# Topic Overview

### Resolved: In the United States, national service ought to be compulsory.

Compulsory national service is generally thought of as a requirement that citizens service in the military or partake in works of social service. In the US, there are two major ways this is thought to occur: military service, and civilian service. Military conscription, also known as the draft, is what has been enforced historically in the US as compulsory national military service. While the draft is no longer in effect, the US does have a system in place (known as the Selective Service System) to serve as a contingency in the event of a widespread emergency. Federal law requires all (except for those with exemptions for disabilities, religion, etc.) 18-25 y/o males, including citizens and noncitizens, to register for the Selective Service.

A national mandated civilian service program has never been instated in the United States, but there is much debate about what one might look like based on existing volunteer programs like AmeriCorps, Peace Corps, etc., which themselves are government programs. Examples of existing or past civilian service programs can be found in Denmark and Finland.

Some international examples of countries with prominent and well-known models of mandatory national service are South Korea, Israel, North Korea, Russia, Brazil, and North Korea. Existing literature on the effects of compulsory service is most often based on their systems and models, especially those of Brazil, Germany, and South Korea.

# Extra Resources

<https://www.jstor.org/stable/48609211>

<https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=2ahUKEwj9wu7VvrCBAxVDFjQIHalNBV0QFnoECA4QAw&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.britannica.com%2Fstory%2Fpro-and-con-mandatory-national-service%23%3A~%3Atext%3DPublic%2520opinion%2520on%2520mandatory%2520national%2Cproposal%2520and%252057%2525%2520were%2520against.&usg=AOvVaw3KmN-zvI8DQ8-eGFyxTIDU&opi=89978449>

<https://www.brookings.edu/articles/united-we-serve-the-debate-over-national-service/>

<https://www.nytimes.com/2021/05/01/opinion/us-national-service-draft.html>

<https://www.brookings.edu/articles/a-bad-idea-whose-time-is-past-the-case-against-universal-service/>

<https://blogs.loc.gov/law/2022/12/falqs-the-conscription-system-of-south-korea/>

<https://www.chicagotribune.com/opinion/commentary/ct-opinion-peace-corps-60-diversity-abolish-20210301-k3g5pso22bajpikbwjsgqcbydq-story.html>

https://theweek.com/articles/835755/mandatory-national-service-terrible-idea

<https://www.theguardian.com/global-development-professionals-network/2013/nov/21/peace-corps-us-development-policy>

<https://foreignpolicy.com/2008/04/22/think-again-the-peace-corps/>

# Affirmative Case

## Definitions

**Ought**

**Merriam-Webster Dictionary**

Merriam-Webster Dictionary, “Ought”, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ought

Used to express obligation, advisability, natural expectation, or logical consequence; can also be an expression of duty

#### National Service

#### Law Insider ND

Civilian employment in Federal or [State Government](https://www.lawinsider.com/dictionary/state-government) in a field in which the Nation and [the public](https://www.lawinsider.com/dictionary/the-public) have critical needs

#### Compulsory

#### Cambridge Dictionary ND

(of something) that must be done; [necessary](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/necessary) by [law](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/law) or a [rule](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/rule)

## Framework

#### For today’s value, I offer general welfare. The U.S. government can promote general welfare by mandating a national service period in one of the existing independent government volunteer agencies.

#### American Constitution Society 09

(<https://www.acslaw.org/wp-content/uploads/old-uploads/originals/documents/Primer-Keeping%20Faith%20Chapter%204-Promoting%20the%20General%20Welfare.pdf>)

One of the purposes of the Constitution, stated in the Preamble, is to “pro- mote the General Welfare.” Promoting the general welfare has two dimensions. One concerns the duty of government to provide for the basic needs of the citizenry. In general, our Constitution has not been interpreted to encompass positive rights to social or economic provision,1 although there are good arguments that the Constitution is properly read (at least by the politi- cal branches if not by the courts) to secure the material conditions necessary for full citizenship and equal opportunity.2 The other dimension concerns the scope of government authority to respond to the nation’s needs. In this chapter, we examine the development of our constitutional understandings in this latter dimension.

#### For today’s criterion, I offer Rousseau’s Social Contract Theory.

#### University of Texas-Austin, ND

(https://ethicsunwrapped.utexas.edu/glossary/social-contract-theory)

Social contract theory says that people live together in society in accordance with an agreement that establishes moral and political rules of behavior. Some people believe that if we live according to a social contract, we can live morally by our own choice and not because a divine being requires it.

Over the centuries, philosophers as far back as Socrates have tried to describe the ideal social contract, and to explain how existing social contracts have evolved. Philosopher Stuart Rachels suggests that morality is the set of rules governing behavior that rational people accept, on the condition that others accept them too.

Social contracts can be explicit, such as laws, or implicit, such as raising one’s hand in class to speak. The U.S. Constitution is often cited as an explicit example of part of America’s social contract.  It sets out what the government can and cannot do. People who choose to live in America agree to be governed by the moral and political obligations outlined in the Constitution’s social contract.

Indeed, regardless of whether social contracts are explicit or implicit, they provide a valuable framework for harmony in society.

## Contention 1: Civilian Service positively impacts US Foreign Policy/Diplomacy

#### Mandatory national service reduces US militarism by increasing participation in nonviolent service activities. This improves relationships between the United States and Less Developed Countries (LDCs).

#### Ye et al. 22

(<https://www.redalyc.org/journal/3842/384275140013/html/>)

From the perspective of pragmatic diplomatic philosophy, Peace Corps can benefit the United States, which is an important reason for the domestic support it receives within the United States. Through the volunteers’ acculturation experience, cultural exchanges between the United States and host countries are promoted and the awareness of the American society about the Third World countries is raised, which is the true value of the Peace Corps from the perspective of American interests. As members of American society, Peace Corps volunteers gain a comprehensive and in-depth understanding of the Third World in their host countries, which is not only an important part of improving the awareness of the American society the Third World, but is also an important bridge to spread this awareness in the United States. When volunteers return to the United States after finishing their service, they bring their understanding of the Third World to different industries and fields in American domestic society. Among them, American education and diplomacy are mostly affected. These are of great significance in improving the international vision and awareness of American education and the reliability of American foreign policy.

#### Government volunteer agencies are making change internationally in the SQUO, exclusively through their volunteer activities.

#### Cortez 19

(https://www.csce.gov/international-impact/first-person-role-peace-corps-promoting-democracy?page=18)

Getting a high five has never felt as satisfying as it did in rural Ukraine. Even after three years serving as a Peace Corps Volunteer I cannot help but smile every time I remember one of my students extending their hand out for a “dye pyat.” I grew up in a large Mexican-American family in small-town California. Removed from the centers of international politics, the only diplomacy I knew was my brothers and sisters deciding who could use the family TV and when. Even as a kid I knew I wanted to be a part of something greater, to explore not only the United States but the other countries around the world, the ones they talked about in the news. The Peace Corps gave me and thousands of others that opportunity.

For 58 years, the Peace Corps has sent Americans young and old to live and work in communities worldwide. Over 235,000 volunteers have served in 141 countries, ranging from Mongolia and Albania to Morocco and China. Volunteers commit to 27 months of service in the country they serve, working in several sectors including education, health, agriculture, community development, and youth development. As of July 2019, there are around 7,000 Peace Corps volunteers serving in 62 countries. Montenegro, an OSCE participating State, is the newest addition to the Peace Corps family, with volunteers slated to launch the program in 2020.

