

From the Left

# It shouldn't hide itself recruiting young people

\$2 billion. The government doesn't need to pay my son \$7 for his opinion. Frankly, they can't afford to.

They don't need to ask him what I think. I'll tell them. For free.

When I got to my computer and Googled JAMRS, I learned that it was the "Joint Advertising Market Research and Studies." But of course.

How about some English and some honesty here? If you want kids to put their lives on the line, tell them who you are. JAMRS "conducts marketing efforts — under the Today's Military brand — to enhance and extend the individual Services' communications efforts with a variety of branding and advertising initiatives."

The "Today's Military brand"? Is serving your country a brand? Do we need branding initiatives to "market" service? Are these people trying to turn us off, or is it just by accident?

I have nothing but respect for young people who choose to serve in the military. In my experience, it's a choice that is certainly affected by economic conditions and educational opportunities (the primary subject of the survey). But at its core — and the reason I respect it so much — it's a choice to serve this country. It's about patriotism and love of country.

Why is it being "sold" behind an unknowable acronym for an organization that makes it sound

like what's involved is a choice between soaps or cereals?

Where is the dignity in paying kids seven bucks to check off some answers?

Where is the pride, the respect?

If the Department of Defense has cash to burn in sending out who knows how many \$2 bills to young people, why not spend it taking care of the young people who already said yes and came home suffering serious long-term injuries that, according to media reports, are going undiagnosed and untreated? If the JAMRS folks want to enhance the conversation with parents about service, which is what their Web site says, why not do so by promising to treat our kids as the precious and irreplaceable lights of our lives that they are?

On the other hand, if they think they're better off hiding behind some marketing acronym, not to mention throwing cash money around, then all the branding in the world won't help our military fulfill its mission.

JAMRS? No thanks.



Examiner Columnist Susan Estrich is nationally syndicated by Creators Syndicate.

**SOUND BITES**

**But all in all, Goldman has done well for itself**

*"We see two main scenarios. A fairly bad one in which the economy grows at a 1 1/2 percent to 2 percent rate through the middle of next year and the unemployment rate rises moderately to 10 percent, and a very bad one in which the economy returns to an outright recession."*

- An e-mail to clients from analysts led by **Jan Hatzius**, chief U.S. economist at Goldman Sachs

**Sovereign debt is a fancy way of saying 'profligate government spending'**

*"Progress toward global financial stability has experienced a setback since April ... [due to] the recent turmoil in sovereign debt markets. The global financial system is still in a period of significant uncertainty and remains the Achilles' heel of the economic recovery."*

- From the International Monetary Fund's Global Financial Stability Report

**Say it ain't so — ACK!**

*"If I hear one more Republican tell me about balancing the budget, I am going to strangle them. To the press, that's a figure of speech."*

- Vice President **Biden** at a Democratic fundraiser in Minnesota

**So much for the civil libertarian presidency**

*"Sending Obama — and any Democrat or Republican who supports his 'big brother' mentality — back into private life is the change we must believe in to get our basic freedoms back."*

- Columnist **Nat Hentoff** on President Obama's shredding of the Fourth Amendment

able blogs in America

**\$150 million**

**\$50 million**

**\$40 million**

**\$37 million**