

Pro

Nuclear War Extinction Overview

Nuclear war→ extinction

International relations professor Siddharth Mallavarapu explains in 2013 that in the event of a nuclear conflict, any nuclear detonation would result in a spiral of retaliation and escalation. This causes extinction, as Carl Shulman at the Machine Intelligence Research Institute finds in 2013 that any nuclear conflict would result in soot and ash being thrown into the atmosphere, which would block out the sun for years, in turn resulting in extinction because agriculture would collapse due to the lack of sunlight.

Nuclear terror escalates

Professor of Strategic Studies Robert Ayson finds in 2010 that a nuclear terrorist attack would escalate to full scale nuclear war because it could be performed against the backdrop of existing US tensions with other countries like Russia and China, forcing the US to use a nuclear counter attack. For example, a nuclear terrorist attack could launch a nuclear missile at the US after breaking into a Russian nuclear facility, prompting a US response.

AT: More Interventions

1. Interventions are inevitable, Hailey Bennett at James Madison University explains in 2015 that the US will always intervene in conflicts to pursue its national interests, increased spending doesn't change US national interests. Two implications.
 - a. Terminally non-uniques all their links, your evidence is all correlation, we'll always intervene.
 - b. Ends the round — if interventions are inevitable, the only questions is whether they're better under the Aff or Neg — we say more spending means more successful interventions with readiness, they never read EV that a stronger military makes interventions uniquely more destructive, they just say interventions themselves are bad.
2. Their impact studies all have sampling biases: intervention only occurs when the conflict is set to escalate anyways, so the data gets skewed in that direction.

Impact turns:

1. Turn, Dunn from the readiness contention says previous interventions in places like Iraq only failed and produced long term instability because our military had low readiness, which resulted in the intervention failing to quickly and decisively resolve the conflict.
2. Turn, a clear victory when we have high readiness leads to more future stability. Virginia Fortna of Columbia University writes in 2004 that “indecisive military outcomes leave all sides capable of resuming the fight,... with no one fully satisfied with the terms of the peace, whereas decisive victories lead to a 70% lower chance of repeat war.
3. Turn, affirming prevents conflicts from the ever starting. Professor of Government David Cunningham explains in 2015 that the threat of American intervention deters rebels from starting civil wars because they’re scared of a loss, resulting in a 50% decline in the chance of civil war.
4. Turn, interventions shorten conflicts. Political scientist Kyle Joyce finds in 2008 that because interventions shift the balance of power in a conflict, they result in shorter conflicts and a higher chance of a negotiated settlement.
5. Turn, interventions cause less violent conflicts. Matthew Krain of International Studies Quarterly finds that because intervention diverts the resources of the perpetrator, the probability that killings increase is reduced by 14%.
6. Turn, intervention is needed to deliver aid. Janice Stein of the National Academy Press writes in 2000 that organizations can’t deliver aid in war torn regions because they lack to security to deliver the goods. However, the United States Institute of Peace explains that these organizations can use the US military for security, which happens more when we increase military spending. Joppe Ree in the 2009 Journal of Development Economics finds empirically that each 10% increase in aid reduces the probability that conflict continues by 8 percentage points.

AT: Power differential link:

1. This is completely non-unique. The power differential between the US and any country they are intervening in is already so high, more spending can't possibly make a significant difference.

AT: MIC/PMCs link:

1. This is non-unique. The Military industrial complex/private military contractors exist with or without spending increases and they push for war no matter what.

AT: More aggressive/pre-emptive link:

1. This is non-unique, military spending is already really high meaning that our foreign policy is pretty aggressive.
2. Correlation does not imply causation, spending doesn't affect foreign policy, presidents determine US foreign policy and the presidents who favor aggressive foreign policy are also the ones who tend to increase military spending after they adopt an aggressive stance.

AT: Threat Construction

1. Non-unique, Economist Ismael Zadeh explains in 2006 that external imagined threats are constructed before military spending is increased to justify the spending increase. In either world, threats get constructed, there's no link differential.

AT: Diplomacy Trade-off

1. Increasing military spending also increases diplomacy spending. Two reasons.
 - a. DOD does diplomacy. The Institute for Policy studies explains in 2012 that the State Department's diplomatic and developmental policies are now being done by the Department of Defense as funding has increased. Increased military spending means more money for the DOD to do diplomacy.
 - b. Higher State Dept funding. Kimberly Amadeo at The Balance explains in 2016 that State Department funding is included in military spending, which means increasing military spending increases diplomacy spending.
2. Turn, military power provides leverage for better diplomacy. UN Ambassador Ilario Schettino explains in 2009 that combining normal diplomacy with threats of military force is the most effective way to persuade adversaries to back down without actually using force. Jennifer Rubin at the Washington Post confirms in 2014 that empirically, Obama's refusal to back up diplomacy with military force has failed to resolve conflicts in Ukraine, Syria, Iran, and Yemen and has tempted our enemies to act more aggressively because they know they US won't respond.
3. They have no evidence that diplomacy is working right now to do anything beneficial. We show you through our case that there are very real threats that can only be responded with military power.
4. Their cards don't account for Trump. They don't prove that Trump even wants to do diplomacy, and his rhetoric indicates otherwise. Even if he does attempt diplomacy, he'll fail: Jed Babbin at The Spectator explains in December that Trump's diplomacy is reminiscent of a "bull who brings his own china shop with him" and Trump has already caused diplomatic backlash over his communications with Pakistan and Taiwan.

AT: Spending Trade-off

1. They have no evidence indicating that money is key to diplomacy's effectiveness. Diplomacy is just talking – cutting the budget won't prevent that.
2. Their evidence is all correlation – the type of government who would expand the military also tends to be the type of government who won't engage in diplomacy, but that doesn't prove that military spending necessitates less diplomacy.

AT: Mindset Trade-off

1. Their evidence is all correlation – the type of government who would expand the military also tends to be the type of government who won't engage in diplomacy, but that doesn't prove that military spending necessitates less diplomacy.

AT: Multipolarity Better

1. Multipolarity prevents stability and makes great power wars inevitable. Political scientist Andrea Varisco writes in 2013 that a deterioration of American unipolarity would revert us back to the multipolar system at the beginning of the 20th century that caused two world wars. Varisco continues that multipolarity is inherently less stable than unipolarity because when there are multiple powers with similar strength, they're more likely to compete for power and influence because they think they can get ahead of their competitors.
2. Cross apply Walt from case, unipolarity means other countries don't rise up to challenge the US because they know they'll lose and it means regional powers don't start wars because they're afraid of the US intervening. Cross apply Khalilzad, who explains that transitioning to multipolarity by allowing the gap between the US and its rivals to close will cause conflict between great powers because they think they can get ahead and win in a conflict and it forces every small country into an arms race because they believe they think they have to defend themselves because the US will no longer guarantee regional stability because it stops intervening due to higher risks of escalation.

AT: Multilateralism Tradeoff

1. The link makes no sense; there's no reason the US would refuse to cooperate and accept help from other countries if it's in our interests.
2. Trump means we won't do multilateralism no matter what; he wants to withdraw from NATO and is planning on withdrawing funding from the UN; he wants to put America first, which means he won't cooperate with other countries.
3. They never prove that military strength trades off with multilateralism in all areas. At worst it just trades off in military sectors, but we can still work with other countries and have close alliances on all other issues.
4. Even if the US stops doing multilateralism, other countries will continue efforts at cooperation, which means your impacts happen in either world. None of your evidence says US efforts at multilateralism are uniquely key.
5. Multilateralism doesn't work. Richard Haas of the Council on Foreign Relations writes in 2014 that divergent national interests and the sheer number of states makes it impossible to have an effective multilateral world order.
6. Turn it, military power is the prerequisite to cooperation. Professor of government Stephen Brooks explains in 2013 that US military efforts to promote stability and US leadership make it easier to launch joint initiatives to cooperate on issues like terrorism, pandemics, and climate change because other countries respect us and are more likely to listen when we take the lead.

AT: Drones Bad

1. Nowhere do they prove that increased military spending would go to drones. All of their evidence is about how Obama expanded drone strikes but that doesn't mean anything because Trump is a complete break from status-quo foreign policy.
2. It's non-unique, their evidence says drone funding is increasing now despite budget cuts, meaning drones increase with or without increased military spending.
3. Drones are rarely used for killing people. Micah Zenko at Foreign Policy explains in 2012 that the vast majority of the time, drones are used for intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance missions.
4. If we win that a stronger military deters conflicts from starting this argument doesn't matter because there are fewer conflicts for the US to use drones in.

AT: Terrorism

1. Turn it, drones kill terrorists. Lawrence Kapp at the Congressional Research Service finds in 2016 that US operations against ISIL which have focused on air strikes and drones have killed 45,000 ISIL fighters. Daniel Byman at the Brookings Institute furthers that between 2008 and 2013, drone strikes killed 3,300 terrorist operatives in Pakistan and Yemen.
2. Drones make terrorist operations much harder, as Byman continues that drone strikes have forced terrorist organizations to stop using electronic communication, making recruiting and training much more difficult because terrorist organizations are too afraid to train new recruits for fear that a drone could wipe out their training camp. This outweighs because there's always going to be motivation for terrorism, so it's more important to constrain their ability to operate.

AT: Civilian casualties

1. Status quo improvements in drone targeting technology are solving, as Michael Lewis at the Atlantic reports in 2013 that the most recent drone strikes in Pakistan have a civilian casualty rate of 1.5%, which is lower than every other type of military technology.
2. Drones are better than the alternative, as Tom Weiner explains in 2014 that drones strikes kill civilians at a rate that is far less than ground troop operations.

AT: Anti-US Sentiment/Terrorism

1. No brightline. They can't tell you how much we need to increase spending to trigger their impacts.
2. This argument is non-unique. Military spending is already super high and even if they win that the US military has created new terrorist threats, those threats exist with or without higher military spending. Their own evidence indicates that anti-US sentiment and terrorism are already high because of past uses of our military.
3. No link. They never explain why more spending increases terrorists' motivation to attack us or why more spending means more military activism abroad, we just say that we should make our troops more ready and reassure our allies
4. Turn it, Dunn in the readiness argument says the reason past interventions have created things like terrorism is because readiness was low, affirming solves this problem and means we have interventions that end a conflict quickly and create long term peace, which means the US is seen as the actor that solved the conflict instead of the problem.
5. Turn it, higher military spending on drone strikes reduce terrorism. Daniel Byman at the Brookings Institute finds in 2013 that status quo drone strikes have killed thousands of terrorists and severely limited the training, communications, and recruitment efforts of terrorist organizations.
6. Turn it, spending can reduce terrorism by increasing homeland security. Professor of international relations Matthew Kroenig finds in 2015 that the use of existing homeland security measures and surveillance deters terrorists by convincing potential attackers that they'll fail.

AT: More interventions→ more terrorism

1. Even if they prove that interventions increase with higher spending, turn it, as communication professor Matthew Powers finds in 2011 that empirically, interventions prevent terrorist groups from acquiring the resources required for an effective terrorist campaign, constraining potential threats.

AT: US created ISIL

1. This isn't true. Michael Pregent at Foreign Policy explains in 2015 that the real reason ISIL has so much support is because the Iraqi government's Shiite militias committed widespread ethnic cleansing on the Sunni population, and ISIL is explicitly an anti-Shiite group.

AT: ISIL is a big threat

1. ISIL isn't a threat, as Alex Ward at the Center on International Security finds in 2015 that ISIL's main focus is on territory grabbing and doesn't care about attacking the US, with lone wolf ISIL attacks being relatively small.