The promotion of democracy is one of the central tenets of the Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and the Helsinki Final Accords. To that end, the Helsinki Commission has monitored aspects of the transition to democracy throughout Europe, including challenges to the rule of law, free and fair elections, and the impact of corruption. Peace Corps volunteers work concurrently in this field to demonstrate the strength democracy brings and help promote civic engagement in their sites. When President John F. Kennedy created the Peace Corps in 1961, the program was designed for large groups of Americans to live abroad and promote the American way of life, including the best aspects of democracy. That mission continues today in the OSCE region, with volunteers serving in Ukraine and eight other OSCE countries, including Armenia, Georgia, Kyrgyzstan, and Mongolia. My Peace Corps service began in September 2016 but was inspired years prior. In 2014, when the Maidan Revolution occurred, I watched it on TV with amazement, drawn by the images of Ukrainians from all walks of life marching on their capital to advocate for a better future. Already eager to work with the Peace Corps, I knew from that moment that Ukraine was the country I wanted to serve in as a volunteer.

Peace Corps Ukraine, which began in 1992, is the largest Peace Corps program operating anywhere in the world. Nearly 300 volunteers have served in the education, youth development, and community development sectors, as well as the President’s Emergency Plan for Emergency AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) programs. When volunteers arrive, they dedicate the first three months to training, learning the Ukrainian and/or Russian languages, discovering local culture, and exploring Ukraine’s history. After training, volunteers move to their permanent sites where they live and work for two years, tasked with the three goals of the Peace Corps.

The first goal of Peace Corps is “to help the people of interested countries in meeting their need for trained men and women.” For Ukraine, this translates to projects focusing on English education, combatting corruption, and working with youth to develop healthy lifestyles. Since gaining independence in 1991, Ukraine has made progress in reorienting itself to the West; a strong partnership with the U.S. has been crucial in this journey. Peace Corps volunteers contribute to this mission every day. Whether it is through teaching English at schools, organizing a summer camp on gender rights, or helping a local NGO secure a grant to fund health projects, Peace Corps volunteers have a tremendous impact on the communities they live in. Volunteers ultimately help promote entrepreneurship and civic engagement, critical facets of the Helsinki Accords.

The second goal, and perhaps the most important in Peace Corps Ukraine, is “to help promote a better understanding of Americans on the part of the people served.” As a former Soviet country, Ukrainians were disconnected from the world for over 70 years, learning about the United States through the limited movies, newspapers, and clothes smuggled past the Iron Curtain. Today, Peace Corps volunteers act as a bridge between both countries, promoting a positive image of the U.S. and bringing back a better understanding of Ukrainian culture. In communities like the one I served in, a small town with no other Americans, a volunteer’s presence is truly felt. I led discussions on race and gender, hosted events highlighting different American groups, introduced my students to American holidays, and much more. Acting as a cultural ambassador is an honor for any Peace Corps volunteer, and a role the program is founded upon.

The third and final goal of the Peace Corps is “to help promote a better understanding of people on the part of Americans.” Volunteers return from service eager to share their experiences with their friends and families. This may include organizing a speech at a local school, attending a Ukrainian-American event, or even joining an organization that focuses on Ukrainian issues. This allows returned Peace Corps volunteers the chance to talk to Americans about their experience in the country: their successes, challenges, memories, and more. In turn, Americans learn about Ukraine and other countries they have never had experience with or knowledge of.

## Contention 2: Civilian Service Builds Better Citizens

#### Civil Service Programs increases voter turnout amount young adults.

#### Mo et al. 22

(<https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.2122996119>)

Enrolling young people to participate as Teach For America (TFA) teachers has a large positive effect on rates of voter turnout among those young people who participate. This effect is considerably larger than many previous efforts to increase youth voter turnout. Each year, TFA places thousands of young adults in 2-y teaching positions in disadvantaged communities around the United States. After their 2 y of service, we find that these young adults vote at a rate 5.7 to 8.6 percentage points higher than that of similar nonparticipant counterparts. Our results suggest that civilian national service programs targeted at young people show great promise in narrowing the enduring participation gap between younger and older citizens in the United States.

#### Civil Service is also correlated to community, individual, and social wellbeing.

#### Stroud et al. 17

(https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK284780/#:~:text=1732)%20found%20that%2C%20“As,to%20endorse%20local%20or%20national)

Volunteering during adolescence and young adulthood is associated with improved health and well-being. Civic engagement and national service can contribute to educational and occupational development and continued citizenship. Military service has both positive and negative effects on the health, safety, and well-being of young adults, with positive effects relating to educational and occupational development, and negative effects relating to military deployment, as well as to difficulties with postmilitary transition. Young adults who are members of racial/ethnic minorities, of lower socioeconomic position, and lacking a college education tend to be underrepresented in many venues of civic engagement and national service, yet there is evidence that these youth might benefit the most from such activities. National service programs have become more competitive and community goal oriented; the military also has changed, largely as a result of extensive deployment in the past decade and a half. Among other implications, these changes mean that past understanding of the effects of engagement in these activities needs to be updated.

#### There is precedent for establishing a mandatory national service system, which would provide young citizens with access to greater education, economic mobility, and more. The idea is gaining traction in the SQUO.

#### Carden ND

(<https://foreignpolicy.com/2021/10/31/us-democracy-mandatory-public-service-program-political-divides/>)

Essentially, participants would provide much-needed public services and, in return, receive significant benefits, including covered college or trade school tuition and living expenses, that would lessen the country’s socioeconomic divide. In doing so, they would interact with Americans from other communities, gain life skills, and transform their own futures—and that of the country itself. There is a precedent for a similarly visionary, transformative, and generous program: the GI Bill passed near the end of World War II that gave millions of Americans returning from the war a free education and a ticket to the middle class. If the U.S. Congress did it then, it can do it now.

Although some may think this idea is unrealistic, public service programs have been gaining serious attention in Washington in recent years. In 2016, Congress passed a National Defense Authorization Act that called for the creation of a temporary federal agency—the National Commission on Military, National, and Public Service—to conduct a review of the military selective service process and “consider methods to increase participation in military, national, and public service to address national security and other public needs of the United States.” The commission’s [final report](https://hasbrouck.org/draft/FOIA/Final-Report.pdf), issued in March 2020, observed that “the current moment requires a collective effort to build upon America’s spirit of service to cultivate a widespread culture of service.”

The commission focused its proposals on existing programs of voluntary public service, such as AmeriCorps and the Peace Corps. It recommended expanding these and other existing programs, which historically have not attracted many volunteers. For example, AmeriCorps has approximately 75,000 volunteers and the Peace Corps has 7,300. The commission [recommended](https://hasbrouck.org/draft/FOIA/Final-Report.pdf) making Americans more aware of opportunities to serve and increasing the “value, flexibility, and use of service incentives.” Current incentives include Segal AmeriCorps Education Awards, which provide some education benefits for those who participate in certain programs. But these awards are modest, taxable to the beneficiaries, and paid directly to educational institutions, so the commission recommended Congress increase benefits to participants. The issue also came up in the 2020 Democratic presidential primaries. When now-Transportation Secretary Pete Buttigieg was running for the nomination in 2019, he proposed [expanding volunteerism](https://www.nytimes.com/2019/07/03/us/politics/buttigieg-national-service.html), observing that young Americans shouldn’t have to enter the military to serve their country. He recommended adding new programs, increasing volunteers to 1 million people by 2026, and providing services in predominantly minority and rural communities. In return, participants would be eligible for debt relief under the existing Public Service Loan Forgiveness program. The estimated cost of the program was $20 billion over 10 years.

# Neg Case

## Definitions

**Ought**

**Merriam-Webster Dictionary**

Merriam-Webster Dictionary, “Ought”, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ought

Used to express obligation, advisability, natural expectation, or logical consequence; can also be an expression of duty

#### National Service

#### Law Insider ND

Compulsory [military training](https://www.lawinsider.com/clause/military-training) followed by either [military service](https://www.lawinsider.com/clause/military-service) and/or a civilian posting (see National Service).

