

What factors determine whether or not the military should sponsor NASCAR?

With an all-volunteer military force continually at war, the defense system needs new recruits and advertising has become an expensive endeavor. Government cutbacks are the focus of the debate and how much is spent on recruiting mediums like NASCAR. As a sponsor of NASCAR, the defense department considers this as an essential recruitment tool. Although the military's longtime relationship with NASCAR seems patriotic, others see it as an excessive waste of tax payer money and want to evaluate its worth in return. Currently, this topic weighs heavily on the government decisions that control defense spending. People have conflicting viewpoints on the prioritizing of defense spending over programs Americans depend on.

Deford, Frank. "Being Sparing with the 'Broad Stripes and Bright Stars'." *Morning Edition*. 23 Feb 2011. *Gales Opposing Viewpoint In Context*. Web. 24 Mar 2011

The military spends a lot of money on NASCAR sponsorship and the amendment opposing this expenditure failed to win over the hearts of Congress. There's a special bond with racecars and military paraphernalia such as with other sport events that we associate with patriotism. This commentator feels the relationship with sports and military is strong but they could try to spend less or "cool their jets" so to speak. The military can still be a part of sports events without all the glitz and glamour, which costs more money.

This is a news commentary and primary research. The comments convey an open-minded opinion on ways to save money and still advertise their recruitment opportunities. The commentary's primary appeal is to logic because it addresses the issue and offers a viable solution. Steve Inskip and Renee Montagne of the *Morning Edition* speak with Frank Deford, author, writer with sixteen years of commentary experiences in National Radio Broadcast (NPR). He sees this issue easily corrected and compared to the other views it's somewhat neutral.

This commentary offers an objective approach to my question. I wanted a source that expresses a general view of the situation and addressed it with useful information viable

to both sides of the debate. Compared to the other views. The person supports the military's relationship with NASCAR then focuses on ways the military could cut back on the other excessive spending patterns or displays of patriotism.

Heistand, Michael. "Ending Army's NASCAR Tie-In Makes Sense." *USA Today*. 17 Feb 2011. Academic Search Premier. EBSCO. Web. 14 Mar 2011.

Current debate over U.S. defense advertising through NASCAR has the budget committee looking at ways to cut spending. Rather than cutting programs that directly affect Americans an amendment to cut NASCAR sponsorship has been issued. This writer opposes his colleague's opinion and is against military sponsorship in NASCAR. He believes cut-backs in the defense department is the best place start budget cuts.

This is a news article and primary research. Although it is based on current information and facts, the writer is expressing an opinion. The writer appeals to pathos by supporting the measures taken by US representative, Betty McCollum, to cut NASCAR sponsorship over programs which fund "homeless vets." This article was published in the *USA Today's Open Mikes*: Michael Heistand voices his opinion on the current legislation and government spending cuts. He is a columnist with *USA Today* reporting on current happenings with sports, government and society. Compared to the other opinions, he is against excessive defense spending and supports the amendment to cut NASCAR sponsorship.

This is a good article for my debate paper. The author explains his point of view as being against the military's expenditures in NASCAR. He would rather see NASCAR sponsorship cut versus cutting other programs directly affecting Americans. The information was current to the debate and will be useful in my paper.

Kitfield, James. "Recruiting in Wartime." *National Journal*. 39:14 (2007). 30-31. Academic Search Premier. EBSCO. Web. 14 Mar 2001.

This news article discusses the military's strategies for recruiting volunteer enlistees during wartime. There is no longer a draft so recruiters use venues like NASCAR, auto shows, drag races, and football games to find those, able-bodied individuals who want to join the armed forces. Statistics show recruiters need at least 40 potential enlistments to get a mere 2 enlistments that are actually qualified. Compared to the other views, this opinion favors military recruitment as being a justifiable expense of military spending.

