blandishments to obtain counterterror concessions. ¶ Force is not a long-term solution. Newer, nontraditional security threats such as disease, human trafficking, and drug ¶ trafficking can only be managed through forms of multilateral cooperation that depend on America's ability to persuade ¶ other nations. Terrorism itself cannot be defeated by force alone, a fact that even the White House recognizes. The 2002 ¶ National security Strategy emphasizes that winning the war on terror requires the United States to lead a battle of ideas ¶ against the ideological roots of terrorism, in addition to rooting out and destroying individual militant cells.

#### Nuclear War

MSNBC 12, (9-16-12, National news organization, “Nothing would remain of Israel if they attack Iran”, <http://theextinctionprotocol.wordpress.com/2012/09/16/nothing-would-remain-of-israel-if-they-attack-iran-we-would-no-longer-be-committed-to-nuclear-non-proliferation-treaty/>)

The top commander in Iran’s powerful Revolutionary Guard warned Sunday that his country’s missiles will ensure “nothing will remain” of Israel if it takes military action against Tehran over its controversial nuclear program. Gen. Mohammad Ali Jafari also warned that Iran might close the Straits of Hormuz if it is attacked, withdraw from the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and hit U.S. bases in the Middle East. Such warnings and references to Israel’s destruction have been made before by Iranian officials. But Gen. Jafari’s comments to a Tehran news conference were an unusually detailed, strongly worded and comprehensive listing of the means that Iran says it has to retaliate against a strike on its nuclear facilities. The U.S. and Israel have left open the possibility of such a strike if Iran does not back down from what they say are a push to develop nuclear weapons. Iran says its nuclear program is for peaceful purposes. US-Israel rift over Iran widens; Obama denies Netanyahu asked for meeting. “Our response to Israel is clear: I think nothing will remain of Israel (should it attack Iran). Given Israel’s small land area and its vulnerability to a massive volume of Iran’s missiles, I don’t think any spot in Israel will remain safe,” he said. He said Iran’s response to any attack will begin near the Israeli border. The Islamic Republic has close ties with militants in Gaza and Lebanon, both of whom have rocket arsenals that could be used for cross-border strikes. He said he did not believe however that Israel would attack on its own. Should the U.S. launch a strike, Jafari suggested that Iran could respond with missile salvos at U.S. bases in the Gulf. “The US military bases sprawled around Iran are considered a big vulnerability. Even the missile shields that they have set up, based on information we have, could only work for a few missiles but when exposed to a massive volume of missiles, the shields will lose their efficiency and will not work,” he said. He also said that Iran warned that oil shipments through the strategic Strait of Hormuz will be in jeopardy if a war breaks out between Iran and the United States. Iranian officials have previously threatened to close the waterway, the route for a fifth of the world’s oil, but less frequently in recent months. “If a war breaks out where one side is Iran and the other side is the West and U.S., it’s natural that a problem should occur in the Strait of Hormuz. Export of energy will be harmed. It’s natural that this will happen,” he said. Gen. Jafari said that, if attacked, Iran will no longer be committed to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, under whose terms U.N. inspectors visit Iranian nuclear sites. He said however that this does not mean that Iran would build a nuclear weapon. -MSNBC

### Scenario 2: Education

#### Military Spending trades off with education and welfare

Foxworth 2006 ["Liberals" Hate the Military? Everybody Hates Social Welfare” Rodney D. Foxworth, Jr April 19th, 2006 http://www.nathanielturner.com/liberalshatethemilitary.htm]

"Every gun that is made," someone once declared "every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed. This world in arms is not spending money alone. It is spending the sweat of its laborers, the genius of its scientists, the hopes of its children." Mr. Anderson would have us all believe that the person behind these words was some card carrying Green, a follower of Gandhi, or worse yet, Martin Luther King or Che Guevara. No, the person behind these words is none other than Dwight D. Eisenhower, the 34th president of these United States and U.S. Army general of World War II, who stood before the American Society of Newspapers Editors in 1953 to deliver his famous " Chance for Peace" address. Eisenhower was never accused of being a "liberal." What Eisenhower understood, and what thousands, if not millions understand today, is that the nation actually has priorities outside of "national security," as defined narrowly by pundits like Anderson, limiting national security concerns to military and defense. This is something that Anderson and his ilk are either unable to understand or unwilling to acknowledge. It is very much a zero sum game: the more resources placed into the militarized state, the fewer the resources available for social welfare programs and education. Military expenditures increase as drastic cuts are made to educational and social programs. While it is impossible to argue that we do not need a "strong" military, no better question has been asked in regards to the military than the one posed by child advocate Marian Wright Edelman, president of the Children's Defense Fund:
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#### Ext. Military cuts coming now

