

Will and I negate.

Contention one is tradeoffs.

Subpoint A: Welfare

Because Republicans want to keep the budget balanced, any increase in military spending will cut other programs. David Morris of Salon writes in 2016 that “Trump will “fully offset” the increase in military spending by reducing spending on non-defense programs” slashing hundreds of billions of funding from food stamps, pell grants, job training, and housing assistance. These programs are key to alleviating poverty, Arloc Sharman of the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities in 2013 writes that welfare programs have lifted nearly 20 million people out of poverty.

Subpoint B: Multilateralism

Increased military spending trades off with multilateralism, as Greenway of the Boston Globe explains in 2002 that focusing on American military power promotes an arrogant mindset of unilateralism in which the US believes it can solve all its problems without the help of other nations. International relations professor Gordon Adams corroborates in 2015 that the focus on increasing US military capability and maintaining military dominance directly reduces efforts at multilateral cooperation. This is problematic, as Audrey Calkins at Wake Forest University finds in 2007 that multilateralism results in more successful conflict resolution because it is perceived as more legitimate since it involves multiple states making individual sacrifices for the greater good.

[1:05]

Contention two is police militarization.

Police militarization is the process by which police departments acquire military grade equipment. Anthony Fisher at Reason explains in 2016 that increased military spending would produce surplus equipment as new equipment replaces the old. Surplus equipment is then given to police free of charge as Matthew Harwood at Mother Jones explains 2014 that the DOD’s 1033 program has transferred \$4 billion worth of military equipment to police.

Police militarization is the root cause of police brutality, as Jesse Singal at New York Magazine finds in 2014 that military grade weapons prime police officers to be more violent and body armor makes police feel invincible, ultimately creating an us vs them mentality where the public is the enemy, resulting in more violent and deadly encounters with citizens.

The impact is racism. Police militarization is racial as Clifton Parker at Stanford reports in 2014 that it disproportionately affects communities of color, with blacks being 24 to 50 times more likely to experience its effects.

[1:59]

Contention three is starting the next Iraq war.

Increased military spending results in more destructive military interventions for 3 reasons.

1. Threat construction. Economist Ismael Zadeh explains in 2006 that politicians justify spending increases to the public by exaggerating and creating external threats such as rogue states and global terrorism. He continues that “the Pentagon and its major contractors have strong incentives to show that they use taxpayers’ money efficiently—often as measured in terms of actual... deaths and destruction per dollar,” leading to needless wars like in Iraq and Afghanistan.
2. More aggressive foreign policy. The Institute for Policy Studies explains in 2012 that higher US military spending enables the US to pursue more ambitious goals, shifting military activities from deterrence and crisis response to missions involving ground troops, attempts to block or remove emerging threats, and weaken adversarial regimes. Thomas Potter at Gettysburg College confirms in 2016 that increased military spending necessitates large militaries that ultimately result in more aggression and wars. Increasing spending would also allow the US to start more conflicts as Diem Salmon of Davis Institute for National Security and Foreign Policy writes in 2015 that the current US military force is not equipped to intervene in more than one regional conflict at a time.
3. Increased power differential. Rabia Aslam at Forman College finds in 2010 that greater US military strength lowers the cost of intervention, making intervening politically viable. Hailey Bennett at James Madison University quantifies in 2015 that as the difference in the military power of a third party and the country in conflict increases, the likelihood of intervention increases by up to 97%.

There are two impacts.

1. More civil wars. Interventions in civil wars increase the chance of future conflicts because interventions entrench political divides, preventing effective diplomatic solutions from lasting. This is confirmed by Professor Michael Kenwick who finds in 2014 that civil conflicts with interveners are 94% more likely to reignite, even after a peace deal. Recurring civil wars are extremely important, as Bethany Lacina at Stanford finds in 2006 that civil wars are the most common type of conflict and account for 90% of battle deaths.
2. Death. Interventions and wars are deadly as James Lucas at the Center for Research on Globalization finds in 2015 that the US military is responsible for 20 to 30 million deaths worldwide through the conflicts it has participated in.