AT: Al Qaeda is a big threat

1. Al Qaeda isn't a threat, as Kangil Lee at the International Center for Political Violence and Terrorism Research finds in 2015 that Al Qaeda has lost 28 of its 29 leaders to drone strikes, lacks any training centers, communications ability, or funding, and has only launched two successful attacks in the last 20 years.

AT: Nuclear terrorism impacts

1. There is no risk of nuclear terrorism, as Leonard Weiss at Stanford explains in 2015 that a terrorist organization acquiring nuclear weapons is virtually impossible, as building a nuclear weapon requires overcoming tons of technical barriers and, stealing a nuclear weapon is practically impossible due to layered safeguards and security, and acquiring a nuclear weapon willingly from a state won't happen because nuclear states fear retaliation from other nuclear states.

AT: Domestic Trade-offs (welfare, healthcare, etc)

1. No causal link, all their evidence is correlation and just says that politicians in the squo plan on funding increased military spending with welfare but that's just because the people who support military spending tend to also support welfare cuts.
2. This argument is non-unique, Trump and the Republican controlled House and Senate are already planning on drastically reducing spending on welfare, medicare, medicaid, and all the programs they talk about. With or without higher military spending, welfare is going to get cut.
3. There's no reason welfare has to get cut to fund the military, we can just do things like deficit spending.
4. Turn, Professor of political science Guy Whitten finds that politicians do not make a tradeoff between military spending and welfare, instead military spending increases employment and boosts the economy because military spending increases the number of civilians employed without crowding out the private sector. Martin Feldstein at Wall Street Journal quantifies in 2008 that a 5% increase in military spending would create 300,000 jobs. Comparatively more important because welfare just lifts people above the poverty line whereas jobs ensure long term upward mobility.
5. Not Topical — resolution requires both sides to impact to international conflict.

AT: Trump DAs

1. Non-unique. Trump is already president. Even if they're completely correct that Trump will wreak havoc militarily, he already has the largest military in the world with which to do so. Increasing spending doesn't change how crazy Trump is.
2. The military won't listen to Trump. Political science professor Peter Feaver explains in 2016 that in the event that Trump attempts to misuse the military, the armed forces would refuse to act, and would be legally correct in doing so.
3. Trump can't get through the red tape. International relations professor Stephen Walt explains in 2016 that the national security bureaucracy interfere with all of Trump's outlandish foreign policy proposals, preventing him from doing anything too crazy.
4. Trump's a people pleaser – he'll follow conventions so people will respect him. Damien Palletta at the Wall Street Journal furthers in 2016 that Trump's senior advisers have explicitly said that Trump intends to follow domestic and international consensus in the foreign policy sphere.

More Military doesn't listen cards

1. Economist Dan O'Brien furthers in 2016 that if Trump tries to follow through on his rhetoric, there will be an effective military mutiny in which military personnel refuse to follow orders.

AT: He's unpredictable (also probably just read this anyways)

1. Turn it, Trump's unpredictability is a ruse. Public Policy professor Peter Navarro explains in 2016 that Trump's unpredictability is actually just Trump utilizing the "madman" theory, in which he pretends to be an irrational actor to get adversaries like Russia, China, and North Korea to back down in the fear that Trump might actually lash out, when in fact, Trump is a completely rational actor and has no intention of doing something stupid.

AT: Police Militarization

1. It's non-unique, Tyler Durden at Zero Hedge explains in 2016 that police militarization has been dramatically increasing in recent years. The Neg doesn't solve, the problem gets worse in both worlds.
2. The impact is non-unique. It's already easy for police to get military grade weapons; any police force that wants them already has them and any police force that doesn't have them yet have made a purposeful choice not to.
3. Police violence has been a problem since before militarization. Police will always have guns — there is no reason that giving them bigger guns or vehicles makes the problem any worse.
4. Turn it, since police want military weapons no matter what, it's better to give it out for free because as Alex Kane at Salon explains in 2015, otherwise police departments raise the money to fund militarization through ramping up SWAT raids to seize cash from citizens.

AT: DHS Grants Link

1. This isn't topical, as The National Priorities Project explains in 2014 that Department of Homeland Security is not designated as military spending.

AT: Surplus Equipment link

1. Their evidence is outdated, Beth Griffith at the 109 reports in 2016 that the surplus equipment transfer program was ended when Obama issued an executive order mandating that police departments return military equipment to the government.
2. Most equipment transfers aren't weapons, as John Harper at Stars and Stripes reports in 2014 that only 5% of equipment transfers are weapons, and less than 1% are vehicles, with most of the transfers being things like office equipment and first aid supplies. Harper furthers that the Pentagon reviews all requests to prevent police departments from getting unreasonable items like tanks.

AT: Provokes China

1. Empirics don't support their claim – China is always as aggressive as it can afford to be. Shaohan Lin at the Journal of Military and Strategic Studies finds in 2015 Journal that China has been aggressive for decades, even when US military spending was low, and that US deterrence is the only thing stopping further expansion.
2. Turn, our military weakness emboldens China. Bruce Klingner at the Asian Studies Center explains in 2015 that the Chinese perception that the “U.S. rhetoric has not been backed by sufficient resources” has emboldened China to act more aggressively in the region. Political scientist James Fearon furthers in 2001 that in three empirical examples when the forces deterring China weakened, they became more aggressive and grabbed territory.

AT: Coop/Relations Impacts

1. They never prove cooperation is succeeding in the status-quo, in fact, we'd argue that cooperation between the US and China is doomed because of Trump.
 - a. China won't cooperate with Trump because he has been hostile and talking with Taiwan.
 - b. Trump won't cooperate with China – he already turned down their pleas to work together on climate change.
2. Asia pivot should have triggered all the impacts — we've dramatically increased our military presence in Asia since Obama, which means if China was going to cut cooperation, it would have already happened.
3. No warrant for spillover — just because China doesn't like the US increasing spending doesn't mean they suddenly stop wanting to cooperate to solve climate change, at worst they'll just stop cooperating with us militarily.

AT: Military spending increases

1. Global Security reports in 2016 that over the past 20 years, China has increased military spending by almost double digit percentages every year, even when the US cut spending. They'll just keep increasing spending in either world, which is why it's important to widen the spending gap to prevent regional arms races. Global security continues that China's military growth has slowed recently due to decreasing economic growth, which means the US would be able to increase spending faster than China and widen the gap.
2. Even if China increases military spending in response to the US, it does not result in an arms race or high risk of conflict. Shaohan Lin at the Journal of Military and Strategic Studies writes in 2015 that China only increases its defensive capabilities in response to the US and actively avoids creating a military presence that would compromise security in the Asia Pacific region.

AT: Rising Power / Thucydides Trap

1. The US and Chinese relationship is unique – their historical analysis is not relevant. Michael Beckley of the Belfer Center writes in 2012 that because of globalization, the US is unlike any past superpower, and China is unlike any past rising power, so “laws of history do not apply to contemporary world politics.”

AT: General Aggression

1. China can't continue to be aggressive. Dan Blumenthal of the American Enterprise Institute explains in 2016 that President Xi can't increase Chinese aggression over the squo because A, it would tank his political image at home, B, China's economy is stagnating and can't support further aggression, C, China's economy is completely dependent on the US allowing them access to sea lanes for trade, and D, China's military is already overstretched and is spread too thin.
2. China will not invade any of its neighbors. Sociologist Salvatore Babones writes in 2015 that China has no incentive to invade any of the countries people often claim they might because the economic and national interests they have are not strong enough. He also explains that no war in history has escalated from small military accidents. [He specifically mentions South Korea, Taiwan, the Philippines, Vietnam, Laos, and Myanmar.

AT: Japan / Senkakus

1. ThinkProgress explains in 2014 that war between China and Japan is incredibly unlikely because A, China fears US nuclear retaliation, and B, the two countries have such strong economic ties.

AT: Taiwan

1. Zachary Keck of the Diplomat writes in 2014 that even absent the US threat, China wouldn't invade Taiwan because A, the rest of the world would backlash against China, and B, China would have to deal with Taiwanese resistance for years to come. The Taipei Times furthers in 2014 that China and Taiwan finalized a series of deals, signaling an increase in cooperation on various issues.

AT: SCS

1. China has been expanding in the South China Sea for decades and nothing has happened. Nicolas Jenny of Real Clear World writes in 2015 that there is little risk of conflict in the South China Sea because every actor has such deep economic ties in the region they would never risk it. Miscalculation is also unlikely. Steven Stashwick of the Diplomat writes in 2015 that the threat of miscalculation is overstated and small tensions are unlikely to escalate.

AT: US-China War

1. Political scientist Charles Glaser writes in 2011 that the nuclear deterrent will always be enough to prevent war from even being a possibility. Zachary Keck of the Diplomat furthers in 2014 that even a small conflict between the US and China wouldn't escalate into all out nuclear war because leaders would try to contain the conflict at every step due to mutually assured destruction.

AT: Provokes Russia

1. The US and Russia aren't going to be enemies much longer. NEIL MacFARQUHAR of the New York Times reports in November that Putin and Trump agreed to thaw relations and want to work together on strategic goals. This means A, the chance of US Russia conflict is at an all time low, and B, even if we did increase spending it wouldn't be used to deter Russia.
2. Russia is only weakening. Harry Kazianis of the Center for the National Interest reports in November that Russia is cutting its military due to demographic and economic challenges that it can't overcome.

AT: US Russia War

1. Russia can't go to war, as James Stewart at the New York Times writes in 2014 that Russia's economy is too vulnerable to fight a war and Russia is economically dependent on Europe for its oil and gas exports, making a conflict basically impossible.

AT: Baltics invasion

1. This is ridiculous. Doug Bandow at the Cato Institute explains in 2016 that Russia will never invade the Baltics because there isn't a large ethnic Russian population there and an invasion would spur population exodus, trigger economic collapse, and cause massive resentment among the Russian people. Even Putin called the idea of a Baltic invasion "nonsense".

AT: Provokes North Korea

1. Turn, higher military spending stops North Korean aggression. Bruce Klingner at the Asian Studies Center explains in 2015 that the perception that US commitments in Asia haven't been backed by sufficient resources has emboldened North Korea to increase its military spending and act more aggressively, whereas a stronger US military posture in Asia would deter this aggression.

AT: North Korea lashes out with nukes

1. North Korea won't suddenly launch nuclear weapons if the US increases military spending, as Euan McKirdy at CNN reports in 2016 that North Korea has explicitly stated that it won't use its nuclear arsenal unless another nuclear power invades it.

AT: North Korea invades another country

1. North Korea won't invade. Van Jackson at the Council on Foreign Affairs explains in 2015 that the idea that minor actions by the US or South Korea against North Korea could cause North Korea to escalate tensions to a destructive large scale conflict is simply false, as North Korea's track record proves that its primary goal is regime survival, meaning it will avoid escalating current tensions to a full on war because it would be suicide for the regime.

AT: North Korea collapses and causes loose nukes

1. North Korea won't collapse, as political science professor Chung-in Moon explains in 2015 that North Korea is currently internally stable because Kim Jong Un has consolidated his power base and the economy is improving and becoming more flexible and adaptive.

AT: North Korea increases military spending

1. Non-unique, North Korea has continually increased military spending for the last decade irrespective of US increases and decreases. They increase spending in either world.

AT: Arms Race/Security Dilemma

Uniqueness

1. Non-unique. There is a current trend towards higher military spending. Lauren Chadwick explains in 2016 that military spending has increased across the board in the long term despite US military budget cuts.
2. The impact is non-unique, as economics professor Michael Chossudovsky explains in 2016 that the US has already started an arms race with China, Russia, North Korea, and Iran.