This article is primary research. It is documentation based on the research found through investigative reporting. This article contains direct translations and interviews from professionals who are qualified and knowledgeable on my topic. The writer appeals to pathos by quoting a general (in the military) who feels that anyone who will enlist during wartime is very bold and honorable. The author of this article has been in journalism for over 20 years and has been in national security and foreign affairs corresponding for the *National Journal*, a weekly publication in Washington DC. This is a reliable source with substantial information to support his aspect towards the debate.

This was a good article on military recruitment. The commentary reveals the importance of wartime recruiting and how our military defense system stays fully manned. It also gives explanation as to why it is harder today keeping those recruitment percentages up. The writer defines one side of the argument which validates the necessity for military recruitment funding and his opinion on ways to cut spending and still keep relations with NASCAR. I will be using this information in my paper.

Long, Dustin. "Lawmaker Seeks Ban of Military NASCAR Sponsor." *The Virginia-Pilot*. 16 Feb 2011. HamptonRoads.com. Web. 25 Mar 2011.

This is a news article. It analyzes the debate over the proposed amendment to cut military sponsorship in NASCAR. Betty McCollum's chief of staff, Bill Harper, clears up misconceptions about the amendment which does not eliminate NASCAR funding but cut the unnecessary costs in the defense department. Harper feels that someone fighting overseas did not sign up just because they saw the Army logo on a racecar and it is unnecessary spending. He wants to see NASCAR sponsorship cut over programs more detrimental to society.

This article is primary research. The information in the article contains quotes from both sides of the debate. The primary appeal is to kairos based on reactions to the proposed amendment which was harshly criticized along with Betty McCollum and her efforts to sustain more important programs affecting citizens. Compared to the other perspectives, this person gives more information on the debate and is not biased toward either side. This does not necessarily represent the writer's point-of-view because it is based on quotes from others.

This was a good article in response to my question. It adds in-depth information to the debate by pointing out which programs will be cut over government recruitment funds.

The author writes for HamptonRoads.com and the Roanoke Times. He has been covering news for over seven years and is a reliable source.

This article covers the views of one side of the debate and references the opposition. The information gathered relates to cutting defense spending versus cutting programs which affect Americans. The information is useful but will not be used in my paper.

McCarthy, Michael. "This Spending is Wise; It Pays to Advertise." *USA Today*. 17 Feb 2001. Academic Search Premier. EBSCO. Web. 14 Mar 2011.

The opinion expressed in this article supports US Military sponsorship in NASCAR to advertise new recruits. Advertisement losses are expected and necessary to maintain recruitment numbers. The writer claims this expenditure is justified compared to the other ways the government wastes money.

This is a news article and primary research. It's a written opinion from a columnist who supports the NASCAR sponsorship. The writer believes defense spending is absolutely necessary in order to keep our defense system operational. The writer covers specific issues pertinent to the debate which is noted but not necessarily factual. The author appeals to kairos by asserting that the "draft" no longer exists and the U.S. military is currently fighting a war with an all-volunteer military. This person sees NASCAR as being the most important advertising medium and a vital recruitment tool of the military.

This opinion was very interesting and useful to my research. I will not be using this information in my paper. The issue has been decided but the overall debate with defense spending and tax payer money will have both negative and positive views.

Rhoden, William C. "Resilient Bond Between Sports and the Military." *New York Times*. 18 Feb 2011. Web. 14 Mar 2011

This is an article based on Rep. Betty McCollum's (D) amendment proposal stipulations to mandate defense cuts affecting their sponsorship in NASCAR. Although the government feels this is an essential recruitment tool and they have not excess to cut. This columnist's views sided with McCollum's amendment to cut sponsorship in NASCAR over other programs which will possibly cut Public Broadcasting and "homeless vet" benefits. The amendment was voted down but McCollum is not done yet.

This article is primary research. The writer appeals to ethos based on values that affect all Americans. For example the writer discusses Betty McCollum's proposed amendment cutting military sponsorship in NASCAR over government funded programs like public broadcasting and homeless Veterans. This article was published in the Sports of the Times by New York Times which is a well-known newspaper and a liable source. The columnist reporting on sports for over thirty years which adds to his credibility.

