Allied Proliferation AC V2

We affirm the resolution Resolved: In order to better respond to international conflicts, the United States should significantly increase its military spending.

Merriam Webster defines significant as having an effect.

[Don’t Read] Should is defined as what is desired

Contention 1: Allied Reassurance

Tom Valasek of the Center for European Reform writes that recent budget cuts in the military has resulted in the closure of many US bases which will be unpopular for governments and US allies across the world. He furthers that many defense guarantees will lose their meaning due to the decrease of military presence in the region. BBC News in 2015 furthers that the US has had to cut 15 bases in Europe due to recent cuts.

Furthermore, Joe Gould of Defense News writes in 2015 that budget cuts have also decreased the size of the military by more than 20% overseas, leaving it incapable of meeting the nation’s defense guideline impacting Europe and Asia. Gould furthers that there are plans to cut 30,000 more troops in the next 3 years. Finally, Jonah Bennett finds that the Pentagon is poised to cut even more bases overseas due to a recent budget cut in 2017.

Increasing military spending would solve for these issues and there would be a high probability of spending going towards bases and personnel as Skye Gould of Business Insider writes that the majority of military spending goes towards the military base budget.

Overseas military presence is crucial in reassuring allies--multiple warrants.

First, James Thompson of the Institute for Defense Analysis writes that a forward-deployed US presence is crucial to reassure allies. Changes would be viewed as destabilizing. Most US allies in Western Europe and Asia have said that US presence within their region reassures them.

Second, George Perkovich of Carnegie University writes that the best way in reassuring our allies and deter adversaries is to station US forces in the region as attacking those forces would draw the US into the conflict.

**It is also the perception that matters.** Kurt Campbell writes that it is the perception of US commitment that matters. A decline in presence undermines US credibility and gives them a perception that the US is becoming weak. Hakan Tunc of Carleton University furthers that demonstrating resolve is necessary because it is the perception that matters. A mere perception of power generates tangible power.

Currently, Michael Auslin of AEI writes that many countries in East Asia perceive America as in decline and weakening due to decreased military spending and presence within the region.

This is crucial in deterring adversaries.

Eric Larson writes that the only way for other countries to win a conflict is to prevent US entry or interference. Larson furthers that the best way to ensure that this doesn’t happen is to keep US presence within the region.

In addition, Bush from the Brookings Institute writes that US military presence in the Southeast Asia region has effectively deterred wars and removing presence would severely weaken US deterrence.

Finally, US military presence overseas is crucial in preventing allied proliferation.

Jacquelyn Davis of the Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis writes that US forward presence within the region have caused most NATO nations, Japan, and South Korea to avoid nuclear proliferation, but trust that the US will come to their defense. Kurt Campbell of the Center for American Security concludes that if US foreign policy took a new direction, then other countries would choose nuclear weapons.

History proves as Campbell furthers that during the late 1900s when the US became disengaged from Southeast Asia, countries such as Taiwan and South Korea became interested in purchasing nuclear weapons and adopting nuclear weapon programs.

The impacts of nuclear proliferation are devastating.

First is an arms race.

Roberto Rodriguez writes that if Japan started obtaining nuclear weapons, other countries in the region such as South Korea, Vietnam, and the Philippines would also start, resulting in massive instability in the region. The Diplomatic Panorama concurs and finds that if one country starts proliferating, other countries will follow.

David Wroe writes that many NATO countries are afraid of Russian power and that removing US presence would cause many of them to proliferate to protect themselves.

This causes destabilization as Graham Allison of Harvard University finds that proliferation increases the chances of one-state miscalculating and striking at another. Rider of Texas Tech empirically finds that an arms race increases the likelihood of war by over 331%.

Second is avoiding nuclear terrorism.

Scott Sagan of Stanford University writes that nuclear proliferation increases the likelihood of nuclear terrorism in which terrorists obtain nuclear material. James Doyle writes that several states have limited resources to defend facilities and have nuclear facilities in conflict-prone areas.

Stanford University writes a terrorist nuclear attack is an existential threat and would be followed by a retaliatory nuclear strike, which brings the capacity to cause extinction.

Third is maintaining EU relations.

Robert Mozley of Stanford University writes that if nuclear proliferation were to happen in Europe, the EU would eventually collapse as each country tries to build up arms and maintain their own policies.

This is extremely problematic as John Bruton writes that the EU is necessary to deal with many issues such as AIDS and international security threats. Without the EU, there would be disastrous consequences.