Turns

1. Link turn, adversaries always want to catch up to US military capabilities so they can have more international power, so they accelerate their military spending when the US cuts its own because they think it's easier to catch up. Richard Palmer at The Trumpet confirms in 2015 that cuts to US military spending have made our allies not trust us and emboldened our adversaries, resulting in arms races in the Middle East, East Asia, and Eastern Europe.
2. Turn the link again, cross apply Khalilzad from C2 who explains that if the military spending gap between the US and other countries closes, it will trigger regional arms races in every global hotspot because other countries will no longer be sure that the US can overpower their enemies and will increase their own military capabilities to defend themselves. Outweighs on scope.
3. Turn the link again, the National Defense Panel explains in 2014 that a credible US commitment to the security of our allies prevents them from pursuing their own military capabilities to defend themselves from adversaries because they trust the US to defend them. Comparatively more important — China and Russia care more if our allies that neighbor them increase military spending because they see our allies as more likely to attack.

Delinks

1. No link. Professor Jack Levy finds in 2010 that there is no statistically significant tendency for countries to balance against the leading sea power, which is the US, despite any increases in military spending.
2. The warrant of the arg is incoherent — China and Russia would only increase military spending in response to the US if they thought the US might attack them, but they don't think that because they know the US has no incentive to start a war with a major power.

China

1. Inevitable — Global Security reports in 2016 that over the past 20 years, China has increased military spending by almost double digit percentages every year, even when the US cut spending. They'll just keep increasing spending in either world, which is why it's important to widen the spending gap to prevent regional arms races as per Khalilzad in C2.
2. We win the arms race —Global security continues that China's military growth has slowed recently due to decreasing economic growth, which means the US would be able to increase spending faster than China and widen the gap.

Russia

1. Inevitable — Russia always has an incentive to catch the US, Suslov says they've been increasing military spending a ton in recent years. They'll just keep increasing spending in either world, which is why it's important to widen the spending gap to prevent regional arms races as per Khalilzad in C2.
2. Reuters reports in 2016 that Russia is cutting military spending by 5% due to the slowing Russian economy, which has been devastated by sanctions and low oil prices. This means the US can increase spending faster than Russia and widen the gap.

Impact D on Arms race

1. No impact. Ian Sundstrom at The Diplomat explains in 2015 that arms races don't cause wars, as for a war to start, there needs to be military capability and the intent to attack, and historically, arms races like the Cold War only increase capability for war. Sundstrom continues that in the present day, countries like China have no intent to start a war using their expanded military capabilities.
2. No impact – their cards are all sampling biases because arms races occur when countries are close to war but they alone aren't the cause of war. Paul F. Diehl of the University of Georgia in 1985 confirms empirically that the chance of war does not increase during an arms race.

AT: Collier 2x increase

1. Misconstrued — collier just says increased military spending causes NEIGHBORS to double spending, so maybe Canada and Mexico increase spending but that's not what their impact scenario talks about.

AT: Rider

1. Rider says arms races only cause war when the countries are neighbors — which means there's no chance of the US-China/Russia war they talk about, but this doesn't take out our Khalilzad EV which says small countries around the world get into arms races with their neighbors when the spending gap closes.
2. Rider's dataset is from 1810 to 2000 — which means the vast majority of his data is super outdated and from a very different time period.

AT: Waste

1. You don't solve. Neg is squo, squo has lots of waste, it's an inevitable part of government spending that neither side fixes. Kimberly Amadeo writes that Congress has prevented the military from cutting unnecessary programs to become more efficient. This means that the military will not be able to reallocate funds and use the money more efficiently.
2. Turn, Mackenzie Eaglen explains that historically, implementing expensive initiatives to make the navy more cost efficient required increasing military spending, which means if you want to cut waste, the best way to do so is to vote aff.
3. This is a counterplan — they're saying to do what we're talking about while cutting waste military spending. Even if they win that squo waste cuts could fund our programs, we should just cut waste and still increase spending.
4. No link — nowhere do they prove increased spending goes to waste. Resolution says increased spending to respond to conflict, which means definitionally the resolution prevents money from being spent on waste.
5. Relatively unimportant — Diem Salmon at Heritage Foundation explains in 2015 that waste only makes up less than 1% of the DOD's budget. This means if we win the other 99% of spending is good, you should still vote aff.

Audit solves

1. Jim Garamone reports in 2016 that for the first time ever, the DOD is being completely audited to make sure they're following proper procedures and recommendations as a result of the audit will be followed. This is a double bind: either means the audit will find waste and eliminate it or it won't, and if it doesn't it means that waste is completely inevitable and they can't solve.

125B

1. The plan to cut 125 billion in waste will never happen. Bob Woodward at the Washington Post, who wrote the article they're citing, explains in 2016 that the people who commissioned the \$125 billion study called it "unrealistic", said that the plan failed to account for basic obstacles to restructuring the public sector, vastly overstated how bloated the military is, that the \$125 billion number was a ballpark number made up out of thin air, and that the plan to cut waste is completely dead.

AT: Heg Unsustainable

1. Decline isn't inevitable. Robert Merry at the National Interest explains in 2012 that the decline [of hegemony]... is a choice and is not an inevitable fate. The kinds of policies a great power wishes to pursue [are what determine whether hegemony lasts]." We argue that increasing military spending is one such policy that preserves hegemony.
2. Their historical analysis of past hegemons is irrelevant, Michael Beckley of the Belfer Center writes in 2012 that because of globalization, the US is unlike any past superpower, so "laws of history do not apply to contemporary world politics."

AT: PMCs Bad

1. PMCs are hired to fight wars or do special operations – they just assume more military spending would fund them more but they never prove that the government will have them do more operations with more money. We aren't currently fighting any ground wars, so there is no demand for PMCs.
2. We argue that by affirming you can prevent conflicts from the ever starting. This is always a better approach because A, there will be less conflicts to hire PMCs for, and B, it will save more lives overall because conflict is bloody regardless of whether we intervene or not.
3. Status quo solves. Stephen Lendman at the Center for Research on Globalization reports in 2010 that Obama has pushed for reforms to reduce PMC spending and shift outsourced work back to government. Matthew Gault at Reuters reports in 2016 that Trump also opposes the use of PMCs.

Turns

1. Turn. Because our military is not ready, we have to use PMCs because the lack of readiness makes the normal military more expensive than PMCs. Cross apply Dunn in case who says that the lack of military readiness caused the catastrophic failed interventions like we saw in Iraq when we outsourced to PMC's.
2. Turn. Erek Sanchez of finds in 2015 that military cuts prevent the military from providing security to civilian projects in war-torn regions like Iraq and Afghanistan, and PMCs fill the gap. Increased spending prevents these cuts.

Impact defense:

1. The impact is reverse causal — PMCS increase when conflict increases, not the other way around. Bruce Stanley of the University of Nebraska empirically finds that as the intensity of a conflict increases, more PMCs are sent in because they're seen as a viable way to resolve the conflict.
2. For this reason, Loven of the University of Nebraska finds in a 43 year analysis that PMCs empirically do not extend conflict duration or intensity.

AT: China decreasing mil spending now

1. This is factually wrong. Global Security reports in 2016 that this year, China increased military spending by 7.6%, which is lower military growth than past years due to the slowdown of economic growth within China.

AT: Selling Arms/Arms exports

1. Topicality. The resolution specifies that the increased spending goes towards international conflict response — increasing spending to sell more weapons isn't a response to international conflict, so the resolution takes out the link.
2. Non-unique. The US is the largest arms exporter in the world. Even if they somehow win one of their absurd internal links, the bad governments that want to use US weapons to crack down on human rights already have them from past arms deals according to their EV, so there's no marginal change in human rights violations. The bad governments that have been blocked from buying US arms in the past aren't suddenly going to be able to access the market post-spending increase either because the US has already made a conscious choice to not sell to those governments.
3. Turn the link, Reuters reports in 2016 that under Obama, military budget cuts caused an increase in arms exports because budget cuts meant that defense firms could no longer sell their weapons to the US government, so they had to sell them abroad to maintain profits.
4. Surplus equipment is almost never sold. Matt Apuzzo at the New York Times explains in 2014 that the majority of surplus equipment is either destroyed or transferred to police departments — not sold to other countries.
5. Squo solves — Lora Lumpe at the Open Society Foundation explains in 2014 that the Leahy Law requires that the State Department vet a group before exporting arms or sending military aid to them, and if the group is violating human rights or begins violating human rights after sending aid, the exports are cut off.
6. No link — this isn't how arms exporting works. Other countries come to the US in advance and we sign a contract to produce a certain number of weapons for them. Higher military spending doesn't mean other countries will want to buy more weapons from us.
7. No link — spending doesn't create new equipment, we just replace old equipment when the maintenance costs for old equipment is higher than buying new equipment. If we spend more, it just means we maintain old equipment until it gets too outdated and follows the natural trend of replacement.
8. No link — exporting arms means we SELL them to other countries and make a net profit, which means we have more money and can spend less on the military because our arms exports are used to fund other parts of the military. You can't increase spending on something that results in net savings.

AT: Military Aid Bad

1. Nowhere do they prove that increased military spending will somehow go towards military aid. Trump explicitly opposes sending money to other countries, there's practically a 0% chance of this happening.
2. They say aid is really low now, which no political support for increased aid because if there was, aid spending would be higher. This means higher military spending won't go to aid.
3. Squo solves — Lora Lumpe at the Open Society Foundation explains in 2014 that the Leahy Law requires that the State Department vet a group before exporting arms or sending military aid to them, and if the group is violating human rights or begins violating human rights after sending aid, the exports are cut off.
4. Turn, intervention is needed to deliver aid. Janice Stein of the National Academy Press writes in 2000 that organizations can't deliver aid in war torn regions because they lack to security to deliver the goods. However, the United States Institute of Peace explains that these organizations can use the US military for security, which happens more when we increase military spending. Joppe Ree in the 2009 Journal of Development Economics finds empirically that each 10% increase in aid reduces the probability that conflict continues by 8 percentage points.

AT: MIC Bad

1. Non-unique — The MIC has control of congress in the squo anyway. George Washington University Professor Jonathan Turley found in 2015 that there are already thousands of lobbyists in the military industrial complex that exert political control over Congress.
2. No link — increasing military spending doesn't make the MIC more powerful. At worse, military spending creates new contracts that fund the MIC's R&D projects to build new weapons and vehicles like fighter jets, but the money in those contracts has to go to R&D, they can't just redirect funding to lobbying efforts.
3. Link Turn — Decreasing military spending would cause the MIC to become desperate, causing them to increase lobbying in an effort to regain control of Congress. When spending increases, they have adequate funding for all their government contracts and are happy to just develop new weapons, and they don't have to fearmonger because their financial interests are more secure.

AT: Pell grants

1. Will Ragland at American Progress explains in 2016 that Trump intends to completely eliminate the department of education. This means pell grants disappear in either world, as Cory Turner at NPR explains in 2016 that eliminating the department of education would mean completely eliminating the pell grant program.