#### Compulsory

#### Cambridge Dictionary ND

(of something) that must be done; [necessary](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/necessary) by [law](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/law) or a [rule](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/rule)

## Framework

#### For today’s value, I offer the value of general welfare. National service in all forms- volunteerism, military, or otherwise, will destroy the welfare Aff claims they generate.

#### Law Insider ND

(https://www.lawinsider.com/dictionary/general-welfare)

General Welfare means any act or anything tending to improve or benefit or contribute to the safety or well being of the [general public](https://www.lawinsider.com/clause/general-public) or benefit the inhabitants of the [watershed district](https://www.lawinsider.com/dictionary/watershed-district). General welfare shall be synonymous with “[public welfare](https://www.lawinsider.com/clause/public-welfare)” or “[public benefit](https://www.lawinsider.com/dictionary/public-benefit)”.

#### For today’s criterion, I offer liberalism. Prioritizing equality and protecting individual freedoms will generate the most welfare for US and global citizens.

#### Arneson 15

(<https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/abs/cambridge-companion-to-liberalism/liberalism-and-equality/315FDB3E00C066AF55BDEB0AF997B48F>)

“Liberalism is the conjunction of two ideals,” Thomas Nagel once wrote. The two he had in mind were roughly an ideal of free speech and individual liberty and an ideal of a democratic society controlled by its members, in which inequalities of wealth and privilege are not excessive. It is hard to know how to individuate and count ideals; perhaps Nagel’s characterization already collects several. One might see liberalism as a jumble of disparate ideals loosely held together, or alternatively as a bundle of ideals and values unified in one coherent doctrine. On either characterization, liberalism combines several distinct norms, and the perennial question is how to find a proper balance among them. Of course, nowadays and in the past, people use the term ‘liberal’ with different meanings, sometimes with honorific connotation, sometimes pejorative. So focusing energy on the question “What’s a liberal?” can seem a fool’s errand.

In this chapter I simply stipulate that liberal political doctrines are those that affirm that people have moral rights to core individual freedoms, including freedom of thought, expression, and culture, freedom of organization and assembly and public protest, the rule of law including the right to a fair trial, wide individual liberty to live as one chooses provided one does not harm others, and rights of private ownership of resources, freedom of contract and market trading, and careers open to talents on a nondiscriminatory basis. These rights to freedom are assigned high priority and not easily overridden. All normally competent adult members of society equally possess these rights to basic freedoms. All of us have a duty to respect and, up to some point, to promote these individual rights, both when acting as individuals and when acting on others through the state.

## Contention 1: US Military Violence

#### The US Military has a rife history of discrimination against BIPOC and ties to white supremacy.

#### Stafford et al. 21

Blergh

For Stephanie Davis, who grew up with little, the military was a path to the American dream, a realm where everyone would receive equal treatment. She joined the service in 1988 after finishing high school in Thomasville, Georgia, a small town said to be named for a soldier who fought in the War of 1812. Over the course of decades, she steadily advanced, becoming a flight surgeon, commander of flight medicine at Fairchild Air Force Base and, eventually, a lieutenant colonel. But many of her service colleagues, Davis says, saw her only as a Black woman. Or for the white resident colleagues who gave her the call sign of ABW – it was a joke, they insisted – an “angry black woman,” a classic racist trope. White subordinates often refused to salute her or seemed uncomfortable taking orders from her, she says. Some patients refused to call her by her proper rank or even acknowledge her. She was attacked with racial slurs. And during her residency, she was the sole Black resident in a program with no Black faculty, staff or ancillary personnel. “For Blacks and minorities, when we initially experience racism or discrimination in the military, we feel blindsided,” Davis said. “We’re taught to believe that it’s the one place where everybody has a level playing field and that we can make it to the top with work that’s based on merit.” In interviews with The Associated Press, current and former enlistees and officers in nearly every branch of the armed services described a deep-rooted culture of racism and discrimination that stubbornly festers, despite repeated efforts to eradicate it. The AP found that the military’s judicial system has no explicit category for hate crimes, making it difficult to quantify crimes motivated by prejudice. The Defense Department also has no way to track the number of troops ousted for extremist views, despite its repeated pledges to root them out. More than 20 people linked to the Jan. 6 siege of the U.S. Capitol were found to have military ties.

The AP also found that the Uniform Code of Military Justice does not adequately address discriminatory incidents and that rank-and-file people of color commonly face courts-martial panels made up of all-white service members, which some experts argue can lead to harsher outcomes. The military said it processed more than 750 complaints of discrimination by race or ethnicity from service members in the fiscal year 2020 alone. But discrimination doesn’t exist just within the military rank-and-file. That same fiscal year, civilians working in the financial, technical and support sectors of the Army, Air Force and Navy also filed 900 complaints of racial discrimination and over 350 complaints of discrimination by skin color, data from the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission shows. In February, Lloyd J. Austin III – a former Army general who now is secretary of defense, the first Black man to serve in the post – [ordered](https://media.defense.gov/2021/Feb/05/2002577485/-1/-1/0/STAND-DOWN-TO-ADDRESS-EXTREMISM-IN-THE-RANKS.PDF) commanders and supervisors to take an operational pause for one day to discuss extremism in the ranks with their service members. Austin gave commanders the latitude to address the matter as they saw fit, but emphasized that discussions should include the meaning of their oath, acceptable behaviors both in and out of uniform, and how service members can report actual or suspected extremist behavior through their chains of command.

A recent [poll](https://www.militarytimes.com/news/your-military/2021/03/22/some-troops-disappointed-by-check-the-block-extremism-stand-downs-others-laud-commanders/) from The Military Times showed the stand-down was received with mixed reviews. Some service members said their units went “above and beyond,” but others reported their trainers made disparaging comments that undercut the discussions and that the sessions were short and non-interactive. The Southern Poverty Law Center sent Austin a letter shortly after his order, applauding him for his decisive action but underscoring that systemic change on all military levels is urgent. “Those who are indoctrinated into white supremacist ideology present a significant threat to national security and the safety of our communities,” SPLC President Margaret Huang wrote. In a statement to the AP, the Defense Department said extremism is not “widespread” in the armed forces, but acknowledged that “efforts to stamp out extremist views from the rank-and-file have historically been reactive versus proactive until recently.” Pentagon spokesman Maj. César Santiago pointed to Austin’s stand-down order in February that stressed the oath of office taken by military personnel, including a “commitment to protecting our nation from enemies foreign and domestic.” Santiago added that “we know that far too many service members indicate they experience discrimination.” He noted that the Defense Department had launched multiple efforts in the past year, including updating its anti-harassment policy, assessing its training on implicit bias, and developing data-driven strategies to guide efforts to attract and retain diverse members and also identify unhealthy work environments.

