Sequestration kills heg

Sequestration would kill military readiness

**AP 8/1**(Associated Press, Defense Official: Cuts Hit Warfighters, Weapons, 8/1/12, NPR)

Compromise, however, seems highly unlikely before the November election as the issue is caught up in the political fight over taxes and spending. Democrats insist any plan to spare the military include tax increases on high-wage earners; Republicans reject any plan that calls for higher taxes. The hearing underscored that political reality. The meeting of the typically bipartisan panel quickly degenerated into finger-pointing over who was responsible for last year's budget deal to cut spending and raise the nation's budget authority. There was little discussion of a solution to the automatic cuts. In a testy exchange, Rep. Randy Forbes, R-Va., insisted that President Barack Obama has done nothing to address the "atrocities" of the impending cuts. Zients pointed out that Congress wrote the law calling for the automatic cuts and has five months to act. "What's holding it up is the Republican refusal to make the top 2 percent pay their fair share" in taxes, he said. Carter said military personnel would be exempt from the automatic cuts, but every other military account would be affected, from weapons to the number of hours commissaries operate to potential furloughs. "Some later-deploying units (including some deploying to Afghanistan) could receive less training, especially in the Army and Marine Corps," Carter said. "Under some circumstances, this reduced training could impact their ability to respond to a new contingency, should one occur." In the three months to the election, Republicans are using the looming reductions in military spending as a political cudgel against Obama, arguing that the commander in chief is willing to risk the nation's security as he uses the leverage in the budget showdown with Congress. Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney has echoed GOP lawmakers' criticism. Democrats counter that Republicans who voted for the cuts are trying to wriggle out of last August's deficit-cutting agreement and they must consider tax increases as part of any congressional compromise to stave off reductions. Twenty-two Republicans on the committee, including the chairman, Rep. Howard "Buck" McKeon of California, and 18 Democrats voted for the cuts. Thirteen committee Republicans and seven Democrats, including ranking member Rep. Adam Smith of Washington state, opposed them. Raising the political stakes, GOP Sens. John McCain of Arizona, Kelly Ayotte of New Hampshire and Lindsey Graham of South Carolina spent two days in some of the most contested presidential states warning of the impact of the cuts on local businesses and jobs. They demanded that Obama negotiate with Republicans and Democrats to work out a solution. Responding to the announcement sparing personnel, the three expressed frustration with the administration's handling of the issue. "Rather than coming to the table with Republicans and Democrats in Congress to finally address the issue of budget sequestration, the Obama administration is flailing around," they said, in an attempt to make the cutting "look less devastating than it actually is. Today's announcement increases the impact of these arbitrary cuts on the readiness of our armed forces."

Sequestration would massively decline private military jobs

**Bloom 8/2** (Jordan Bloom, staff writer, Sequestration Schadenfreude, 8/2/12, The American Conservative)

“All the concern about sequestration falls on that we may lose private defense jobs,” Kaine said. “There are going to be all kinds of cuts affecting public employees for a couple of years and nobody’s gotten out of line about it. A job loss is a job loss.” (Washington Post) Kaine’s remarks reinforce the idea that the sequester cuts would fall largely on private defense companies rather than, say, benefits for military personnel. This explains Lockheed Martin’s threat to send out hundreds of thousands of legally unnecessary memos to employees days before the presidential election warning that their jobs are in jeopardy (some dispute whether the memos are necessary, but at any rate it’s clear that Lockheed Martin has a good political reason to push them out, regardless of their coordination with McCain’s campaign-style jobs tour).

A decrease in the private section of the military kills heg - downsizing

**Lendman 10** (Steve Lendman, MA at Harvard, Outsourcing War: The Rise of Private Military Contractors, 1/19/10, Steve Lendman Blog)

In the 1991 Gulf War, the Pentagon employed one PMC operative per 50 troops. For the 1999 Yugoslavia conflict, it was one for every 10, and by the 2003 Iraq War, PMCs comprised the second largest force after the US military. They've also been used in numerous civil wars globally in nations like Angola, Sierra Leone, the Balkans throughout the 1990s, Papua New Guinea, and elsewhere. From 1990 - 2000, they participated in 80 conflicts, compared to 15 from 1950 - 1989. Singer cites three reasons why, combined into "one dynamic:" 1. Supply and demand Since the Cold War ended in 1991, the US military downsized to about two-thirds its former size, a process Dick Cheney, as defense secretary, called BRAC - Base Realignment and Closure, followed by privatizing military functions. But given America's permanent war agenda, the Pentagon needed help, especially because of the proliferation of small arms, over 550 million globally or about one for every 12 human beings, and their increased use in local conflicts.