AT: Austerity

1. Underfunding the military makes it unprepared, not efficient. Empirically, Majumdar in case says cutting military spending specifically from 2013 to 2016 resulted in decreased readiness, not more efficiency. Postdates your EV.
2. Loren Thompson of Forbes writes in 2011 that military austerity will result in the loss of at least a million jobs because cuts will primarily affect workers that create new technology and result in fewer troops.
3. Turn, Mackenzie Eaglen explains that historically, implementing expensive initiatives to make the navy more cost efficient required increasing military spending, which means if you want to cut waste and improve efficiency, the best way to do so is to vote aff.
4. Military inefficiency is inevitable. Two reasons
 - a. James Carafano explains in 2010 that the reason for military inefficiencies are “overly prescriptive laws, particular demands, and whipsaw policies established by Congress.” Cutting the budget doesn’t change congressional policies.
 - b. Historically, Kimberly Amadeo writes that Congress has prevented the military from cutting unnecessary programs to become more efficient. This means that the military will not be able to reallocate funds and use the money more efficiently.
5. Even if austerity has efficiency benefits, realize that direct spending will always be better because efficiency caps out, but direct spending will always increase the cap of our hard power.

AT: Colleyville

1. No strategy reshape, Michael Meese at the Center for Strategic Research finds in 2014 that empirically, cutting military spending almost never results in reshaping strategy because political infighting about which projects to cut results in across the board cuts that don't force strategy changes.
2. Turn, even if strategy gets reshaped, Meese finds that cutting military spending results in the DOD being unable to implement their strategy because the military is too small to meet demands, increasing the risk of longer wars with higher casualties.
3. Turn, Meese continues that cutting military spending is inherently unstable because it causes politicians and lobbying groups to scramble to save pet projects from cuts, leaving no one focusing on spending to maintain our own security, ultimately resulting in more conflict.
4. Turn, Meese continues that austerity-esque cuts to military would embolden our adversaries and destroy our allies' confidence in the US.

AT: Econ Harms

1. Turn, Professor of political science Guy Whitten finds that military spending increases employment and boosts the economy because military spending increases the number of civilians employed without crowding out the private sector. Martin Feldstein at Wall Street Journal quantifies in 2008 that a 5% increase in military spending would create 300,000 jobs.
2. Turn: Military spending is on net beneficial for the economy. The institute for economics and peace in 2016 explains that military spending spurs economic demand particularly in periods of low growth, contributes to the development of new technologies, and results in more efficient income distribution.
3. This is happening empirically, as Jennifer Schultz of the National Conference of State Legislatures explains that military infrastructure contributes tremendously to personal income and gross state product creating upwards of 4.6 billion dollars in additional spending and 30,600 jobs in the state of Massachusetts where only 9 billion was invested.
4. Not topical — resolution dictates both sides must impact to international conflict

AT: Knight

The key card in the arg is Knight, who they cite as military spending leads to economic harms. However, Knight makes two key concessions.

1. He states that “the empirical literature, taken as a whole, yields a [neutral] answer to the question whether military spending cuts have a positive impact on growth.” Here, he is conceding that the majority of the literature shows no relation between military spending and growth and that his own article is the outlier. One article from supports my opponents” argument, but “the empirical literature, taken as a whole,” shows there is no relationship.

2. Knight states that “improvements international security would almost certainly result in improvements in the other economic variables that are significant determinants of economic growth.” That means that when you affirm, international security improves, and their own author says that this benefits the economy.

AT: Deficit Spending Bad

1. Non-unique — deficit already ridiculously high, if your link story was true all your impacts would have been happening already.
2. Diem Salmon at the Heritage Foundation explains in 2015 that federal health care, retirement, and welfare programs are the main drivers of the ever increasing deficit.

AT: Dollar Heg

1. No brightline — how much debt do we need to collapse dollar hegemony and why hasn't it happened yet.
2. Non-unique dollar heg is increasing now— Ambrose Pritchard at the Telegraph explains in 2016 that the dollar's share in international transactions has increased 20% since 2014 and there are no viable currencies to supplant the dollar, with the Euro being inherently unstable and the Yuan taking decades to make a dent. She concludes the world is more reliant on the dollar than ever. Proves your link args are wrong.
3. Inevitable — US govt always does deficit spending, no president is able to balance the budget since Bill Clinton.
4. No warrant for why debt destroys dollar hegemony, countries always have incentive to use the currency of a stable major power.
5. XA C2, loss of military dominance kills dollar hegemony too because if US is a declining hegemon there's a high incentive for other countries to switch to the currency of the rising power.

AT: China Rels DA

1. Asia pivot triggers the link — we've increased military presence and spending in Asia for past 5 years — proves the link story false because their EV says we're still cooperating with China.
2. Even if higher US spending pisses off China, no warrant for why it spills over and everyone stops cooperating on everything.
3. Cooperation between the US and China is already terminally low due to Trump:
 - a. China won't cooperate with Trump because he has been hostile and talking with Taiwan.
 - b. Trump won't cooperate with China — he already turned down their pleas to work together on climate change.

AT: Offshore Balancing

1. Literally a counterplan — you don't get to fiat that we suddenly adopt a completely new foreign policy approach with our military.
2. Doesn't solve the aff — our ev specifically says we need to widen the spending gap or everything will go to shit and that squo cuts and future cuts devastate readiness. Withdrawing and using our allies to balance can't stop others from closing the gap or improve troop readiness — and it probably decks cred and triggers allied prolif.
3. Thomas Fingar at Stanford University finds in 2014 that US attempts at offshore balancing in the past resulted in both world wars and forced the US to intervene militarily to restore stability. He continues that returning to the strategy would today would guarantee great power instability in Eurasia as countries compete to get ahead in the absence of the US.
4. Paul Salem at the Middle East Journal finds in 2016 that Obama's attempts at offshore balancing in the Middle East created a power vacuum that destabilized the region, resulted in multiple failed governments, and allowed for the resurgence of Al Qaeda and the creation of ISIL because the conventional cost benefit calculations that offshore balancing requires to be effective don't extend to terrorist groups.

Con

Racism Weighing Overview

1. Racism is a prerequisite to ethical decision-making. Sociology professor Albert Memmi writes in 2000 that rejecting every instance of racism is a prerequisite to all morality and creating an ethical society because to accept racism “to the slightest degree is to [the] endorse fear, injustice, and violence” that accompanies it.
2. The likelihood of high impact scenarios like wars are blown out of proportion, ignoring everyday violence. Philosophy professor Chris Cuomo explains in 1996 that a focus on future crises and wars distracts from the violence and oppression perpetrated by the militarized agents of the state like the police.

Spending Doesn't Solve Overview — ONLY **READ when we don't have blocks or when** **multiple advocacies**

There's no probability of their projects being funded. John Isaacs of the National Interest finds in 2016 that despite Pentagon requests, Congress tends to increase military spending on projects to satisfy constituents with job creation by spending on outdated technology and weapons and keeping empty missile silos open. This means when the Aff increases spending, it will go to projects that don't actually make the military stronger. In fact, Anup Shah at Global Issues finds in 2013 that the lion's share of military spending goes to international activities like interventions.

Arms Race Overview

Increased military spending would start a regional arms race in Asia. Gabriel Domínguez at Deutsche Welle explains in 2015 that Southeast Asia is on the brink of an arms race right now due to fears of Chinese aggression. Michael Swaine at the Carnegie Endowment finds in December that if the US doubled down on military spending, it would destroy cooperation with China and trigger an arms race. This is problematic for two reasons.

1. First, Toby Rider empirically finds in 2000 that arms races increase the chance of war by 5 times because there are no political barriers to escalation.
2. Second, Thomas Fingar of Stanford writes that only a cooperative relationship between the US and China can avoid great power wars, resource scarcity, economic collapse, environmental degradation, and increased carbon emissions.

Cuomo Overview

The Aff is focused on stopping future hypothetical crises[INSERT SPECIFIC LINK TO AN IMPACT IN THE AFF OR CX]. This is bad because philosophy professor Chris Cuomo explains in 1996 that this focus on future hypothetical crises and massive wars distracts from the oppression perpetrated by the militarized agents of the state like the police and creates complacency over the destructive effects of overseas militarism in things like military interventions because we're always focused on preventing low probability crises instead of addressing the violence sitting under our noses. Two implications.

- a. It's an independent reason the crisis rhetoric of the Aff is bad and reifies oppression by making the people in this round complacent to ongoing violence.
- b. It means our second and third contention always outweigh on probability and timeframe; your conflict scenarios will never happen but police violence and interventions are forms of ongoing, high probability, long term violence.

AT: Readiness

1. Spending doesn't solve. Kimberly Amadeo at The Balance explains in 2016 that the DOD already spends \$500 billion to maintain military readiness; if 500 billion isn't enough to keep readiness high, there's no reason to think higher spending will solve, especially when they don't give a brightline for how much more we need.
2. Readiness is high now. Tom Donilon at Foreign Policy explains in 2014 that the US defense budget is 5 times larger than the next highest spender and the military remains ready to defeat any adversary.
3. Readiness is no longer necessary, as Lawrence Kapp at the Congressional Research Service corroborates in 2016 that precision weaponry, technological advances, and tactical innovations have eliminated the need for a large number of combat ready troops.
4. The status quo is solving former CIA director David Petraeus writes in 2016 that the Army and Marine Corps are planning on putting a large percentage of their forces through training exercises to improve readiness in 2017, and 90% of military equipment is battle ready.
5. Increased interventions kill readiness, as Jack Spencer at the Davis Institute for International Studies explains in 2000 that using the US military abroad in multiple missions strains resources and reduces readiness by wearing out troops and equipment faster and reducing funding for training exercises.

MORE READINESS WORTHLESS:

Economist Satyajit Das explains in 2014 that the US has maintained military superiority by shifting its focus away from things like troop readiness to technological dominance through drones and other sophisticated weapons systems.

AT: Recruitment Link

1. They just prove trump generally supports more troops, not that he supports hiring more DOD recruiters, which is what their 10% increase leads to 4% higher recruitment card talks about

AT: Wages Link

1. Wages are already incredibly high. Ryan McMaken of the Mises Institute finds in 2015 that US soldiers earn above the 80th percentile of civilian earnings.
2. McMaken continues that the DoD has met their target goal for wages, which means they have no probability that funding would go to wages.

AT: Dunn

- a. Super misconstrued — Dunn only says low readiness means we get destroyed in early battles and lots of troops die — he doesn't say low readiness is the reason interventions create power vacuums, terrorism, and recurring conflict.
- b. No warrant for why having a strong military avoids creating long term instability, there have been plenty of interventions with a ready military that were still bad.
- c. No empirical example of a single intervention that was good because the military was ready.

AT: Navy Specific

1. Squo solves, Gregg Easterbrook at the New York Times explains in 2015 that the US has 10 nuclear powered naval supercarriers, more than the rest of the world, and still maintains complete naval dominance, with no other nations rivaling the US navy.

AT: Deterrence (Generic)

1. DETERRENCE DOESN'T WORK: Military strategist Sean Larkin explains in 2011 that because other countries are unpredictable and don't think like the US, we can't make calculated decisions to deter them. Political science professor James Fearon confirms in 2002 that of 58 different encounters, only 2 attempts to deter a conflict were successful. That's a success rate of less than 4%.
2. Turn, deterrence causes miscalculation and conflict. Dallas Boyd at Strategic Studies Quarterly finds in 2016 that US attempts to coerce and deter adversaries will prompt adversaries to misjudge the robustness of deterrence, and, believing in their own military capacities, miscalculate and start a conflict with the US.
3. Turn, deterrence goes too far and we try to deter threats before they even exist. Political scientist Chris Fettweis writes in 2010 that the US obsession with deterrence leads to an inflated perception of threat and therefore creates preventative wars like the one in Iraq that ultimately exacerbate conflict. He finds that historically when the US cut military spending the amount of conflict actually went down.

