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The Evidence Standard

Speech and Debate provides a meaningful and educational experience to all who are involved.

We, as educators in the community, believe that it is our responsibility to provide resources that uphold the foundation of the Speech and Debate activity. Champion Briefs, its employees, managers, and associates take an oath to uphold the following Evidence Standard:

1. We will never falsify facts, opinions, dissents, or any other information.
2. We will never knowingly distribute information that has been proven to be inaccurate, even if the source of the information is legitimate.
3. We will actively fight the dissemination of false information and will provide the community with clarity if we learn that a third-party has attempted to commit deception.
4. We will never support or distribute studies, news articles, or other materials that use inaccurate methodologies to reach a conclusion or prove a point.
5. We will provide meaningful clarification to any who question the legitimacy of information distributed by ourselves or by any third-party.
6. We will actively contribute to students’ understanding of the world by using evidence from a multitude of perspectives and schools of thought.
7. We will, within our power, assist the community as a whole in its mission to achieve the goals and vision of this activity.

These seven statements, while seemingly simple, represent the complex notion of what it means to advance students’ understanding of the world around them, as is the purpose of educators.
To our readers,

Once again, the community has chosen a resolution that is beautiful in its simplicity and powerful in its message, questioning the role of American money in the international theater. The broad wording of January’s topic leaves teams open to discuss virtually any form of international military policy they so choose. As such, teams have ample opportunity to practice a plethora of strategies and argument combinations and isolate the effectiveness of discussion on distinct global problems, military policies, or U.S. enemies. Crucially, this resolution asks us to consider the interaction between economics and the military, which provides a needed chance to consider the deep impacts of even the slightest policy shift.

In this brief, you’ll find just a skeleton of the possible discussion areas on the topic; we kept our approach as broad as the topic to give you access to as many avenues of research as possible. Every argument is just one facet of analysis that will make debates in January a powerful educational experience.

One final note: remember that discussions about the military often require addressing sensitive subjects that are personal to many among us. We should be respectful of those experiences while debating any topic, but especially here, remember to remain sympathetic to those around you.

In summary, enjoy this month’s topic – it will likely be one of the most fun topics with some of the most diverse arguments of the year.

Michael Norton
Editor-in-Chief
Public Forum Briefs
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Resolved: In order to better respond to international conflicts, the United States should significantly increase its military spending.

Introduction

This month is always an interesting one to debate in during the competition season. Tournaments like Blake, Emory, and James Logan provide a great competitive pool for debaters at all levels. These tournaments head off the larger invitations in February and should be used as an opportunity to gauge your skills and stamina against teams from very competitive schools round after round. This month’s resolution, “In order to better respond to international conflicts, the United States should significantly increase its military spending,” allows debaters a lot of creative freedom in constructing arguments. With a topic that can be defined this broadly, writing a solid strategy for both sides is critical. Once teams have established a clear answer to the fundamental question of the topic, collapsing the round down in later speeches becomes a lot easier and allows for the most effective impact weighing.

Approaching the Topic

Laying out an effective strategy in case is the key to success on this topic. The wording of the resolution allows an expansive breadth of arguments to materialize and teams may have to deal with scenario after scenario that the falls within the scope of the topic and what can be linked to increased military spending. Before attempting to understand what it takes to write a strategic case itself, it’s important to examine the fundamental question of the resolution. While the wording of the topic is broad, it still places a burden on both teams to link their arguments back to the US’s response to international conflict. Given this initial constraint, teams on both sides should be mindful to collapse the round down in a way that answers this question. This thinking is also a useful tool for both sides to point out to the judge. Summary speakers can begin to frame voters in a way that best answer this question and argue that if their opponents fail to do the same, then they are failing to answer the fundamental question of the resolution.
Another important aspect of this definition that should be addressed is delineating between the different types of international conflicts. The US doesn’t respond to a full-scale civil war in another country the same way it may respond to small-scale regional conflicts. Actors in international conflicts can differ depending on the scenario. The US deals very differently with political leaders in other countries than it does with non-state actors or opposition leaders. These are critical distinctions to keep in mind when responding to cases and may even be a useful overview strategy for the rebuttal speaker.

Another initial constraint the resolution examines is the issue of the defining the phrase *significantly increase*. This introduces a possible argument about thresholds within the round. I would argue that a “significant increase” in spending is an increase that is either (1) counter to current trends of spending being downsized in recent years or (2) a particularly large amount beyond the scope of what budgets in past fiscal years have looked like for the same sector. While teams shouldn’t get too caught up in the details (since it will probably be difficult to find evidence saying that a “significant increase” in spending is the link into a certain argument), I think it’s still important to delineate between status quo spending and a substantial deviation from it. When writing cases, Affirmative teams should ask themselves whether or not certain shift in policy, technology development, or any other kind of project that might benefit from an increase in spending would inevitably happen without a “significant increase” in spending. Affirmative teams are in the best position if they are able to construct scenarios that are contingent on a deviation from the status quo in spending trends, since this is probably the clearest way to illustrate what a “significant increase” looks like in real policymaking. Negative teams can use this same framing as a way to beat back Affirmative benefits by either proving that such benefits are inevitable given status quo spending (meaning that an increase in spending is somewhat non-unique) or that this increase trades off with progress in a coinciding endeavor that may be more important or effective in the long term. Affirmative teams could also counter harms presented by the Negative by arguing that certain harms, again, may be inevitable given status quo spending, or that perhaps increasing spending in other things may counter some of the harms the Negative presents. All in all, both teams benefit by addressing
threshold arguments. At the very least, they become a way to introduce defense on your opponent’s case that can cast doubts in your judge’s mind starting in the rebuttal speech or even first crossfire.

Framework on this topic can be addressed in two ways: analyzing how current trends in spending affect policymaking now and the current strategies the US uses to address international conflicts. In terms of analyzing current trends in spending, teams should, as soon as it’s possible, frame for the judge what the world of military spending looks like currently. For example, if military spending is at risk of cuts in a pending administration or fiscal year, teams ought analyze how this may be corrected through increased spending and then answer why that is a good thing. The second way to do this is to explain that certain endeavors in a world with increased military spending are more probable than others. For example, teams could argue that an increase in spending would mainly support the development of drone technology and further efforts of coercive airpower while focusing less on conventional methods of warfare. This framing is probably more useful at the contention level, but giving judges background in the topic is never something that hurts either team.

**Affirmative Strategy**

The overall Affirmative strategy should rely on well-warranted spending scenarios, nuanced links and multidimensional issues. Teams should push themselves to look beyond singular implications of spending – such as technological development or financial assistance – to how spending triggers long term effects – such as shifts in foreign policymaking, our relationships with our allies, and how the US is perceived by the rest of the world on a diplomatic level. Diversifying impacts helps the Affirmative collapse on certain arguments that have more narrative-like implications rather than just numbers and statistics.

There are a few arguments that I think provide unique, measureable benefits for the Affirmative and make for an interesting debate overall. The first is an increased investment in airpower technology. This argument has two dimensions-the development of technology itself and the policy implications of
better airpower. The first is quite straightforward: investment in this aspect of technological development generates jobs and has higher returns on investment than investments in traditional military technology. Airpower technology through unmanned drones improve precision accuracy in targeted killings, incur less civilian casualties than traditional forms of warfare, and achieve military objectives faster. The allure of airpower in American military policy is that it originated as a tool to overcome the costs of land power and the limits of traditional military means on the ground in other countries. When equipped and employed properly, air forces can secure military victory more quickly and at a less cost than traditional forms of fighting. The question then becomes, how do we use airpower to overcome the limits and costs of land power? The answer lies in the second part of this argument. The best arguments for airpower will demonstrate how airpower strategies in the military ought to reflect a mix of technology and ideas about how we can/should use new means of warfare. This requires transforming the traditional doctrines of warfare into a translatable form via airpower. This provides the base for better military strategy for a few reasons. Not only is airpower more precise, but it avoids the traditional costs of military warfare, including boots-on-the-ground methods that cost lives, entrench military installations in other countries for years at a time, or overstretched US capacity into drawn out conflicts. Airpower also better addresses more complex international conflicts. For example, when the US supports opposition leaders, several factions of an opposition, or even perhaps prevailing terrorist cells and/or non-state actors in another country, airpower avoids the confusion and costly harms of implementing traditional warfare strategies against groups them, their complex ties to one another, and the country in which they are fighting. The remote ability to influence a conflict and support groups is a unique advantage of airpower maintained by the US. Terrorist leadership elimination is a strategy almost entirely possible because of strategic airpower, as well as targeted bombing strategies and even food and medical aid delivery. This argument is a good example of going beyond just the simple singular effects of spending. Not only is the development of airpower technology highly likely since it is more cost effective, teams can argue that an increased investment in airpower will shift most foreign policies to center around strategic airpower. These benefits
can be weighed out in round as more effective alternative to conventional warfare while avoiding the costs of land power.

The second argument I think the Affirmative should focus on is the development of more effective diplomatic strategies based on increased military spending. While this may sound counterintuitive at first, it is important to point out that diplomacy as an option is only an effective tool of foreign policy if the US can be trusted to uphold security commitments and provide extended security to our allies and actors we enter negotiations with. The Affirmative can compose this argument to prove that diplomacy is only an effective tool given a strong, modern military structure that follows through on commitments to security allies.

Both above arguments can be incorporated into larger strategic goals within an Affirmative case. For example, if the thesis of the Affirmative case is that spending should be increased in order to better fight international terrorism, investments in strategic airpower and targeted strikes can be the mechanism through which this is achieved. The idea is to stay away from scenarios that are too ground-restricting or don’t frame the topic in an honest way. If Affirmative teams want to use specific solvencies, it is critical to frame them as being the most likely investment from increased military spending or to have a large share of any proposed spending. Otherwise, teams may be able to outweigh case arguments on scope.

Negative Strategy

The Negative strategy should take a similar approach to the Affirmative as far as presenting arguments with multidimensional harms and long-term impacts. I think that Negative teams can consider two arguments with unique impacts along this line.

The first argument is that a significant increase in military spending furthers the free-riding problem of the US’ extended security policy towards our allies. This strategy in foreign policy essentially extends a blanket of protection to critical allies for the US. Negative teams can present this argument by
pointing out the disparity in defense spending between the US and those that benefit from an extended security doctrine, and can effectively argue that any significant increase in spending mitigates any incentive for our international counterparts to restructure their own defense spending. There are a few impacts that can be made off of this point. The first is a pretty straightforward impact about burden sharing and the inherent issue with the US spending billions of times over what our security allies do in defense spending. This can also translate into arguments about the overextended capacity of troop stationing that the US pays to maintain security commitments abroad. If our security allies paid closer to their fair share of the cost of extended security, the US would be able to mitigate some of this spending and perhaps reinvest it into other sectors that need a larger cut of domestic spending than they receive currently (healthcare, education, etc.). The second impact of this point is that paying to maintain most of the burden of this extended security method inhibits the ability of other US deployments to adequately address international conflicts. For example, teams could argue that the US would be better equipped to fight non-state actors or groups like ISIS if funding was merely reallocated away from existing security commitments where allies don’t pay a fair share. This allows the Negative to absorb of the Affirmative impacts by arguing that the true problem with addressing international conflicts is not a lack of funding, but a spread of funding across efforts that are not being equitably funding by other allied actors involved. The Negative can then argue that simply increasing funding further substantiates the US sharing majority of this cost burden among other countries that receive the benefit of extended security and protection without contributing to it.

The second argument the Negative can capitalize on is the international optics of substantially increasing military spending. Given that the “significant increase” in spending ought to be defined as a serious deviation from the status quo, the Negative can argue that other countries will not see this as a regulatory increase in spending for existing US military efforts. The Negative can argue that the effect of signaling materializes as a result of increased spending, and this has a few harmful implications. For example, increased spending in US military efforts in Syria could signal to the regime or its Russian allies
that the US is prepared to further support and train opposition leaders. This could preemptive lead to aggressive responses from fractionalized groups supported by the Russians to increase attacks on US-backed groups. Another example could be that if the US increases spending after signing the Iran Nuclear deal, it signals to regional countries surrounding Iran that the US may be preparing to substantiate existing security outposts to prepare for a possible nuclear threat from Iran, or at the very least, preemptively balance their efforts. Countries may take this as an indication to engage in an arms race to further balance themselves against Iran and a growing US counterbalancing efforts. All of these scenarios have implications not just for the regions they occur in, but in their effects in the long term for American policy. If regions become reactive to this type of signaling, it may further spur instability in conflict-brink areas, effectively contradicting the goals of increased military spending to address international conflicts.

My overall thoughts on this topic basically par down to a few bits of advice: be sure to analyze current trends of military spending, substantiate why your arguments on either side meet the threshold requirement of increased spending, and incorporate diverse impacts into whatever argument you choose to run. This topic gives teams a lot of creative freedom, and with a strong strategic approach on both sides, rounds should never fail to be engaging and educational.

Good luck!
Liya Khan

About Liya Khan
Liya Khan competed for Dougherty Valley High School in California for four years, serving as the Public Forum captain for two of them. As a sophomore she reached late elimination rounds at the MLK Invitational and broke at every national circuit tournament that year. She reached late elimination rounds at the Harker, Stanford and Berkeley invitationals her junior and senior year and was a National Finalist in Public Forum at NSDA Nationals in 2015. She is currently a sophomore at the University of Chicago and an assistant coach for Coleyville Heritage High School.
Resolved: In order to better respond to international conflicts, the United States should significantly increase its military spending.

Introduction

With debates about the internet of things and probable cause behind us, this month’s resolution looks like it will provide some quality debate regarding benefits and drawbacks of a very contentious issue. The nice thing about this topic is that it’s a very straightforward policy resolution wherein there is little doubt that debaters are meant to discuss a world with a significant increase to military spending versus a world with no such increase. This means we’re less in the weeds about arguing relative and subjective issues and grounded firmly in a cost-benefit analysis debate that most should be very comfortable having. Within this debate, there will likely be several key benefits and drawbacks, but most teams will find success through a simple utilitarian approach.

Major Tournaments

The month of January may be my favorite because there is such an amazing pool of tournaments taking place. Most states have several large local tournaments that draw large and competitive crowds, and some - including my home state of Massachusetts - have their NSDA Qualifying Tournament using this topic. That makes success extremely important, and is another reason to be thankful for a solid policy resolution.

First off, there’s no forgetting Blake, which decides to use the January resolution though the tournament is very much in December. This tournament is well-known for its fun atmosphere, and debaters who attend will be competing in hotel rooms. Blake is also unusual
because debaters receive 4 minutes of prep time instead of the usual 2 - a second speaker could literally practice an entire final focus before getting up to give it if they used their time effectively. The pool has a very solid amount of both experienced and coach judges, including a decent pool of first-year-outs who attend with their high school teams or the schools for whom they coach. The field is already at well over 150 teams, and debaters should expect stiff competition.

Lexington, which takes place in Massachusetts in the middle of the month, has an equally difficult pool of over 150 teams, with east-coast schools featuring more prominently than at Blake. The judging pool will likely contain more inexperienced judges, with parents featuring more prominently, so debaters should be ready to use their lay appeal should they need to.

There are several other important tournaments, including the Sunvitational and Columbia, which I have personally never attended. Sunvite is generally full of extremely qualified teams from Florida and the surrounding area, along with some powerhouse teams attending from other states. I encourage you to attend if you’re looking for stiff competition. Columbia takes place the next weekend, too. With so many bid tournaments this month, it’s even more imperative than usual that debaters have good prep and are prepared for both stiff competition and judge adaptation.

**Breaking Down the Resolution**

Within the resolution, there are a few really important observations to be made about what it asks debaters to do. For one, the word *significant* needs to be analyzed, as it does not specify the amount that is going to be added in military spending. How much is really considered significant? Merriam Webster Dictionary would define significant as “having or likely to have
influence or effect” or “of a noticeably or measurably large amount,”¹ and in this case either
definition could be applicable. One could say that the resolution asks us to consider adding
enough money to the military budget to have a noticeable effect or influence on the military, and
this may in fact not require a large increase. If the only threshold to cross is that of having an
influence on the military, this would likely refer to most regular budgets that slightly increase or
decrease the military budget, because each of these probably changes programs and practices at
least slightly, meeting the threshold. If one instead argues that significant is referring to a
noticeably large amount, this would likely mean a larger sum of money, because one could argue
that current increases or decreases in defense spending don’t really affect military operations due
to the vastness of the existing budget.

Another crucial point regarding this resolution is noting how the word significant relates
to what is currently happening to the military budget. During President Obama’s years in office,
there has, by all accounts, been a decline in military spending, and each year this spending has
become a smaller share of the budget. This hasn’t happened in an extremely impactful or drastic
way, but our overall spending on national security has decreased every year since 2011 by a
cumulative 15 percent margin. Not only that, but it is becoming a smaller and smaller share of
the budget as a whole - while it used to be over 20 percent of the federal budget, it is now around
15 percent, which is likely both a testament to an overall increase in government spending and
less military spending.² As this is an instance of arguably run-of-the-mill changes in military
spending, one may have to argue that a larger increase than recent downsizing is necessary to

  <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/significant>

qualify as “significant.” This status quo also makes it possible to argue that the reason we need to increase the military budget is to save it from budget cuts that are eating away at its effectiveness, something that makes a lot of intuitive sense.