Sequestration hurts the economy

Sequestration cuts would destroy the economy

**STN 8/3** (Second to None, Sequestration Puts 2.14 Million Total Jobs at Risk, 8/3/12, Second to None)

Arlington, Va. — A new economic impact analysis concludes that 2.14 million American jobs could be lost if the Budget Control Act’s sequestration mandate takes effect on January 2, 2013. That is the date that budget cuts of $1.2 trillion start throughout government unless Congress and the administration agree on a solution. Dr. Stephen S. Fuller, Dwight Schar Faculty Chair and University Professor and Director for Regional Analysis at George Mason University, in conjunction with Chmura Economics and Analytics, conducted the study on behalf of the Aerospace Industries Association. “The results are bleak but clear-cut,” said Fuller. “The unemployment rate will climb above 9 percent, pushing the economy toward recession and reducing projected growth in 2013 by two-thirds. An already weak economy will be undercut as the paychecks of thousands of workers across the economy will be affected from teachers, nurses, construction workers to key federal employees such as border patrol and FBI agents, food inspectors and others.” The analysis concludes that the automatic spending cuts mandated in the Budget Control Act of 2011 affecting defense and non-defense discretionary spending in just the first year of implementation will reduce the nation’s GDP by $215 billion; decrease personal earnings of the workforce by $109.4 billion and cost the U.S. economy 2.14 million jobs. “This report shows that sequestration is not just a defense problem, it’s an American problem,” said AIA President and CEO Marion C. Blakey. “Unless our leaders in Washington take action, massive cuts have the potential to devastate our economy. In addition, more than one million defense-dependent jobs on the line will risk our national security, economy and the technological innovation that keeps America Second to None.” According to “The Economic Impact of the Budget Control Act of 2011 on DOD and Non-DOD Agencies,” 48,059 jobs in healthcare, 98,953 in construction, 473,250 in manufacturing and 617,449 federal jobs are at risk. The study outlines the impacts in all 50 states with California, Virginia and Texas experiencing the largest potential jobs loss and most states taking five-digit job losses. The threat of sequestration is bringing many voices to the table. At the July 17 press briefing releasing the numbers, participants said: Senator Kelly Ayotte (R-NH): “Military leaders have been clear that defense sequestration will deprive our troops of the resources they need and undermine our national security for generations,” said Senator Ayotte, Ranking Member of the Senate Armed Services Readiness Subcommittee. “This new study underscores that sequestration will also crush our economy, devastate our defense industrial base, and put tens of thousands of Americans out of work. Republicans and Democrats must work together now to find alternate spending reductions that will not add a national security crisis to our fiscal crisis.” Senator Jeanne Shaheen (D-NH): “I want to thank the AIA for conducting this study, which looks at this question in the proper context of the entire problem. Focusing on only one half of the problem creates the impression that we only need half a solution, but that won’t work,” Shaheen said. “We cannot continue to avoid tough decisions on the future of our debt and deficit. We should continue to work on a comprehensive solution that puts everything on the table. It’s the right thing to do for our national security, for our economy, and for our people.” Phoenix Mayor Greg Stanton: “The report’s findings are proof that Arizona faces serious job loss – nearly 50,000 high-wage jobs – at the expense of Congress’s failure to deal with looming, indiscriminate cuts to our aerospace and defense industries,” Phoenix Mayor Greg Stanton said. “We can’t afford to take that kind of a hit. We know some cuts will happen, but we need to be strategic, propose a solution and protect jobs to keep our momentum going forward out of the recession, not backward.” San Diego Mayor Jerry Sanders: “Like every other city in the country, San Diego has been struggling to recover from the worst national recession in nine decades. Arbitrary, politically motivated cuts to the national defense budget are the last thing our city needs right now, given that a quarter of all jobs in this region are tied to the defense industry.”