More Cards:

4. OTHER COUNTRIES RESPOND WEIRD: Michael Ruhle at NATO furthers in 2016 that other leaders may adopt risky offensive strategies in response to attempts at deterrence and that other countries have different cost-benefit calculus that render deterrence ineffective.
5. CAN'T PREDICT: Defense professor Keith Payne explains in 2015 that while deterrence theory can predict how leaders should behave, it can't be used to make confident predictions because of the gap between theory and how leaders actually make decisions.

AT: Credibility/Commitment/Allied Assurances

1. Trump means our credibility is already doomed. Khang Vu at The Diplomat explains in 2016 that Trump intends to withdraw the US's commitment to the security of our allies and that his victory signals to our Asian allies that the US will no longer defend them.
2. TURN: US security umbrellas increase conflict. Ben Friedman of CATO in 2012 outlines two reasons for this.
 - a. US commitments embolden countries to take risks that they would have otherwise not have, leading to more provocation and conflict, AND
 - b. It can cause adversaries to feel more threatened and leads to arms races and higher tensions.
3. TURN: Focusing on credibility sets up misperceptions that lead to unneeded conflict. Political scientist Chris Fettweis writes in 2010 that the US obsession with credibility leads to an inflated perception of threat and therefore creates preventative wars like the one in Iraq that ultimately exacerbate conflict.
4. This should have already happened, as international relations professor David Kang finds in 2015 that if US military disengagement from Asia was going to start an arms race, it would have happened already because the US troop presence in Asia has decreased 90% over the past generation.
5. TURN IMPACT: Political science professor Paul MacDonald finds in 2011 that reducing military spending and partially withdrawing from trying to unilaterally manage global affairs would "not undermine the credibility of U.S. alliance commitments," and that "By incrementally shifting burdens to regional allies and multilateral institutions, the United States can [actually] strengthen the credibility of its core commitments." MacDonald finds that empirically, decreased US troop presence in South Korea and Taiwan actually resulted in improved relations and decreased regional tensions.

AT: Allies abandon us

1. This makes no sense. Even if the US appears slightly weaker to allies, Tom Donilon at Foreign Policy explains in 2014 that the US is still the largest military power by far, allies still have an incentive to stay with the US.
2. Should have happened already, we've been cutting spending since 2011 and none of our allies have abandoned us to bandwagon with another country.

Extra terminal D

1. Military spending doesn't affect credibility unless it goes to defending our allies. In fact, Jonathan Solomon at Georgetown University explains in 2014 that the key determining factor for whether a deterrent is credible is the presence of forward deployed troops. Unfortunately, increased military spending won't fund more forward deployed troops to help our allies, as Khang Vu at The Diplomat explains in 2016 that Trump will withdraw the US's forward deployed troops from our allies like Japan and South Korea.

AT: Alliances solve generic conflict

1. Non-unique, their EV just says having an alliance reduces conflict, but we already have alliances and they don't prove that those alliances will completely END without increased military spending.
2. NO IMPACT: Decreasing allied commitments doesn't cause conflict, Ted Carpenter of the CATO institute reports in 2013 that if US power declined in Europe, the EU and its allies would still be sufficient to deter Russia in Europe. Carpenter continues that if the US withdrew from in declined, other countries like Japan, South Korea, and Australia could pick up the slack and create a regional balance of power.

AT: Asia Cred

1. This should have already happened, as international relations professor David Kang finds in 2015 that if US military disengagement from Asia was going to start an arms race, it would have happened already because the US troop presence in Asia has decreased 90% over the past generation.
2. Trump means our credibility is already doomed. Khang Vu at The Diplomat explains in 2016 that Trump intends to withdraw the US's commitment to the security of our allies and that his victory signals to our Asian allies that the US will no longer defend them. Vu furthers in 2016 that Trump will withdraw the US's forward deployed troops from our allies like Japan and South Korea.

AT: SoKo Prolif

1. Se Young Jang at the Harvard Belfer Center explains in 2016 that South Korea will never go nuclear due to internal dissent from the populous, the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, international pressure, lack of access to nuclear material due to treaties with the US, and the risk of political and economic backlash.
2. Troy Stangrone at the Korea Economic Institute of America finds in 2016 that if South Korea pursued nuclear weapons, the countries that export nuclear reactor fuel to South Korea would cease exports. Because South Korea is completely dependent on imports to fuel its nuclear reactors, which provide one third of its electricity, Stangrone concludes that South Korea won't pursue nuclear weapons.

AT: Japan Prolif

1. Japan won't nuclearize Mark Fitzpatrick at the International Institute for Strategic Studies explains in 2016 Fitzpatrick continues that within Japan's nuclear technology field, there exist numerous anti-nuclear whistleblower scientists and engineers who could immediately veto any attempt at nuclearization.
2. Fitzpatrick continues that internal study ever conducted that has taken into account Japan's motivations and capabilities concludes that there are numerous social, economic, and political factors that will stop Japan from nuclearizing.
3. Se Young Jang at the Harvard Belfer Center explains in 2016 that Japan will never go nuclear due to internal dissent from the populous, the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, international pressure, and the risk of political and economic backlash.

AT: NPT Collapse

Even if Japan and South Korea nuclearize, the NPT won't collapse. Liviu Horovitz at the Center for Security Studies finds in 2015 that in order for the NPT to collapse, more than twenty countries would have to leave the treaty, or over one third of the members.

AT: Cred solves China aggression

Turn it, shoring up cred by appearing more active in Asia causes more Chinese aggression, as Political scientist Robert Ross writes in 2012 that empirically, when the US increased its presence in Asia, China responded by not only ramping up aggression and territorial claims but also by cutting off cooperation on key issues like North Korean nuclear weapons.

AT: Cred solves North Korean aggression

Turn it, shoring up cred by appearing more active in Asia causes more North Korean aggression. North Korea's Pyongyang Broadcasting Station reports in 2003 that the North Korean government views the US military policy as an aggressive attempt to dominate North Korea, and sees itself as simply acting in self defense when it responds militarily. Empirically, Euan McKirdy at CNN reports in 2016 that joint military exercises between the US and South Korea prompted North Korea to test new ballistic missiles.

AT: Cred solves Arms Race

This should have already happened, as international relations professor David Kang finds in 2015 that if US military disengagement from Asia was going to start an arms race, it would have happened already because the US troop presence in Asia has decreased 90% over the past generation.

AT: Prevents Genocide

1. Funding isn't needed to intervene in genocides – it's a question of political resolve. We are even intervening in Syria right now, but we aren't stopping the genocide.
2. The US will never intervene to stop genocide. Chaim Kaufmann of Foreign Affairs writes in 2002 that because there is never enough domestic support for the US to respond to genocides, American has historically failed to stop genocides.
3. Turn it: interventions increase genocide. Reed Wood of the Journal of Peace Research finds in 2012 that "interventions shift the balance of power between conflict actors," leading the weakened side to get increasingly desperate, causing them to intensify violence. He finds that civilian deaths increase by 25% to 40% during an intervention.
4. Turn it: because interventions entrench political divides and force the weakened side to double down on their convictions, there is a lower chance of negotiation. Nicholas Sambanis of the World Bank quantifies in 2000 that external interventions cause conflicts to last on average 6 times longer.
5. XA Kenwick 94% chance recur

AT: Krain / Diverts Resources Warrant

Krain concludes that there is a marginally lower chance that killings escalate. Even if that's true, the conflict lasts longer and which means more people die on net.

AT: Drones Good

UNIQUENESS:

1. Nowhere do they prove that increased military spending would go to drones. All of their evidence is about how Obama expanded drone strikes but that doesn't mean anything because Trump is a complete break from status-quo foreign policy.
2. It's non-unique, drone funding is increasing now despite budget cuts, meaning drones increase with or without more military spending.

TURNS:

1. Turn it, drone strikes increase terrorism. Law professor Thomas Donnell finds in 2012 that US drone strikes legitimize the message of terrorist organizations that the US is at war with Islam, strengthening terrorist organizations both internally and externally and boosting terrorist recruitment. Peter Bergen at the Institute for Labor Economics finds empirically in 2011 that a terrorist attack is 8.8% more likely in the 5 days following a successful drone strike.
3. Turn it, drone strikes kill civilians. Hira Bashir at Brown University finds in 2014 that empirically, 94% of US drones strikes killed between 8 and 15 civilians for every terrorist killed.
4. Turn it, drone strikes destroy the US's international credibility. Doyle McManus at the LA Times explains in 2014 that the use of drone strikes has prompted global backlash to America from the entire international community and hasn't reduced the amount of terrorism. This outweighs because if other countries don't respect the US, they won't cooperate with the US to fight terrorism, which is a prerequisite to solving since the unilateral US attempt to fight terrorism over the last decade hasn't worked.

AT: Solves Civil Wars

1. Civil wars are decreasing now, as the Human Security Report Project finds in 2014 that the number of civil wars has declined substantially since the end of the Cold War and that most modern civil wars have relatively low fatality counts, whereas interstate conflicts kill far more people.
2. Turn it, intervening in a civil war makes the conflict worse for four reasons.
 - a. Interventions make the initial conflict more deadly, as the Human Security Report finds in 2012 that civil wars with third party interventions are twice as deadly as those without interventions because interventions result in at least one side gaining access to more destructive weapons.
 - b. They make conflicts last longer, as Nicholas Sambanis of the World Bank finds in 2000 that civil wars with intervention last 6 times longer than those without because interventions prevent diplomatic solutions that would end the conflict peacefully.
 - c. They cause future conflicts, as Professor Michael Kenwick finds in 2014 that civil conflicts with interveners are 94% more likely to reignite into a new conflict because interventions disrupt the functioning of society and inspire resentment among the populous, making a future war more likely, even if the intervention leads to a peace deal.
 - d. They increase civilian casualties, as professor of politics Reed Wood finds in 2014 that third party support for one actor in a civil war shifts the balance of power, causing the non-supported actor killing 25 to 40% more civilians to try to maintain control and gather more resources for war.

AT: Deter Civil wars

This is non-unique, the US military is already significantly stronger than any potential rebel group. The thing that deters rebels from starting a civil war is whether or not they think the US is willing to intervene, which doesn't change with increased spending.

AT: China

DE-LINKS:

1. US hegemony is not the cause of modern peace. Ben Friedman of George Washington University writes in 2014 that “factors other than US power are diminishing war” such as globalization and nuclear proliferation. Chris Fettweis of Tulane University finds empirically in 2011 that “there is no evidence to support a direct relationship between the...level of US activism and international stability.” Instead, “the world grew more peaceful while the United States cut its forces.”
2. There are alternatives to US deterrence. Ted Carpenter of the CATO institute reports in 2013 that if US hegemony in Asia declined, other countries like Japan, South Korea, and Australia could pick up the slack and create a regional balance of power.
3. Political scientist Charles Glaser writes in 2011 that even if China surpassed the US in military power, the nuclear deterrent would still be enough to prevent war from even being a possibility. Zachary Keck of the Diplomat furthers in 2014 that even a small conflict between the US and China wouldn't escalate into all out nuclear war because leaders would try to contain the conflict at every step due to mutually assured destruction.

TURNS:

1. TURN IT: The more we threaten China, they more aggressive they become. Political scientist Robert Ross writes in 2012 that when the US increased its presence in Asia, China responded by not only ramping up aggression and territorial claims but also by cutting off cooperation on key issues like North Korean nuclear weapons. This is important as Thomas Fingar of Stanford writes that only a cooperative relationship between the US and China can avoid great power wars, resource scarcity, economic collapse, environmental degradation, and increased carbon emissions.
2. XA Arms race - Swaine and Rider.
3. TURN IT: China is going to rise either way, we should let them do it peacefully. IR professor Christopher Layne writes in 2008 that China will inevitably rise to power, so “if the United States tries to maintain its current dominance in East Asia, Sino-American conflict is virtually certain” during the transition because the US strategy demands anticipatory violence in order to maintain dominance.