When Davis was medically retired by the Air Force in 2019 after more than two decades of service, she felt ground down by overt racism and retaliated against for accusing a superior of sexually assaulting her. She noted how insidious racism can be to members of the ranks – service members entrust their lives to their fellow troops, and a lack of cohesion in a unit can be deadly. “It creates a harmful and dangerous work environment,” Davis said. “And a lot of us suffer in silence because we feel like there’s nothing that can be done.” In the midst of last year’s summer of unrest sparked by police killings of Black Americans across the nation, Army Gen. Mark A. Milley, who is also the Department of Defense’s Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, told congressional leaders the military cannot afford racism or discrimination. “We who wear the cloth of our nation understand that cohesion is a force multiplier,” Milley said. “Divisiveness leads to defeat. As one of our famous presidents said, ‘A house divided does not stand.’” Austin pledged to rid the ranks of “racists and extremists” during his confirmation hearing before Congress, which came on the heels of the Capitol insurrection. “The job of the Department of Defense is to keep America safe from our enemies,” he said. “But we can’t do that if some of those enemies lie within our own ranks.” It’s standard custom for enlisted personnel to show their respect to higher-ranking colleagues by offering salutes that are held until the gesture is returned. When Marine Maj. Tyrone Collier was a newly minted second lieutenant and judge advocate, he had a profound experience with that practice. Collier, a Black man, was at Joint Base Myer-Henderson Hall in Virginia when he was saluted by a Black enlisted Marine. But even after Collier acknowledged the gesture, the salute continued. Puzzled, Collier asked why the Marine held it for so long. “He said, ‘Sir, I just have to come clean with something. ... We never see Black officers. We never see people like you and it makes me extraordinarily proud,’” Collier recalled. “You can imagine what it’s like for a Black enlisted Marine who, for example, might want to consider becoming a warrant officer or a commissioned officer or who served under commander after commander and received so few opportunities to see people that look like them in higher ranks,” Collier said. “Representation really does matter.” Though that prolonged salute took place in 2010, the racial picture has not improved much since. At the end of 2020, the Defense Department’s Diversity and Inclusion Board released a report aimed at identifying ways to improve racial and ethnic diversity in the U.S. military. Among the report’s findings: The enlisted ranks of the active and reserve military were “slightly more racially and ethnically diverse than its U.S. civilian counterparts.” But not the officer corps. Furthermore, it found that the civilian population eligible to become commissioned officers was “less racially and ethnically diverse than the civilian population eligible for enlisted service.” The breakdown of all active commissioned officers: 73% white; 8% each Black and Hispanic; 6% Asian; 4% multiracial; and less than 1% Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander, American Indian or Alaska Native. And the diversity gap widened the higher individuals moved up in the ranks.

The report emphasized the increasing importance of the representation of minorities reflecting the nation’s morphing demographics, saying the Defense Department “must ensure that all service members have access to opportunities to succeed and advance into leadership positions.” Several Black officers interviewed by the AP said the culture must give way if they are ever to flourish. While serving in Afghanistan, one Marine officer recalled being questioned by a white colleague about why he was conversing with fellow Black officers. “My response to him was ‘I don’t ask you why you’re always hanging out with white officers,’” said the Marine, who asked not to be named because he remains on active duty. “Why can’t they just be officers? Why the qualifier?” Thomas Hobbs, an infantry colonel who retired after 27 years of service in the Marine Corps in 2018, was among the officers interviewed who spoke of the pressures of trying to blend into an overwhelmingly “white male culture,” while also feeling the need to outperform white officers to negate racial stereotypes. Hobbs said the Marines have done better than other branches of the service in recruiting Black candidates into the officer corps, but noted that “many of them don’t stay in the military past their 10th year.” “At the moment, we have more captains than we ever had before,” he said, “but our field grade levels are actually going down. Why don’t they stay in? Because they’re exhausted from having to act a certain way all the time and they can never be themselves.” The Marine who remains on active duty also called it “exhausting,” adding “not only do you have to deal with your own things but whenever a Black enlisted Marine gets in trouble, they will come to you and say, ‘Oh man, what’s wrong with these guys?’ Coming to you like you’re the expert on everything Black.” Collier said he felt pressure to act differently from the first moments he was recruited, recalling an encounter at a formal dinner with a Marine major trying to bring him into the service. “I was one of two Black men who were applying … and he and I were chatting, and the selection officer kind of mentioned to us, ’Hey, you guys might not want to isolate yourselves in this way because it might not look good,’” Collier said. “I mean, this is one of my first experiences involving the Marine Corps and I have a Marine major telling me I can’t talk to another Black person without worrying about how people will look at us if we’re purposely isolating ourselves from the group.” Other service members of color detailed incidents in which they said they were discouraged by superiors from openly embracing their cultures. Some said they were told to avoid speaking languages other than English to not offend their mostly white colleagues. Former Air Force Master Sgt. Ricardo Lemos, who was medically discharged in 2019, said a superior once discouraged him from speaking to his mother in Spanish on the phone in the office “because people can’t understand you.” And some Black women detailed the challenges they faced navigating a culture that often labels them as “aggressive or difficult” and their natural hair as unkempt or unprofessional. DeMarcus Gilliard, a 34-year-old former Marine captain, told the AP that he felt an unspoken pressure to prove himself better than his peers when he entered the Basic School, where new officers learn the ropes, feeling like a symbol of Black Americans. But he said he never experienced overt racism there and credits the Marine Corps for making strides toward diversifying its top ranks. “It’s a great idea, ‘I don’t see color,’ but it actually is pretty dismissive. And I think not talking about issues of race actually exacerbates the problem and we need to be able to talk about these things,” said Gilliard. “I think the Marine Corps would be a great place to do it.”

#### US Militarism plays an integral role in increased global violence, and the only way to stop it is to shrink our arsenal.

#### Walters 22

(<https://jacobin.com/2022/03/military-conscription-compulsory-service-armed-forces-ukraine-russia>)

As Ukraine’s own stutter-stepped efforts to eliminate the draft over recent years have demonstrated, the universal abolition of conscription is profoundly unlikely in a world still dominated by inter-power competition. So long as Russia was free to amass its own armies right next door, unmolested by international pressure and motivated at least in part by the United States’ and EU’s own military buildups, Ukraine could not eliminate the draft while also satisfying its population’s demand for the perception of military security.

The same is true of Cuba, which is nearly as near to the North American imperial hegemon as Ukraine is to Russia, and which has maintained a policy of mandatory military service, in various forms, since at least 1976. Cuba, of course, is perpetually threatened by a US military that stands apart from Russia’s in that it has no need for conscripts — the United States’ all-volunteer force has arguably been the most destructive military of the twenty-first century so far. Just as the world urgently needs unprecedented levels of international cooperation to address climate change, it also needs such cooperation to facilitate a mutual and permanent drawdown of military capacity across the globe. (In many ways, in fact, those two tasks are one and the same.) This would necessarily involve a coordinated worldwide program intended to collectively diminish not only military arsenals but also standing armies according to internationally agreed-upon benchmarks. This kind of multilateral cooperation, while certainly ambitious, is not as outlandish as it may seem on first blush. As a matter of fact, the world has tried this before — consider, for example, the landmark Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1970, which sought not only to freeze countries’ acquisition of new nuclear weapons but also to mandate the gradual permanent disarmament of all existing nuclear arsenals worldwide.

Predictably, however, that treaty was scuttled by the United States, which habitually refuses to submit to any multilateral agreement that would limit its own military ambitions.

## Contention 2: Mandatory Conscription Harms Wellbeing

#### National service detrimentally effects the health of South Korean men.

#### Bethmann & Cho 23

Almost all South Korean men serve in the country's armed forces for two years. In this paper, we investigate whether the military service affects the health of draftees. Using an event study design, we use the conscription years to identify the effect the military service has on soldiers' physical health as well as on their smoking and drinking behavior. Our results show that the compulsory military service has a strong and long-lasting negative effect on physical health. Moreover, people who are drafted into the armed forces are more likely to consume more alcohol and cigarettes even years after they are discharged. Our results are of great interest to decision-makers weighing the pros and cons of conscription armies: mandatory military service adversely affects the male labor force and exacerbates drinking and smoking behavior.

#### More than this, in the US, active officers are individually harmed by the mishandling of assault and harassment.

#### University of Southern California 19

(<https://msw.usc.edu/mswusc-blog/military-sexual-assault-prevalence-prevention/>)

Military sexual assault affects service members of all ages, genders, sexualities and ranks. Approximately 6.2% of active duty women and 0.7% of active duty men ages 17 to 24 experienced sexual assault in 2018. The aforementioned Pentagon report indicates that the majority of sexual assaults in 2018 occurred between people ages 17 to 24 who work, train or live in close proximity to each other. Female service members reported that offenders were most often friends or acquaintances. Approximately 20,500 service members experienced sexual assault in 2018, comprising 6.2% of female service members and 0.7% of male service. Service members who are young, just entering their first duty station, or being transferred to a new duty station are particularly vulnerable, said Kintzle. “Those are the times when you don’t know a lot of people, when you’re new to the unit,” she said. “Those are times when you’re really shaping your views about the culture of the military.” One positive finding from the Pentagon study is the uptick in reporting. During the past decade, reporting rates have quadrupled. In 2018, approximately one-third of those estimated to have experienced sexual assault reported the incident, though the rate for active duty men (17%) significantly lags behind that of active duty women (37%). The total number of reports of sexual assault filed by service members has increased from 2,340 in fiscal year 2008 to 6,053 in fiscal year 2018.

