Offshore Balancing NC

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

Contention 1 is a tradeoff.

Subpoint A: Healthcare

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. 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% reduction in Medicare payments by patients, there is a 2% increase in mortality rates of patients due to the decreased ability of hospitals to properly treat their patients.

Subpoint B: Economy

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.

Overall, 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.

Contention 2: Offshore Balancing

According to John Mearshimer of University of Chicago in 2016 the United States should stop spending so much on its military budget and adopt a strategy that better protects American interests and stops unnecessary spending. This strategy is called offshore balancing. Voting pro directly contradicts this strategy as they advocate for an increase in military spending and ask for US intervention in conflicts worldwide.

**Offshore leads to international cooperation and stability, but forestalling means terrorism, WMD use, and perpetual war.**

**Christopher Layne of UC Berkeley writes**

Primacy’s neorealist critics have outlined an alternative grand strategy that increasingly resonates with the American public: offshore balancing.3 Its proponents believe that **offshore balancing can do a better job** than primacy **of enhancing American security** and matching US foreign policy objectives with the resources available to support them. The driving factor behind offshore balancing is its proponents’ recognition that the US has a ‘hegemony’ problem. America’s strategy of **primacy increases US vulnerability to a geopolitical backlash** – whether in the guise of countervailing great power coalitions, or **terrorist attacks – and alienates public opinion in large** swaths **[areas] of the globe, including** Europe and **the Middle East.** Offshore balancing is based on the assumption that the most vital US interests are preventing the emergence of a dominant power in Europe and East Asia – a ‘Eurasian hegemon’ – and forestalling the emergence of a regional (‘oil’) hegemon in the Middle East. Only a Eurasian hegemon could pose an existential threat to the US. A regional hegemon in the Middle East could imperil the flow of oil upon which the US economy, and the economies of the advanced industrial states depend. **As an offshore balancer, the US would rely on the** tried and true **dynamics of the balance of power** to thwart any states with hegemonic ambitions. **An offshore balancing strategy would permit the US to withdraw its ground forces** from Eurasia (including the Middle East) and assume an over-the-horizon military posture. If – and only **if – regional power balances look to be failing would the US re-insert its troops** into Eurasia. Offshore balancing contrasts sharply with primacy because primacists fear a world with independent, multiple poles of power. Primacy is based on the belief that it is better for the US to defend its allies and clients than to have them defend themselves. Offshore balancers, on the other hand, believe for an insular great power like the US, the best strategy is to rely on a balance of power approach that devolves to other states the costs and risks of their defense. Offshore balancing is a realist strategy because it eschews the ideological crusading on behalf of democracy that is endemic to Wilsonianism, defines US interests in terms of what is vital rather than simply desirable, balances ends and means, and is based on prudence and self-restraint in the conduct of US strategy. Most of all it is a strategy that fits within the broad realist tradition because it recognises the difference between, on one hand, what the sociologist Max Weber called the ethic of conviction and, on the other hand, the ethic of responsibility. In foreign policymaking the road to hell is paved with good intentions, and policies must be judged on their consequences, not on the intentions that underlie them. **The Bush administration’s** disastrous **policies in** Iraq and **the Middle East** are a much needed reminder that this is a test Wilsonianism **[shows that intervention] too often fails.** Although there are some nuanced differences among offshore balancing’s proponents, they fundamentally agree on the strategy’s basic premises. First, **offshore balancers recognise that one of the** few ironclad **rules in international politics is that when one great power becomes too powerful – when it bids to achieve hegemony – it is defeated by the counter-balancing efforts of the other major powers in the international system.** The **history** of the modern international state system (which dates back to about 1500) **is littered with the wreckage of great powers that tried and failed to achieve geopolitical primacy:** the Hapsburg Empire under Charles V, Spain under Philip II, France under Louis XIV and Napoleon, and Germany under Hitler (and, some would argue, under Kaiser Wilhelm II). Failure is the fate of hegemons. The reason is simple: the basic motivation of all major states is to survive, and when one among them threatens to gain preponderant power, the security of the others is threatened.

First, they indicate that other major states regard US geopolitical dominance as a problem that needs to be addressed. Second, soft balancing efforts to rein-in American power may help the other major states learn to cooperate in ways that will the open the door to future hard balancing against the US.7 In addition to soft balancing, **asymmetric strategies are** another **[a] type of** nontraditional **balancing that is being employed to contest US primacy.** When employed by states, **asymmetric strategies mean the acquisition of weapons of mass destruction** (WMD) capabilities. Regional powers – especially those on the US hit list like Iran and Saddam Hussein’s Iraq – cannot slug it out toe-to-toe against the US’ dominant high-tech conventional forces. Because they are threatened by the US, however, these states seek other methods of offsetting American power, and dissuading Washington from using its military muscle against them. WMD – especially the possession of nuclear weapons – is one way these states can level the strategic playing field and deter the US from attacking them. **Terrorism is another asymmetric strategy – one employed by non-state actors like Al-Qaeda** and similar jihadist groups – **to resist US dominance. The use of [terrorism]** asymmetric strategies **to oppose American power** – especially in the Middle East where US policy has an imperial dimension – **illustrates** the dictum **that empires inevitably provoke resistance.**

There are a few impacts to utilizing offshore balancing.

First, offshore balancing reduces terrorism.  Hegemony commits the United States to spreading democracy in unfamiliar places, which sometimes requires military occupation and always involves interfering with local political arrangements. Choi of the University of Illinois finds that when the US intervenes terrorism against the US increases as seen in Lebanon in the 1980s, Somalia in the 1990s and the Middle East in the 2000s.

Eric Neumayer of the Journal of Peace empirically confirms this and finds that an increase in military aid or personnel raises the expected count of anti-American terrorism by 135%. Dursun Peksen of the University of Memphis furthers that US intervention leads to harmful consequences. He finds that the probability of civil war increases by 57% after intervention. He furthers that interventions also give the state the ability to commit human rights abuses under the disguise of maintaining domestic cohesion which was empirically confirmed as interventions increases the likelihood of political imprisonment by 93% and extrajudicial killings increase by more than 250%.

Second, offshore balancing prevents international conflicts.

Doug Bandow of the Cato Institute writes that China is slowly growing to be able to contest US military presence. However, China’s goals are not to contest US dominance elsewhere. Their goals are just to deter against US expansion within the region. Bandow continues that Washington cannot afford to provoke China or intervene as there would be disastrous consequences. Instead, the United States should focus more on diplomacy rather than hard power.

Furthermore, offshore balancing would allow China to prevent North Korea expansion and nuclearization. Dick Nanto of the Congressional Research Service writes that China has substantial leverage over North Korea but chooses not to utilize it to complicate US dominance within the region.