AT: General Aggression

China will not invade any of its neighbors. Sociologist Salvatore Babones writes in 2015 that China has no incentive to invade any of the countries people often claim they might because the economic and national interests they have are not strong enough. He also explains that no war in history has escalated from small military accidents. [He specifically mentions South Korea, Taiwan, the Philippines, Vietnam, Laos, and Myanmar].

AT: Japan / Senkakus

ThinkProgress explains in 2014 that war between China and Japan is incredibly unlikely because A, China fears US nuclear retaliation, and B, the two countries have such strong economic ties.

AT: Taiwan

Zachary Keck of the Diplomat writes in 2014 that even absent the US threat, China wouldn't invade Japan because A, the rest of the world would backlash against China, and B, China would have to deal with Taiwanese resistance for years to come. The Taipei Times furthers in 2014 that China and Taiwan finalized a series of deal, signaling an increase in cooperation on various issues.

AT: SCS

China has been expanding in the South China Sea for decades and nothing has happened. Nicolas Jenny of Real Clear World writes in 2015 that there is little risk of conflict in the South China Sea because every actor has such deep economic ties in the region they would never risk it. Miscalculation is also unlikely. Steven Stashwick of the Diplomat writes in 2015 that the threat of miscalculation is overstated and small tensions are unlikely to escalate.

AT: US-China War

Political scientist Charles Glaser writes in 2011 that even if China surpassed the US in military power, the nuclear deterrent would still be enough to prevent war from even being a possibility. Zachary Keck of the Diplomat furthers in 2014 that even a small conflict between the US and China wouldn't escalate into all out nuclear war because leaders would try to contain the conflict at every step due to mutually assured destruction.

AT: North Korea

1. There are alternatives to US deterrence. Ted Carpenter of the CATO institute reports in 2013 that if US hegemony in Asia declined, other countries like Japan, South Korea, and Australia could pick up the slack and create a regional balance of power.
2. Turn it, increasing military spending and being more active in Asia makes North Korea lash out. North Korea's Pyongyang Broadcasting Station reports in 2003 that the North Korean government views the US military policy as an aggressive attempt to dominate North Korea, and sees itself as simply acting in self defense when it responds militarily. Empirically, Euan McKirdy at CNN reports in 2016 that joint military exercises between the US and South Korea prompted North Korea to test new ballistic missiles.

AT: North Korea lashes out with nukes

North Korea won't suddenly launch nuclear weapons if the US doesn't increase military spending, as Euan McKirdy at CNN reports in 2016 that North Korea has explicitly stated that it won't use its nuclear arsenal unless another nuclear power invades it.

AT: North Korea invades another country

North Korea won't invade. Van Jackson at the Council on Foreign Affairs explains in 2015 that North Korea's track record proves that its primary goal is regime survival, meaning it will avoid escalating current tensions to a full on war which could result in the regime collapsing.

AT: North Korea collapses and causes loose nukes

North Korea won't collapse, as political science professor Chung-in Moon explains in 2015 that North Korea is currently internally stable because Kim Jong Un has consolidated his power base and the economy is improving and becoming more flexible and adaptive.

AT: Middle East

1. Middle Eastern instability is a recurring problem that can't be solved by US intervention. Marc Lynch of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace writes in 2017 that countless American approaches to the Middle East have all failed and only resulted in more instability because they can't address the underlying ideological and political divides.
2. TURN: American presence causes more terrorism. Lynch continues that "A more assertive America, whether in Syria or elsewhere, would likely produce yet another surge of anti-Americanism in response." Eric Neumayer of the London School of Economics finds in a 2011 study that all forms of American military support in the Middle East increase terrorism.

AT: Funding for fighting ISIL

1. Status quo solves, as Zack Beauchamp at Vox reports in 2015 that ISIL is losing ground and power in the status quo and is severely outnumbered.
2. ISIL isn't a threat, as Alex Ward at the Center on International Security finds in 2015 that ISIL's main focus is on territory grabbing and doesn't care about attacking the US, with lone wolf ISIL attacks being relatively small.
3. Turn, James Fearon of Stanford University writes in 2015 that US attempts to fight ISIL crowd out other local parties from fighting ISIL, which is crucial as he concludes that the only good way to get rid of ISIL in the long run is to let local actors deal with it.
4. Third contention turns, intervening in Iraq destabilized the entire region and created the conditions for ISIL's rise, intervening to fight ISIL just continues the cycle.

AT: Fund the Syrian Rebels

1. Trump would never do this. Political science professor Marc Lynch confirms in 2017 that he directly opposes the Syrian rebels – he's much more likely to support Assad against the re
2. Funding isn't the problem. Jim Sciotto of CNN reports in 2015 that despite allocating significant funding, efforts to support the Syrian rebels are failing because A, recruits are physically unfit and often underage, B, recruits are quitting in mass numbers and going home, C, the rebels just want to fight Assad not ISIS.
3. This isn't topical. The resolution requires the US to increase spending to make itself better at responding to conflict, not improve the conflict response of an external group like the Free Syrian Army.

AT: Fund the Kurds

1. This isn't topical. The resolution requires the US to increase spending to make itself better at responding to conflict, not improve the conflict response of an external group like the Kurds.
2. If the Kurds are succeeding at fighting ISIL in the status-quo, there's no reason to give them US money.
3. There is zero probability of this happening. No one in power is proposing funding the Kurds, and there's no evidence that increased military spending would go to the Kurds.

AT: Heg Good

IMPACT DEFENSE

US hegemony is not the cause of modern peace. Ben Friedman of George Washington University writes in 2014 that “factors other than US power are diminishing war” such as globalization and nuclear proliferation.

Probably Don't read

Chris Fettweis of Tulane University finds empirically in 2011 that “there is no evidence to support a direct relationship between the...level of US activism and international stability.” Instead, “the world grew more peaceful while the United States cut its forces.”

FIRE RETRENCHMENT CARD:

1. The decline of hegemony will not result in disaster. Political science professor Paul MacDonald finds in 2011 that empirically, the decline of hegemony doesn't cause higher rates of conflict and that US decline will be gradual and controlled, meaning it wouldn't spark great power conflicts because there would be no incentive to start a potentially devastating war. He furthers that decline wouldn't start regional arms races because a gradual decline avoids the Chinese expansionism that would start arms races.
2. Turn, MacDonald finds that reducing military spending and adopting a policy of retrenchment in which the US partially withdraws from trying to unilaterally manage global affairs would allow the US to shift security burdens to its allies and multilateral institutions, avoiding the unnecessary military clashes that come with forward deployments while ensuring that China rises peacefully by signalling the US's willingness to accommodate China's rise.

HEG COLLAPSE INEVITABLE:

1. US hegemony is unsustainable. Because of China's inevitable rise, Richard Maher of Brown University writes in 2010 that the US cannot maintain its global power status for very long and needs to start planning for the multipolar world.
2. Trump will destroy hegemony in both worlds. Thomas Wright of the Brookings institute writes in 2016 that Donald Trump will "liquidate the US-led liberal order by ending America's alliances [and] closing the open global economy.
3. Interventions destroy hegemony, so if we win that interventions increase we turn the link. David Smith at the Guardian finds in 2016 that the invasion of Iraq did huge damage to America's international standing, and another invasion today would guarantee that China becomes a superpower and would weaken America.

ALLOWING CHINA RISE GOOD:

1. Trying to outpace China triggers an arms race. Michael Swaine at the Carnegie Endowment finds in December that if the US doubled down on military spending, it would trigger an arms race with China. This would be disastrous, as Political science professor Toby Rider finds in 2000 that arms races increase the chance of war by 5 times because there are higher diplomatic tensions.
2. Pursuing hegemony causes China to cut off cooperation. Political scientist Robert Ross writes in 2012 that when the US increased its presence in Asia, China responded by cutting off cooperation on key issues like North Korean nuclear weapons. This is problematic because Thomas Fingar of Stanford writes that only a cooperative relationship between the US and China can avoid great power wars, resource scarcity, economic collapse, environmental degradation, and increased carbon emissions.
3. China is going to rise either way, we should let them do it peacefully. IR professor Christopher Layne writes in 2008 that China will inevitably rise to power, so “if the United States tries to maintain its current dominance in East Asia, Sino-American conflict is virtually certain” during the transition because the US strategy demands anticipatory violence in order to maintain dominance.

Heg Deters Nuke Prolif:

TURN: Political scientist Charles Glaser writes in 2011 that the reason other states aren't counterbalancing and proliferating nuclear weapons "Is not best explained by America's large advantage in power. Instead, the key reason states are not energetically balancing against the United States is because they do not believe that the United States poses a large threat to their vital interests," and that if that were to change due to an aggressive increase in military spending "Countries would likely increase their defence spending and the pressures created by insecurity would likely lead to improved coordination of the acquisition of military forces"

If deters enemies:

TURN: According to Butler Professor Harry van der Linden in 2009, the overwhelming power of the United States' conventional military force is what forces other countries to proliferate in the first place. Lindern explains that "Countries... can largely avoid [the] predicament of conventional military powerlessness by creating a credible deterrent against potential U.S. aggression [through acquiring] nuclear weapons," and that as a result, " nuclear proliferation is a security cost of American military hegemony."

AT: Russia

1. The US and Russia aren't going to be enemies much longer. NEIL MacFARQUHAR of the New York Times reports in November that Putin and Trump agreed to thaw relations and want to work together on strategic goals. This means A, the chance of US Russia conflict is at an all time low, and B, even if we did increase spending it wouldn't be used to deter Russia.
2. There are alternatives to US deterrence. Ted Carpenter of the CATO institute reports in 2013 that if US power declined in Europe, the EU would still be sufficient to deter Russia in Europe.
3. Russia is only weakening. Harry Kazianis of the Center for the National Interest reports in November that Russia is cutting its military due to demographic and economic challenges that it can't overcome.
4. TURN IT: Michael Kofman of Kennan Institute in November writes that military shows of force only undermine our relationship with Russia because they're seen as the US being unnecessarily aggressive, increasing the chance of a crisis.

AT: US Russia War

Russia can't go to war, as James Stewart at the New York Times writes in 2014 that Russia's economy is too vulnerable to fight a war and Russia is economically dependent on Europe for its oil and gas exports, making a conflict basically impossible.

AT: Baltics invasion

This is ridiculous. Doug Bandow at the Cato Institute explains in 2016 that Russia will never invade the Baltics because there isn't a large ethnic Russian population there and an invasion would spur population exodus, trigger economic collapse, and cause massive resentment among the Russian people. Even Putin called the idea of a Baltic invasion "nonsense."

AT: Military Aid

1. Nowhere do they prove that increased military spending will somehow go towards military aid. Trump explicitly opposes sending money to other countries, there's practically a 0% chance of this happening.
2. Turn it, military aid causes terrorism. Political science professor Eric Neumayer finds in 2011 that because military aid, which mostly goes to Middle Eastern countries, legitimizes the message of terrorist organizations that the US is at war with Islam, a one standard deviation increase in US military aid increases the amount of Anti-American terrorism by 135%.
3. They say aid is really low now, which means there's no political support for increased aid because if there was aid would be higher. This means higher military spending won't go to aid.
4. Turn it, military aid recipients feel more emboldened powerful hegemon on their side, decreasing the chance of them cooperating to end the conflict. Brock Tessman of the University of Georgia finds empirically in 2011 that more military aid decreases country's' willingness to cooperate.