Kintzle and her colleagues published a study in 2017 that detail. Challenges that people who have experienced sexual assault can face as a result of sexual trauma include but are not limited to: Chronic pain, Chronic fatigue, Headaches, Gastrointestinal symptoms, Eating disorders, Depression, Dissociative disorder, Substance misuse, Panic disorder, Posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD). Sexual assault trauma can have short- and long-term effects. Compared to civilians, those who experience military sexual assault may be less able to take time off or away from work to process their trauma. They may also be forced to relive their trauma when continuing to live and work alongside their assailant. If developed, psychological and emotional problems can affect a person’s ability to perform physically and maintain full employment, reducing overall quality of life. These issues can also develop years after the incident has occurred and the service member has separated from the military.  “For some women who were in the military 20, 30, or 40 years ago, they talk about being sexually assaulted and waking up the next day and just trying to move on with their lives,” Kintzle said. “It wasn’t until they got out of the military, or when they got married and had children that, all of a sudden, the emotions and everything they pushed away came back into their lives and caused a lot of pain and discomfort.”

To ensure people receive timely and appropriate care so they can address their experience and cope with what has happened, the military will need to acknowledge the psychological impact of sexual assault. In another [study on mental health care utilization in female veterans who have experienced sexual trauma,](http://doi.org/10.1037/ser0000054) Kintzle and colleagues found a number of barriers to getting care including avoidance, stigma, lack of availability of gender-sensitive care, poor relationship with the military system and concerns about the effect on one’s career. Men who have experienced sexual assault can encounter even greater stigma from leadership who choose to avoid the issue.

# Aff Extensions

#### International volunteerism increases skills necessary to interact with and maintain relations in a globalized society.

#### Lough et al. 14

(<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/260270343_The_impact_of_international_service_on_the_development_of_volunteers%27_intercultural_relations>)

Approximately one million people from the United States perform international volunteer service each year, representing a significant flow of ideas, people, resources, and aid across international borders. This quasi-experimental study assesses the longitudinal impact of international volunteer service on volunteers’ intercultural relations, international social capital, and concern about international affairs. Using linear mixed regression models that control for a counterfactual comparison group of individuals that did not travel abroad, international volunteers are more likely to report significant increases in international social capital and international concern two to three years after returning from service. Results indicate that intercultural relations may also continue to increase years after returning from service. International service may be a useful approach to helping people gain skills and networks that are needed in an increasingly global society.

#### Teach for America also shown to increase voter turnout among young voters

#### Mervis 22

(https://www.science.org/content/article/u-s-teacher-training-program-boosts-voting-among-young-adults)

The effort, called Teach for America (TFA), places them at high-needs urban and rural public schools across the country while training them to become teachers. Its goal is better student outcomes. But the new study found those who spent 2 years in TFA were significantly more likely to vote than those who applied but weren’t chosen for the program. Researchers had theorized that national service programs could improve dismally low voting participation rates among young adults. But the analysis of the TFA program, published today in the Proceedings of the National The finding strikes a personal chord for the paper’s lead author, Cecilia Mo, a political scientist at the University of California, Berkeley. Mo spent 2 years in the early 2000s as a TFA corps member, teaching math in a Los Angeles high school, and says the experience fueled her decision to study ways to foster democratic ideals and reduce inequality. “We would all sit around and talk about how the experience has shaped our view of politics, increased our empathy for others, and influenced our career paths,” she says about her TFA colleagues.

Launched in 1990, the nonprofit TFA has 66,000 alumni who have worked in more than 9000 elementary and secondary schools as paid employees of the school district. After Mo become a quantitative social scientist, she decided to tap into TFA’s extensive database of applicants to test whether what she and her friends had experienced might be universal. The nearly 30,000 subjects in the sample—most of them recent college graduates—were drawn from those who fell on either side of a narrow band of TFA applicants recommended or not recommended for the program between 2007 and 2015. Mo and her co-authors used a clever statistical tool known as regression discontinuity design to create a group of TFA teachers and a control group of rejected applicants with minimally different demographic characteristics. The scientists then searched through a national voter registry to see how many from each group voted in the 2012 presidential and 2014 midterm elections. They found that those who completed their 2-year TFA commitment voted at a rate 5.7 to 8.6 percentage points higher than their counterparts not in the program. (The range stems from the various ways the scientists matched TFA fellows with identical names on voting registries.)

That increase, if generalized to the entire population, would close by as much as 30% the current 30–percentage point gap between the voting rates of Americans under age 30 and those older than 60. The authors say serving in TFA was also 14 times more effective in promoting voting than simply urging eligible young people to do their civic duty through a get-out-the-vote campaign or other direct appeals. The researchers admit they can’t pinpoint the reason why being part of TFA makes one more likely to vote. But they offer several hypotheses, including that the program gives participants a prolonged exposure to social inequalities and helps them develop the “skills and beliefs … to engage in politics.” If those turn out to be causal factors, Mo says, it’s reasonable to expect that other U.S. national service programs, such as the Peace Corps or the domestic AmeriCorps VISTA program, increase civic engagement. Such a finding, she says, would be a boon to advocates of national service. “It suggests that even programs that are not explicitly designed to do so have downstream effects that can create more civic-minded citizens,” she says. But Sunshine Hillygus, a political scientist at Duke University, thinks it’s likely too soon to draw that conclusion. “The mechanism [for changing voting behavior] is an important question for future studies,” says Hillygus, who has collaborated with one of the paper’s co-authors, John Holbein of the University of Virginia, on studies of youth voting but not on this research. It’s possible, Hillygus says, the TFA applicants already “were primed for civic participation,” and that the program simply gave them a nudge. Campbell likens the TFA effect to “pushing them through an open door.” The PNAS study also doesn’t address whether compulsory national service, such as being drafted into the military, would also lead to more civic engagement. (William James, a pacifist, considered wars inevitable and called national service “the moral equivalent of war.”) Hillygus and Campbell think it could even have the opposite effect, because participation is involuntary. Even with those caveats, however, Hillygus calls the TFA study “an important first step” in charting a course for greater civic engagement and higher voter turnout among the young. “There have been so many efforts to improve voter turnout that don’t work,” she says. “So even if this is in only one group, and under certain conditions, it’s a very important result.”

# Neg Extensions

#### US Militarism cannot be our only means to an end in a world of escalation.

#### Ward 20

(<https://www.vox.com/22176111/usa-military-power-tomorrow-the-world-stephen-wertheim>)

Since 1991, I think almost everybody has lost out, aside from the major defense firms and some ruling elites. America’s strategy has been incredibly destructive for people throughout the greater Middle East, and of course, the Iraq War resulted in the deaths of hundreds of thousands of civilians.

And I don’t think the American people have won out, either. I think that we have gotten less safe and more fearful as a society as a result of constantly being told by leaders of both parties that the whole world is out to kill us and that that’s why we’ve got to go to war to kill them first.

Look, the argument that US military power contributed to world order was very real. The Bretton Woods system played an important role in stabilizing global capitalism. But since the 1970s, and especially the 1990s, I think it’s hard to argue that US military dominance somehow underpins everything else.  It’s very difficult to see how applying sanctions on dozens of countries and waging continual warfare in the greater Middle East somehow serves the general interest of capitalism. Maybe it serves the interests of particular firms, but not the system of capitalism.