However, it’s also important to remember that historical trends for military spending makes the recent budget decline similar to removing a cup of water from an ever-expanding ocean. Since the 1960s and 70s, there has been - in terms of dollar figures strictly - an increase in military spending of hundreds of billions of dollars. When this is taken as a share of GDP, the impact is lessened significantly, but overall defense spending has still gone up significantly on net since the massive spike in 2001 following 9/11. Even after a budget cut of around $100 billion since 2011, there has been an increase in military expenditures from $400 billion in 2001 to over $600 billion in 2013, presenting a spending hike of 50%. This is important to understand, because this can really put into context what a significant increase would look like.

It also presents more interesting questions - is this increase happening all at once, or over an extended period of time? Is significant being defined as what has occurred since 2011 or since 2001? These are questions with no clear-cut answer where it will be up to each team to provide these distinctions and to pro teams specifically to set up the terms upon which the round can be debated and weighed. No matter what way one looks at it, though, understanding historical trends in the military budget will be important.

One last crucial thing to note regarding the wording of the resolution is that the wording itself specifies the kind of impacts to be accessed in the debates. It states that the U.S. is

---

increasing its military budget “in order to better respond to international conflicts,” meaning that the pro team must access their benefits of increased military spending by explaining how they relate to our ability to do this. Other impacts that are accessed by the pro do not provide reasons to vote because the resolution asks us to increase the U.S. military budget for the purpose of responding to conflict; if the impact does not do so, it isn’t a reason to affirm. This actually provides the con with more ground, because they can discuss impacts not directly related to international conflict while the pro cannot. Con teams may want to take advantage of this ability to either broaden or narrow the debate. If teams want fewer impacts to analyze in a debate round, they should tailor their impacts to international conflict. If they want to bring in other impacts and arguments that the pro team can’t access for offense, they should discuss impacts related to other aspects of military spending.

**Potential Arguments and Strategies**

Pro arguments for this month, as stated above, need to be tailored to how they affect our ability to respond to international conflict, which is in some ways limiting. However, within that frame there are a great many arguments to be made for increased spending, and I feel that there are 2 primary ways a team could go about this. On the one hand, they could discuss general reasons for increased spending. This includes everything from the ability to maintain hegemony and maintain security commitments to revamping our nuclear arsenal and funding the drone strike program. These arguments, while they might be more specifically tailored to certain regions or against certain groups, do not refer explicitly to a certain conflict or group that the U.S. is fighting and needs to effectively respond to. They examine more generally the benefits of spending money on the military, which can be beneficial because the impacts are widespread and provide more general benefits. However, these impacts are also less specific, likely with fewer
exact numbers or precise benefits. For this reason, another effective approach would be to tackle one or several specific zones of conflict in the world, and how military spending would affect these places. Some major hotspots in the world today include Syria, Russia, China, and even Iran. There is a plethora of evidence out there about how more military forces or resources would affect each of these conflicts. Perhaps most interestingly, we have had resolutions in the past about many of these very locations. Russian sanctions was the topic last January, and last March was about Okinawa (which had large impacts on Chinese aggression). Nuclear proliferation (which placed a lot of emphasis on Iran) was several years ago in September/October, and we have had resolutions both specifically about ISIS and about the Syrian refugee crisis (last November). In this way, going specific could provide debaters an opportunity to go into their backfiles and find great evidence that has already been cut. Beyond this important factor, impacts for these conflict zones will likely be more specific and a result easier to weigh. There are benefits and drawbacks to each approach, and debaters can choose to either have a cohesive case theme by doing a just one approach or do bit of both to get both general and specific impacts. Regardless of strategy, pro debaters should find a great many arguments to draw from, and over the next month, aff arguments will likely develop significantly.

On the con, as stated previously, there’s a bit more ground that can be covered in terms of case impacting. Not only can the con discuss impacts to international conflicts, but issues unrelated to this point. This means that the economic harms of increased military spending through fewer jobs and less innovation or budget shifting with negative impacts to other government sectors are all completely fair game. It may be a good idea to take advantage of this to give yourself more ground that is inaccessible to aff teams - even if they turn one of these arguments, it isn’t an independent reason to affirm, because it wouldn’t be an increase in military
spending to better respond to international conflict. In addition, it will likely be more beneficial for con teams to use broad arguments that cover more than one specific scenario, and address the specific cases brought up by the pro in rebuttal in order to expand the debate to their benefit. That being said, there are many ways for a con team to access massive impacts, whether their contentions are discussing the negative impacts of drone usage or harms to alliances or ineffective conflict intervention.

It’s also important to remember that the pro team, whether they are discussing specific conflicts or general principles, will likely have to make some assumptions about where the military funding will go. This is important because con teams can contest this on a fact level (i.e. unless the pro has concrete evidence that funds would be used in this manner, con teams can call them out for having no grounds for their arguments). If they talk about increased military aid, for example, ask them to provide any evidence that increased defense spending would be funneled into military aid. This is a good way to make the pro team appear less credible and can even remove the validity of their argument entirely, making it an easy way to take out opposing contentions. Overall, con teams should seek to diversify their arguments beyond the scope of what the pro has the ability to argue and go broad on the scope of their arguments and impacts.

**Conclusion**

This January should be a great month for debate. Not only will there be a surplus of bid tournaments, qualifiers, and locals, the topic is one that inspires well-balanced debate. Military spending is one of those age-old debates that this country has been having for a very long time, much like the merits of tax increases versus spending cuts. One important note to make is that judges, in particular those with less experience, will come into rounds with many pre-existing
notions regarding the issues at play. This is true in a way that it likely wasn’t for Plan Colombia, the Internet of Things, or Probable Cause. Keep this in mind as you attend tournaments, and make sure you’re doing good research, because more judges than normal will likely know if you aren’t well-prepared!

Arguments should develop significantly as the month goes on, and as always I look forward to seeing what teams are running and how arguments change over time. Try to stay ahead of the curve on this topic by thinking outside the box for more unique and creative arguments. I hope to see some really interesting points!

Good luck!

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

Introduction

The January topic follows in the vein of past topics that have been broad, foreign policy related, and discuss international conflict. January is a very competitive month on the circuit with prep and competitiveness at an all-time high, as students who spent their winter breaks practicing come back to test out their new skills at the variety of high stakes tournaments that dominate the scene. This topic interestingly plays on a variety of judges’ sensibilities: many people believe our military is too large and overcommitted, but equally vocal are those that believe the current budget of the defense department to be woefully inadequate. These views intercede people of all walks of life, making it almost impossible to tell if the judge sitting in front of you is predisposed to one avenue of argumentation or another.

Tournament Considerations

January is one of the most competitive months on the national circuit. The tournaments are technical, have large fields, and are very prestigious.

The first tournament that uses the January topic is the Blake tournament in Minneapolis. Blake is a great tournament. It is well run, has a technical judging pool, and has a large pool of competition. Blake is in mid-December, so teams have not had a lot of time to practice the January topic, or cut much prep. This equalizes some of the imbalances that come from having a lot of time to prep a topic, such as big schools being able to pool resources or schools which trade prep with others. As such, Blake out rounds have been known to have teams ‘break out’ and do well for the first time on a national stage, because the playing field is more level. Blake is
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an excellent opportunity to experience competition from across the circuit and get a head start on the January competition. Because Blake happens so early and comes prior to the other tournaments on the topic, it might be a good idea to keep an ear to the floor to see what arguments are run, because they will set the tone for which arguments are run for the rest of the topic.

Other tournaments on the topic include Emory, Lexington, Laird, and Columbia. Personally, having only experience with Lexington and Columbia I will focus on those. These are two quarters-bid tournaments with strong east coast competition. The two tournaments have fairly traditional judging, so make sure arguments are accessible. Lexington is known for having especially lay judging with high variance in speaker points. Columbia is also known for not breaking all 4-2s, so it might be advisable to make extra sure that you are speaking well enough to clear. This creates an interesting environment of many technical teams debating in front of traditional judges.

**Strategy Consideration**

Before we get into the meat of the topic, we should consider how the resolution is framed and what potential areas of contention might be within the ground of the topic.

Clearly one important question is ‘what does it mean to significantly increase spending?’ The USFG already spends hundreds of billions of dollars on defense, and funding new programs can be incredibly costly. Smart teams can discuss the current political climate and what forms or timetable the spending might take. This also allows for argumentation about the political reactions, changes, and backlash which might occur due to a ‘significant’ increase in spending, and how that might play out with media and popular perception of such actions. It is also important to remember that the neg does not advocate for defense cuts, merely the status quo,
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and we currently spend so much money on the military that it can be hard to determine what any marginal change from current policy would be.

We also must consider how the increase in spending would play out. Aff teams are likely to argue that a significant increase in spending would result in the funding of programs that departs from the status quo: new initiatives and projects which could not be achieved with old levels of funding. However, on the neg teams should make a point that the Aff cannot just decide where and how spending changes will be allocated, because the resolution does not specify a plan. Therefore, the spending will inherently be targeted towards current projects and underfunded plans. This debate is very important because it defines the ground for the resolution, it sets the agenda for what policies the money will be spent on. One way this can be looked at is how the current budget has forced the pentagon to cut corners, and argue that were we to increase the budget, these corners would no longer be cut. Some of these programs include understaffing offices, cuts to military aid, and back to back rotations for soldiers.

Next we ought to consider what types of international conflicts we are looking at. Presumably most conflicts that the Pentagon deals with are international in nature and can be put within the scope of the resolution, but familiarity with the big ones is important in grasping the intricacies of what teams will be arguing about. The most discussed areas of conflict that debaters should familiarize themselves with are Russia, Syria/Iraq, and China.

Russia has a history of expansionism, and the recent crisis is no exception. The last few years have seen Russian funding of a rebellion against the Ukrainian government, the annexation of Crimea, adventurism in Syria, and war in the caucuses. Russian aggression is problematic for its neighbors which are our allies, and potentially an issue in terms of economic destabilization. Traditionally the US has balanced Russia by supporting and committing to our NATO allies,
who live in an expansionist Russia’s back door. Increases and decreases in spending directly impact our ability to support these allies who overwhelmingly depend on our preponderance of power for military support.

Syria’s civil war and Iraq’s associated ongoing conflict with ISIS is another one of the US’s major international conflicts. For half a decade Syria has been in constant conflict with many factions vying for control, the most dangerous among them ISIS, also operational in Iraq. ISIS is a major threat to US interests because it is a sponsor of terror, and exports that terror globally. Unlike in Russia’s recent territorial escapades in Europe, we are using a different strategy to fight for Syrian freedom. The UK employs a joint combination of drones, airstrikes, and military aid for friendly rebel factions. These open up a whole new range of debates beyond balancing, from the effectiveness of targeted killing, to the efficacy of supporting rebel insurgent forces. Teams arguing about Syria should be prepared to delve into the advantages or disadvantages of any of these fields.

The last potential area for international conflict that should be touched upon is the rise of China. China has been steadily growing over the last few decades, and with it comes a hunger for security and expansionism. This puts China at odds with a host of US allies and partners including Japan and South Korea. This debate, unlike the Russian debate, focuses on how an increase or decrease in military funding affects the potential for future conflict, and the willingness to enter conflict or be aggressive. Russia has already established itself as a revisionist power, but China still has room to make its stance in international affairs as either a cooperative nation or a hostile one, and teams should look at Chinese high politics to see whether or not an increase in military spending would change the tone for Sino-US relations.
Affirmative Argumentation

There are a few arguments that Affirmative teams should consider, but before they do we ought to do some framing of how impacts work on Aff. The problem that many teams will experience is a problem of marginality. The US Federal government already spends the most money on military spending out of the combined total of all other nation. We have bases in almost every region of the world, naval fleets that can project power at will, and almost unquestioned air power. The question here becomes whether or not the marginal change in spending creates any of the impacts that the aff or neg argues about, which can be difficult to separate from the general arguments. Keep this in mind this framing before rounds to avoid tripping up.

The first avenue of affirmative argumentation to consider is the idea of establishing credible commitments. Credibility is very important in terms of guaranteeing a strong US presence abroad for several reasons. First credibility is important to make sure our allies stay allies. For many nations, especially those that are near several regional powers, a credible US commitments to their security is the make or break between joining onto the US bangwagon or joining some other regional bloc. If our commitment to our allies is not rock solid, then why will they have faith that we will defend them? This is especially important because you can highlight particular important areas of the world where our budget shortfalls are apparent, the recent series of base closures, our scaling down of infantry divisions, all send a signal that we might not be the reliable partner that we used to be. Increased spending also send the signal of credible commitment to our adversaries. Foreign powers look to the United States when judging the permissibility of their action. Most nations would take a second glance before embarking on a course that put them towards war with the United State. This is critical because credibility can
make the difference between a stable relationship of deterrence and an actively hostile relationship or even all-out war. Perhaps if Kuwait had been credibly defended by the US for instance, Saddam Hussain might not have attacked it, and in turn we wouldn’t have to intervene in the conflict.

Another avenue for Affirmative teams to consider is to look at underfunded US commitments and how increasing funding would solve them. It is difficult to see how increases in money would be spent, so instead let’s look at programs that are underfunded in the status quo and presumably upon an increase in funding would return to their normal levels. One such program is troop rotations. The US military has had to cut the amount of armed forces personnel to keep up with budget shortfalls. However, this results in a stretching of the combatants that we have remaining in deployment. This is because with fewer active duty personnel we have to either call upon reserve forces or those in the National Guard, or force service people to engage in multiple rotations back to back.

The issue of budget shortfalls impacting troop deployment is serious. For one thing, it results in a decrease in National Guardspersons or reserve personnel who often do not expect to be called into combat roles upon enlisting. Being relocated for months and months disrupts the lives of servicepersons, making it more difficult to justify logistically. Furthermore back to back deployments put people through psychological stress and hurt the wellbeing of our soldiers, who already serve their country in the first tour. You can make the analysis here that not increasing spending will not result in fewer conflicts, just more stretched-thin personnel, and as a result if we are to maintain the current level of overseas commitment, we ought to make sure that those that are serving our country are not disadvantaged.
Negative Argumentation

The negative side in the January topic has a lot of interesting argumentative ground to work with. Before we go into the specifics though we should look at an issue of framing. Negative teams should be wary of Affirmative teams aggressively defining their own ground on the topic. They should argue that the resolution does not specify exactly how the money will be spent and the affirmative cannot simply say what that will look like. This is important because it restricts the affirmative from the scope of any possible spending of money, which would in turn force the negative to defend any possible spending, and therefore put teams at a significant disadvantage. Be sure to stress that Aff teams have to defend the most likely implementation of the money being allocated, and it might also be a good idea to map out what that manifestation would look like.

There are a few interesting spaces for argumentation on neg. One would be that no matter how the money is spent, it signals aggression and inflames tensions. In international relations theory, increases in military spending trigger what is called a “security dilemma,” where states who are unsure of our intentions perceive an increase in military spending as at least a potential threat, triggering some retaliatory increases in military spending. This makes sense because for many nations, the United States is a potential military threat, and an increase in military spending would look scary. This has a number of impacts. For one it could trigger an arms race, creating more hostile enemies and a worse political climate. In areas like Russia this could be a disaster, with more money and guns flowing to anti-NATO anti-Ukraine rebels that destabilize our allies every day. These signals have tangible results, as our enemies’ spin our military policy to fit their ends. The list does not end with Russia, because other actors such as ISIS and Iran draw regime
support for themselves and their expansionist revisionist policies by painting the US as an aggressor imperialist nations.

Another problem with military spending would be that the way we use our military is ineffective. This argument can be made by analyzing current applications of military hardware. Each neg team will have to find their own example to focus upon, but should research these specific scenarios in depth. There are many example, such as Arial strikes against terrorists. It can be argued that air strikes are ineffective and counterproductive. Airstrikes are bad because they result in high levels of civilian deaths while also usually failing to eliminate terrorist leadership. Even if elimination works it usually is only short-term as terrorists have advanced bureaucracy and can usually replenish their ranks. If the money will be spent on airstrike it might be better for the money to not be spent at all. Remember though this is just one possible example of a cherry-picked policy. If a team can justify why this is a likely implementation of the increase in funding then the pro will have to defend it.

Good Luck!
Jakob Urda
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General Information

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

Foreword: We, at Champion Briefs, feel that having deep knowledge about a topic is just as valuable as formulating the right arguments. Having general background knowledge about the topic area helps debaters form more coherent arguments from their breadth of knowledge. As such, we have compiled general information on the key concepts and general areas that we feel will best suit you for in- and out-of-round use. Any strong strategy or argument must be built from a strong foundation of information; we hope that you will utilize this section to help build that foundation.

Introduction

The United States Military Budget is a complicated beast to understand not only because it’s a large and deep collection of funds being allocated for a litany of different purposes throughout the many different departments under the DoD but also because it’s practically a living/breathing entity that is constantly changing from year to year.