Nissenbaum 1-4-13, (Dion Nissenbaum, Journalist at the Wallstreet Journal, *Defense firms Seek alternative as U.S. Cuts Military spending*, The Wallstreet Journal, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887323291704578199902312480268.html?mod=googlenews_wsj>)

### Soft power can rebound

#### U.S. image in Africa can recover despite the Bush Administration – new policies will be key

Moehler, Visitng Scholar, Harvard Academy for International and Area Studies, ‘07 ¶ [Devra C., also currently Assistant Professor of Government at Cornell University; Ph.D., Department of Political ¶ Science, University of Michigan, “African View of the United States,” Address to House Foreign Affairs ¶ Committee, March 28, 2007, http://www.house.gov/delahunt/Moehlertestimony.pdf download date: 9-28-07]

Nonetheless, it is clear that the unilateralism of the present administration is viewed negatively in the region, particularly by ¶ elites. ¶ As citizens of poor countries, Africans are more likely to believe in the central importance of multilateralism and in the ¶ United Nations, and to oppose a foreign policy which systematically undermines that institution. It is difficult to tell whether ¶ the increasingly negative attitudes towards the present administration and its policies will translate into a more permanent ¶ shift in attitudes towards the United States. I suspect the answer to this question depends in large part on the evolution of ¶ American policy over the next decade. The U.S. retains a positive image because of general factors described in this ¶ testimony which have demonstrated lasting influence. But the U.S. may come to be viewed in a sharply different light in the ¶ coming years if current administration policies are sustained.

#### **Soft Power is recoverable – post-Vietnam era proves that it can occur in just a few years**

National Public Radio ‘07

[“Bush Team Explores Use of 'Soft Power'” March 23, proquest]

NORTHAM: Francis Fukuyama with the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies and author of "America at the ¶ Crossroads" says the whole nature of power itself needs to be re- examined in the context of increased terrorism and the insurgency in ¶ Iraq. ¶ Professor FRANCIS FUKUYAMA (John Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies): The way that you're trained to think about ¶ power is just different in the 21st century and it has to do with this world of weak states and transnational actors that just makes the old ¶ rules much less applicable. ¶ NORTHAM: But one rule hasn't changed. If you're going to use hard or military power, you better win, says William Martel, an associate ¶ professor of International Security Studies at the Fletcher School at Tufts University. ¶ Professor WILLIAM MARTEL (Fletcher School, Tufts University): If you don't get it right, you undermine the sense to ¶ which other societies respect and fear you, and it can encourage other states to challenge you.¶ NORTHAM: But analysts say the U.S. can regain that respect and leverage that it seems to have lost in ¶ recent years. The U.S. was pilloried for the policies it pursued during the Vietnam War. But within a ¶ few years after American troops pulled out of Vietnam, the U.S. had regained its prestige and ¶ diplomatic power.

## Link

### Generic Trade Off

#### Empirics prove military spending trade off with other spending

Zadeh 10, (Ismael Hossein-zadeh, graduate of New School for Social Research in New York City, professor of economics at Drake University, Author of several economic books, June 2010,”Social vs. Military spending”, <http://politicaleconomics.info/docs/ASBBS-RSE-Rejoinder.pdf>)

From the mid-1950s to mid-1970s, the share of non-military ¶ government spending of GNP rose from 9.2 to 14.3 percent, an ¶ increase of 5.1 percent. During that time period, the share of military ¶ spending of GNP declined from 10.1 to 5.8 percent, a decline of 4.3 ¶ percent. That trend was reversed when President Reagan took office ¶ in 1980. . . . From 1978 through 1983, real military spending climbed ¶ more than 28 percent, from $161 billion to $207 billion. During that ¶ period, real federal grants to state and local governments—a major ¶ source for investment in public works projects—dropped 25 percent, 3¶ from $109 billion to $82 billion. From 1983 through 1988, military ¶ spending jumped another 27 percent in real terms, while federal grants ¶ to state and local governments ‗were practically unchanged. Thus, in ¶ the late 1980s only 13 percent of state and local government spending ¶ was going to public capital formation compared with an average of 30¶ percent in the 1950s and 1960s‘

### Soft Power

#### Ext. Military spending trades of with soft power

Korb 12, (Lawrence Korb, Senior Fellow at the Center for American Progress and a Senior Adviser to the Center for Defense Information. He was formerly Director of National Security Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations in New York, 3-22-12, *New Ryan Plan Hurts U.S. Foreign Policy*, “Center for American Progress”, <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/security/news/2012/03/22/11311/new-ryan-plan-hurts-u-s-foreign-policy/>)

### Soft power booster

#### Foreign Policy does affect Soft Power and can build international support for other American policies

Nye, Professor of International Relations, Harvard, ‘04

[Joseph, Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics, pages 13-14]