**Alex Ward**

The US has clearly made some horrible, deadly mistakes. No one is denying that. How can you say confidently, though, that the world wouldn’t be worse if the US didn’t play such an active role?

**Stephen Wertheim**

It’s now been three decades since the Soviet Union collapsed. Why haven’t we been able to do everything we want to effectively? It turns out that the enemies are skeptical of working with us to address shared challenges.

Now, it’s true sometimes that the use of hard power can back up diplomacy and make other endeavors more effective. But we have so overshot the mark that it’s more often the case that military dominance gets in the way of the kinds of constructive engagements in the world that I think many people in Washington want to see.  What I’m opposed to, first and foremost, is military dominance as an end in itself. That’s what I think it has become in our own time, and I don’t think it began that way. That doesn’t prohibit the US from being a robust power: It’s going to be a great power and it’s going to have a strong military. We should absolutely be able to defend ourselves. I’m not even closing the door on things like humanitarian intervention, either.  What we have to ask, though, is if the US has used all this power wisely and judiciously. It’s clear that we haven’t, and it’s making all of us in America and around the world less safe. Just think of this: Roughly 80% of all US military interventions have occurred after 1991. Can we really say the millions at home and abroad have had their lives improved by that? I don’t think so.

#### Making military service mandatory would literally be bad for the military—performance-wise and economically.

#### Bandow 12

(https://www.forbes.com/sites/dougbandow/2012/07/16/a-new-military-draft-would-revive-a-very-bad-old-idea/?sh=7ac60df55bb8)

Politicians have been busy taking America into war.  Some commentators want to make the American people pay by conscripting 18-year-olds into the military. It’s a bad idea.

Throughout most of their history, Americans freely defended their nation from threats both domestic and foreign.  Only in their greatest conflicts—the Civil War, World War I, and the lead-up to World War II. The practice persisted during the Cold War, when the U.S. maintained globe-spanning alliances to protect friendly war-ravaged states from the Soviet Union.  However, four decades ago the Nixon administration inaugurated the All-Volunteer Force, which successfully deterred the Red Army.  Now Russia is moving in America’s direction by professionalizing its force. Despite a rough start, the AVF has been a brilliant success.  Quality is far better than under a draft.  A volunteer military can be choosy and set higher standards.  Even when the army was reducing its requirements during the worst of the Iraq years, its quality standards remained well above those of conscript forces.  Moreover, noted a recent Congressional Research Service report, “starting in 2008 these concerns were alleviated by the more favorable recruiting and retention environment,” which CRS expected to remain “over the next few years.” The end of the draft also has dramatically improved commitment and morale in the armed forces.  The difference is simple:  recruits who want to serve and succeed are likely to perform better than draftees who want out, the sooner the better.  The AVF also enjoys higher reenlistment rates, which reduce turnover and enhance experience.

Returning to conscription would generate a force that looked a lot more like the force during the Vietnam War than World War II.  Even reluctant draftees in the latter identified with the campaign against Nazi Germany.  Vietnam War conscripts shared no similar commitment to defending Saigon.  Personnel drafted to patrol Afghan valleys on behalf of a corrupt government in Kabul or stop ethnic slaughter in a post-civil war Syria likely would be no more enthused with their respective task.

All told, shifting to conscription would significantly weaken the military.  New “accessions,” as the military calls them, would be less bright, less well educated, and less positively motivated.  They would be less likely to stay in uniform, resulting in a less experienced force.  The armed forces would be less effective in combat, thereby costing America more lives while achieving fewer foreign policy objectives.

Why take such a step? One argument, most recently articulated by Thomas Ricks of the Center for a New American, is that a draft would save “the government money.”  That’s a poor reason to impress people into service.

First, conscription doesn’t save much cash.  It costs money to manage and enforce a draft—history demonstrates that not every inductee would go quietly.  Conscripts serve shorter terms and reenlist less frequently, increasing turnover, which is expensive.  And unless the government instituted a Czarist lifetime draft, everyone beyond the first ranks would continue to expect to be paid.

Second, conscription shifts rather than reduces costs.  Ricks suggested that draftees should “perform tasks currently outsourced at great cost to the Pentagon:  paperwork, painting barracks, mowing lawns, driving generals around.”  Better to make people do grunt work than to pay them to do it? Force poorer young people into uniform in order to save richer old people tax dollars.  Ricks believes that is a good reason to jail people for refusing to do as the government demands? The government could save money in the same way by drafting FBI agents, postal workers, Medicare doctors, and congressmen.  Nothing warrants letting old politicians force young adults to pay for Washington’s profligacy.  Moreover, by keeping some people who want to serve out while forcing others who don’t want to serve in—creating a veritable evasion industry along the way—conscription would raise total social costs.  It would be a bad bargain by any measure. Worse, some draft advocates, like Ricks, would join military conscription to civilian national service.  But it is bizarre to equate patrolling city streets in Kandahar with shelving library books in Washington, D.C.  Moreover, it is offensive for any society which calls itself free to consider drafting people to do the latter.  Surely it is better to hire than effectively kidnap, say, guides at national parks.

Moreover, the idea of government-mandated national service is foolish economically.  There are an infinite number of “unmet human needs.”  Years ago one national service advocate helpfully toted up 5.3 million jobs which the government could fill with cheap labor—indeed, with truly universal “service” the government could keep the entire population busy.  Alas, there is an “opportunity cost” of other work forgone.  Forcing someone to pick up garbage in a park instead of attending medical school could end up being very expensive for society. More fundamentally, compelling service violates government’s essential responsibility to protect individual liberty.  Ricks argued:  “the government could use this cheap labor in new ways,” but the labor does not belong to America’s government, nation, or people.  It belongs to Americans, individually.  People should serve others, but genuine service is good precisely because it is voluntary.  Compulsory compassion is an oxymoron.

Within the public-spirited rhetoric behind national service is an ugly collectivist core.  In 1979 a Potomac Institute report on national service noted that two commission members returned from China “impressed and challenged by the extraordinary mobilization of the talent of young people possible under authoritarian, post-revolutionary conditions” and determined “to try to devise a democratic equivalent.”  There isn’t one.  Self-seeking politicians who lecture the young about selflessness and concoct schemes to give other people’s lives meaning are only likely to multiply public contempt and cynicism.

Some conscription advocates also contend that a draft would make war less likely.  A few years ago Rep. Charles Rangel (D-NY) proposed conscription to "bring a greater appreciation of the consequences of decisions to go to war."  Three years ago Bill Moyers suggested that “If our governing class wants more war, let’s not allow them to fight it with young men and women who sign up because they don’t have jobs here at home.” In May Jon Meacham of Time wrote that “the politics of war are inescapably different than what they would be if the children of the most influential families in communities across America were at risk of being drafted to face fire at the front.”  More recently Stanley McChrystal, former commander in Afghanistan, argued:  “I think if a nation goes to war, every town, every city needs to be at risk.  You make that decision and everybody has skin in the game.”

Yet the widespread use of reserve and guard units unintentionally achieved much the same social effect, but with little political impact.  People complained when their communities lost people from different walks of life, but George W. Bush nevertheless pursued his misguided nation-building missions in Iraq and Afghanistan.  And the American people reelected him despite his deadly military mistakes. Moreover, the Vietnam War demonstrated that a draft gives the government a virtually limitless manpower supply with which to keep fighting even an increasingly unpopular war with heavy casualties—more than ten times the number of dead in Iraq, for instance.  It took years before opposition to the Vietnam-era draft reached critical levels.  In the meantime Washington had no difficulty maintaining its forces and continuing the war.