To be able to tackle the current state of the US Military budget, one has to understand how the budget works in the first place.

Take the defense budget from 2015, for instance.4

The entire discretionary defense budget can be more easily split up into 5 main categories. The base budget is the recurring budget that exists no matter what the geopolitical landscape calls for. The Overseas Contingency Operations Fund or OCO is a newer fund that is otherwise known as the war funds.

The National Priorities project explains, “Originally used to finance the Iraq and Afghanistan wars, the OCO continues to be a source of funding for the Pentagon, with a fraction of the funds going to the State Department. Since the OCO fund has very little oversight and is not subject to the sequestration cuts that slashed every other part of the budget in 2013, many experts consider it a “slush fund” for the Pentagon.”

The next big portion of the budget covers the nuclear missile defense program, followed by a portion set aside as funding for international security projects and aid. Finally, the remaining 1% of the budget covers additional expenses not traditionally covered elsewhere.

Going further into the numbers, the base budget can be split up in a few different ways as well.

![Diagram showing 2015 US military budget by appropriations title](image)

More than 2/3 of the 2015 base budget was spent on essential costs to maintain the status quo of the operation. This is the large chunk that simply keeps the lights on and the checks mailed. The remaining 1/3 was spent primarily on the procurement and advancement of weapons technology for the military. If these numbers seem lower than what you assumed they might be, it would be wise to under the budget sequestration cuts that have come in the last few years.

Jacobson and Sherman of Politifact in December of 2015 note, “National security spending made up 20.1 percent of the federal budget in 2010, but in 2015 it was 15.9%.”

---

percent. Over the same period, spending fell from 4.6 percent of gross domestic product to 3.3 percent. There are two main reasons for the spending drop. The first is the Obama administration’s decision to start removing U.S. troops from Iraq and Afghanistan. The second has to do with a process known as sequestration. Sequestration refers to the framework for automatic, across-the-board cuts to both military and non-military spending that were originally designed to force bipartisan negotiators in Congress to strike a deal in 2011. When negotiations fell apart, the cuts went into effect. The bipartisan nature of the sequestration provision means that both parties merit a share of the blame, experts say.²

With all of that in mind, it’s possible to break down the current state of the military budget. For the upcoming year, Congress has been at work trying to negotiate and pass a budget under the current confines of the sequestration limits.

O’Brien of Politico in December of 2016 points out that, “The House handily passed a $619 billion defense policy bill Friday, approving a compromise to fund U.S. wars in Afghanistan and against the Islamic State, fill gaps in military readiness and halt reductions in military manpower. The vote was 375 to 34, well above the two-thirds majority needed to override any presidential veto. The Senate is set to consider the National Defense Authorization Act next week and is expected to easily send it to President Barack Obama. The legislation, hammered out over months by the members and staff of the House and Senate Armed Services Committee, adds $3.2 billion over the president's budget request in war funds to mitigate readiness shortfalls in the Pentagon's base budget. It also incorporates the administration's $5.8 billion supplemental defense spending request for more troops in Afghanistan and stepped-up operations against the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria. The funding agreement comes after months of haggling by lawmakers over whether to tap the war-related Overseas Contingency Operations account to fund everyday defense priorities. The House version of the bill tapped $18 billion in war funds to pay for base budget programs, while the Senate version did not. The funding maneuver, which didn't include spending increases for domestic programs, drew a veto threat from the president. The compromise bill funds a higher 2.1 percent troop pay raise above the 1.6 percent increase proposed by the administration. The measure also would authorize more troops than requested by the administration, setting 476,000 troops for the Army, 16,000 more than requested. And it would authorize a 185,000-troop active-duty Marine Corps, 3,000 more than requested. Both proposals were popular among lawmakers.”³

---

The upcoming budget marks a slight increase over the one in 2015 as operations in the Middle East and elsewhere ramp up. Critics cite a concern with using OCO funds to cover base elements of defense despite them not being regulated like base funding. Others maintain that the current budget is subject to abundant waste.

Whitlock and Woodward of the Washington Post in December of 2016 broke the story about the Pentagon secretly working to keep the public in the dark about alleged waste in its budget.

“The Pentagon has buried an internal study that exposed $125 billion in administrative waste in its business operations amid fears Congress would use the findings as an excuse to slash the defense budget, according to interviews and confidential memos obtained by The Washington Post. Pentagon leaders had requested the study to help make their enormous back-office bureaucracy more efficient and reinvest any savings in combat power. But after the project documented far more wasteful spending than expected, senior defense officials moved swiftly to kill it by discrediting and suppressing the results.”

Despite this, the bill is expected to be signed by President Obama and the budget itself is expected to be expanded even further in keeping with President-elect Trump’s campaign promises to bolster up our military.

Without getting into too many specifics, Vice-President Elect Mike Pence hinted at some of the first objectives planned for a Trump administration come late January.

John T Bennett of Roll Call in December of 2016 reports, “Though he mostly repeated first-100-days pledges he and Trump have made since Election Day, Pence did reveal plans to send Congress a “military supplemental” spending bill during the administration’s first 100 days to help with its pledge to “rebuild our military.” Existing defense spending caps will be an instant hurdle. Pence did not specify whether the Trump team plans to classify the extra funding in a way that would make those dollars subject to the caps. Trump officials have not indicated whether they would cut a deal with Democrats to secure the additional defense dollars by giving them extra domestic spending. (Pence also did not indicate the size of the coming Pentagon spending bill, known as a “supplemental” in Washington parlance.)”


It is yet to be seen what exactly a Trump White House will end up doing to achieve its goals. Business analysts consider Mr. Trump to be a bit of a wild card and his dealings in the month of December during the transition period have certainly been up to that expectation.

However, as Congress moves quickly and more is speculated about what the new administration could end up doing, certain plans of action increasingly solidify themselves as the likely outcomes.

O’Neal of the IB Times in December of 2016\(^\text{10}\) writes, “After Congress failed to pass a budget for fiscal year 2017, which started in October, the House GOP opted for a continuing resolution, which would fund the government until March 31, preventing another shutdown. Because the 2017 budget isn’t yet set in stone, Trump can reshape $1.07 trillion of it—$550 billion of which could go to defense—soon after he enters office, said Ed Lorenzen, a senior advisor at the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget. After that, Trump would have to work with Congress to repeal the Budget Control Act and meet his military expansion targets for the 2018 fiscal year, a move that would require 60 Senate votes in a chamber of 51 Republicans. If he’s successful, according to Lorenzen, the Defense Department could begin handing out contracts to companies by May 2017.”

The expansion of the military budget even further could potentially fuel an ever-growing engagement of US military operations on foreign soils. Delman of The Atlantic in March of 2016 argues, “And yet while America’s military footprint abroad is fainter today than when Obama took office, it’s also more dispersed. Not counting the probable expansion of the anti-ISIS campaign to Libya and other parts of Africa in the near future, the U.S. military is, by my reckoning, involved in more countries now than when Obama took office in 2009, albeit to varying degrees. To be fair, defining U.S. “military involvement” is tricky, partly because there are many levels of engagement between no military involvement and full-scale invasion, and partly because so much of the U.S.’s military activity is done from the shadows.”\(^\text{11}\)

The Obama military doctrine struck a different tone than the Bush doctrine as the new administration will as well. The problem arises in just how different the next Commander in Chief decides to play it.

---


Dovere of Politico in December of 2016 reports, “We will stop racing to topple foreign regimes that we know nothing about, that we shouldn’t be involved with,” Trump said. “Instead, our focus must be on fighting terrorism and destroying ISIS.” Trump said he’d be taking note of which countries join in the fight against ISIS on his terms, and remembering them going forward, and that that effort will be stepped up. He has long said he has a secret plan to fight ISIS, but he has yet to provide any details of it or evidence that it exists.”

Again, still a lot to be seen from President Trump. What can be pointed out, however, is that Trump’s comments about abandoning decades of NATO protocol commitment may not come to fruition as the potential for NATO allies to increase their own spending also increases.

Dan Bilefsky of the New York Times in November of 2016 notes, “But in his first speech since the election last week, Jens Stoltenberg, the NATO secretary general, said that he looked forward to meeting Mr. Trump soon and that he was certain Mr. Trump would not waver on the United States’ role in the alliance. “Europe needs America and America needs Europe,” Mr. Stoltenberg said at an event in Brussels organized by the German Marshall Fund of the United States, a think tank that focuses on trans-Atlantic affairs. “I am absolutely confident that President Trump will maintain American leadership in the alliance and will maintain a strong commitment to European security. It is important for Europe, but it is also important for the United States.” Mr. Stoltenberg, who is a former prime minister of Norway, said he would tell Mr. Trump that Europe was prepared to increase its financial commitment to the alliance, which he said was crucial at a time of increased instability, including a more assertive Russia; the threat of the Islamic State; turmoil in the Middle East; and cyberwarfare. “I will tell President-elect Trump that my main priority is that European allies increase defense spending,” Mr. Stoltenberg said. Mr. Trump’s insistence that Europe pay more, Mr. Stoltenberg added, was hardly a new demand. He said he had heard the same message from other leading American officials, including President Obama and every member of Congress that he had met. The United States accounts for 70 percent of spending on the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and Mr. Stoltenberg noted that other than the United States, only four NATO countries — Britain, Estonia, Greece and Poland — spent at least 2 percent of gross domestic product on defense, the alliance’s goal for its members. He stressed that if all NATO members matched that target, it would mean an additional $100 billion a year for the alliance.”

---


This news bodes well for the current state of affairs. Trump seems to be softening on NATO as a result while also considering cabinet picks that support his message of increased support from other member states.

Demirjian of The Washington Post in December of 2016 writes, **“Senator Bob Corker is one of an apparently growing number of candidates that Trump is considering to be his chief ambassador to the world. They have recently included Corker, who supported Trump during the campaign; former archrival Mitt Romney; former New York mayor Rudy Giuliani; former Utah governor Jon Huntsman, ex-U.N. ambassador John Bolton; Exxon head Rex Tillerson; and Sen. Joe Manchin (D-W.Va.). Many of those candidates are likely to break with Trump, including Corker, in a number of key foreign policy areas especially concerning Russia. Since winning the election, Trump has tempered his rhetoric on NATO, to the extent that even outgoing President Obama said he was confident Trump would maintain U.S. obligations to the alliance after meeting with the president-elect.”**

Considering the aforementioned broad reach of US military engagements, it’s important to continue to keep an eye on the approach of the Trump administration with regards to responding to geopolitical crises, especially with NATO nations if the proposed increases don’t come to fruition.

---
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Affirmative Framework 1

We observe that the primary concern of this debate should be related to maintaining US hegemony as the most important impact in the round.

Joseph S. Nye writing for World Finance in 2015 argues, “The question now is whether the era of US primacy is coming to an end. Given the unpredictability of global developments, it is, of course, impossible to answer this question definitively. The rise of transnational forces and non-state actors, not to mention emerging powers like China, suggests that there are big changes on the horizon. But there is still reason to believe that, at least in the first half of this century, the US will retain its primacy in power resources and continue to play the central role in the global balance of power. In short, while the era of US primacy is not over, it is set to change in important ways. Whether or not these changes will bolster global security and prosperity remains to be seen.”

US Hegemony has been controversial at worst and relatively stable at best. Maintaining this balance of power will continue to foster peacemaking through strength and posturing. The team that best promotes US hegemony is the team that should win the round.

- **Explanation:**
  - This is a fair framework that allows both sides a chance to tackle the issue of maintaining the status quo and keeping the peace. Even if your opponents don’t take the bait, you can go in with a clear strategy for weighing in later speeches.

- **Answer:**
  - It's not far-fetched to suggest that the unpredictability of the new administration might be a sign of caution with regards to the current pillars of Western hegemony. Not increasing the military budget means we kill less on foreign soil.

---

Affirmative Framework 2

We observe that the judge ought to look to timeframe as a means of evaluating arguments in the round.

In order to better respond to international conflicts, we need to be able to respond more quickly.

The Heritage Foundation published a report in 2015 regarding US Military readiness and found that, “Faced with the current sharp reductions in funding mandated by sequestration, military service officials, senior DOD officials, and even Members of Congress have warned of the dangers of recreating the “hollow force” of the 1970s when units existed on paper but were staffed at reduced levels, minimally trained, and woefully equipped as a consequence of inadequate funding to conduct training, hone skills in exercises, and repair broken or replace worn-out equipment.”

Whichever team can create quicker response times and more sustained operations is ahead on both a short term and long term timeframe and should win the ballot.

• **Explanation:**
  o This is a framework that allows for a lot of different avenues to the ballot. Our military responses can either be quicker or prolonged and either one is a leg up on what the negative can claim with maintaining the status quo as the main advocacy.

• **Answer:**
  o The negative can attempt to undercut this framework by showing that a response by the United States is wholly unnecessary or worse, entirely problematic. This takes the wind out of the affirmative’s sails and leaves the negative with the leg up in the race to the end.

We observe that a realistic approach to a better-funded military is an increase in both hard and soft power.

“Harvard Professor Joe Nye who coined the term “soft power” argues it is not a binary choice. He developed on his original definition of power by identifying a third way states could convince others to do what they wanted – with “smart power” – basically wielding a mix of hard and soft power. Looking at how the United States, Russia and China have conducted themselves through this lens shows all three are trying – with varying levels of success – to use smart power.”

This promotion of smart power is the preferable outcome primarily because a stocked up up military that is ready to strike at a moment’s notice by always being on guard is one strength, but smart power assumes that aggression is not the first option, making it one of many strengths.

The team that best promotes smart power for the US and allies is the team that best meets the burden of the resolution.

• **Explanation:**
  o This framework pushes a catchall argument in a simple narrative. This will be easy to push forward as the central focus of your case if you can focus on improvements to both hard and soft power.

• **Answer:**
  o The easiest way to respond to this is to show how the upcoming administration upsets the neoliberal order more than anything else in the last few years. The balance between hard and soft power is going to be called into question as the Trump administration abandons the norms of the past.

---

Negative Framework 1

We observe that impacts to human rights ought to be evaluated as the most important in the round.

Reyes of the ACLU in March of 2014 notes, “The U.N. Human Rights Committee issued a blistering report on the U.S. government's role in perpetuating injustices both within its borders and abroad. This month in Geneva, the U.S. faced a barrage of questions from renowned human rights experts regarding its compliance with the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), one of the few international human rights treaties the U.S. has ratified.”

US response to international conflicts often times erodes the protection of human rights and the team that best promotes human rights for all is the team that has the impact with the most weight, winning the ballot.

- **Explanation:**
  - This framework opens up a more critical conversation of the effects of US intervention. The impacts you set up under that should be easy to weigh in front of most judges.

- **Answer:**
  - The best bet here is just to counter this directly by saying that US intervention is the best chance at lasting peace, promoting more lives saved in the long run.

---

Negative Framework 2

We observe that the weighing mechanism through which you view this round should consider irreversibility of impacts first and foremost.

The military budget of the United States can change year to year but the lives lost and the damage dealt in prolonged conflicts can never truly be replaced.

Countless examples from Iraq to Africa to Central America and beyond show time and time again that the US can intervene for any variety of reasons and still leave a lasting impact both positive and negative.

This mixed record has provided enough reason for concern regarding future involvements. In order to prove that we should respond to conflicts better, the affirmative has to prove that we have to respond to conflicts more than we already are at all after considering the irreversibility of that action.

- **Explanation:**
  - This framework provides a pre-requisite of sorts for the affirmative to get past. The lasting damage in both past and present conflicts is enough to convince most judges that irreversibility matters.

- **Answer:**
  - You could argue either that an affirmative ballot is not an irreversible change in military policy but simply a more well-funded effort at maintaining the peace, or that in the long run you still achieve more of a lasting stability regardless. As the military becomes more technologically advanced, the response can be more swift and efficient.
We observe that a multilateral response to conflicts is preferable to a US based response. This approach ensures that a response can exist despite mixed performance by the US.

Shuster of Time Magazine in November of 2016 notes, “The Europeans made deep cuts in defense spending at the turn of the century, leaving the U.S. to carry an ever-greater share of the costs within the alliance. In an effort to reverse that trend, all NATO countries committed in 2002 to spend at least 2% of their GDP on defense. But only five of its 28 members – the U.S., the U.K., Greece, Poland and Estonia – currently meet that benchmark. Massive economies like Germany and Canada have not even come close, despite President Obama’s persistent demands that they spend more.”

Unless the affirmative team can demonstrate a reversal of this on a large enough scale, US response to international conflicts will be insufficient and not leave many impacts to be weighed.

- **Explanation:**
  - This framework puts the affirmative in a bind. Either they take the stance that the US should increase the budget to act multilaterally and jump through two hoops, or they have to prove that multilateralism will somehow survive in a Trump White House, which is a big enough hoop in itself to prove concretely.

- **Answer:**
  - Arguably the best strategy to point out is that the negative doesn’t have offense to stand on with this point and therefore shouldn’t be voted up on it.