Sequestration would kill job growth and the economy

**STN 8/3** (Second to None, Analysis Projects One Million Jobs at Risk from Defense Cuts, 8/3/12, Second to None)

Arlington, Va. — An economic impact analysis projects more than one million American jobs could be lost as a result of defense budget cuts if the deficit reduction select committee fails to reach agreement on alternative balanced budget solutions and total cuts to defense reach $1 trillion. Dr. Stephen S. Fuller, Dwight Schar Faculty Chair, University Professor and Director, Center for Regional Analysis at George Mason University and Economic Modeling Specialists Inc. (EMSI) conducted the analysis on behalf of the Aerospace Industries Association. “Our analysis reveals bleak outcomes for both the defense industry and the economy as a whole if the budget sequestration trigger is pulled and $1 trillion is cut from defense,” said Dr. Fuller. “Dr. Fuller and EMSI’s study shows the dramatic and devastating impact these cuts would have, not only on our industry but on the economy at large,” said AIA President and CEO Marion C. Blakey. “Congress must find budget deficit solutions that don’t sacrifice the jobs of those who supply the American warfighter.” “We cannot add .6 percent to the current 9.1 percent rate of unemployment, it would devastate the economy and the defense industrial base and undermine the national security of our country,” she added. Commenting on the findings, Tom Buffenbarger, President of the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers said “the spending cuts of the Budget Control Act enacted last summer place at risk the jobs of highly skilled, highly motivated workers.” “We can ill afford to idle these men and women and the machines they operate indefinitely,” Buffenbarger added. Dr. Fuller and EMSI concluded that under the scenario of a $1 trillion cut to defense spending, an option under consideration by the budget deficit “Super Committee,” the flow down effect from the aerospace and defense industry to its supply chain and communities is significant, particularly given two factors. The defense industry has a notably high rate of subcontracted work flow and systems with high component volumes, driving job loss directly to program partners and the supply chain. Dr. Fuller’s analysis was based on an annual reduction of $45.01 billion to the military modernization accounts from which the aerospace and defense industry derives its revenues. “The total impact each year of a $45 billion cut would be to reduce GDP by $86.456 billion. This is equivalent to 25 percent of the projected annual increase in GDP for 2013 and its loss would reduce currently projected growth for 2013 from 2.3 percent to 1.7 percent,” Fuller said.

Sequestration hurts the nuclear triad/bomber

Sequestration would destroy our nuclear triad’s capabilities—specifically the bomber

**Maginnis 11** (Robert Maginnis is a retired Army lieutenant colonel, and a national security and foreign affairs analyst for radio and television, ‘CATASTROPHIC’ DEFENSE CUTS SEEN AS TIPPING POINT OF U.S. MILITARY SUPREMACY, 10/20/11, Human Events)

Our nuclear deterrence could diminish. Cuts would undermine our nuclear triad—our ability to detect and defend against missile attack, nuclear weapons inventories, and satellite space-launch capabilities. These cuts could cause allies and adversaries to question our ability to provide a nuclear response to an attack, concludes the Republican staff. Military infrastructure and the industrial base could suffer a serious blow. Shipyards could be closed, long-planned military construction projects may be scuttled, and a new round of Base Realignment and Closure would be necessary. Much of the armed services’ equipment modernization and recapitalization could be put on hold or canceled, including the Joint Strike Fighter and the much-needed aerial refueling tanker. Defense spending may be discretionary, but constitutionally national security is government’s top responsibility. We live in a dangerous world which demands a significant armed force to protect America across all domains—air, land, sea, space and cyberspace. America must get its fiscal house in order, and defense should share the burden. But providing national security on the cheap to avoid cutting social programs to help Democrats’ political fortunes is wrongheaded, and may in fact create a tipping point for America as the world’s leading military power.

Nuclear triad solves three unique scenarios for nuclear war – allied proliferation, hostile aggression, and crisis escalation

**Williams 10** (David E. Williams, Jr., Major, U.S. Air Force, A Review of U.S. First-Strike Ambiguity and the Triad Nuclear Force, 10/10, Defense Threat Reduction Journal)