This was a good article for my debate because the writer has followed the amendment proposed that went into legislature cutting military sponsorship in NASCAR. It establishes what legal measures were taken in apposition of military recruitment costs.

Out of my six sources, I have decided to use the articles written by James Kitfield, Michael Heistand, and Frank Deford for my essay. I chose these three sources based on their opposing views towards my question. All views express what they think is applicable to recruitment costs and whether or not it's senseless spending or an important military expenditure. Currently, government issued cutbacks threaten programs that directly fund Americans and may be cut over the millions spent on recruiting through NASCAR. The issue resides in legislation as a proposed amendment cutting NASCAR sponsorship. The amendment was ultimately voted down. Although it seems cut and dry, the military forces have their side which is the need to spend money on advertising to facilitate the armed forces defending our country.

Kimberly Smith

Lynn Kilpatrick

Writing 1010-096

10:00 am

**What factors determine whether or not the military should sponsor
NASCAR?**

With an all-volunteer military force continually at war, the defense system needs new recruits and advertising has become an expensive endeavor. Government cutbacks are the focus of the debate and how much is spent on recruiting mediums like NASCAR. As a sponsor of NASCAR, the defense department considers it to be an essential recruitment tool. Although the military's longtime relationship with NASCAR seems patriotic, others see it as an excessive waste of tax payer money and want to evaluate its worth in return. Currently, this topic weighs heavily on the government decisions that control defense spending and other government funded programs. Many Americans have conflicting views about the government's prioritization of defense spending over programs citizens depend on. This issue affects tax payers some of who are racing fans either in support of defense spending or against it. Sports and political columnists have expressed their views regarding recruitment and the money spent

on NASCAR sponsorship currently being debated in congress.

For instance, James Kitfield a political and foreign affairs correspondent for the National Journal, associates recruitment costs within the defense budget as a necessary expense to facilitate the armed forces due to the difficulties recruiters face with getting new enlistments. There is no longer a draft and today's generation is skeptical of joining during wartime making recruitment difficult. On the other hand, people like seasoned journalist Mike Heistand, who reports on sports and political issues for USA Today, argues that NASCAR sponsorship is an ineffective recruitment tool that should be cut in lieu of the national deficit. Also debating the issue from another angle is Frank Deford, an expert on political issues and foreign affairs correspondence for the Morning Edition, is suggesting ideas that would not eliminate the military's relationship with NASCAR but spend less on embellishments.

The military's association with NASCAR and other affiliated sports puts them in a position that targets the demographic most likely to join the armed forces. Michael Heistand appeals to logos by maintaining a fully facilitated military as important due to the U.S. current involvement in war. Nevertheless, he doesn't feel the military needs to pay out \$7 million dollars for sponsorships and logos on cars without appropriate plausibility. Unlike the military, which is a well-known entity, Heistand says this advertising strategy only works for established brand names already affiliated with the heightened energy of racing, like Cheerios and Hamburger Helper or maybe unknown brands trying to establish

their identity. Even though many contest the military's sponsorship in NASCAR there are those who support its purpose.

Among military personnel and those affiliated with racing, the relationship between the military and NASCAR is seen as an obvious match-up. According to Kitfield, who has field researched modern recruitment techniques, maintaining the recruitment percentages needed to facilitate the forces has become a numbers game and a highly prioritized obligation for military recruiters. Kitfield appeals to pathos by addressing the difficulties the military faces today with wartime recruitment, creating adverse qualifications standards within the Armed Forces. He says today's "McDonaldized" and "X-box" generation of teens are skeptical of enlisting during war, which is understandable. Kitfield says recruitment is the #1 job considered equivocal to defense because there is no longer a draft. He explains how recruitment officers have a difficult job playing both pitchman and counselor to those they sign up.