---
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Pro Arguments with Con Responses
PRO – Military Spending Benefits the U.S. Economy

Argument: Increased government spending on the military benefits the economy through increased jobs and higher GDP

Warrant: Military spending is currently on the decline


Senior defense officials have been busy explaining the negative consequences of inadequately funding defense for 2011. If Congress does not support the President’s budget request for 2011, the defense budget plans for FY 2012 will then be adversely affected. The military would be able to buy even less defense in the out years than it plans on the books today due to a readjusted lower baseline from which future spending is calculated. A survey of recent pronouncements from military and defense officials highlights the real-world impact of Congress’s messy spending plans for defense. Army officials are currently lacking funds to purchase four new helicopters that are employed extensively in overseas operations in Afghanistan and Iraq. Under current spending constraints, the army is “unable to buy four new CH-47 Chinook helicopters for the Army’s 13th Combat Aviation Brigade.”[1]
**Warrant:** These spending cuts have harmed the economy


Liberals take the Keynesian line that **government spending acts like an economic multiplier:** It not only generates immediate economic activity by guaranteeing that money is spent (creating demand), but that spending provides an opportunity for private actors to recycle the money into further investment and further spending. This chart, from the FT’s Matthew Klein based on data from the BEA, seems to show that government has a pretty straightforward effect on GDP. When spending goes up, it adds to economic growth. When it goes down, it subtracts from it and hobbles the economy: Klein has another chart isolating the effect of defence spending on growth. **Reduced military spending** — the withdrawal of troops from Iraq and Afghanistan, basically — also hurts growth. The chart shows that as military spending went negative in 2011, it truncated GDP growth. Only recently, as non-defence government spending has outweighed defence cuts, has total government spending been a net contributor to GDP again.
Warrant: Defense cuts have cost the economy 1 million jobs


Meanwhile, a special congressional committee established by the recently enacted Budget Control Act began gearing up to recommend budget cuts that could destroy a million jobs -- jobs tied to the current level of defense spending. What's wrong with the picture is that Washington is wasting a lot of time and energy trying to implement contradictory measures that will cancel each other out in terms of their impact on the economy. The Budget Control Act signed by the president in August could result in cuts to defense totaling $100 billion annually for nine straight years beginning in fiscal 2013, and similarly sizable cuts to domestic programs. In a moment, I'll illustrate how the defense cuts by themselves could wipe out a million jobs, many of them high-paying tech positions in areas related to exports and innovation.
Impact: Increasing military spending improves the economy and increases jobs


The FY 2010 baseline defense budget is projected to reach about $587 billion. Importantly, every $1 billion spent on defense generates close to 10,000 jobs. Only about two-thirds of the defense budget is spent in the years for which it is authorized. Consequently, some spending can be accelerated without adding to the nation’s long-term debt or purchasing items that do not enhance our overall national security. For example, funds authorized for military construction, or MILCON, which includes base facilities and military housing, can be spent over five years. The wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have worn out equipment much more rapidly than anticipated. When the Pentagon purchases a piece of equipment, be it a truck or tank, it assumes that the equipment will last for a given number of years. However, the harsh environmental conditions in Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as combat damage, have destroyed large amounts of equipment much faster than anticipated. This equipment will have to be replaced or repaired, a process the military terms reset. According to Congressman John Murtha (D-PA), Chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, resetting all of the equipment in need could total $100 billion. There is no reason that this reset cannot be done much more rapidly. Because of the demands on our ground forces, the Army and Marine Corps plan to add about 48,000 men and women to the active component between now and 2013.
Impact: Increased military spending grows GDP as well as increasing jobs


A new paper by Jón Steinsson and Emi Nakamura, assistant economics professors at Columbia, looks at boosts in military spending over the past half-century and separates their impacts in states with lots of military contractors and personnel, and those with relatively few—specifically, California and Illinois. The difference allows them to run a regression to see how much the extra military spending boosted the economy. In recent work, our approach has been to exploit regional variation in military spending in the US (Nakamura and Steinsson 2011). We use the fact that when the US embarks upon a military buildup, there is a systematic tendency for spending to increase more in some states than others. For example, when aggregate military spending in the US rises by 1% of GDP, military spending in California on average rises by about 3% of California GDP, while military spending in Illinois rises by only about 0.5% of Illinois GDP. Under the assumption that the US doesn’t embark upon military buildups like the Vietnam War because states like California are doing badly relative to states like Illinois, we can use regional variation associated with these buildups to estimate the effect of a relative increase in spending on relative output. Our conclusion is that when relative spending in a state increases by 1% of GDP, relative state GDP rises by 1.5%.

Analysis: This argument is very straightforward - military funding provides jobs and raises GDP, and so we should increase this funding to benefit the economy. This provides the U.S. with more economic hegemonic power, which benefits us on the global stage, making it more likely for other nations to work with us and not against us. The point is a clear reason that the U.S. benefits from more military spending, and can be weighed as such. And economic boon that provides millions of jobs is hard to combat when the alternative is allowing those jobs to be lost!
A2 – Military Spending Benefits the U.S. Economy

**Answer:** The military budget isn’t on the decline, so there won’t be any decline in military employment.

**Warrant:** Looking closely at the numbers, the military budget may actually be increasing.


First, it’s worth noting, this budget—like all defense budgets through the decades—is much larger than it seems at first glance. According to the Defense Department, it amounts to $583 billion, a mere 0.4-percent increase over this year’s budget. However, that’s only the sum requested by the Defense Department. The Office of Management and Budget, which oversees the entire federal government, speaks of appropriations for “national defense,” which also include the Energy Department’s nuclear weapons programs and assorted items in various other agencies, which together total another $25 billion. All told, then, the budget request for national defense adds up to $608 billion—a 2.1-percent increase over this year’s budget: not enormous, but not trivial either, and certainly not a cut. But even this understates the magnitude of the money involved. Let’s look again at the Defense Department’s share of $582.7 billion. The Pentagon’s budget documents divide this request in two parts: the “base budget” and “OCO,” standing for Overseas Contingency Operations. OCO refers to the cost of wars that U.S. forces are fighting (or advising those fighting) in Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, and elsewhere.

**Analysis:** If there’s actually an increase in the military budget, people’s jobs aren’t being cut, and so the aff ground gains no benefit.
Answer: The jobs created by the military actually on-net loses the economy jobs

Warrant: The jobs created by the military are extremely expensive

<http://prospect.org/article/defense-spending-most-expensive-way-create-jobs>

Which brings us to a new report from the Center for International Policy, which argues that *Lockheed Martin's claim that the F-35 "supports" 125,000 jobs is wildly exaggerated, and the true figure is between 50,000 and 60,000*. But let's remain agnostic on that question for a moment. What might we be spending on the F-35 to create each job? There's some fuzziness in both the numerator and the denominator here, but the cost estimates for building the planes now run around $400 billion, making the F-35 the most expensive weapons system in American history. Estimates for the long-term cost, which includes maintenance over the decades the plane is supposed to be in service, run well over a trillion dollars, but let's use the $400 billion figure. If we used Lockheed's number of 125,000 jobs, $400 billion divided by 125,000 gives us $3.2 million spent for each job "supported." If we use the CIP's more modest number of 50,000 jobs, we get $8 million dollars spent per job. Those are some pretty fancy jobs. Of course, jobs aren't the only reason to build a plane; we also get a plane. Unfortunately, the F-35 has been plagued by a spectacular array of technical problems, so much so that at the moment, the jet isn't allowed to fly at night. Or in the rain. Or within 25 miles of lightning. Or above the speed of sound. Or while climbing at an angle above 18 degrees. You get the idea.
Warrant: Money used in the military sector could be used to make more jobs in other areas


The evidence on this point is clear. A billion dollars devoted to a tax cut creates 34% more jobs than a billion dollars of military spending; Spending on clean energy production produces one and one-half times more jobs; And, spending on education creates more than two and one-half times more jobs. And though average overall compensation is higher for military jobs than the others, these other forms of expenditure create roughly as many decent-paying jobs (those paying $64,000 per year or more) as military spending does. The exception is education, which creates more than twice as many good paying jobs as military spending.1 Part of the reason that military spending creates fewer jobs than other forms of expenditure is that a large share of that money is either spent overseas or spent on imported goods. By contrast, most of the money generated by spending in areas like education is spent in the United States.
Warrant: Reducing military funding would create jobs and mean massive gains in other sectors

<http://scholarworks.umass.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1122&context=peri_workingpapers>

For example, they found that the impact of a gradual reduction in military spending, starting with $35 billion in 1990 and reaching $105 billion in 1994, would produce a net gain of 477,000 jobs within the U.S. economy. Employment Effects of $1 Billion in Spending for Alternative Purposes We present in Table 1 our estimate of the relative effects of spending $1 billion on alternative uses, including military spending, health care, education, mass transit, and construction for home weatherization and infrastructure repair. Our estimates are derived from the 2005 U.S. input/output model, along with other data sources on national income and employment within the United States. We show the full list of our data sources in the Appendix. The table first shows in column 1 the data on the total number of jobs created by $1 billion in spending for alternative end uses. As we see, defense spending creates 8,555 total jobs with $1 billion in spending. This is the fewest number of jobs of any of the alternative uses that we present. Thus, personal consumption generates 10,779 jobs, 26.2 percent more than defense, health care generates 12,883 jobs, education generates 17,687, mass transit is at 19,795, and construction for weatherization/infrastructure is 12,804. From this list we see that with two of the categories, education and mass transit, the total number of jobs created with $1 billion in spending is more than twice as many as with defense.

Analysis: If the money being spent to create military jobs could be spent more effectively elsewhere, we shouldn’t increase military spending. This is a basic turn that leaves the pro very little ground to move back from.
**PRO – Military Spending Enables Maintenance of Bases**

**Argument**: If more is spent on the U.S. military, it will allow us to maintain our foreign bases to support peacekeeping and economic growth worldwide.

**Warrant**: Current military spending cuts prevent the military from having success in locations around the world.


Senior defense officials have been busy explaining the negative consequences of inadequately funding defense for 2011. If Congress does not support the President’s budget request for 2011, the defense budget plans for FY 2012 will then be adversely affected. The military would be able to buy even less defense in the out years than it plans on the books today due to a readjusted lower baseline from which future spending is calculated. A survey of recent pronouncements from military and defense officials highlights the real-world impact of Congress’s messy spending plans for defense. Army officials are currently lacking funds to purchase four new helicopters that are employed extensively in overseas operations in Afghanistan and Iraq. Under current spending constraints, the army is “unable to buy four new CH-47 Chinook helicopters for the Army’s 13th Combat Aviation Brigade.”[1]
Warrant: Base spending is an increasing part of the budget, so increased military spending means an increase in base spending.


The effect of defense cuts on personnel would depend on which part of personnel spending decreases. Of the $195 billion in Department of Defense payroll outlays in 2009, only $84 billion went to active-duty military pay. Retired military pay, which does not directly increase defense capabilities, accounted for nearly 20 percent of total personnel expenditures in 2009. The number of personnel employed by the Department of Defense has declined since the 1960s, while personnel costs have risen rapidly, in part due to rising U.S. health-care costs. In the base budget, the cost of military pay and benefits has risen almost 80 percent since FY 2001, while the active-duty and reserve personnel count has declined by almost 6 percent. Military health care costs have risen from $19 billion in FY 2001 to $47.4 billion in FY 2015.
Impact: Overseas bases are imperative in maintaining peace globally


Overseas presence contributes to contingency responsiveness, deterrence, assurance, and security cooperation. In many cases — but not all — overseas presence enhances contingency responsiveness. In-place forces are critical for the initial stage of major contingencies. The global en route infrastructure enables reinforcement of in-place forces and broad responsiveness. Access to bases from which direct air support can be provided is important. Global naval presence contributes to response flexibility. Overseas ground forces may not provide an advantage for regional responsiveness when not proximate to the area of conflict. Overseas forces targeted to specific threats provide deterrence and regional assurance. In-place forces signal the ability to thwart quick victories and assure allies of U.S. commitments. Regional air and missile defenses protect and assure allies and partners. Overseas presence enhances security cooperation, which builds U.S. capabilities to work with partners and helps develop their capabilities. The marginal cost of security cooperation activity for forces based overseas is low, resulting in higher activity. The greatest benefits accrue from working with advanced partners.
**Impact:** Military bases provide economic benefits for their surrounding locations


Military installations can benefit communities, especially posts that import the equivalent of a corporate headquarters, with highly paid jobs — engineers, scientists, professionals, and high-level managers. Those locales see more of a boost than ones with bases that only process and train troops. Already, 40 new defense contractors have set up shop in Harford County, Md., in anticipation of APG’s economic boon. Though communities may benefit long term, an influx may mean short-term pain in the form of crowded schools and congested roads. The region near Fort Bragg will need to educate the expected 6,000 new students that may crowd classrooms and overwork teachers. Moreover, Fort Bragg’s expected 41,000 new people will crowd area roads. Bragg, Aberdeen, and Lee: Gateways to Growth Growth inside military gates can mean growth outside the gates. Jobs may expand in construction, retail, health care, and hospitality. But the economic effects are likely to be larger in locations where there’s already a healthy mix of professional positions in scientific research and development and engineering.

**Analysis:** Military bases provide massive benefits to every country that contains them. Not only are these nations effectively protected while other nations are deterred, but the economic benefits to the host nation can provide an important boost. This argument is, like many on the topic, easy to understand, but perhaps most importantly it’s great for weighing. These bases deter conflict essentially everywhere in the world in addition to providing massive economic benefits for all nations. The benefits of deterring conflicts certainly outweigh the monetary costs of maintaining bases, and considering that they also benefit the economy aff can gain the advantage here.
Pro Arguments with Con Responses January 2017

A2 – Military Spending Enables Maintenance of Bases

Answer: The military budget isn’t on the decline, so there won’t be any decline in military base spending

Warrant: Looking closely at the numbers, the military budget may actually be increasing

<http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/war_stories/2016/02/president_obama_s_military_budget_is_still_one_of_the_biggest-ever.html>

First, it’s worth noting, this budget—like all defense budgets through the decades—is much larger than it seems at first glance. According to the Defense Department, it amounts to $583 billion, a mere 0.4-percent increase over this year’s budget. However, that’s only the sum requested by the Defense Department. The Office of Management and Budget, which oversees the entire federal government, speaks of appropriations for “national defense,” which also include the Energy Department’s nuclear weapons programs and assorted items in various other agencies, which together total another $25 billion. All told, then, the budget request for national defense adds up to $608 billion—a 2.1-percent increase over this year’s budget: not enormous, but not trivial either, and certainly not a cut. But even this understates the magnitude of the money involved. Let’s look again at the Defense Department’s share of $582.7 billion. The Pentagon’s budget documents divide this request in two parts: the “base budget” and “OCO,” standing for Overseas Contingency Operations. OCO refers to the cost of wars that U.S. forces are fighting (or advising those fighting) in Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, and elsewhere.
**Warrant:** There are already a massive number of military bases


In short, there is almost no way to overemphasize how thoroughly the US military now covers the region with bases and troops. This infrastructure of war has been in place for so long and is so taken for granted that Americans rarely think about it and journalists almost never report on the subject. Members of Congress spend billions of dollars on base construction and maintenance every year in the region, but ask few questions about where the money is going, why there are so many bases, and what role they really serve. By one estimate, the United States has spent $10 trillion protecting Persian Gulf oil supplies over the past four decades. Approaching its 35th anniversary, the strategy of maintaining such a structure of garrisons, troops, planes, and ships in the Middle East has been one of the great disasters in the history of American foreign policy. The rapid disappearance of debate about our newest, possibly illegal war should remind us of just how easy this huge infrastructure of bases has made it for anyone in the Oval Office to launch a war that seems guaranteed, like its predecessors, to set off new cycles of blowback and yet more war.
Warrant: Across the globe, there are a massive number of military bases


To the extent that Americans think about these bases at all, we generally assume they’re essential to national security and global peace. Our leaders have claimed as much since most of them were established during World War II and the early days of the Cold War. As a result, we consider the situation normal and accept that US military installations exist in staggering numbers in other countries, on other peoples’ land. On the other hand, the idea that there would be foreign bases on US soil is unthinkable. While there are no freestanding foreign bases permanently located in the United States, there are now around 800 US bases in foreign countries. Seventy years after World War II and 62 years after the Korean War, there are still 174 US “base sites” in Germany, 113 in Japan, and 83 in South Korea, according to the Pentagon. Hundreds more dot the planet in around 80 countries, including Aruba and Australia, Bahrain and Bulgaria, Colombia, Kenya, and Qatar, among many other places. Although few Americans realize it, the United States likely has more bases in foreign lands than any other people, nation, or empire in history.

Analysis: If there’s actually an increase in the military budget, foreign bases aren’t being cut, and so the aff ground gains no benefit. In fact, there could potentially be an increase in bases in the status quo, completely eliminating the need for more funding.
Answer: The number of military bases we have are unnecessary and have too many personnel.