Government policies at home and abroad are another potential source of soft power. For example, in the 1950s racial ¶ segregation at home undercut American soft power in Africa, and today the practice of capital punishment and weak gun ¶ control laws undercut American soft power in Europe. Similarly, foreign policies strongly affect soft power. Jimmy ¶ Carter’s human rights policies are a case in point, as were government efforts to promote democracy in the Reagan and ¶ Clinton administrations. In Argentina, American human rights policies that were rejected by the military government of the ¶ 1970s produced considerable soft power for the United States two decades later, when the Peronists who were earlier ¶ imprisoned subsequently came to power. Policies can have long-term as well as short-term effects that vary as the context ¶ changes. The popularity of the United States in Argentina in the early 1990s reflected Carter’s policies of the 1970s, and it ¶ led the Argentine government to support American policies in the UN and in the Balkans.

## Impacts

### Laundry List

#### Ext. Soft Power is key to building the international coalitions necessary to solve global problems, such as economic competitiveness, terrorism, war, proliferation, disease, human trafficking, and drugs

Kurlantzick, Scholar, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, ‘05 ¶ [Joshua,;visiting scholar in the Carnegie Endowment’s China Program and a fellow at the USC School of Public Diplomacy ¶ and the Pacific Council on International Policy; previously foreign editor at The New Republic; “The Decline of American ¶ Soft Power,” December 2005, Current History, Vol. 104, Issue 686; pg. 419, proquest, accessed 07/10/07]

### Trafficking

#### The conditions of sex trafficking victims are extreme – they are exposed to extremely dehumanizing forms of rape. Women are forced into having sex with more than 25 men a day.

April Rieger, “VICTIMS PROTECTION ACT FAILS TO PROTECTSEX TRAFFICKING VICTIMS IN

THE UNITED STATES “J.D., Cornell Law School, 2006; B.A., University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2002. The author would like to thank her family for their love and endless encouragement, Erika Sussman for her assistance in writing this Note, JoAnne Miner for being a wonderful source of inspiration at Cornell Law School, and Jennifer Judge, a dedicated teacher and friend whose memory lives on in the work to end violence against women.

In fact, the U.S. Bureau of Citizenship & Immigration Services (“USCIS,” formerly the Immigration and Naturalization Services) has discovered over 250 brothels in 26 different cities—many of which are thought to be staffed by sex traf ficking victims.95 **Many victims suffer rape and violence at the hands of their traffickers and customers, often repeatedly. Being forced to have sex with twenty-five men or more per day is not uncommon**.96 Rape is a frequently deployed tool used to initiate victims into the world of prostitution, although virgins are often not raped until after their virginity has been “sold” at a higher price.97 **After being raped by “customers” all day long, many victims are raped by their traffickers at night.** One victim reported, “In the first brothel, there were **terrible guards . . . awful perverts**. Once they gobbled some pills that prevent men from cumming quickly. They fucked me for five hours straight. I have never experienced anything like that.”98 Similarly, a social services provider reported that Latinas trafficked into the South protected themselves by sleeping together, because the **traffickers had “underlings who would rape them in the middle of the night.”**99

### Nuclear War

#### Nuclear War

MSNBC 12, (9-16-12, National news organization, “Nothing would remain of Israel if they attack Iran”, <http://theextinctionprotocol.wordpress.com/2012/09/16/nothing-would-remain-of-israel-if-they-attack-iran-we-would-no-longer-be-committed-to-nuclear-non-proliferation-treaty/>)

## A-To’s

### Economy

#### NOPE, Chuck Testa

Armbruster 12,(Ben Armbruster,  is National Security Editor for ThinkProgress.org at the Center for American Progress Action Fund, bachelor’s [degree in history](http://thinkprogress.org/author/ben/) from Ohio University and a master’s degree in international relations from King’s College London, 7-25-12,Romney’s Stimulus: Government spending on the military will create more jobs, <http://thinkprogress.org/security/2012/07/25/581571/romney-government-spending-military-jobs/?mobile=nc>)

But Lehman is wrong to say that military spending creates more jobs. A study [released late last year](http://thinkprogress.org/security/2011/12/05/382071/military-spending-job-creation-domestic-mit/) by the University of Massachusetts, Amherst found that non-military spending can create more jobs than money going to defense programs. Averaged between the three domestic spending priorities of clean energy, [health care](http://thinkprogress.org/security/2012/07/25/581571/romney-government-spending-military-jobs/?mobile=nc), and education, those areas create about twice as many jobs per dollar spent as military expenditures, according to the study. Moreover, [polling shows](http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/03/09/us-usa-budget-poll-idUSTRE7286DW20110309) that Americans would rather cut the military budget in order to reduce the debt and deficit rather than take funding from public retirement and [health programs](http://thinkprogress.org/security/2012/07/25/581571/romney-government-spending-military-jobs/?mobile=nc).