Tradeoff NC V2

“Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired, [is] a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and not clothed.” Because we agree with Eisenhower,

We negate the resolution Resolved: In response to international conflicts, the United States should significantly increase military spending.

Observation 1: [Jacqueline Leo](http://www.thefiscaltimes.com/Authors/L/Jacqueline-Leo) writes in 2015 that over the past 2 decades, there has been 8.5 trillion dollars unaccounted for in military spending. Green Shadow Cabinet furthers that almost one-third of the Pentagon’s spending is unaccounted for each year and by auditing the Pentagon hundreds of billions of dollars can be saved each year. This brings 2 implications. First is that my opponents have to show that the money will actually be used correctly and not wasted. Second, the United States Federal Government can just audit the Pentagon and use the money saved instead of significantly increasing the budget.

Observation 2: Should is defined as what is most probable. This means that the pro can only defend the resolution as a general principle and cannot decide where the money goes. This means that the only fiat power that the pro gets is that military spending increases, they cannot decide where they go to.

Our sole contention is that military spending is harmful to American society.

Subpoint A: Medicare and Medicaid.

Kathleen Peroff of the University of Maryland writes that military spending consistently trades off with several important government funding programs. The biggest tradeoff that is seen amongst government services is that with public aid programs such as medicare which helps about 45 million people. For every dollar of increased military funding, 25 cents are taken from public aid programs.

A 2011 study from the National Bureau of Economic Research quantifies the impact of budgets on Medicare and finds that for every 10 percent reduction in Medicare payments by patients, there is a 2 percent increase in the number of deaths due to the decreased ability of hospitals to properly treat their patients, resulting in hundreds of thousands of more deaths.

Subpoint B: Increasing military spending leads to decreased job creation.

The Watson Institute at Brown University gives 3 warrants as to why this is true. They write that other industries are more labor-intensive so more dollars go towards hiring workers and less on equipment and materials. Second, a greater percentage of non-military spending stays within the US, creating more jobs. Finally, wages and benefits are lower in these sectors than for military personnel, meaning that the same amount of money hires more people in non-military industries.

They conclude that if between 2001-2014, the US had channeled resources into expanding other sectors instead of defense, 3 million more jobs would have been created, reducing unemployment significantly.

Subpoint C: Increasing military spending decreases infrastructure spending.

Ismael Zadeh of Drake University writes in 2010 that increasing military spending pushes out capital for infrastructure as well as human capital. He furthers that increasing military spending has always been accompanied by compensating decreases in non-military spending.

Decreasing infrastructure spending is extremely harmful because America’s current infrastructure is in horrible condition. The American Society of Civil Engineers currently rates America’s infrastructure a D+ rating.

Gillian White of the Atlantic writes in 2015 that America’s poor transportation infrastructure systems contribute to income inequality as everything needed for upward mobility such as healthcare, food, and jobs all require one to travel in order to obtain it. Sarah Kaufman of New York University in 2014 empirically confirms this and finds that limited transportation infrastructure often leads to an increase in unemployment and limits upward mobility.

Furthermore, Mikayla Bouchard of the New York Times in 2016 writes that commuting time is the single strongest factor in the odds of escaping poverty. Michael Strain of the Washington Post finds that improving infrastructure leads to shortened commuting times. This is critical in alleviating income inequality as Raj Chetty of Harvard University in 2015 finds that a decrease in commuting times leads to a 10% increase in annual incomes.

Increasing spending on infrastructure also creates jobs. Robert Lenzner of Forbes in 2016 writes that for every billion dollars invested on infrastructure, 23,000 jobs are created.

Finally, the American Civil Society of Engineers finds that if America does not improve its infrastructure, the US is expected to lose nearly 4 trillion in GDP by 2025.

Subpoint D: General Economic Harms

Randall Kesselring of Arkansas State University finds that a 1% increase in military spending decreases economic growth by 1.3%. Prefer this evidence because it studies the entire country as compared to my opponent’s which only studies one state.

Economic stability is crucial for the US to exercise soft power as Iwan Morgan of the University of London finds that American economic success is fundamental to soft power and the promotion of free-market values across the world.

Finally, Jesse Hubbard of the American University writes that economic stability is critical for the US to maintain its status as a world hegemon.

For all of these reasons, we negate.