Frank Deford believes the issue is not completely irresolvable. He suggests the military cut-back on excessive spending without doing away with NASCAR and racing affiliations. In support of military recruitment, he says they need to find ways to spend less on their recruitment ventures that cost the tax payers money. For example, he notes how every NASCAR race is commemorated with 2 jets flying overhead to starting off each race. Is this really necessary? Sure it's a great moral booster and reflects patriotism, but we can only guess how much this costs based on theory. Deford is implying the costs associated with defense

spending need to be thoroughly researched for inefficiencies. The money being wasted could be appropriated towards other defense needs. On the other hand, Kitfield claims NASCAR is a necessary tool for recruitment. As far as recruitment goes he says NASCAR and sports arenas are considered “fertile ground” with the majority of the profiled individuals potentially qualified to enlist. The recruitment officers circulate forums like NASCAR in search of potential enlistments.

Nevertheless, can the military actually justify spending \$7 million dollars plus just on NASCAR sponsorship. According to Heistand, this is not an effective recruitment tool. He says soldiers fighting in Afghanistan are not there because they saw the Army Car racing around the track. In contrast, Deford explains how this forum does attract those interested in military vehicles which are continually being used in and out of war. Kitfield’s field research on recruitment clarifies the difficulty recruiters have in attaining the numbers needed to the maintain defense system. He says the recruitment officers need to sign up forty possible recruits to possibly attain two that actually qualify for enlistment. He explains how social gatherings like racing are the logical recursive action for successful recruitment. Crossing the demographic areas throughout the nation using recruitment stations can be a slower process with inconsistencies. Kitfield says statistically one of every four enlistments are high school graduates who meet the requirements set forth through the standard qualifications the military maintains. He also says in order to draw in young people the military uses racing platforms as the “Wow

Factor”. Recruiters find these mediums to be a valuable asset in their venture to seek out new enlistments.

Even though NASCAR and the military appear to be a natural match-up, other sources say they could cut back on how much is spent on extras, like the Air Force demonstrates by flying jets overhead commemorating the start of every race. Deford is addressing the military’s wasteful spending habits but at the same time is compassionate towards their bond with NASCAR. He compares this display of patriotism to special events deserving such acknowledgment like the Olympics. The Olympics is celebrated throughout the world and seen as more important but simply commemorated by releasing two doves. He also mentions other events like the opera, theater presentation or rock concerts that are not commemorated at all. He says sports and patriotism go hand and hand much like baseball, being the All-American sport, which is still only celebrated by reciting the national anthem and Pledge of Allegiance. This is a display of patriotism with just as much importance but costs tax payer much less.

Deford is not giving solutions but rather ideas on how to cut spending. He thinks the military needs to ease up on what they are spending and where they are spending it. Deford, who watches sports and racing, admits he sees a plethora of commercials to support the Armed Forces. Commercials are another medium to focus the attention of new enlistments but the cost is also high. So herein lies the question of lowering these expenditures without burdening the tax payers. This is why members of the House Budget Committee want to find reasonable ways to

cut the deficit without putting more stress on an unstable economy. Heinstand is appealing to ethos by siding with the views expressed by Betty McCollum, Minnesota's (D) Representative, who recently proposed the amendment to cut NASCAR sponsorship. Heinstand and others supportive of McCollum have concerns about another amendment on the floor, which would cut program funding for "homeless vets." and public broadcasting. This will have a negative affect millions of American who depend on the programs funded by the federal government. Unfortunately, these programs are more likely to be cut over the millions spent on NASCAR and racing. Recently, McCollum's amendment was struck down in congress and was not up for discussion. McCollum in her effort was threatened for even suggesting the amendment and those who supported her tried to get her to drop the issue. This explains what the nation is up against and eventually will have to contend with.