Warrant: Many facilities have too many personnel


How could the DoD become more efficient? First, it needs to rationally reduce its civilian workforce, which grew by 100,000 in the last decade, instead of resorting to hiring freezes and unpaid furloughs. Second, it must reduce pay and benefits costs for each soldier. Instead, it plans to raise both. Third, and most important, it should close unneeded military bases. By its own estimates, the DoD is operating with 21% excess capacity in all its facilities. However, Congress won't allow it. The Bi-Partisan Budget Act of 2013 blocked future military base closings. Few elected officials are willing to risk losing local jobs caused by base closures in their states. The Pentagon will be forced to reduce the number of actual soldiers so it can afford these benefits. (Source: "Pentagon Lays Out Way to Slash Spending," The Wall Street Journal, August 1, 2013.)

Analysis: We can reduce the number of military bases and the personnel at those bases without causing any problems, because there is an excess of bases and troops at those bases.
Arguments with Con Responses

PRO – Increased Spending would help Fight ISIL

**Argument:** Spending more on the military would help combat ISIL.

**Warrant:** The US needs significantly more to fight ISIL.


The United States needs “much more” than airstrikes to defeat the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria (ISIS), Secretary of Defense Ashton Carter said Saturday. “If you say, is it enough? I don’t think it’s enough. I think we’re looking to do more,” Carter said of the U.S. campaign against ISIS during a defense forum at the Ronald Reagan Presidential Library in California. More than a year into the U.S.-led fight against ISIS, only incremental gains have been made against the extremist group, which continues to control large swaths of territory in Iraq and Syria. “Yes, we are willing to do more,” Carter said. “As we identify opportunities to do more, you will see us doing more. And we need to do more, much more than airstrikes.” Carter’s call for a more robust effort against ISIS comes at a time when the Obama administration is tweaking its approach. President Obama last week authorized fewer than 50 U.S. special operations forces to deploy to northern Syria to train and assist local forces, putting American boots on the ground in Syria for the first time since that country’s civil war began. In order to deal a “lasting defeat” against ISIS, Carter said the U.S. must succeed in training local forces to fight the group on the ground. “We can defeat ISIL, but it’s keeping them defeated that is the hard part,” Carter said, using another acronym for the group. “It’s making it stick.” The administration’s effort to recruit local fighters to battle ISIS suffered an embarrassing setback last month when the Pentagon closed down a $500 million program to train and equip moderate Syrian rebels.
Warrant: The Pentagon is asking for more money to fight ISIL


The Defense Department has asked Congress for an additional $20 million to deal with the Islamic State group's drone threat. Some of those enemy-owned drones carry improvised explosive devices (IED) while others are being used for reconnaissance, according to Joint Improvised-Threat Defeat Organization (JIDO) spokesman David Small. And more money is needed in order to find and buy solutions to detect and defeat enemy drones on top of $189.7 million already allotted for attacking the networks of terrorist organizations in fiscal 2015 Overseas Contingency Operations funding, according to an omnibus reprogramming request sent to Congress last week. The money would be funneled into the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund used for JIDO projects.
**Warrant:** ISIL is a threat to the U.S.


**The threat posed by Sunni jihadi militancy has been evolving for some time.** While terrorist plots against Western targets continue to surface, **the principal threat to Western interests today is posed by increasing instability in the Middle East, which jihadi groups have exploited in order to emerge, expand, and consolidate operations.** Intense turmoil in Syria and Iraq in recent years has created socio-political vacuums in which jihadi groups have been able to thrive. Most notable in this respect has been the rise to prominence of the Islamic State (IS), previously known as the Islamic State in Iraq and al-Sham (ISIS). After IS declared the establishment of a caliphate stretching across 423 miles of Iraq and Syria on June 29, 2014 the perceived threat posed by the group has led to the initiation of air and cruise missile strikes against IS targets in Iraq and northern Syria in August 2014. While led by the United States, this ongoing intervention has been a coalition initiative, involving local, regional, and international states opposed to IS’s existence. While a first attempt at Islamic state building in 2006-2008 proved overzealous and alienating, a second attempt from 2013 onwards has proven more sustainable, although concerted international intervention begun in 2014 will pose a serious challenge to its success. Nevertheless, **through its impressive advances across large swathes of Iraq and Syria in 2013 and 2014, IS has proven a more successful organization than al-Qaeda.**
Warrant: ISIL has the ability to continue to expand


"For ISIS, this means vast swaths of new friendly territory is opening up in Africa and elsewhere, offering it more opportunity to recruit fighters and find logistical and other operational support for attacks it may wish to commit internationally. Addressing the view that there are splits between ISIS and their Al Qaeda factions, And while some have pointed optimistically to splits between fellow traveler groups like ISIS and Al Qaeda’s formal affiliate in Syria, the al-Nusra Front, there is less to such splits than meet the eye. They are almost always over tactics, like ISIS’ wanton killing of Sunni Muslims, which core Al Qaeda believes hurts the broader jihad movement. The splits are not over the goals of the movement itself. In fact, such splits may actually incentivize competition between the different groups to see which can carry out the most high-profile and devastating attack, in order to boost its own franchise name, and reinvigorate its financing and recruitment. Nothing would do so more than a major attack against the United States.

Analysis: This argument falls into the category of arguments most often known as “advocacies or plans.” Instead of the affirmative standing up and defending military spending in general, the aff is able to defend only a very small part of the resolution, in this case defeating ISIL. While strategic in that it means you don’t have to defend against disadvantages to the entire system of US overseas presences, be prepared to explain why this one conflict is so important it beats the generalized disadvantages of the neg.
A2 – Increased Spending would help Defeat ISIL

Answer: ISIL isn’t a threat.

Warrant: ISIL is losing land and power in the status quo.


But, after months of ISIS expansion and victories, the group is now being beaten back. It is losing territory in the places that matter. Coalition airstrikes have hamstrung its ability to wage offensive war, and it has no friends to turn to for help. Its governance model is unsustainable and risks collapse in the long run. In conventional terms, ISIS is pretty badly outnumbered. The CIA estimates that ISIS has between 20,000 and 31,500 fighters; some private sector sources suggest that figure may be closer to 100,000. There are about 48,000 official Iraqi government soldiers, but 100,000 to 120,000 Shia militiamen fighting on the government’s side buttress them. The BBC reports that there are 190,000 Kurdish Peshmerga in Iraq's north. And that's to say nothing of ISIS's enemies in Syria. The group's ideology demands total and absolute adherence to its narrow and extremist interpretation of Islamic law. In their view, nobody — including alQaeda — is sufficiently pure. This causes ISIS fighters to lash out at people and groups who would otherwise be allies, making any alliances that ISIS forms temporary at best. Warrant: Sanctions hurt the wrong people...
Warrant: ISIL can’t attack the U.S.


Similarly, Pentagon press secretary Rear Adm. John Kirby said last month that the Islamic State does not have “the capability right now to conduct a major attack on the U.S. homeland.” National Counterterrorism Center Director Matthew Olsen said Wednesday that “we have no credible information that ISIL is planning to attack the United States.” The Islamic State certainly warrants media coverage, given its territorial gains in Iraq and Syria and its brutal tactics, such as the gruesome beheadings of two American journalists in recent weeks. Moreover, supporters of increased intervention argue that failing to address the threat in Iraq and Syria could create a safe haven where militants could plot a future attack against the U.S., a similar rationale to the one used to justify the war in Afghanistan. They also argue that members of the Islamic State who hold American or European passports could reach U.S. soil and perpetrate an attack, or that someone in the U.S. who is inspired by the group could build a crude bomb or stage a small-scale attack.

Analysis: If ISIL isn’t a threat to the U.S. then there is no need for intervention and delinks the aff from their impact.
Answer: Intervention makes the conflict worse.

Warrant: Intervention increases terrorism.


The large number of terrorist attacks that occurred in retaliation for an interventionist American foreign policy implicitly demonstrates that terrorism against U.S. targets could be significantly reduced if the United States adopted a policy of military restraint overseas. That policy change has become even more critical now that ostensibly "weak" terrorists whether sponsored by states or operating independently might have both the means and the motive to inflict enormous devastation on the U.S. homeland with weapons of mass destruction. The U.S. military presence in Lebanon in the early 1980s and in Somalia and Saudi Arabia in the 1990s also spawned terrorist attacks. The Iranians hated the United States for its longtime support of the shah and resented the U.S. presence in Lebanon. In Somalia in 1993 the now-infamous Osama bin Laden trained the Somali tribesmen who conducted ambushes of U.S. peacekeeping forces in support of Somali clan leader Mohammed Farah Aideed. The result of the attack was 18 dead U.S. Army Rangers and U.S. withdrawal from Somalia. Osama bin Laden, a Saudi, did not merely object to U.S. intervention in Somalia. His main reason for attacking U.S. targets was the American presence in Saudi Arabia and Washington's support for Israel. Bin Laden was allegedly linked to the 1996 truck bombing of the U.S. military apartment complex, Khobar Towers, in Saudi Arabia that killed 19 U.S. airmen and wounded 515 others. He was also allegedly linked to the simultaneous bombings of U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania in 1998 and other attacks.
Warrant: Empirically, American intervention destabilizes regions and ignites violent political ideation.


Our study yields one resounding finding: The rate of terrorist attacks around the world by jihadist groups and the rate of fatalities in those attacks increased dramatically after the invasion of Iraq. Globally there was a 607 percent rise in the average yearly incidence of attacks (28.3 attacks per year before and 199.8 after) and a 237 percent rise in the average fatality rate (from 501 to 1,689 deaths per year). A large part of this rise occurred in Iraq, which accounts for fully half of the global total of jihadist terrorist attacks in the post-Iraq War period. But even excluding Iraq, the average yearly number of jihadist terrorist attacks and resulting fatalities still rose sharply around the world by 265 percent and 58 percent respectively.

Analysis: If intervention provides no solvency for the problems at hand, then there is no reason to intervene and thus you negate.
**Argument:** Increased military spending will curtail Russian aggression.

**Warrant:** War with Russia is possible soon.

<https://www.thenation.com/article/the-united-states-and-nato-are-preparing-for-a-major-war-with-russia/>

For the first time in a quarter-century, the prospect of war—real war, war between the major powers—will be on the agenda of Western leaders when they meet at the NATO Summit in Warsaw, Poland, on July 8 and 9. Dominating the agenda in Warsaw (aside, of course, from the “Brexit” vote in the UK) will be discussion of plans to reinforce NATO’s “eastern flank”—the arc of former Soviet partners stretching from the Baltic states to the Black Sea that are now allied with the West but fear military assault by Moscow. Until recently, the prospect of such an attack was given little credence in strategic circles, but now many in NATO believe a major war is possible and that robust defensive measures are required.
Warrant: The U.S. is increasing funds to deter Russia right now.

<https://www.thenation.com/article/the-united-states-and-nato-are-preparing-for-a-major-war-with-russia/>

The United States, of course, is deeply involved in these initiatives. Not only will it supply many of the troops for the four multinational battalions, but it is also taking many steps of its own to bolster NATO’s eastern flank. Spending on the Pentagon’s “European Reassurance Initiative” will quadruple, climbing from $789 million in 2016 to $3.4 billion in 2017. Much of this additional funding will go to the deployment, on a rotating basis, of an additional armored-brigade combat team in northern Europe. As a further indication of US and NATO determination to prepare for a possible war with Russia, the alliance recently conducted the largest war games in Eastern Europe since the end of the Cold War. Known as Anakonda 2016, the exercise involved some 31,000 troops (about half of them Americans) and thousands of combat vehicles from 24 nations in simulated battle maneuvers across the breadth of Poland. A parallel naval exercise, BALTOPS 16, simulated “high-end maritime warfighting” in the Baltic Sea, including in waters near Kaliningrad, a heavily defended Russian enclave wedged between Poland and Lithuania.
**Warrant:** Russia is a threat to NATO.


**Russia’s goal is no different now than the Soviet Union’s during the Cold War: It seeks to neutralize or even break up NATO.** Precisely because the West perceived Russia as less threatening than the Soviet Union, this goal appeared to be easier to achieve: Before Ukraine, the Alliance had less reason to hang together. Russia’s bellicose behavior is especially threatening to Eastern European allies due to their geographic proximity. Russia is already waging psychological and public diplomacy warfare, especially in the Baltic NATO member states. For its part, NATO must be capable of defending its members’ territorial integrity. The 1949 North Atlantic Treaty is clear that NATO’s area of responsibility is “in the North Atlantic area north of the Tropic of Cancer.” First and foremost, NATO is a collective security alliance. Everything else the Alliance does is secondary to this mission. NATO members need to be diligent in providing for their own and Alliance defense. To stay relevant, NATO needs to prepare to defend against 21st-century threats in the North Atlantic region, including Russia
Warrant: Russia threatens Europe.


In Washington, Senator John McCain, who had to watch in frustration as his urging to arm the “moderate” rebels in Syria fell on deaf ears at the White House, believes bipartisan support in Congress for weapon supplies means more leverage to ensure that this time the administration does not let down allies. “The US must act with urgency and supply defensive lethal assistance to Ukraine,” he reiterated. “Russian aggression is the gravest threat to European security in decades.” administration do not let down allies.

Analysis: This argument allows the affirmative to link into a direct western interest, the protection of Europe, and to U.S. hegemony and hegemonic stability theory. This advocacy is clearly the U.S. telling other major powers to back down, and thus reinforces the monopolar world we live in today.
A2 – Increased Spending Curtails Russian Aggression

**Answer:** Status quo is solving back the issue.

**Warrant:** Sanctions solve the problem.


By October, amidst decreased economic growth projections – from 6% to 0.5% – and concerns over the stability of the ruble, Russian finance minister Anton Siluanov announced that military spending would have to be cut, “reconsider[ing] the amount of resources that will be spent from the budget [on the military] in order to make it more realistic” (Kelly 2014). **Sanctions not only forced a cut to Russian military spending, they also decreased Moscow’s ability to pay for occupying larger slices of Ukraine**: even before the invasion Russia subsidized Ukrainian industry to the tune of $5 to $10 billion per year. Despite taking indirect control of several Ukrainian cities, Russia was forced by the sanctions regime to cut these subsidies, leading a Brookings report to conclude that “[w]hat Russia could not afford is to win Ukraine” (Gaddy and Ickes 2014). Sanctions worked in this instance not by forcing a Russian surrender of Crimea or Donbass, but by preventing a Russian seizure of Kiev[.]
Warrant: Russia is backing off right now.


As Russia ratchets up military action in Syria, the fighting in east Ukraine is winding down. The leaders of Russia, Ukraine, France and Germany will meet in Paris on Friday for talks on Ukraine, and while a lasting political solution still seems some way off, there is confidence on all sides that the military action could finally be over, a year after the first ill-fated, and largely ignored, ceasefire agreement was signed in Minsk, Belarus. **With all sides tired of military conflict, the most likely outcome appears to be Moscow pushing the territories back to Ukraine legally**, with an ensuing period of uncertain peace as both Moscow and Kiev decide how far they are ready to compromise on their goals.

Analysis: If the tensions between the U.S. and Russia are winding down in the status quo, there is no need to ramp up intervention in order to stop further aggression.
Answer: Intervention and militarization make the situation worse with Russia.

Warrant: NATO is the root cause of Russian aggression.

Clifford, Jordan. "Putin’s NATO: Reshaping the Political Space " World Policy Blog

Therefore, in Putin’s eyes, NATO expansion is the root cause of Russian aggression, not his aspirations to reestablish the old Soviet sphere of influence (though that would be a plus too). Simultaneously, Putin is keenly aware that the establishment of NATO greatly tipped advantageous military capabilities away from Moscow, and would never launch an offensive, at least not outright. Recent actions taken by Moscow, however, along with the dangers of a deteriorating NATO, increasingly convey a Russian strategy aimed distinctly at breaking the alliance. As in Georgia and now Ukraine, Putin is merely testing the waters.

Warrant: Intervention starts an arms race.


Then there is the matter of self-fulfilling prophecies. By announcing the return of great-power competition and preparing for a war with Russia, the United States and NATO are setting in motion forces that could, in the end, achieve precisely that outcome. This is not to say that Moscow is guiltless regarding the troubled environment along the eastern front, but surely Vladimir Putin has reason to claim that the NATO initiatives pose a substantially heightened threat to Russian security and so justify a corresponding Russian buildup. Any such moves will, of course, invite yet additional NATO deployments, followed by complementary Russian moves, and so on—until we’re right back in a Cold War–like situation.