AT: Humanitarian Aid

1. This argument isn't topical. Humanitarian and developmental foreign aid are not a form of military spending — they're done by the State Department, which is definitionally not the military.
2. Nowhere do they prove that increased military spending will somehow go towards humanitarian aid. Trump explicitly opposes sending money to other countries, there's practically a 0% chance of this happening.
3. They say aid is really low now, which means there's no political support for increased aid because if there was aid would be higher. This means higher military spending won't go to aid.
4. Turn it, Rebecca Morton at the University of Bristol finds in 2014 that empirically, military operations trade off with funding for developmental and humanitarian aid. This means if we win that increased spending causes more wars, there will be less aid.

Impact turns:

1. Aid increases the chance of war. Mary Anderson at the Collaborative for Development Action finds in 1999 that when aid agencies start helping civilians in another country, it frees up the government's resources for civilians, which are then redirected towards funding war efforts. This:
 - a. Makes wars more likely to start. Richard Nielsen from the Department of Government at Harvard University finds that regardless of the amount of aid, each unit increase in aid leads to a 2 unit increase in armed conflict, AND,
 - b. Makes wars more deadly. Daniel Strandow from Uppsala University finds that a greater funding concentration increased military fatalities by 40% compared to if there were low or no funding.
2. Aid causes human rights violations. Michael Shank at US News finds in 2013 that empirically, US aid to countries like Ethiopia and Kenya has been used to repress civil society, crackdown on dissent, reduce civil rights, and torture refugees. Daniel Langenkamp at the Fletcher School of Law corroborates in 2002 that US aid has gone to corrupt governments and results in less governmental accountability, more structural violence and human rights violations, and directly increases the chance that genocide is ignored.
3. Long Term Democratic Failure. Because aid goes to corrupt leaders and has non-ideal distribution, Oeindrila Dubey from NYU outlines how foreign aid not only leads to increased attacks and conflict, there are increased assassinations of political figures and less voter turnout, leading to an ultimate long term "undermining [of] domestic political institutions."
4. Political Cooperation. Patricia Sullivan from the University of Georgia in 2011 finds that US military aid significantly reduces cooperative foreign policy behavior with the US because the US can no longer incentivise cooperation with future aid, as the country is already receiving it.

AT: Nation Building

1. They never prove we need more money to do nation building. It's not the lack of funding that prevents us from engaging in nation building, it's a lack of political resolve.
2. They never prove increased military spending would go to nation building - Trump would never do it. Ali Vitali of NBC reports in September that Trump would "refuse to employ strategies of... nation building."
3. The US fails at nation building. Political scientist Chris Fettweis writes in 2011 that due to widespread resistance against the US, nation building fails to create meaningful change and ends up promoting instability and conflict.

AT: Terrorism

Nation building doesn't prevent terrorism. Benjamin Friedman of CATO writes that nation building can't prevent terrorist safe havens because it's not "failed states" that are the problem but instead government's' political support for terrorism.

AT: Terrorism Impacts

AT: ISIL is a big threat

ISIL isn't a threat, as Alex Ward at the Center on International Security finds in 2015 that ISIL's main focus is on territory grabbing and doesn't care about attacking the US, with lone wolf ISIL attacks being relatively small.

AT: Al Qaeda is a big threat

Al Qaeda isn't a threat, as Kangil Lee at the International Center for Political Violence and Terrorism Research finds in 2015 that Al Qaeda has lost 28 of its 29 leaders to drone strikes, lacks any training centers, communications ability, or funding, and has only launched two successful attacks in the last 20 years.

AT: Nuclear terrorism impacts

There is no risk of nuclear terrorism, as Leonard Weiss at Stanford explains in 2015 that a terrorist organization acquiring nuclear weapons is virtually impossible, as building a nuclear weapon requires overcoming tons of technical barriers and, stealing a nuclear weapon is practically impossible due to layered safeguards and security, and acquiring a nuclear weapon willingly from a state won't happen because nuclear states fear retaliation from other nuclear states.

AT: Counterterrorism Good

Turn it: economist Nasir Muhammad finds in 2011 empirically while terrorism attacks initially decrease in response to more military spending because we kill more terrorists, in the long term attacks increase. This is for three reasons.

1. Much of the spending will go to fueling drone strikes, which increase anti-American sentiment. David Jaeger of the Institute for the Study of Labor confirms in 2011 that “a terrorist attack in Afghanistan is 8.8% more likely five days after a successful drone strike.”
2. Spending will signal to terrorist groups that the US will be more aggressive. Lawrence Korb of the Center for American Progress writes in 2002 that high spending will “aggravate the grievances that serve as rallying points” for terrorists.
3. Spending prevents multilateral cooperation. Korb continues that “alienate European allies by widening the technology gap between our military and theirs,” which is problematic because he writes that we can only effectively combat terrorism with Europe by our side.

AT: Infrastructure Spending Increases

1. This is obviously not how the budget control act works. That act requires that the budget stays low – there is no way it means that higher military spending will cause more infrastructure spending. A Brown University publication confirms empirically in 2016 that infrastructure spending did not grow significantly when military spending grew.
2. Infrastructure investment only benefits the rich anyways, because it improves the return on capital. That's why economist Stephen Turnovsky finds in 2012 that raising infrastructure investment from 5% to 8% of GDP will result in a 5% increase in long-run income inequality.
3. Infrastructure causes gentrification. Professor Richard Florida writes in 2015 that gentrification is shaped by large-scale infrastructure investments. Since over 80% of the poor rent their homes, they are often kicked out of their neighborhoods and leaving them with nowhere to go and often causing them to lose their jobs. That's why Dedrick Muhammad of the Racial Divide Initiative writes that the first step to ending inequality must be to stop gentrification.

AT: Modernization

1. READ ISAACS
2. Nowhere do they prove that there's a high probability that increased military spending will go to modernization.
3. Their impact should have happened. The US military has been aging continually and out of date for decades, if lack of modernization was going to cause some disastrous collapse of deterrence, we should have seen it happen already.
4. Modernization isn't useful. Dave Majumdar at the National interest explains in 2016 that spending on modernizing military equipment always happens without enough spending on maintenance and support infrastructure to make the modernized equipment useable.
5. TURN: The cost of increased interventions trades off with increasing Military Modernization. According to Jack Spencer in 2000, even a single intervention can put a massive strain on military budgets. Thus, by increasing interventions the US Military will have even less money for readiness.

AT: Nuclear Modernization

1. The impact should have happened. Our nuclear arsenal has been outdated for decades, if there was going to be an accident or some collapse of nuclear deterrence it would have already happened.
2. Turn it, modernizing nukes makes them more vulnerable to terrorism. Jason Fritz of St Cloud University explains that the more computerized our nuclear arsenal is, the more entry-points for terrorists there are.
3. It's too expensive. Dr. Lawrence Wittner in 2016 explains that the cost to modernizing the American Nuclear Arsenal would be upwards of 1 trillion dollars. He concludes that this tremendous cost would either bankrupt the country or require massive cutbacks to positive government programs.
4. The status quo solves: Chief pentagon reported Lara Seligman 2016 outlines how the US is currently modernizing the nuclear arsenal at a slow rate, so the neg gets all the advantages of aff, while avoiding the massive spending tradeoff.
5. Turn it, nuclear modernization causes nuclear proliferation, as Sam Worthington at Tufts University finds in 2016 that modernization will increase the risk of accidental nuclear escalation during a crisis and will signal a more aggressive US nuclear posture and undermine arms control agreements, causing global nuclear proliferation. For example, Ashton Carter in the Harvard Asia Pacific Review finds that an attempt to modernize and expand our current nuclear arsenal would not only fail to protect America from a Chinese attack, it would likely prompt China to build a larger nuclear force.

6.

AT: Cyber-security

1. Turn it. Ian Wallace of Brookings in 2013: trades off with private sector, which is always more efficient.
2. No link - homeland security does it.
3. The US isn't as vulnerable as they claim – if we were really that vulnerable Russia or terrorist groups would have already hacked us because they definitely have the intent. In fact, according to Evgeny Morozov of the Wall Street Journal in 2013, much of the threat is drummed up by cybersecurity firms trying to sell more product.
4. Even if there are vulnerabilities, it's unclear how spending would solve them. In fact, Morozov writes that “Ironically, the more we spend on securing the Internet, the less secure we appear to feel” because we can't find real solutions, hackers always get stronger and adapt, and spending just enables more fearmongering.
5. Cyber security is failing not because of a lack of funding, but rather, because of the way we approach the cyber threat. Adam Rice of ComputerWeekly explains that cyber security is failing because of administrative gridlock. He writes, “To develop a cybersecurity plan by computer and manage the administrative burden does almost nothing to prevent an advanced persistent threat actor from running roughshod over a network.”

[Only read if necessary]

6. Senior Correspondent of Defense One, Aliya Sternstein explains in 2015 that funding cyber operations is difficult “because authority over cyber mission is fragmented--split between the Cyber Command, the Defense Information Systems Agency, and various military services. Increasing military spending in no way solves this fragmentation.

AT: State Cyber Threat

The cyber war threat is overstated. Political scientist Ryan Maness writes in 2015 that large scale state cyber attacks are as unlikely as interstate nuclear war because A, the weapons can only be used once, B, countries fear retaliation, C, there is a high probability of civilian harm, and D, launching a cyber attack is very expensive and has weak payoffs.

AT: Cyber Terror Threat

The cyber terror threat is overstated. Political scientist Ryan Maness writes in 2015 that the cyber terror threat is benign because no terrorist organization has the operational capacity to launch an attack.

AT: Economy/GDP Boom (Military Keynesianism)

1. Topicality. Increasing military spending for economic reasons means funding will never go towards better responding to international conflicts. John Isaacs of the National Interest finds in 2016 that Congress spent \$4.5 billion on useless projects that the Pentagon didn't even ask for to satisfy their constituents with job creation.
2. Turn it: it trades off with private investment. Davide Furceri of OECD finds in 2009 that government spending crowds out private sector investments. The private sector is better because Eric Alterman of the Center for American Progress writes in 2012 that bureaucracy makes military spending a less efficient stimulus than the free market based private investments.
3. Turn it: military spending forces cuts in welfare which hurt the economy. David Morris of Salon in 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, and 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.

MORE TURNS:

4. Turn: Military Keynesianism decreases GDP and tanks the economy. In an analysis of the US economy from 1960 to 2008, Professor Luca Pieroni finds in 2011 that military spending decreases Gross Domestic Product and private consumption because military spending is financed from increases in budget deficits and cuts to other programs like welfare and infrastructure.

AT: Innovation (R&D)

1. This is non-topical. They need to spend to respond better to international conflicts – just because innovation has the effect of helping us respond later does not make it topical otherwise anything that ends up doing the resolution is topical and they can get countless extra-topical advantages.
2. It's non-unique. Increases in R&D spending happen even if you negate. The Department of Defense writes that the 2017 military budget increases R&D funding and invests in new technologies.
3. Eric Alterman of the Center for American Progress explains in 2012 that Military R&D Spending is ineffective because the military “grossly abuse[s] the Defense R&D budget,” by creating false successes. He gives the example of a 100 million dollar missile project that failed but was officially deemed a “success” because no benchmarks had been established.
4. MIT researcher Subrata Ghoshroy explains that because of inefficiencies in military R&D spending, increasing the budget will not solve the problem. Only “reform” will solve.
5. Turn it: it trades off with private sector innovation. Davide Furceri of OECD finds in 2009 that government spending crowds out private sector investments. The private sector is better because:
 - a. Military R&D ignores civilian needs. The United Nations University confirms that past major military R&D projects don't work for civilians applications because they were designed for the military, ignoring civilian constraints like cost-effectiveness, AND
 - b. Military R&D is less efficient. Eric Alterman of the Center for American Progress writes in 2012 that the Pentagon actually benefits more from private sector innovation than the other way around because the free market makes private research much more efficient.
6. Turn it: military spending forces cuts in welfare which hurt the economy. David Morris of Salon in 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, and 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.

