

Chris and I affirm.

Contention one is stopping allied nuclear proliferation.

South Korea and Japan will acquire nuclear weapons in the status quo. David Feith at the Wall Street Journal explains in 2016 that a majority of South Korean citizens and politicians are increasingly supporting nuclearization due to fears of US abandonment, and that South Korea is capable of creating 5,000 bombs. Henry Sokolski at the Wall Street Journal furthers in 2016 that due to fears over the credibility of US security commitments to defend them from China, Japan's taboo on nuclear weapons has eroded, and Japan could create 2,000 bombs.

Increased military spending would prevent Japan and South Korea from nuclearization because it would increase US credibility. The National Defense Panel finds in 2014 that recent US military budget cuts have prompted allies to question US resolve and commitment to their security. Bruce Klingner at the Davis Institute for National Security explains in 2015 that this is because our allies measure credibility using the quality and quantity of US military forces, which is why Klingner finds that increased US military spending would reassure Asian allies that US commitments are credible.

This credibility is key to preventing proliferation as UN Representative Yukio Satoh explains in 2009 that Japan's commitment to non-proliferation relies entirely on the credibility of US defense commitments. The same applies to South Korea, as Richard Weitz at the Hudson Institute explains in 2013 that high US credibility and military capacity are key factors in South Korea's decision to not proliferate.

Empirically, Toshi Yoshihara of the US Naval War College finds in 2009 that Taiwan and South Korea previously attempted to acquire nuclear weapons when they lost confidence in the US's ability and willingness to defend them.

The impact is global nuclear proliferation. Robert Zarate at the Foreign Policy Initiative explains in 2014 that if Japan or South Korea got nuclear weapons, it would destroy the legitimacy of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, causing countless other international actors to cite double standards and acquire nuclear weapons.

International relations professor Matthew Kroenig explains in 2015 that nuclear proliferation increases the risk of nuclear detonation for two reasons.

1. Nuclear terrorism. Kroenig explains that nuclear proliferation increase the risk of nuclear terrorism because A, corrupt states could sell nuclear weapons to terrorist groups, B, new nuclear states have minimal security, so the weapons could be stolen, or C, a nuclear armed state could collapse, causing weapons to fall into terrorist hands.
2. Nuclear war. Kroenig explains that since new nuclear states lack second strike capabilities, they might preemptively launch nukes out of the fear that their nuclear capacities will be taken out by an enemy nuke. Similarly, another country is likely to

launch first at a new nuclear state to neutralize the threat with no fear of nuclear retaliation.

[2:16]

Contention two is maintaining military dominance.

Right now, military dominance is waning, as Dmitry Suslov at the Higher School for Economics finds in 2014 that US primacy and international influence is decreasing due to the closing gap in military spending between the US and countries like Russia and China. The National Defense Panel finds in 2014 that increased military spending maintains US military dominance by preventing other countries from equalling our military capabilities.

The impact is preventing massive interstate conflict. UN Ambassador Zalmay Khalilzad explains in 2011 that the closing gap between the capabilities of the US and its rivals both increases the probability of arms races because small countries perceive the US as unable to ensure regional security *and* increases the chance of wars between great powers because they become more competitive to get ahead. International affairs professor Robert Gilpin confirms in 2013 that when China's military closes the gap with the US, a war is practically guaranteed, as no dominant state in history has ever relinquished its position without a fight and no rising power has ever established itself as dominant without winning a great power war.

[3:13]

Contention three is improving readiness

Currently, the military is unprepared. Dave Majumdar of the National Interest reports in 2016 that due to sequestration budget cuts, no branch of the military has maintained proper readiness levels since 2013. Increased spending would reverse these cuts, improving readiness.

There are two impacts.

1. Deterrence. Jack Spencer at the Davis Institute for International Studies explains in 2000 that when US military readiness is low, hostile nations are more likely to lash out because they perceive the US as weak, whereas high military readiness deters rival nations from being aggressive, preserving peace.
2. Effective conflict response. Richard Dunn at the Davis Institute for International Studies explains in 2013 that the reason US interventions in Korea, Vietnam, and Iraq failed was because of low military readiness. Dunn concludes that if US military operations had more funding for equipment, training, and resources, the US military would have been more effective and avoided catastrophic failure.