Analysis: If western escalation only creates a self-fulfilling prophecy where aggression begets intervention and makes the problem worse, there is no incentive to intervene as tensions will only rise.
PRO – Increased spending helps with our aging nuclear arsenal

**Argument:** The US nuclear weapons infrastructure has been underfunded for decades and needs more money quickly to avoid issues with accidents and deterrence

**Warrant:** US Nuclear arsenal is old and out of date


The Pentagon recently admitted there are "systemic problems across the nuclear enterprise." Thanks to arms-control treaties and the end of the Cold War, the U.S. has reduced its stockpile of nuclear weapons from 31,000 to about 4,800 over the last 48 years. **But as fears of nuclear war eased, the government failed to adequately maintain and update this immensely dangerous arsenal, which still contains enough collective destructive force to lay waste to every country on Earth.**

**Warrant:** This has resulted in widespread problems with our nuclear infrastructure


The U.S.'s 450 intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) are stored in decaying 60-year-old nuclear silos in Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming that look like a poorly maintained Cold War museum. **The demoralized Air Force personnel safeguarding the weapons have been plagued by scandals reaching to the very top of the command structure — including drug rings, mislaid missiles, and widespread cheating on readiness tests.** Today, the real nuclear threat to America isn't an enemy strike, says Air Force Lt. Gen. James Kowalski. It's "an accident."
Warrant: Old Nuclear Weapons could lead to an accidental detonation


Which is now a problem. The **nuclear warheads** that sat atop missiles and bombs before the Cold War ended **weren't intended to last forever. Components degrade and need to be repaired or replaced.** And in very high-precision machinery, there's an **enormous difference between an original part and the almost — but not quite — identical replacement part.** Many original component manufacturers have gone out of business, and so now "equivalent" replacement parts need to be used. In some cases, this has even involved the reverse engineering and reinvention of "lost" highly classified materials. But "almost the same," "nearly the same," and "highly similar" are just different ways of saying "a bit wrong," "not quite right," and "slightly off." **Add lots of little shortcomings like that together, and you get a final product that may not work very well, leading you to wonder what happened to your "Earth-shattering kaboom" when you try to light the candle.**

Warrant: Upgrading our arsenal could actually save costs by letting us cut down on the number of nuclear weapons we need

Alternately, the US could make replacement nukes, but efforts to do that face stiff political opposition. The last attempt to address this — the aptly-named "Reliable Replacement Warhead" program — was nixed by the Obama administration in 2009 because building new nukes runs counter to the administration's stated goal of pursuing a nuclear-free world. **Perversely enough, the unreliability of the current warheads actually makes it harder to get rid of existing weapons.** Dr. John Hamre, former Deputy Secretary of Defense under Bill Clinton and current head of the Center for Strategic and International Studies, was just quoted in the Los Angeles Times as saying, "**We have the worst of all worlds: older weapons and large inventories that we are retaining because we are worried about their reliability.**"
Warrant: Faulty Equipment has led to false alarm scares in the past

Fresh Air *Nuclear Command and Control, A History of False Alarms* August 14, 2013  

We had another serious, serious incident ... **when Zbigniew Brzezinski, President Carter's national security adviser, was awoken at 2:30 in the morning and told by his military aide that the United States was most likely under attack by 220 missiles.** And as Brzezinski said, "I need confirmation of that," and his military aide got off the phone and the military aide called back Brzezinski and said, "It's actually 2,200 soviet missiles [that] are coming toward the United States." Brzezinski wanted further confirmation, and as he lay there in bed in the early morning hours, he decided not to wake up his wife, because if Washington, D.C., was about to be destroyed, he preferred that she die in her sleep. And **Brzezinski was preparing to call President Carter to talk about the American retaliation, and his military aide called back one more time and said it was a false alarm.** Eric Schlosser wrote *Fast Food Nation,* his look at the practices of the meatpacking and fast food industries, and *Reefer Madness.* His latest book, *Command and Control: Nuclear Weapons, the Damascus Accident, and the Illusion of Safety,* is out in paperback later this month. **And this false alarm was later traced to a faulty computer chip that cost 46 cents that had malfunctioned** and had sent this signal that 2,000 Soviet missiles with warheads were on their way.

Analysis: Nuclear weapons infrastructure is of critical importance to the United States, and the benefits of maintaining it are clear. Strategically, this argument can be used as a bait and switch, with two impacts of deterrence and cost cutting thrown. If opponents respond only with deterrence, i.e. by saying we do not need to increase spending to get the same deterrent effect, you can drop that impact and simply say that even if we do not increase deterrence through increased spending, we cut costs, freeing up money to be spent elsewhere.
A2 – Increased spending helps with our aging nuclear arsenal

Answer: Upgrading our Nuclear Arsenal is a violation of international law

Warrant: The Non-Proliferation Treaty requires that nuclear powers engage in disarmament, rather than increased spending on nuclear weapons.


“Perpetual nuclear modernization appears to undercut the promises made by the five NPT nuclear-weapon states. Under the terms of that treaty, they are required to “pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament.” Nearly 50 years after this promise was first made, the non-nuclear-weapon states, who in return for that commitment renounced nuclear weapons for themselves, can rightly question whether continued nuclear modernization in perpetuity is consistent with the NPT. Without some form of limitations on the pace and scope of nuclear modernization, the goals of deep cuts in and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons remain elusive and appear increasingly unlikely as continued reaffirmation of the value of nuclear weapons, sustained by a global nuclear competition, threatens to extend the nuclear era indefinitely.”
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Warrant: A modernized arsenal is perceived as a violation of international law


American allies and adversaries, the report warned, may see the modernization “as violating the administration’s pledge not to develop or deploy” new warheads. The report, which urged a more cautious approach, cited a finding by federal advisory scientists: that simply refurbishing weapons in their existing configurations could keep them in service for decades.

Analysis: As a signatory of the NPT, a significant increase in spending on our nuclear arsenal is illegal under international law, and perceived as both illegal and a violation of American promises to reduce our nuclear arsenal. This signals untrustworthiness to our allies, and threatens our enemies, isolating America in the international community.

Answer: Modernization triggers a new arms race

Warrant: When America develops better weapons, our geopolitical rivals are uneasy and do the same


The B61 Model 12, the bomb flight-tested last year in Nevada, is the first of five new warhead types planned as part of an atomic revitalization estimated to cost up to $1 trillion over three decades. As a family, the weapons and their delivery systems move toward the small, the stealthy and the precise. Already there are hints of a new arms race. Russia called the B61 tests “irresponsible” and “openly provocative.” China is said to be especially worried about plans for a nuclear-tipped cruise missile. And North Korea last week defended its pursuit of a hydrogen bomb by describing the “ever-growing nuclear threat” from the United States.
Warrant: Other countries are already beginning proliferation as a response


"Obama’s proposed “modernization” increases our vulnerability, not our security. The first and most obvious reason is that it will certainly lead other countries to seek equivalent arsenals of their own. It is especially upsetting to Russia, which already feels under increasing American threat as a result of our military maneuvers on its borders and the fact that many of our missiles are positioned in Germany, Turkey, and other countries near its territory. The Russian defense minister recently announced that in response to Obama’s plan, Russia will “bring five new strategic nuclear missile regiments into service.” China would surely match that escalation. If it does so, India will follow. Then Pakistan will jump into the race. It is a recipe for disaster."

Analysis: When America develops new nuclear weapons, geopolitical rivals view this as a threat and begin to develop their own modern nuclear weapons to counter this threat. The result is more geopolitical stability and a further step away from a nuclear free world.
Answer: Modernization increases risk of use

Warrant: Better bombs are easier for the US to use


There is to my knowledge no evidence that potential adversaries are counting on being able to get away with using nuclear weapons because the United States is self-deterred. Moreover, all gravity bombs and cruise missiles currently in the U.S. nuclear arsenal have low-yield options. But **poor accuracy and collateral damage have limited their potential use to military planners in some scenarios. The improved accuracy of the B61-12 appears at least partly intended to close that gap.** For NATO, the improved accuracy has particularly important implications because the B61-12 is a more effective weapon that the B61-3 and B61-4 currently deployed in Europe. **The United States has never before deployed guided nuclear bombs in Europe but with the increased accuracy of the B61-12 and combined with the future deployment of the F-35A Lightning II stealth fighter-bomber to Europe, it is clear that NATO is up for quite a nuclear facelift.**
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**Warrant:** When we have more controlled nuclear weapons, the stigma against using them is not as great, increasing the risk that a general or president orders their use.


"If I can drive down the yield, drive down, therefore, the likelihood of fallout, et cetera, does that make it more usable in the eyes of some — some president or national security decision-making process? And the answer is, it likely could be more usable."

**Analysis:** Part of the reason why military leaders refrain from using nuclear weapons is that the massive fallout and uncontrolled blast makes it tactically useless. When modern tactical missiles and bombers allow for easier, safer, more precise use, the ability for a political or military leader to order its use increases, as does the odds of nuclear weapon use overall.
PRO – Increased military spending maintains U.S. hegemony

Argument: If more is spent on the U.S. military, it will allow us to maintain symbolic military and economic hegemony, preventing other nations from initiating conflict

Warrant: Perception of U.S. hegemony is on the decline


Indeed, the limits of U.S. military strength are already evident. One example could be found in the so-called “leading from behind” strategy in the Libyan war, which reflected constraints on U.S. forces. Washington’s Ukraine policy today is another example. Obama has made it clear that “We are not going to be getting into a military excursion in Ukraine.” At a joint press conference with Italian Prime Minister Matteo Renzi on March 27, he stressed that the U.S. would not make promises to Ukraine it could not keep. In both cases, the embarrassment for the United States lay not only its “defensive” geostrategic posture, but also in the questions raised by its allies over its ability to fulfill the commitments. This distrust has implications for Washington’s ability to retain global leadership, given that the international order created and dominated by the United States depends heavily on the broad U.S. alliance and partner network. The elements that support this network are the comprehensive power of the U.S. and the confidence that it will provide protection at a critical moment. How does the U.S. ask its allies and partners to retain confidence in those security commitments when it is in decline?
**Warrant:** Spending more on the military increases our military prowess, and by extension our global hegemony


One pillar of U.S. hegemony is the vast military power of the United States. A staple of the U.S. debate about the size of the post–Cold War defense budget is the observation that the United States spends more than virtually all of the world’s other major military powers combined, most of which are U.S. allies. Observers of the actual capabilities that this effort produces can focus on a favorite aspect of U.S. superiority to make the point that the United States sits comfortably atop the military food chain, and is likely to remain there.

**Warrant:** Increased military apparatus improves our global hegemony


Many of Kalecki’s ideas were developed further by Paul Baran and Paul Sweezy in 1966 in *Monopoly Capital*. Baran and Sweezy argued that there were at least five political-economic-imperial ends propelling the U.S. oligarchy in the 1950s and ‘60s toward the creation of a massive military establishment: (1) defending U.S. global hegemony and the empire of capital against external threats in the form of a wave of revolutions erupting throughout the world, simplistically viewed in terms of a monolithic Communist threat centered in the Soviet Union; (2) creating an internationally “secure” platform for U.S. corporations to expand and monopolize economic opportunities abroad;
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Warrant: High levels of spending grants the U.S. “command of the commons” - control over sea, space and air - that gives us military and economic hegemony


U.S. command of the commons is the result of a Cold War legacy of both capabilities and bases, married to the disparity in overall economic power between the United States and its potential challengers. This disparity permits the United States to sustain a level of defense expenditure that dwarfs the spending of any of the world’s other consequential powers. If grand strategists wish to pursue an activist global foreign policy, then they must preserve command of the commons. What then must the United States do? In the very long term, if a country comes to rival the United States in economic and technological capacity, it will be difficult to prevent a challenge, though it may be possible to out-compete the challenger

Impact: Command of the commons prevents other nations from attempting to engage with us military or economically


The reason command of the commons is so important is that the U.S. is and has long been a trading nation, and if rival states could deny the U.S. access to the commons, the U.S. would always be at the mercy of these rival states. The U.S. managed to get by when the British Empire had command of the commons in an earlier era, but we have little experience of a world in which access to the commons was controlled by an unfriendly power. One of the chief arguments for the U.S. involvement in the First and Second World Wars was that if some other power grew dominant on the Eurasian landmass, it might then achieve command of the global commons and tie an economic noose around America’s neck. Command of the commons is extremely valuable, yet America has had it for so long that we tend to take it for granted. That is a mistake. And command of the commons is getting more expensive to maintain.
Impact: U.S. hegemony is essential for our success as a nation


Norrlof argues that the United States has incentives to use its dominant position to organize and maintain an open economic system, providing security and access to markets for other states while enjoying a steady stream of economic benefits for itself. With the special role of the dollar, the United States has been able to externalize the costs of macroeconomic adjustment, and its global military presence reinforces the perceived stability of the dollar and the U.S. market.

Analysis: America’s ability to maintain standing on the international stage is essential to our security and economic success, and this standing is on the decline currently. An increase in the military budget could reverse this trend, leading to a much-needed win for our country. This argument would be successful with less experienced judges because it’s very intuitive and easy to understand. It’s also very effective for weighing, because one could argue that America’s success itself hinges on the perception of us worldwide.
A2 – Increased military spending maintains US hegemony

**Answer:** U.S. hegemony is not on the decline, so there is no need to bolster it

**Warrant:** U.S. hegemony has remained high due to positional advantages


There is a widespread belief that the era of U.S. global dominance is rapidly giving way to a multipolar system. Norrlof disagrees. In this carefully argued treatise, she contends that despite a gradual decline in its relative economic size, the United States still possesses three critical features that give it "positional advantages" over all other states: the largest domestic economy, the key world currency, and the strongest military. Although some observers think that the United States' hegemonic burdens outweigh any benefits, she suggests otherwise: Washington actually reaps more than it pays out in the provision of public goods. Drawing on "hegemonic stability theory," which was developed by Charles Kindleberger, Robert Gilpin, and others in the 1970s and 1980s, Norrlof argues that the United States has incentives to use its dominant position to organize and maintain an open economic system, providing security and access to markets for other states while enjoying a steady stream of economic benefits for itself.
**Warrant:** Spending is less and less important in the face of an already plentiful budget and more experienced units


This is not to argue that the U.S. government should ramp up taxes and spending, but it does illustrate the fact that it has enormous potential fiscal resources available to it, should it choose to use them. **Deficits come and go.** America’s fiscal capacity in 2015 is stupendously greater than Great Britain’s was in 1815. **Financially, there is every reason to think that America’s century lies in the future, not in the past.** The same is true of the supposed exhaustion of the U.S. military. On the one hand, thirteen years of continuous warfare have reduced the readiness of many U.S. combat units, particularly in the army. On the other hand, **U.S. troops are now far more experienced in actual combat than the forces of any other major military in the world.** In any future conflict, the advantage given by this experience would likely outweigh any decline in effectiveness due to deferred maintenance and training. Constant deployment may place an unpleasant and unfair burden on U.S. service personnel and their families, but it does not necessarily diminish the capability of the U.S. military. On the contrary, it may enhance it.

**Analysis:** If there is no decline in U.S. hegemony, there is no need for increased military spending to increase it. This argument removes your opponent’s uniqueness, forcing them to stop debating impacts or even links to prove that hegemony is in fact going down.
Answer: No matter the level of U.S. hegemony, it does not actually benefit or protect our economic interests - in fact, it can harm them

Warrant: U.S. military hegemony is a mixed blessing for our economic prospects


For over fifty years the American military establishment has been a source of support for multinational capital, and for alliances whose logic is to preserve an open trade and investment system throughout the world. The U.S. military presence still protects economic interests, notably in Saudi Arabia and other oil satrapies, and it may now allow the United States to control Iraq’s oil fields, but the extent and duration of that control, and whether it will increase the leverage of the United States over supplies and prices in the world’s oil markets, remain highly problematic. Pax Americana has always been a mixed blessing for U.S. allies: it has been maintained partly by military power, undercutting efforts by U.S. allies in Europe and Japan to forge independent foreign policies. With the demise of the Soviet Union, the United States became “the only superpower still standing” and quickly set about using the new configuration of power in the world to reassert and expand its dominion over all comers.
Warrant: Military power may have positive impacts on our trade, but it hurts our exports enough to make the aggregate effect on the economy a negative one.


For David Gordon and his collaborators in the social structures of accumulation (SSA) tradition, the willingness to threaten potential adversaries with military forces capable of acting on a global scale was seen to positively affect the U.S. terms of trade. U.S. hegemony yielded specific supply side benefits as favorable terms of trade reduced relative input prices and boosted profitability. Although Gordon and his co-authors recognize the potential costs of sustaining a large, globally active military apparatus, these costs are not incorporated in the econometric models supporting the SSA theory. This paper attempts to extend the SSA analysis by empirically measuring the effects of both military spending and military power on U.S. trade performance over the 1951-1987 period. **It is shown that while military power and spending commitments may have positive effects on the terms of trade, these military variables had direct and indirect negative impacts on the U.S. net export balance and therefore domestic aggregate demand.** In the context of a model of U.S. growth performance open to international transactions, **the overall effect of the postwar military system on U.S. economic growth was likely negative in the cold-war era.**

Analysis: One of the largest impacts of hegemony, according to the pro, is the economic benefits tied to it. In fact, the impacts may run the other way, and you can argue that the economy is decremented by a massive military force in the U.S.
**PRO – Increased spending deters Chinese aggression**

**Argument:** The U.S. should increase military spending to deter Chinese aggression.

**Warrant:** Russia has an interest in Iranian military assets


In March 2013, shortly after China had increased its defense spending nearly 11 percent (further cementing it as the world’s second largest military budget), developed its first aircraft carrier, stealth fighter jet, and anti-aircraft carrier missile, and ramped up its combative military rhetoric, the Commander of U.S. Pacific Forces (Admiral Samuel Locklear) stated that Asian-Pacific security was most threatened by climate change. **In January 2014, two months after China had created an air defense identification zone (ADIZ) overlapping with those of Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan, America’s then Pacific Fleet Commander said that Beijing’s unilateral move highlighted coercion by China “and other countries as well,”** and that the U.S. “welcome[s] … the growth of China as a military power in the Pacific. There is nothing wrong with that.” In November 2014, Captain James Fanell, a senior naval intelligence officer, was fired for warning, based on his analysis of a large Chinese amphibious military exercise, that Beijing was preparing for a “short, sharp war” with Tokyo. Although a senior Chinese military officer had already used that exact phrase when proposing how China should reclaim disputed territory administered by Japan, top-ranking U.S. military officials quickly repudiated Captain Fanell’s “unnecessarily antagoni[stic]” comment and reassured Beijing that Washington views its rise as “a good thing for the region.”
**Warrant:** U.S. needs to ramp up in order to prove its not luffing in the South China sea.


