We negate the resolution that in order to better respond to international conflicts, the United States should significantly increase its military spending.

Contention 1 is destroying diplomacy.

Increasing military spending reduces our likelihood of using diplomacy for 2 reasons.

First, military spending is financed by cuts in diplomatic spending. Jonathan Broder of Newsweek reports that **“in recent years, budgets for diplomacy have shrunk as lawmakers [have] pushed for more money to pay for new weapons and technology.”** William Hartung of the Center for International Policy corroborates, noting that historically, **“Overspending on the Pentagon has been accompanied by underspending on diplomacy.”**

Second, military spending undermines our willingness to approach challenges diplomatically. This is because spending more on our military makes the use of force more appealing. William Nordhaus of Yale explains “At best, **an excessive military budget** is simply economic waste. At worst, it **causes problems rather than solving them by tempting leaders to use an existing military capability.** During the Clinton administration, Madeleine Albright is reported to have asked Colin Powell, then Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, what's the point of having this superb military if we can't use it? Colin Powell is said to have replied, wisely if not presciently, that American soldiers are not toy soldiers to be moved around on some global game board.

David Vine of AU explains the result, writing “**When all you have in your foreign policy toolbox is a hammer, everything starts to look like a nail.**

 Cuts in diplomacy hurt our best tool for stopping conflict at its root. The Department of State writes that **“diplomacy play[s] a critical role in preventing threats such as instability within countries, inter-state** and great-power **conflict, and the spread of violent extremism”**

UN Under Secretary General of Political Affairs B. Lynn Pascoe confirms **“the root causes of most conflicts [are] political problems requiring political solutions.”**

Contention 2 is arming the world

Military spending would increase global arms flow for three reasons.

First, by increasing funding for the US to purchase weapons on behalf of other nations.

Trends in American spending suggest that increase in our own spending would likely go towards our efforts to buy and sell arms for others.

According to Derek Gilman of the Defense Security Cooperation Agency,

**“**The **Foreign Military Sales** (as defined above, “FMS”) **program has been a key component of U.S. foreign policy** and national security for the last several decades. **In** 3 **recent years**, it has taken on increased importance, as the **United States has** sought to build the capabilities of foreign partners to participate in counter-terrorist operations, and in operations in Afghanistan and Iraq. Further, the enactment of various “building partner capacity” authorities has resulted in **increased reliance on** the FMS process to implement so-called “FMS pseudo cases.” As noted above, **sales by the U.S. Department of Defense** (“DoD”) have increasedsubstantiallyover the past decade.”

Spending is key to our efforts to buy weapons for other nations. William Hartung of the Center for International Policy explains

“**Arms deals are a way of life in Washington.** From the president on down, significant parts of the government are intent on ensuring that American arms will flood the global market and companies like Lockheed and Boeing will live the good life. From the president on his trips abroad to visit allied world leaders to the secretaries of state and defense to the staffs of US embassies, American officials regularly act as salespeople for the arms firms. And **the Pentagon is their enabler. From brokering, facilitating, and literally banking the money from arms deals to transferring weapons** to favored allies **on the taxpayers’ dime, it is in essence the world’s largest arms dealer.**

The countries we sell arms to are hardly trustworthy. Anup Shah of Global Issues notes **“respect for human rights is often overlooked as arms are sold to known human rights violators.”**

Secondly, the arms that we buy for ourselves eventually wind up abroad.

The State Department confirms that

“**The Excess Defense Articles** (EDA) **program is a mechanism through which the Department of Defense disposes of excess military equipment by providing it to** allied and friendly **nations on a grant or sale basis.** PM/RSAT serves as the Department’s point of contact on EDA issues, and coordinates the approval of proposed transfers with DoD and the Department’s regional bureaus.”

Spending on new weapons would certainly create a larger surplus, because we are already overstocked with weapons. According to Hartung of the Center for International Policy,

“November 2015: **The DoD had $857 million in excess parts and supplies as of September 2014”**

Thus, increasing defense spending would mean more weapons could be sold overseas.

Third, an increase in spending would spark a global increase in arms production. This is because American spending would signal that there is a new demand for weapons, motivating suppliers to produce more arms, increasing supply and lowering global prices. According to Oana Tocoian of Claremont College,

“I show that **military spending contributes to international arms proliferation through a push effect: large demand encourages production growth in the domestic market** if transport costs are non-negligible. Under increasing returns to scale, **the country can then supply weapons on the global market at low prices.**”

Overall, Tocoian finds that “**a 10% increase in military expenditure is associated with a 4.3 to 10.4% increase in arms exports.”**

SaferWorld continues that

**“Arms flows provide the means to initiate and sustain war. Easy access to arms can lengthen the duration of conflict by providing the means for conflict actors to persist with armed struggle.”**

That’s why Moses Naim of Foreign Policy finds

**“**According to the United Nations, only 18 million (or about 3 percent) of the 550 million small arms and light weapons in circulation today are used by government, military, or police forces. Illict trade accounts for almost 20 percent of the total small arms trade and generates more than $1 billion a year. **Small arms helped fuel 46 of the 49 largest conflicts of the last decade and** in2001 **were estimated to be responsible for 1,000 deaths a day**; more than 80 percent of those victims were women and children**.”**

Thus, an increase in military spending would spread weapons that enable and escalate conflicts.