In contrast, the reduced willingness of Americans to volunteer for both the active and reserve forces as deployments increased in both Iraq and Afghanistan had an immediate impact on the military.  Policymakers worried and debated how to respond.  Whispers began about the necessity of reinstating the draft.  Government officials recognize that volunteers can stop an unpopular war by just not signing up. Anyway, unless the U.S. ended up in a big war, even a draft wouldn’t much affect the policymaking elite.  Roughly four million people turn 18 every year; at the same time the military takes about 160,000 new accessions, or four percent of the total.  Moreover, draftees with education and connections would be least likely to end up in combat arms.  Sending the kids of the elite to shuffle paperwork at a base stateside, as Ricks proposed, wouldn’t have much impact.

Some draft promoters argue more generally for a more representative military.  Rep. Rangel promoted the common myth that conscription would make the military inclusive of today’s population.  He argued:  "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."

It’s simply not the case.  America’s military is quintessentially middle class.  The elite is underrepresented, but as noted earlier, drafting four percent of 18-year-olds isn’t going to put many of the privileged into uniform anyway.  However, the underclass is not represented in today’s military at all. If you don’t have a high school diploma or GED, and don’t score well on the military’s aptitude test, you won’t be accepted.  Last year all recruits met the high school standard, while two-thirds of Army, three quarters of Marine Corps, 90 percent of Navy, and essentially all of Air Force scored in the top half of the five categories of the Armed Forces Qualification Test.

The officer corps is largely university educated, many with advanced degrees.  The enlisted members are more educated and read at higher levels than youth generally; recruits also are college capable, joining the military rather than entering university.  Many go to school after getting out, using their educational benefits.  There still are regional (the South is overrepresented) and racial/ethnic differences (more African-Americans, 17 percent compared to 12.6 percent of the population, and fewer Hispanics, 10.8 percent compared to 16.3 percent of the population) but not enough to suggest that the AVF is not truly America’s military.  Moreover, unless armed services refused to take any volunteers, a draft would have limited impact because those who tend to volunteer now would still be more likely to volunteer.

Finally, many conscription enthusiasts wave the flag and ring the patriotic bells.  Yet the truest form of patriotism is serving, not making someone else serve.  Patriotism no more than compassion can be coerced.  A society which no longer wins the voluntary allegiance of its people has no moral authority to coerce them into its service.  Especially when most of Washington’s foreign policy goals today—subsidizing prosperous and populous allies, rebuilding failed states, exercising influence for economic or political ends—have nothing to do with defending America, the federal government’s most basic responsibility.  Americans owe their allegiance to their nation, not the gaggle of politicians who happen to be in power at any particular moment. Americans will continue to disagree sharply about the Iraq war and other conflicts.  But if the U.S. goes to war, it should do so with the best military possible—which it has today.  The AVF also ensures that a free people are voluntarily defending a free society.  Which is as it should be.

#### Mandatory service can discourage enrollment in college/higher education.

#### Bauer et al.

(<https://www.iza.org/publications/dp/5744/do-guns-displace-books-the-impact-of-compulsory-military-service-on-educational-attainment#:~:text=Compulsory%20military%20service%20typically%20drafts,returns%20to%20human%2Dcapital%20investments>.)

Compulsory military service typically drafts young men when they are at the height of their learning ability. Thus, it can be expected to depress the demand for higher education since skill atrophy and the delayed entry into the civilian labor market reduce the returns to human-capital investments. Attending university, however, might open the possibility to avoid the draft, leading to an increase in the demand for tertiary education. To estimate the causal effect of conscription on the probability to obtain a university degree, we use a regression-discontinuity design that employs special regulations associated with the introduction of conscription in Germany in 1956. We estimate conscription to increase the probability of having a university degree.

#### **Government volunteer agencies have high rates of sexual assault and harassment—without the resources to help the volunteers their systems traumatize.**

#### Gaber 21

(https://docs.house.gov/meetings/FA/FA00/20210930/114085/HMKP-117-FA00-20210930-SD002.pdf)

[introduction omitted due to explicit content] Tremblay feared he might go further. Half undressed, in pain and unsure whether she could fight him off, she stared him down. I'm fine, she said. When he backed away, Tremblay gathered her things and rushed onto Quito’s crowded streets. Then, another violation of her trust: The Peace Corps had been warned the doctor was a threat.

Ashley Lipasek, a fellow volunteer, told Tremblay she had complained to the Peace Corps three months earlier in 2018 after the doctor hit on her and made vulgar remarks while touching her during a physical exam. The news left Tremblay shell-shocked. “They knew he was predatory. They knew this could happen,” she said. “And they sent me to him anyway.” A USA TODAY investigation revealed the Peace Corps is failing to manage the threat of sexual assault against its volunteers, at times placing them in dangerous situations and inflicting further trauma by bungling its response to assaults. Although sexual assaults cannot always be prevented, USA TODAY found other examples like Tremblay’s in which Peace Corps staff ignored known threats. Volunteers have also accused staff of misrepresenting sexual assaults in official records, failing to explain the option of having a sexual assault forensic exam, and otherwise violating policies established over the last decade to address the Peace Corps’ vexing track record on sexual assault.

The burden for these failures is borne by volunteers who once trusted the Peace Corps with their lives. Each year the federal agency deploys thousands of Americans — most of them young women, many fresh out of college — to far-flung posts around the globe with the goal of promoting world peace. A dozen volunteers who said they were sexually assaulted while serving between 2016 and 2020 shared their experiences with USA TODAY. Reporters corroborated many of their accounts with agency records, contemporaneous messages and interviews with fellow volunteers. A woman in Kyrgyzstan endured frequent assaults on a bus she took to work before she learned the local Peace Corps office knew the route was dangerous. Another volunteer said she was repeatedly groped by the father in her host family in Zambia, but Peace Corps staff waited more than a year before pulling her from the site. In Togo, after a volunteer left the Peace Corps because an employee at the school where she worked cornered her and pressured her for sex, the agency placed another woman in the same job — without telling her what happened. Fellina Fucci said after a man in her Samoan village raped her, a Peace Corps safety and security manager questioned her memory, chastised her for not using a whistle during the attack and told her the assailant was a friend of his who would likely gossip about her. In an interview, Fucci said she felt prepared for the risks of being a woman alone in a remote, foreign village. But she wasn’t prepared for how an agency she trusted ultimately let her down. “I spent more time during my trauma therapy discussing the Peace Corps staff’s response to my assault rather than the assault itself,” Fucci said.

Peace Corps officials, in a series of interviews with USA TODAY, touted reforms such as improved privacy protections, increased sexual assault awareness training and the designation of liaisons in each country to assist victims. The agency said it regularly assesses risks to volunteers and takes steps to reduce assaults. But confronted with USA TODAY’s findings, Acting Director Carol Spahn said in a written statement the agency would review the structure of its sexual assault program and direct its inspector general to investigate the cases identified by the newspaper. She did not comment on individual accounts but praised the women for speaking out and encouraged others to come forward. Spahn committed to finalizing several ongoing reform efforts before putting volunteers back in the field. The agency pulled all volunteers, nearly 7,000 in total, last year due to the pandemic and is now preparing to send a new class out. “Although Peace Corps has made significant improvements in our risk reduction response and support programs over the last decade, these stories demonstrate that we still have work to do to support our volunteers,” Spahn said. It’s unclear whether she and other top Peace Corps officials grasp the extent of the agency’s sexual assault problem. Renée Ferranti, director of the agency’s Sexual Assault Risk-Reduction and Response Program, told USA TODAY that rapes and aggravated sexual assaults have “remained pretty steady over the years.” That’s not true. Peace Corps data USA TODAY analyzed show rapes and forceful sexual assaults volunteers disclosed at the end of their service nearly doubled from 2015 to 2019. One out of every 3 volunteers — about 1,280 — who finished service in 2019 experienced a sexual assault ranging from groping to rape, up from roughly 1 out of 4 in 2015, according to Peace Corps data. For women, the toll is even higher: 44% who finished service in 2019 were sexually assaulted in some way. Spahn acknowledged that sexual assaults are up but suggested that was mostly because agency reform efforts and the #metoo movement have made more victims comfortable coming forward. But that discounts the agency’s own data, which undercuts the idea that volunteers are more likely to report to the agency. Reporting rates for rape and forcible sexual assaults have been relatively stagnant for the past five years, USA TODAY’s analysis found. Roughly half of rapes and three-quarters of aggravated sexual assaults of volunteers who ended their service in 2019 were unreported — the same as in 2015. Reporting rates only rose during that period for non- aggravated sexual assault. Dyan Mazurana, a Tufts University professor who has studied sexual violence in the international aid community, said the Peace Corps’ sexual assault statistics depict “an organization that can’t get its act together.” She said the agency should shut down programs if Peace Corps staff can’t ensure its volunteers will be safe. “That is so unacceptable. This is a job. You’re offering these people a job in programs that you run,” she said, “in projects that you set up, with communities that you have vetted, with hosts that you have vetted.”