These image problems are not hypothetical. For instance, a Chinese military officer said that because “we have decided that the U.S. is bluffing in the East China Sea, we should take this opportunity to respond to these empty provocations with something real.” Indeed, while the U.S. has held its tongue, Chinese hostility has escalated and its military reach has grown. For example, Beijing has ramped up from merely announcing its control of the South China Sea to building military facilities in and to forcefully denying rival claimants and the U.S. access to those waters. It is thus unsurprising that the fear of Chinese backlash caused a Vietnamese military officer to disclose — while Beijing was illegally exploring for oil and ramming and buzzing Vietnamese boats in Hanoi’s waters — that “[w]e’re talking to [the] U.S. [about increasing our countries’ military cooperation], but it is too early to say how the tensions now will change our approach. We have a lot to consider.”
**Warrant:** U.S. lack of substantive action encourages aggression.


It could be argued that the U.S. had helped preserve its relationship with Beijing through its nuanced approach. **However, relative U.S. passivity may well have encouraged China to take a more aggressive approach to the territorial dispute than it would have in the face of a more determined, clear, and unambiguous U.S. indication of support for its treaty ally, Japan. Far from serving as an effective deterrent to Chinese aggression, the net effect may well have been destabilizing. Moreover, U.S. failure to strongly back up an ally may have had a deleterious demonstration effect on other U.S. allies in the region facing similar territorial disputes with China, and indirectly encouraged China to continue on its present path of militarization and confrontation in the South China Sea.**

**Warrant:** Chinese Aggression risks war with Japan.


“China risks triggering unintended conflict with Asian rivals through its aggressive stance in maritime disputes, Japan said Tuesday in a security assessment, as a Beijing minister urged preparations for a "people's war at sea." China's sweeping claims over the South China Sea, where it has built a series of artificial islands capable of supporting military operations despite overlapping claims from other nations, have stoked international alarm. **The region's superpower "continues to act in an assertive manner" and its actions "include dangerous acts that could cause unintended consequences," Tokyo said in a defense white paper.** Beijing is under pressure to respect a UN-backed tribunal's finding last month that there is no legal basis for its ambitions over the South China Sea where the Philippines, Vietnam, Malaysia and others also have claims.”
Warrant: Chinese aggression threatens U.S. Hegemony in the region.


China’s militarization of the South China Sea includes beefing up its military facilities on Woody Island in the Paracel chain – occupied by China but also claimed by Taiwan and Vietnam – where the Chinese reportedly just deployed eight batteries of its advanced, long-range HQ-9 air defense system. This is the latest step by Beijing to deploy anti-access/area denial (A2/AD) capabilities designed to complicate or disrupt U.S. power projection in the Western Pacific. Seen against this backdrop, the territorial dispute between China and Japan over the Senkaku Islands seems like an open and shut case from a U.S. national security perspective: Japan is a U.S. treaty ally, the Senkaku Islands are under the administration of Japan, and Article 5 of the treaty stipulates in part that, “Each party recognizes that an armed attack against either Party in the territories under the administration of Japan would be dangerous to its own peace and safety, and declares that it would act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional provisions and processes.”

Analysis: This argument has massive consequences for the world as a whole, potentially giving the affirmative a link into a nuclear war impact. The tensions in Asia between China and all the countries surrounding them are only going up by the day, and it shows no sign of stopping anytime soon.
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**A2 – Increased spending deters Chinese aggression**

**Answer:** Increased military spending is not the way to deter Chinese aggression.

**Warrant:** Diplomacy is more effective.


“Any effort to form coalitions to deter Chinese belligerence begins with American diplomatic leadership. As the traditional guarantor of international freedom of navigation and commerce in the region, the United States is uniquely positioned to sponsor and guide any emerging multinational partnerships. It alone possesses the national power and influence and lead combinations of conciliatory and provocative diplomacy. This would include both bi-lateral and multi-lateral economic arrangements and broader military coalitions with long-standing allies like Japan, South Korea, the Philippines, and Australia, and newer partnerships with modernizing powers like India, Vietnam, and Burma.
Warrant: Economic agreements deter China


A third opportunity for deterring Chinese aggression in the South China Sea centers on economic agreements and partnerships designed to incentivize coalition members. According to the U.S. Department of Defense’s Asia-Pacific Maritime Security Strategy, America remains “committed to ensuring free and open maritime access to protect the stable economic order that has served all AsiaPacific nations so well for so long.”[3] This interest could be furthered by lucrative trade deals with both established and emerging economies like Australia and India, in addition to numerous smaller states, to encourage meaningful participation. The current Association of Southeast Asian Nations, though historically lacking capacity to coerce, may provide a forum to both incentivize and counter Chinese economic behavior. Taking economic initiatives further, the U.S. could sponsor targeted loans and grants for emerging partnered economies from international financial institutions. While increased trade with coalition members would prove strategically beneficial—with the U.S. military playing a significant role with its local purchasing power and mandate to protect sea and air lanes for commerce—continuing trade with China would be equally important for maintaining a peaceful equilibrium. Seeking to both accommodate and limit Chinese expansionist interests, America could use its massive imports from Chinese manufacturing as incentive and leverage to attain desirable behavior in the South China Sea. Should the world’s oldest nation choose volatile courses of action, the U.S. could simply shift vital economic relationships to other nations with massive and inexpensive labor reserves like India and Vietnam.

Analysis: This argument forces the affirmative to prove very clear uniqueness on increased military spending as opposed to other forms of deterrence. A strategic neg team would use these responses to put aff into a corner where the argument is either nonunique or bites into a turn, forcing them to most likely concede the argument.
Answer: Increased military presence would make the situation worse.

Warrant: China prepared to respond to U.S.


"The Chinese people do not want to have war, so we will be opposed to [the] U.S. if it stirs up any conflict," said Liu Zhenmin, vice minister of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. "Of course, if the Korean War or Vietnam War are replayed, then we will have to defend ourselves." The so-called "nine-dash line" that China has drawn over most of the South China Sea — a gargantuan territorial claim that stretches about 1,200 miles from its shores — would give Beijing control over a zone that's estimated to handle about half of global merchant shipping, a third of the planet's oil shipping, two-thirds of global liquid natural gas shipments, and more than a 10th of Earth's fish catch. The Obama administration, backed by several Asian governments and entities such as the Brookings Institution, argues that such massive ocean claims at great distance from land are "inconsistent with international law."
Warrant: China prepared to defend south east Asia at all costs.

Kemp, Ted. "China: We're Ready If US 'stirs up Any Conflict' in South China Sea."

As the dispute festers, experts see a higher chance of an unintended conflict between U.S. and Chinese vessels or aircraft, something that was witnessed in 2001 when a Chinese and a U.S. plane collided. China watchers say if a collision were to happen in 2016, a strong response from both sides could be possible. "China attaches far greater importance to peace in the South China Sea — much greater than the U.S. and Japan. No one should doubt our sincerity in this subject," Liu said. "The Chinese government will uphold peace in Southeast Asia even for the sake of our own survival. In this sense we are actively against any moves that will jeopardize peace in the South China Sea." Liu warned that a conflict between China and the United States would have wide repercussions for the global economy.

Analysis: This argument straight turns the aff, proving that increased U.S. presence would not deter conflict from china, far from it. In fact, anything perceived as a form of territorial encroachment would be seen as an act of war, and china may respond accordingly.
PRO – Military spending provides more money for military aid

**Argument:** More funds given to the military means there is more money to use for foreign military aid, which can be a colossal boon to the nations that receive it

**Warrant:** Military aid is regularly cut by the annual budgets, even more so than other military programs


WASHINGTON — America’s budget crisis at home is forcing the first significant cuts in overseas aid in nearly two decades, a retrenchment that officials and advocates say reflects the country’s diminishing ability to influence the world. As lawmakers scramble to trim the swelling national debt, both the Republican-controlled House and the Democrat-controlled Senate have proposed slashing financing for the State Department and its related aid agencies at a time of desperate humanitarian crises and uncertain political developments. The proposals have raised the specter of deep cuts in food and medicine for Africa, in relief for disaster-affected places like Pakistan and Japan, in political and economic assistance for the new democracies of the Middle East, and even for the Peace Corps. The financial crunch threatens to undermine a foreign policy described as “smart power” by President Obama and Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton, one that emphasizes diplomacy and development as a complement to American military power. It also would begin to reverse the increase in foreign aid that President George W. Bush supported after the attacks of Sept. 11, 2001, as part of an effort to combat the roots of extremism and anti-American sentiment, especially in the most troubled countries. Given the relatively small foreign aid budget — it accounts for 1 percent of federal spending over all — the effect of the cuts could be disproportional.
**Warrant:** Increased military budgets would consequentially increase the foreign military aid budget, as exemplified by recent attempts to compromise on the budget.


**But as the House and Senate Appropriations Committees begin writing domestic spending bills, the clamor for compromise is likely to grow louder.** Constituent interests are already beginning to pinch. Representative Kristi Noem, Republican of South Dakota, said, “My job is to make sure rural areas get taken care of.” Senator John Hoeven, Republican of North Dakota, fretted over further cuts to agriculture. Representative John Culberson, Republican of Texas, who leads the Appropriations subcommittee that funds the departments of Commerce, Justice and State, said, “Of course we are concerned about the effects of sequestration, and we need a long-term statutory solution,”. Representative Hal Rogers of Kentucky, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, said he “absolutely” wanted legislation to raise the spending limits. “At the end of the process, it will be difficult to increase military spending without providing some assistance to nondefense,” said Representative Charlie Dent, Republican of Pennsylvania and a senior member of the House Appropriations Committee.” At some point, there are going to have to be negotiations between the House, the Senate and the White House about rebalancing.”
Impact: Not using aid has catastrophic consequences for other nations


Duration and Design. Reform is difficult even under the best circumstances. Even in organizations that are amenable to change, longterm assistance does not guarantee success in improving the effectiveness and accountability of domestic security agencies. However, *early withdrawal of aid generally assures failure*. Duration is critical for a number of reasons. First, it can take years to train, equip, and mentor police and other internal security forces; to change police culture; and to build infrastructure. Second, *institutionalization of new structures* takes time, as new generations ingrained with the concepts of transparency and accountability come to power. However, there are several types of assistance that can foster reform in the near term. While institutionalization takes a long-term commitment, *the provision of equipment and skills that make accountability and transparency possible is both a prerequisite for success and a way to help bolster support for reform*. Such assistance can take the form of training on how to conduct and provide oversight for forensic, crime-scene, and cause-of-death investigations. It can also include providing equipment that monitors borders and that may also be used to ensure that border guards behave appropriately.
Impact: Lack of aid leads to international conflict

<http://journalistsresource.org/studies/international/conflicts/foreign-aid-armed-conflict>

The study’s findings include: Within the time period studied, there were 15 severe shocks when foreign aid was suddenly withdrawn. Of these cases, four countries — Liberia (1999), Ghana (1981), Guinea-Bissau (1997), and Sierra Leone (1990) — experienced armed conflict within one year of the shock. A negative aid shock to an average country was associated with more than doubling the risk of violent conflict, from 2.1% to 5.0%, even after controlling for both in-country and between country variation and characteristics. There was no statistically significant evidence that sudden infusions of development funding — “positive aid shocks” — were associated with increased probability of conflict. After controlling for other factors, there was no association between per-capita GDP, population, or mountainous terrain and increased risk of conflict. Human rights violations, factional democracy, oil production and ethnic fractionalization were all found to be statistically significant determinants of higher risk of civil conflict. The study concludes that, for aid recipient countries, “sudden aid shortfalls make governments relatively less able to make enough side-payments or military investment to preserve the peaceful status quo in the future.”
**Impact:** Increases in foreign aid are widely supported and beneficial


There is good reason to believe the public would support a sizable increase in foreign-aid spending, especially if a popular Republican president were to make the case. Most Americans have a wildly inflated view of how much Washington spends on foreign aid. In one 1995 University of Maryland poll, Americans said on average that we spent 15 percent of the federal budget on foreign aid. If that were true, our foreign-aid budget would now be more than $300 billion. It shouldn't be hard to persuade Americans to spend a tenth of that on foreign assistance today. But, for all the talk about the importance of giving people hope, the administration hasn't tried to make the case. Foreign aid alone will not bring us security, but neither will bigger bombs. Like the eagle on the dollar bill, which clutches an olive branch in one talon and arrows in the other, we must learn to strike the right balance between building peace and fighting wars and not sacrifice one at the expense of the other.

**Analysis:** Foreign military aid is extremely beneficial in toppling bad regimes without using a single troop. This is very good for weighing, because no soldiers are being sent into battle (therefore no casualties) but we’re still flexing our military might. That way, fewer lives are being lost while we still implement successful missions. In this way, the argument is easy-to-understand and great for weighing!
A2 – Military spending provides more funds for military aid

**Answer:** The military budget isn’t on the decline, so there won’t be any decline in military aid spending.

**Warrant:** Looking closely at the numbers, the military budget may actually be increasing.

<http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/war_stories/2016/02/president_obama_s_military_budget_is_still_one_of_the_biggest ever.html>

First, it’s worth noting, **this budget—like all defense budgets through the decades—is much larger than it seems at first glance.** According to the Defense Department, it amounts to $583 billion, a mere 0.4-percent increase over this year’s budget. However, that’s only the sum requested by the Defense Department. The Office of Management and Budget, which oversees the entire federal government, speaks of appropriations for “national defense,” which also include the Energy Department’s nuclear weapons programs and assorted items in various other agencies, which together total another $25 billion. All told, then, the budget request for national defense adds up to $608 billion—a 2.1-percent increase over this year’s budget: not enormous, but not trivial either, and certainly not a cut. But even this understates the magnitude of the money involved. Let’s look again at the Defense Department’s share of $582.7 billion. The Pentagon’s budget documents divide this request in two parts: the “base budget” and “OCO,” standing for Overseas Contingency Operations. OCO refers to the cost of wars that U.S. forces are fighting (or advising those fighting) in Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, and elsewhere.

**Analysis:** If there’s actually an increase in the military budget, foreign aid isn’t being cut, and so the aff ground gains no benefit.
Answer: Foreign military aid is actually damaging to other nations

Warrant: In all but the most specific of circumstances, foreign aid is not beneficial


Justice System. As the Afghanistan case illustrates, the reform of police and other internal security forces is not sufficient to ensure security, accountability, and human rights. Sustainable security requires a functioning justice system, including courts and a prison system. Arbitrary or politicized sentencing, an incompetent or corrupt judiciary, and inhumane prison conditions quickly undermine the benefits that come from better policing. A weak justice system also increases the prevalence of organized crime and extremist groups and can lead to a spiral of political assassinations, extrajudicial killings, and petty crime. The inability to establish a viable justice system has plagued many efforts to reconstruct police and security forces. The justice sector also plays a crucial role in human rights. For example, it can help end the use of torture by rejecting coerced confessions in criminal cases. In addition, education and training are insufficient unless the appropriate structural and institutional mechanisms are put in place to ensure continuity of oversight and accountability. These mechanisms can include Inspector Generals’ offices and improved management, personnel, and financial processes. Robust institutional development programs are critical to creating lasting change in the culture of internal security agencies. A Conducive Environment. Viable reform can take place only in an atmosphere of support from the local government, including the leadership of key ministries.

Analysis: Without very specific circumstances, there can be no benefit of foreign military aid. The country has to have a viable justice system, stable local government, and a lack of corruption, something not found in the vast majority of nations to whom we give aid. This severely undermines the foreign aid argument.
Answer: U.S. Military aid enables human rights abuses

Warrant: In Africa, money from the U.S. was used for HR abuses


This "Western money" and "African boots" approach to security assistance programs is increasingly seen by Washington as an innovative alternative to large-scale wars – one that allows for "sharing" the burden of security and empowering foreign forces to address their own problems. But without careful accountability and rigorous evaluation, its implementation looks a lot more like short-sighted Cold War policies in Latin America than local empowerment. Take a look at how bad it's gotten as part of the mission creep on the African continent's northern half. Human Rights Watch released a report last month documenting the abuse, rape and torture of at least 1,000 Somali refugees by U.S.-backed Kenyan police forces as retaliation for supposed terrorist attacks. This follows a report by the Open Society Justice Initiative released last November that connected U.S. counterterror assistance and influence to systemic human rights abuses in Kenya and Uganda, and another account of U.S.-backed torture in Mauritania. And then there's always the Ethiopian government, another major recipient of U.S. assistance, which has used anti-terrorism laws to actively repress civil society, crack down on peaceful dissent and limit the civil rights of Muslims and others.