The Defense Department is appropriated a yearly budget of \$200 million dollars and \$7 million which is earmarked for the Army's #39 car driven by Ryan Newman. Some might argue as to why the government should have to spend any money to be represented in NASCAR and if so, why isn't the ARMY logo splashed all over the car? This issue has initiated more questions than the government can deal with. Ultimately McCollum's amendment embarks on the beginning of a long controversial debate creating irreconcilable differences precluding government decisions. There are many discerned citizen who want to know how and if government, issued budget-cuts will affect them. If government

officials can't resolve the deficit problem it will have a greater social impact. Heistand appeals to logos by stating the obvious place to start cutting back is the military's sponsorship in NASCAR considering its inconsistencies for recruitment value. He implies that the military provides no logistical proof that NASCAR has any recruitment benefits. On the other hand, Kitfield claims the military has resorted to granting waivers on health requirements and misdemeanor convictions, just so they could keep the military fully facilitated. He is appealing to pathos in saying how this has helped with meeting recruitment quotas and it enables kids who continually have run-ins with the law, a chance to make something of themselves by joining the military. He stands by military recruitment strategies which maintain our defense system and claims recruiting is a very high priority no matter what mediums they utilize.

Overall, the U.S. military sees their longtime partnership with NASCAR racing as a vital recruitment tool and a patriotic bond that reflects heroism and pride for our nation. But, considering the national deficit has climbed well over \$14.1 dollars, the need to cut-back on excess spending has created high controversy over the continuation of military funding in NASCAR. Furthermore, there is controversy stemming from a parallel amendment proposal to cut government funded programs for Americans. The Defense Department claims they have no "fat" to cut and dismiss any attempts to prove otherwise. The people are concerned about the government's responsibility towards our nation's business and if it will affect them. We can assume most American's are patriotic

but this creates a question of importance over need for many. Although the amendment to cut NASCAR sponsorship was voted down in a congressional hearing members of the Budget Committee are determined to discredit the military's position on defense spending foregoing the proposed amendment.

My discussion of NASCAR sponsorship is in fact addressing a larger matter concerning the national deficit. Not only does the government have a responsibility to defend our country but they need to decide on what's best for economic success. If the government decides to make budget cuts elsewhere it will have a devastating effect on the citizen. For instances homeless veterans who have already served their duty to this country will have no income which they depend on. Can the government continue supporting a recruitment variance that has no calculated value? Defense costs need to be reanalyzed for discrepancies then refigured appropriately to accommodate recruitment needs. Economically speaking if the government appropriates too much into defense needs it will eventually takes its toll on tax payers. In fact most Americans want to see the government as a responsible entity capable in making decisions that benefit our needs.

Work Cited

Deford, Frank. "Being Sparing with the 'Broad Stripes and Bright Stars'." *Morning Edition*. 23 Feb 2011. *Gales Opposing Viewpoint In Context*. Web. 24 Mar 2011

Heistand, Michael. "Ending Army's NASCAR Tie-In Makes Sense." *USA Today*. 17 Feb 2011. Academic Search Premier. EBSCO. Web. 14 Mar 2011.

Kitfield, James. "Recruiting in Wartime." *National Journal*. 39:14 (2007). 30-31. Academic Search Premier. EBSCO. Web. 14 Mar 2001.

Lynn Kilpatrick

Writing 1010

blog

**What factors determine whether or not the military should sponsor
NASCAR?**

The national deficit has created a controversial debate whether or not the Defense Department should continue sponsoring NASCAR. Currently, efforts to cut the budget have defined sides within the congressional voting process. Recently, Betty McCollum Minnesota's (D) Representative and member of Budget House Committee, proposed an amendment that would eliminate \$7 million dollars allocated for the Army's Car driven by Ryan Newman. Even though the odds were stacked heavily against her and strangely threaten by some who opposed her amendment, McCollum feels that NASCAR and other racing formats should be cut in preservation of federally funded programs assisting "homeless Veterans" and Public Broadcasting. On the other hand, the Defense department doesn't see it that way and claim they have no excess to cut. They consider NASCAR and other racing venues as valuable recruitment sites necessary to sustain the Armed Forces. Needless to say the amendment was harshly voted down in a congressional hearing without question. But the issue has defined sides in congress and within the media over the prioritizations set forth regarding budget-cuts. Those who have been following the debate have voiced their opinion about the amount being spent on recruitment variances within the defense budget.