Such criticism is not new for the Peace Corps, which launched sweeping reforms in 2011  
after coming under fire for mishandling sexual assault. The agency has yet to fully implement nearly two dozen recommendations related to volunteer safety and support issued years ago by its Office of Inspector General, an internal watchdog. The oldest dates to 2013. They include directives designed to prevent placing volunteers in dangerous locations, ensure overseas staff complete sexual assault response training, and make sure victims seeking mental health care get needed assistance. The women USA TODAY interviewed raised all those issues with respect to their own cases. Meanwhile, the agency’s Sexual Assault Advisory Council, which was pitched as another key reform, has not issued a public report since November 2016, the last year of the Obama administration. The council received expanded authority from Congress in 2018 to review individual assault cases but has not assessed a single case. The agency provided USA TODAY with copies of reports from the council since 2016 but redacted every recommendation. Lipasek, the volunteer who first complained about the doctor in Ecuador, told USA TODAY that Peace Corps staff sent her to a follow-up appointment with him, despite her complaint. They later agreed to send her to a new physician.

#### **2nd card: government volunteer agencies have high rates of sexual assault and harassment—without the resources to help the volunteers their systems traumatize.**

#### Dorsey 18

(<https://www.cbsnews.com/news/americorps-programs-sexual-misconduct-oversight-breakdown/>)

A CBS News Radio investigation of years of complaints about AmeriCorps programs has found multiple allegations of sexual harassment, abusive behavior and mismanagement since 2013. The allegations are detailed in complaints to the agency's Inspector General, obtained through a Freedom of Information Act request. AmeriCorps, a network of national service programs, is the largest issuer of grants for service and volunteering. It is overseen by the Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS), which was established as a federal agency in 1993 – and has been dogged for years by claims that it is poorly managed. Conservative critics say AmeriCorps is a waste of money and promotes liberal causes. The Government Accountability Office [found last year](https://www.gao.gov/assets/690/683461.pdf) that CNCS has fallen short in monitoring whether the organizations it grants money to meet federal standards and requirements. In one recent case, CNCS was slow to respond to allegations of sexual harassment against the founder of one its programs, Impact America. In May 2018, CNCS was alerted to the case by a call to the telephone hotline of its Office of the Inspector General. The complaint reported "sexually explicit text messages and emails" were being sent to an AmeriCorps member from a supervisor. It also alleged timesheet fraud. Days before, in a resignation letter obtained by CBS News, the young woman who received the inappropriate messages alleged Impact America president Stephen Black tried to pursue a romantic relationship with her and "that this kind of attention from him had isolated me from my co-workers and put an enormous strain on me as I tried to distance myself from him emotionally while still carrying out my responsibilities to him as my boss." Black, who founded Impact America 14 years ago, is a prominent Alabama attorney and the grandson of the late U.S. Supreme Court Justice Hugo Black. The woman said in the letter Black ignored her attempts to turn down his advances. Two other former Impact America AmeriCorps members corroborated her account.

"This was affecting her mental health and her physical health," said a former co-worker. "She wasn't really eating, she was crying a lot ... she felt really guilty," because she felt obligated to stay at the non-profit. Black admitted to CBS News to exchanging inappropriate messages with the woman, and called it the "worst professional mistake I've ever made." But Black denied the messages were sexual harassment. Black has since stepped down. However, he continues to provide consulting services to Impact America, according to its board of directors in a statement to CBS News. And he is also still prominently featured on the Impact America website as "Our Founder." Black teaches at the University of Alabama, where he is director of the Center for Ethics & Social Responsibility. After this story was published Monday, a spokesperson for the school said Black had been placed on leave "pending further evaluation of the situation arising from his prior role at Impact America."

The victim's attorney, Allen Schreiber, says his client is satisfied with the changes the Impact America board has made to the organization. The changes included the hiring of a human resources director. Schreiber would not confirm whether any settlement was reached with Black or Impact America. But one of the former Impact America AmeriCorps members who spoke to CBS News said AmeriCorps was slow to respond to the complaint and launch an investigation. It took two months for Inspector General investigators to visit Impact America. Even then, they probed the separate allegation of timesheet fraud – not sexual harassment. And now five months later, the Impact America board says a formal report from AmeriCorps on its investigation is still pending.

"It was obvious our word didn't count as much," one of the victim's co-workers told CBS News. The Impact America board says it conducted its own investigation and made several changes, including hiring a human resources director and installing new leadership of the non-profit. "It was a challenging time for Impact but the important work continues without distraction, thanks to the competent new President, as well as the supportive staff in multiples states, and a deeply engaged Board," public relations consultant Jane Evans-Ryan told CBS News on behalf of the Impact America board. AmeriCorps grantees have been plagued with other issues. At a site in Kentucky, a CNCS Office of the Inspector General official told CBS News "AmeriCorps has found widespread criminal history check issues in the files" of members. The finding came in response to a July 2018 complaint to the Inspector General about a member who had been "arrested for the rape of a minor."

An Office of the Inspector General official said the search of the National Sex Offender Public Website conducted for this member was both late and incomplete. However, a search of the database found no disqualifying criminal history for the member, according to the official. The database only reports convictions – not arrests. One former AmeriCorps member serving at a site in North Texas said he was retaliated against for seeking grief counseling after two friends died. He said he reported the issue to an AmeriCorps team leader but that she dismissed his concerns. He complained to CBS News that he felt he had few avenues with AmeriCorps to report and resolve his concerns. "I feel that my case must have slipped through the cracks and that everybody that knew about the situation wasn't willing to address it properly with me," he said. They weren't "willing to take steps to make sure that this does not happen again for future service members." He said AmeriCorps must do more to support its members. "There are some host sites that sign up for AmeriCorps members without realizing that this is a federal program at the federal level, which is federally funded and with that come certain regulations and expectations: The right to non-retaliation, the right to being able to work in an environment where you're not harassed," he said. AmeriCorps does directly oversee and manage [NCCC](https://www.nationalservice.gov/programs/americorps/americorps-programs/americorps-nccc), often in partnership with FEMA, where young adults travel together to work on projects like rebuilding areas affected by disasters.

Sexual misconduct has affected that program as well. In 2011, a joint investigation between the CNCS and Department of Veterans Administration OIGs disclosed that a Maryland AmeriCorps NCCC member sexually assaulted another member. A complaint in January 2013 about an NCCC site in Iowa reported "constant bullying and harassment" by a team leader, causing an "emotional breakdown." A September 2013 complaint from a father reported his daughter assigned to a NCCC team in California "was under stress and metal (sic) abuse" by the team and unit leader.