**Cyber-attacks Allow China to Clone [DON'T READ IF THEY RUN
CYBER SECURITY]**

1. No Impact: According to the US Naval Institute in 2015, China's ongoing cyber espionage program has given them the ability to steal the designs for and reproduce all of our weapons. Thus, even if increased military spending would create novel weaponry, China and the rest of the world would quickly copy it, negating any unique impact.

Not Relevant

1. Alterman writes that “Most of the U.S. casualties in the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have been caused by improvised explosive devices,” and technology would do little to “[protect] American soldiers”.

AT: Space Mil

1. No probability — militarizing space is an idea that has been around for decades, but no country has done it because no one wants to.
2. Non-topical. Militarizing space isn't a response to international conflict — it's just spending on technology that eventually results in less conflict through their super absurd internal link chain.

Impact turns:

1. Space militarization causes massive wars. Professor of communication Gordon Mitchell explains in 2001 that space weapons can hit targets in a split second, forcing governments to make their space weapons on a hair trigger, which results in miscalculation and accidental usage of space weapons. Mitchell continues that any use of a space weapon would cause maximum retaliation because space weapons are more powerful than nuclear weapons.
2. Space militarization causes a space arms race, as professor Noam Chomsky explains in 2001 that US attempts at space militarization increase the risk of World War III because other countries will be forced to build their own space weapons, anti-satellite weapons, and proliferate nuclear weapons.
3. Space militarization causes space debris. Rebecca Johnson at the Liu Institute for global issues explains in 2003 that space militarization increases the risk of a conflict in space, with even a minor conflict causing a cascade of space debris as debris fragments when it hits more debris, resulting in a cloud of space debris covering the Earth, preventing space exploration and blocking out the sun.

AT: China decreasing mil spending now

1. This is factually wrong. Global Security reports in 2016 that this year, China increased military spending by 7.6%, which is lower military growth than past years due to the slowdown of economic growth within China, but it's still an increase.

AT: Austerity Good

1. Underfunding the military makes it unprepared, not efficient. Empirically, Majumdar and Dunn from our case say that because we did not have enough money, our interventions in Korea, Vietnam, and Iraq failed.
2. In fact, Loren Thompson writes in 2011 that military austerity will result in the loss of at least a million jobs because it cuts spending meaning less funding for mil jobs.
3. Cutting the military budget will not make the military more efficient. Mackenzie Eaglen notes that between 2002 and 2005, initiatives to make the navy more efficient were implemented, but they resulted in higher, not lower costs. This is for two reasons
 - a. James Carafano explains in 2010 that the reason for military inefficiencies are “overly prescriptive laws, particular demands, and whipsaw policies established by Congress.” Cutting the budget doesn’t change congressional policies.
 - b. Historically, Kimberly Amadeo writes that Congress has prevented the military from cutting unnecessary programs to become more efficient. This means that the military will not be able to reallocate funds and use the money more efficiently.
4. Even if austerity has efficiency benefits, realize that direct spending will always be better because efficiency caps out, but direct spending will always make our military better, no cap.

AT: Arctic

1. No probability that increased military spending goes to the arctic. Your EV that the DOD wants to increase spending in the arctic is irrelevant — the DOD always asks for increased spending in every region of the world, but Congress doesn't allocate the funding.
2. T — There is no conflict in the arctic in the squo which means an increase in arctic spending is not a response to international conflict — additionally, aff has to impact to only conflict, so all your oil spills/biodiversity/other impacts aren't topical.
3. No arctic war. Professor Alyson Bailes explains in 2013 that there is no chance of an arctic conflict because most of the states with claims in the arctic will keep their military presence small scale in the long term and have modest plans.
4. Turn, the aff causes a war with China. Shiloh Rainwater at Pepperdine University explains in 2012 that China has a sense of entitlement to ownership of arctic resources and fears that the expansion of other countries into the arctic will shut it out of the arctic. Rainwater continues that because China views the arctic as a critical national interest, if it perceives its arctic interests as being threatened, it could respond with military force, destabilizing the region and creating an escalating conflict.

AT: Russia US War over arctic

1. Professor Alyson Bailes explains in 2013 that the US and Russia have cooperated on the arctic since the end of the cold war and there's no incentive for either to start a conflict due to the high risk of escalation, as Russia would basically be waging a war against multiple NATO countries. Bailes continues, since the 1950s, MAD has prevented the US-Russia standoff in the arctic from ever starting a conflict.
2. Read the AT: Russia impact D/turns.

AT: Coast Guard/Drugs

1. In this round, we must look to the most probable way that the money would be spent. The Maritime Executive writes that in the planned 2017 budget, the coast guard funding will be cut 10%, indicating that if you were to affirm, the money would definitely not go to the coast guard, and you would not my opponent's impacts.
1. Drug smuggling has nothing to do with international conflict. Confiscating drugs is not a conflict. Therefore, their plan is not topical.
2. My opponents are overstating the problem. If this was such a large problem, the government would be increasing funding, not decreasing.
3. My opponents think that cutting off the supply of drugs will stop drug use. However, the Drug Policy Alliance writes that if the demand is not dealt with, drug users will simply find another supply in a "ceaseless battle".
4. The reason the CG has empirically decreased drugs caught is that the smugglers adapt to not get caught. Prefer this warrant because it explains why despite the coast guard's success drug trafficking has only increased.

AT: Peacekeepers

1. Non-Topical. As International Relations Professor Gordon Adams needlessly points out, the funding for UN Peacekeepers comes directly from the State Department—not the Defense Department. Thus, increasing Military spending won't increase funding to UN Peacekeepers.
- 2.

AT: Protect satellites from hacks/Russia/China

1. No probability — your EV is all awful
2. T — hacking space satellites doesn't count as an intl conflict
3. T — no reason military has to be the one to secure the satellites — NASA isn't military and probabilistically they'd probably be the ones to fix satellite cybersecurity
4. Solvency mechanism makes no sense — satellites are basically sitting ducks in space, there are tons of ways they can get physically attacked or cyberattacked, Aff can't possibly solve all of them.
5. Non-unique and can't solve — Chelsea Macdonald reports in 2016 that all satellites are inherently vulnerable to normal missile strikes, which means the Aff can't solve; it's impossible to make a satellite missile-proof. Macdonald continues that other weapons like the ones the Aff talks about that are specifically designed to destroy satellites are prohibitively expensive, meaning there's no threat.
6. Your uniqueness arguments are god awful — If our satellites are vulnerable to cyber attacks or physical attacks by other satellites since December why the hell haven't Russia/China attacked us yet? Because they don't want to start a war with the US. They might have the ability to take out our satellites, doesn't mean they want to do it.
7. The Aff attempt to secure satellites is perceived as militarizing outer space because it's the military doing it instead of NASA, which causes a space arms race, as professor Noam Chomsky explains in 2001 that US attempts at space militarization increase the risk of World War III because other countries will be forced to build their own space weapons, anti-satellite weapons, and proliferate nuclear weapons to defend themselves.

AT: Space debris impacts

1. Inevitable. NASA chief scientists Donald Kessler explains in 2012 that the mathematical point of no return for space debris has already been passed and no technology exists to solve space debris, but it will take decades for the chain reaction to pick up steam.
2. T — Not an international conflict.

AT: Cut the OCO

1. Probability — there's no reason to think increased spending will go to eliminating the OCO fund — historically the OCO budget increases when spending does.
2. Uniqueness overwhelms your probability argument — we have \$600 billion in military spending in the squo, if there was actual political will to eliminate the OCO fund we would be using existing spending to do so.
3. Your \$18B in increased spending solves OCO EV is actually awful — it just says that next year's defense budget, which has ALREADY PASSED AND IS HAPPENING IN THE SQUO, will REDIRECT 18B from the OCO budget into the DOD's base budget. It DOES NOT say that the OCO can be eliminated with 18B in new spending.
4. Topicality — they're literally advocating for a net decrease in military spending. The National Priorities Project explains in 2016 that OCO funding totals close to \$60 billion, they say it costs \$18 billion to eliminate the OCO fund. Aff has to increase military spending to be topical. THIS SPECIFIC abuse of T is a voting issue — they can use the fact that they net decrease spending to spike out of all our links.
5. No warrant as to why the OCO lets Congress avoid answering questions about interventions. Makes literally no sense.
6. Link turn — The OCO fund is what is used to fund interventions — means if we win a link to contention three, there's higher OCO funding. IPS says higher spending means politicians allocate more money to ground troop interventions and do more agg fopo because politicians perceive a higher chance of success. Zadeh says increased military spending has to be justified to the public, and that justification is done by measuring deaths per dollar.
7. Link turn — Amy Belasco at the Congressional Research Service explains in 2015 that the Budget Control Act sets a hard cap on annual military spending until 2021, but these caps don't apply to the OCO fund. This means the only way to increase military spending is to put all the new funding in the OCO fund.

AT: Spending solves PMCs

1. PMCs are hired to fight wars or do special operations. We aren't currently fighting any ground wars, so there is no demand for PMCs in the Neg world, but when you affirm, there are more interventions, which means more PMC usage.
2. Status quo solves. Stephen Lendman at the Center for Research on Globalization reports in 2010 that Obama has pushed for reforms to reduce PMC spending and shift outsourced work back to government. Matthew Gault at Reuters reports in 2016 that Trump also opposes the use of PMCs.
3. Squo solves. Leo Shane at the Military Times explains in 2016 that the new defense budget authorization act increases troop wages and increases the size of the army, navy, and air force.
4. No warrant for why normal troops trade off with PMCs — PMCs are cheaper than normal troops, so there's always an incentive to use PMCs even when our troops are trained.

Impact defense:

1. The impact is reverse causal — PMCS increase when conflict increases, not the other way around. Bruce Stanley of the University of Nebraska empirically finds that as the intensity of a conflict increases, more PMCs are sent in because they're seen as a viable way to resolve the conflict.
2. For this reason, Loven of the University of Nebraska finds in a 43 year analysis that PMCs empirically do not extend conflict duration or intensity.

AT: Disaster Relief

1. Topicality — natural disasters are not international conflict because there's no armed dispute. Responding to them isn't topical
2. This argument isn't topical. Humanitarian and developmental foreign aid are not a form of military spending — they're done by the State Department, which is definitionally not the military.
3. Probability — Trump explicitly opposes sending money to other countries and has an "America First" policy, which means there's no chance higher military spending will go to military disaster relief.
4. No explanation as to why we need increased military spending to continue doing disaster relief — we already spend money and save lives with military disaster relief.
5. Other actors solve. Even if the US stopped doing disaster relief for some reason, there are tons of other international actors and organizations like the Red Cross and NGOS that would fill the US's place.
6. Turn it, Rebecca Morton at the University of Bristol finds in 2014 that empirically, military operations trade off with funding for developmental and humanitarian aid. This means if we win that increased spending causes more interventions, there will be less aid.
7. (Aid impact turns)