The Case for Continuity The case for the continuity of current U.S. nuclear policies and structure involves consideration of their benefits in terms of security, international prestige, domestic politics, and technology. 8 From a security perspective, nuclear weapons ensure security because the potential usage of nuclear weapons during a conflict raises the cost of war to an unacceptable level. 9 Scott Sagan notes that: Nuclear declaratory policy is meant to enhance deterrence of potential adversaries by providing a signal of the intentions, options and proclivities of the U.S. government in different crisis and war-time scenarios. 10 I would argue, however, that an ambiguous U.S. first use policy of nuclear weapons creates valuable uncertainty on the part of potential adversaries. This uncertainty, coupled with U.S. nuclear and conventional superiority, makes overt state aggression against the U.S. or its’ allies a very uncertain and potentially disastrous proposition, thus not likely to happen. After all, no state has started a war with the U.S. since it acquired nuclear weapons. No part of the U.S. nuclear triad can be eliminated without creating an adverse impact on deterrence. This is the case because each element of the triad fills a unique role that makes U.S. nuclear forces lethal, survivable, and visible. Submarines offer the greatest degree of survivability, but the lowest degree of accuracy and become vulnerable upon surfacing. Bombers are the most accurate and only recallable option, but they are vulnerable to defensive counter-air missions and groundbased anti-aircraft fire. ICBMs are the most reliable means of delivery and the only sovereign launched option, yet are all located at known, stationary sites that are easily targeted by enemy ICBM forces, special operations teams, or terrorist surrogates. One may not consider the visibility of nuclear forces to be desirable, but the visibility of bombers and ICBMs allows for clear signaling to potential adversaries about U.S. intentions during a crisis. Take the Cuban Missile Crisis for example: President Kennedy used naval and air forces in order to signal his intent toward Premier Khrushchev. This signaling ensured there were no doubts about U.S. willingness to go to war to prevent Soviet missiles from being placed in Cuba. Future conflicts may require signaling of a similar nature to prevent deadly exchanges. For example, if Kim Jong Il were notified that the U.S. was uploading nuclear-armed bombers in response to North Korean deployments of nuclear-armed missiles, he might reconsider his actions. From the perspective of international prestige, other powers are retaining and in some cases enhancing their nuclear capability, yet as Younger points out, the U.S. is not modernizing any aspect of its inventory. 11 Instead, the U.S. is relying on mathematical projections and estimations regarding the reliability of its systems and deploying them well beyond what most states would consider a reasonable service-life. Further reductions in strategic nuclear forces could be seen as evidence of retrenchment on the part of the U.S. by ambitious rising or reemerging powers, thus increasing the risk of war. The U.S. could be characterized as a declining power by rising powers who are seeking either initial or enhanced nuclear technology. Rising powers, after all, will work to realign the international balance of power in their favor: one way of doing so is through countering U.S. military capabilities. If the U.S. were to reduce its capability by eliminating portions of the triad, then it would essentially be making it easier for other powers to challenge the current U.S. position. Further, without the potential threat of a nuclear first strike, U.S. allies might feel less secure about U.S. security commitments, especially in light of current troop commitments in Iraq and Afghanistan. Such insecurity has the potential to lead these allies to pursue nuclear capabilities of their own, as well as embolden hostile states to gamble on a lack of U.S. retaliation for WMD usage or conventional aggression. For example, when the U.S. considered reducing troop levels in South Korea, the government in Seoul signaled a potential shift in policy toward a nuclear capability to protect itself from possible North Korean aggression. 12 This threat resulted in very quick U.S. reassurances about troop levels and its commitment to defending South Korea

A strong nuclear triad is key to deterrence

**Perry et al 09**

(William Perry, Chair of the Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States, America’s Strategic Posture The Final Report of the Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States, May 2009, United States Institute of Peace Press)

Given that the triad was designed for a Cold War that has now well receded into history, does the United States need to maintain it? Might a dyad be preferable? The Commission has reviewed arguments in favor of a dyad but recommends retention of the current triad. Each leg of the triad has its own value: • The bomber force is valuable particularly for extending deterrence in time of crisis, as their deployment is visible and signals U.S. commitment. Bombers also impose a significant cost burden on potential adversaries in terms of the need to invest in advanced air defenses. • The Intercontinental Ballistic Missile (ICBM) force imposes on a prospective aggressor the need to contemplate attacking only with very large number of nuclear weapons, substantially depleting its forces while ensuring a devastating response by the United States. The force is also immediately responsive in a highly controlled manner. And for the foreseeable future, there is no prospect that a significant portion of the ICBM force can be destroyed by a preemptive strike on the United States by small nuclear powers, including China. • The Submarine Launched Ballistic Missile (SLBM) force is currently the most survivable, meaning that no attacker could contemplate a nuclear attack on the United States without expecting U.S. retaliation.

Your generic offense doesn’t apply—the bomber is specifically key to any kind of deterrence

**Watts 08**(Barry Watts, senior fellow at the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, The Case for Long-Range Strike: 21st Century Scenarios, 2008, Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments)

The context in which the US defense establishment thinks about long-range bombers has changed dramatically since the end of the Cold War. The basic trend has been to see bombers increasingly as systems for conventional operations only. Not only is the role of nuclear forces an area of increasing neglect, but there is no longer any consensus on the place of bombers in nuclear deterrence despite growing evidence that weapons of mass destruction (WMD) may proliferate markedly in coming decades. If indeed they do, the chances will grow over time that the post-Nagasaki taboo against nuclear use will eventually be broken. This prospect poses a fundamental challenge for thinking about the USAF’s next bomber. The next two sections explore the requirements that should shape the design of the next generation of bombers, starting with the platform’s use in non-nuclear or conventional operations. Given America’s growing neglect of nuclear capabilities and lack of agreement on their role in US security, it may be tempting to make the next-generation bomber a conventional-only system. This temptation, however, should probably be resisted. Hardening against electromagnetic pulses as well as against non-nuclear high-powered-microwave weapons is best undertaken during design and production, not after the fact. To this extent at least, it may not be wise to think about the 2018 LRSS exclusively in terms of delivering guided munitions in non-nuclear strike operations.