Over the past few months, sports and political columnist have been taking notes in

response to the current debate over NASCAR sponsorship. The sources express speculation regarding government budget-cuts and the \$200 million dollars spent on recruitment costs. Political and foreign affairs correspondent, James Kitfield of the *National Journal* has studied modern recruitment techniques within a published article called “Recruiting in Wartime”. Within the article, he interviews Houston’s company commander Capt. Antonio Hernandez who knows firsthand what difficulties recruiters face employing new enlistees during wartime. Hernandez says recruitment is the second most important job of the military, first being to protect the nation. The commander also explains how persuading today’s “McDonald super-sized” and “Xbox” generation to enlist has forced the military to lower qualification standards issuing waivers for medical and criminal misdemeanors. Kitfield says NASCAR and other social gatherings are vital to recruitment and necessary tools in maintaining enlistment percentages. He says the military values NASCAR and racing and considers it as the “Wow Factor” used to stimulate those interested in enlisting. Even though there is no longer a draft and recruitment is difficult, other sources are not as compassionate towards the military’s relationship with NASCAR and see it as an easy place to start budget cuts.

The debate in congress has brought forth negative rebuttal from those who oppose spending tax payer money for unaccountable recruitment ventures. USA Today’s sports and political journalist, Mike Hiestand voices his views on McCollum’s amendment proposal in an article called “Ending NASCAR tie-in makes sense.” He is not in favor of the \$7 million dollars spent on the Army Car or the \$200 million set aside for recruitment via racing which the military claims as valuable recruitment mediums. He mentions how

logos on racecars only work for brands associating themselves with the excitement of racing like Cheerios and Hamburger Helper ,or unknown brands trying to make a name for themselves. He says the military is in fact well known and soldiers deployed to Afghanistan are not there because they saw the Army car racing around the track. Heistand sympathizes with military efforts in keeping defense but considers military recruitment strategized through racing as a waste of money. His views on the debate are similar to others who feel the government in spending way too much in patriotic embellishments without accounting rate of return.

Nonetheless the military's continuing relationship with racing and sports is seen as a patriotic reflection of what our nation believes in. Frank Deford sports fan commentator for NPR's *Morning Edition* and senior correspondent for HBO's Real/Sports, takes the discussion further in a broadcast called "Be Sparing with the 'Broad Stripes And Bright Stars'". Deford comments on the government's position stating, "There are a lot of congressman prepared to do away with a lot of good old-fashioned, all-American stuff, but keep your hand off my NASCAR." Deford's approach to the debate compromises the assertions made towards government spending habits. He compares events like the Olympics, which is simply commemorated by releasing two doves, to NASCAR's commemoration of two jets, flown by Air Force personnel, starting every race. Deford says Americans expectedly associate the military's flamboyant displays of grandeur at sports and racing events. Considering the demographic interested in sports and racing, he says this strategy does target the intended

audience potentially qualified to enlist. But then again this massive display of patriotism can lose its luster after continual repetition therefore losing its meaning. Deford is suggesting the military make changes to their lavish spending patterns in order to accommodate more legitimate recruitment endeavors.

The issue of military's sponsorship in NASCAR has stimulated controversy over future appropriations set forth by Congress. McCollum's amendment to cut sponsorship in NASCAR was voted down leaving no room for question. She plans on continuing her efforts eliminating recruitment variances like NASCAR and racing in order to preserve other programs assisting Americans. Currently efforts to bring down the national deficit have created a stalemate in the decisions affecting budget-cuts. This issue has initiated a possible government shut-down and reason to question the competency of our government and how it carries out major decisions affecting Americans.