Analysis: If U.S. military aid embraces questionable practices and human rights abuses, it shouldn’t be used. This severely damages the credibility of the aff team.
PRO - Increasing military spending helps meet our security commitments

Argument: The US force structure is spread too thin, with understaffed embassy’s and undermanned convoys. In order to keep up a credible fighting force that can do its job we need to increase military spending.

Warrant: The US is spread too thin considering our current security commitments


The US Army is far more heavily engaged around the world than projected when it began slashing force size several years ago, and its commitments will be hard to maintain in the long run as troop numbers shrink, General Ray Odierno said on Friday. Odierno, the Army chief of staff, said decisions about cutting the size of the force from 570,000 to the current 490,000 were made several years ago when Pentagon planners expected a peaceful Europe, a declining commitment in Afghanistan and no return to Iraq. Instead, he said, the Army is regularly using three brigades in eastern Europe because of concerns about Russia's support for rebels in Ukraine. It has another three brigades in Afghanistan, a brigade in Iraq, a brigade in Kuwait and is rotating a brigade to South Korea, Odierno added.
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Warrant: Current Budget controls are stretching our military’s ability to keep up troop numbers


Odierno said he had been warning for two years that tight budgets would require the Army to cut the active-duty force to 450,000 troops from the current 490,000. He said he was surprised by the recent outcry when the service specified which bases would be hit in the coming years. "We've been very clear that the Army will have to move down to 450,000 with the current budget we have," he said, noting that a further reduction to about 420,000 could be required if spending reductions continue. The Pentagon is currently trying to absorb nearly $1 trillion in projected cuts to spending over a decade. The reductions were ordered as part of the Budget Control Act passed in 2011.

Warrant: Overstretch has harsh consequences for our force presence abroad


Two recent developments - the Army's plan to "double up" short tours and the Pentagon's proposal to establish rotation schedules for Reserve and National Guard unit deployments -- confirm that the U.S. military is undermanned and over-missioned. Already, the Army has 60 percent of its active-duty combat strength deployed in Korea, Iraq and Afghanistan. With those units on announced one-year tours, Army officials admit they have a problem in finding replacements. The problem is especially acute in Iraq, where all or parts of three divisions are scheduled to return to their home bases next spring.
**Warrant:** Over-stretching our military is not just bad for our readiness, but also bad for soldiers and their families.

<http://www.military.com/NewContent/0,13190,Defensewatch_090403,00.html>.

Second, the **rotation plan will not produce** Hall's promised *predictability.* Personnel experts warn that instead it will spark an exodus of Guardsmen and Reservists from the military, simply because any part-time soldier facing a guaranteed mobilization and overseas deployment one year or six months every three years will come under tremendous pressure from his family and employer. Hall claimed last week that future mobilizations will focus on the traditional "specialties" such as civil affairs, air traffic control, mortuary affairs and force protection. His statement sidestepped - or deliberately ignored - the Army's already announced plan sending two National Guard infantry brigades to Iraq. Although the Pentagon argues that a rotation plan is necessary and the end-strength numbers do show the service is stretched tighter than a drum, the **officials who concocted the rotation plan either do not understand the impact on morale from employer pressure and family disruption, or simply do not care.**

**Warrant:** More funding is the solution

<http://www.military.com/NewContent/0,13190,Defensewatch_090403,00.html>.

Any choice that truly aims at alleviating the serious personnel shortfall will require a **major increase in defense spending.** Elected officials will worry that higher taxes and budget deficits will alienate voters from both political parties. **That's not the worst scenario:** Continuing the status quo means setting up our men and women in uniform for a future conflict where insufficient live troops will mean a much higher number of casualties. Allowing that to happen is the truly unacceptable scenario.
Analysis: This argument is pretty straightforward, the US needs money to maintain its commitments abroad. This argument can be impacted out in two ways, international security and troop wellbeing and safety. This is important because many of the responses surrounding the argument will be along the lines of ‘scaling back international commitments is good for the US’, but this allows an affirmative team to argue that the current budget does not result in a decrease in commitments, it just forces us to use the soldiers we already have more dangerously.
A2 - Increased military spending helps meet our security commitments

Answer: Increased spending feeds into free-riding for allies

Warrant: When America increases military spending, free riding allies feel secure and decrease military spending


"Our results thus reject the second part of the free-riding in alliances theory that claims that the extent of free-riding is a function of country size, but lend support to the first and main part of the theory: the smaller allies free-ride on the superpower."

Warrant: Free Riding is caused by an unjustified, unquestioning faith in American power.


Such neglect betokens dangerous levels of trust in America’s capacity to bear the brunt of allied defense. This isn’t kicking the dirt over American decline. It’s simple political reality. There are no automatic commitments to dispatch forces to protect others. If you doubt me, parse the text of the Taiwan Relations Act, the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty, or even Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty. You’ll find wiggle-room in the closest of international covenants.
Warrant: Free Riding ultimately harms American allies and American interests


America’s key strategic alliance throughout the cold war is in far deeper trouble than most members admit. The Atlantic allies face a host of new and old dangers. Without more and wiser European military spending — on equipment, training, surveillance and reconnaissance — NATO faces, as Mr. Gates rightly warned, “a dim if not dismal future” and even “irrelevance.” The secretary is retiring at the end of this month, which is likely one of the reasons he jettisoned the diplomatic niceties. But not the only one. As he made clear, this country can no longer afford to do a disproportionate share of NATO’s fighting and pay a disproportionate share of its bills while Europe slashes its defense budgets and free-rides on the collective security benefits. NATO’s shockingly wobbly performance over Libya, after the Pentagon handed off leadership, should leave no doubt about the Europeans’ weaknesses. And while America’s NATO partners now have 40,000 troops in Afghanistan (compared with about 99,000 from the United States), many have been hemmed in by restrictive rules of engagement and shortages of critical equipment. Too many are scheduled for imminent departure.

Analysis: States become free riders, or choose not to pay the burden of collective defense, when they are convinced that their allies will protect them. Increasing military spending signals that there is no need to ensure independent self-defense, which will further facilitate free riding. This free riding undermines the legitimacy of international agreements, and reduces our ability to project power abroad, since we have less support from our nominal allies.
**Answer:** Increased spending is not a solution for security flaws

**Warrant:** Inefficiency, not a lack of money, explains American insecurity abroad


The data say we pay far more than we should have to pay to keep America safe. The fault lies not in the brave men and women in uniform who put their lives on the line. The fault lies in our contractors, our political system, and our doctrine and strategies. We must set a target for a leaner, but still adequate military budget. We must hold government and contractors accountable for delivering the security we need for a reasonable price.
**Warrant:** High cost of production for American security means any additional money spent would be inefficient for making America safer.


**The United States, it turns out, is a high-cost producer of security.** We have to pay much more than the world average to keep ourselves safe. **We have become very inefficient at providing security for ourselves.** Imagine that the United States were a corporation rather than a nation. The CEO would turn to the vice president of national security and say, "Your costs are too high. From now on, your budget is based on a multiple of what other countries spend. You can spend up to three times what our number two competitor (China) spends (not five times) or you can spend up to 100 percent of what the next three countries together spend. **No more. Find a way to keep America safe at a price we can afford, and at a price that's competitive with what other countries spend.**" Then it would be up to the management of the Defense Department to get the job done for a reasonable price. They would figure it out.

**Analysis:** The argument that we need to spend more to secure our interests assumes that increased spending makes defense more effective. However, due to political inefficiencies, having more money will not increase security, due to our high production costs.
PRO – Increased spending would help fight Bashar Al-Assad

**Argument:** Increased military spending would help the U.S. defeat Bashar Al-Assad

**Warrant:** Intervention in Syria would benefit the U.S.


Over the course of months, a sustained military-political-humanitarian strategy could target any extremists who harm civilians, telegraphing a clear position about Syria’s future. To be sure, this strategy would be messy; it would require careful political management, and it might fail. It relies on the United States displaying more competence in a foreign intervention than it has in recent decades. Increased U.S. intervention would represent a useful reassertion of American power and engagement in the crisis, and it would achieve multiple humanitarian and strategic aims. At worst, the Syrian crisis would be as problematic as it is today, but there would be fewer civilian casualties, and the United States would gain leverage with its allies on other matters because of its beefed-up engagement in Syria. At best, a more aggressive U.S. effort in Syria would limit Russian overreach, increase the likelihood of a political solution, and roll back some of the destabilizing regional consequences of the Syrian implosion.
Warrant: Failure is better than nothing.


Even in failure, increased intervention would mark a correction of American policy in the Middle East, which today suffers from a credibility gap, driven by two mutually reinforcing mistakes: first, an over-eagerness to pull away from regional crises, even when those crises implicate core U.S. national security interests, and second, a major gap between rhetoric and practice. That disconnect was vividly displayed when President Obama disavowed his “red line” and backed off his threat to bomb Bashar al-Assad for using chemical weapons, and continues to characterize a White House that speaks constantly of disengagement while devoting the lion’s share of its foreign policy attention at the Middle East.

Warrant: Over 400,000 people have died already


The United Nations stopped tracking an official death toll in 2014 because it said it could not find reliable data. **Estimates published by independent Syrian researchers in the spring of 2016 put the death toll at 470,000**, and the UN envoy to Syria told reporters in April 2016 that he believed 400,000 was a reliable estimate. The lack of a solid number of dead, displaced, and wounded, along with a tally of children out of school, health impact, and infrastructure damage should not obscure the overall narrative arc: a modern, developing country, with pivotal strategic significance, is being rapidly destroyed.³ A Western official who has maintained close contact with Syrian officials on many sides of the conflict, almost since its duration, painted the Syrian war in almost apocalyptic terms.
**Warrant:** The U.S. should double its spending to aid in the conflict


The “assist” plank is the most straightforward. The United States should double its already generous humanitarian expenditures, marking a major financial commitment (although it would amount to a fraction of the costs of a military campaign). This expenditure would have serious impact. It would mark America’s position as the leading humanitarian donor, and should be accompanied by far more political messaging to make clear that the United States gives the lion’s share of humanitarian aid to Syria, as it does in many other troubled parts of the world. The tangible impact is important: every additional group of children enrolled in school, ill people given medical care, or displaced people sheltered, is important—these are clearly achievable goals. The moral impact is equally crucial: the United States can and should frame Syria’s conflict as a war against human beings and the institutions that enable them to live with basic services and dignity.
Warrant: US Intervention has a multiplier effect.


As it is, American policy is subjected to these problems. A more active intervention will persuade many of these reluctant allies to get in line because there will be a more robust policy to fall in line behind. American military initiative will benefit from a multiplier effect. Today, all of America’s partners follow independent military policies in Syria. With an armed hand on the tiller, the United States can demand that its allies actively support U.S. strategy, and cease supporting groups who oppose it.

Analysis: Everyone agrees that fighting the Assad regime in Syria would be beneficial to the west and people of Syria, and U.S. intervention is a very possible avenue to do that. Any sort of campaign in Syria would require an increase in spending, thus access your link to the resolution.
A2 – Increased spending would help fight Bashar Al-Assad

**Answer:** Intervention will heighten tensions and make the conflict worse

**Warrant:** Russia and Iran back Assad.


The regime’s recent gains come thanks to a major acceleration in support and direct intervention by Russia, Iran, and Hezbollah. The economy is in ruins and the Syrian pound has collapsed, surviving financially on credit and grants from Iran. The military gains have come almost entirely thanks to foreign intervention on behalf of the regime. Russia and Iran can probably maintain their current level of military support indefinitely, although some analysts differ on this point. Hezbollah, which has contributed the most important infantry fighters, along with critical commanders, can probably maintain its share for several more years to come. Frontlines have fluctuated, but there are signs that the regime’s hold over its home ground is porous. Bombings in the Alawite coastal heartland in May revealed alarming security lapses, and raise once again the danger that millions of displaced Sunnis, living under government control, might turn into a fifth column for the rebellion.
**Warrant:** Intervention may help ISIL


In fact, there is a clear and preferable middle course: strategic, robust but limited military intervention, embedded in a clear political strategy to press for a negotiated settlement. Such a course would entail increased and sustained proxy warfare; some direct military intervention to protect civilians from indiscriminate bombing; and pressure on U.S. allies. The U.S. intervention would have two aims, neither of them new: to reduce civilian death and displacement, and to increase the faint chances of a diplomatic solution by raising the cost of continuing war for the Damascus government and its sponsors. **In the short-term, hostile actors such as the Islamic State group (IS, also known by an earlier acronym, ISIS) and the Nusra Front might enjoy collateral benefits from increased U.S. intervention,** but an American policy that employed force to protect civilians from the Syrian government would have to protect them from jihadists as well. (For example, if the United States shoots down helicopters that bomb civilians, jihadist fighters in the same area would enjoy greater freedom of movement, but U.S. proxies and allies could restrain these jihadists from taking control of new areas as a result).

**Warrant:** U.S. intervention empirically increases conflict.


Our study yields one resounding finding: **The rate of terrorist attacks around the world by jihadist groups and the rate of fatalities in those attacks increased dramatically after the invasion of Iraq. Globally there was a 607 percent rise in the average yearly incidence of attacks** (28.3 attacks per year before and 199.8 after) **and a 237 percent rise in the average fatality rate** (from 501 to 1,689 deaths per year). A large part of this rise occurred in Iraq, which accounts for fully half of the global total of jihadist terrorist attacks in the post-Iraq War period. But even excluding Iraq, the average yearly number of jihadist terrorist attacks and resulting fatalities still rose sharply around the world by 265 percent and 58 percent respectively.
Warrant: Competing interventions, such as the ones that would occur in this scenario, increase the duration of the conflict.


Table 1 presents the results of the Weibull model of conflict duration, with the unit of analysis being the conflict month. The results are presented in an accelerated time failure metric and identify the effect of an outside intervention on the expected future duration of a conflict, when controlling for some of the characteristics that define its scope. The coefficients associated with an accelerated time failure parameterization can be translated into expected time until the end of a conflict (Box-Steffensmeier and Jones 1997). Although a direct interpretation of the results is somewhat problematic, in general, a unit change on a predictor variable has an effect on the expected time until the conflict ends, which is consistent with the sign of the coefficient. If you exponentiate the coefficient, the marginal effect can be calculated in terms of the percentage longer (or shorter) than we would expect a conflict to continue. For example, when the conflict is organized around ethnoreligious groups in conflict, the hazard that the conflict will end decreases by about 36% over conflicts organized along ideological lines (e.31). Likewise, the results suggest that opposing interventions reduce the probability that a conflict will end in the next period by well beyond 1,000%. And contrary to what one might think about the effect of the costs of the conflict, the total number of fatalities does not influence the expected time until the conflict ends. An increasing number of fatalities per month, however, does reduce the likelihood that a conflict will end sooner (4%). We must evaluate this role of costs (fatalities and intensity) with caution, however, because both represent ex post indicators of the cost of continued conflict.

Analysis: If intervening in the conflict makes the conflict worse, there is no reason for the U.S. to ever intervene.
**Argument:** Increased government spending on the military promotes more innovation in technology and medical research

**Warrant:** The military uses funding to engage in a great deal of medical research


The U. S. Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Diseases (US AMRIID), located at Fort Detrick, Maryland, is the government's principal biological defense laboratory. The USAMRIID is an organization of some 600 civilian and military employees, more than 100 of them doctoral level professionals. The Institute's medical defense efforts include development of vaccines and diagnostic systems for diseases caused by viruses, bacteria, ric-ett siae, and toxins. Development of vaccines, drugs, toxoids, and antitoxins for prophylaxis and therapy of biological agent intoxication and infection is the cornerstone of the laboratory's program.
Warrant: A larger budget provides more money for military R&D, which has massive civilian applications


Both Bernanke and Muro developed a final point. In effect, they recognized the many ways in which defense research and development can help the broader economy by promoting innovation and new technology. This was clearly true in the past and remains true, albeit at lower relative levels of overall resourcing, today. This is not to say that the defense sector by itself should be relied upon to create a national research, innovation, or manufacturing strategy. But in effect, it has somewhat stealthily (in Muro’s words) provided one, or at least an approximation to one, in the past. In so doing, this has on balance helped the nation. Going forward, we may need to consider complementary efforts on the civilian side of things, rather than relying exclusively on the military sector and on laissez-faire decisionmaking within the private sector. We also need to bear in mind that basic research is generally of greater benefit to the broader economy than applied, mission-specific research and development and testing programs. But defense has nonetheless played an important economic role in the innovation sector as well, and will continue to do so in the future.
Impact: Military research creates technology faster and more efficiently than civilian research.


“As war became so technologically dependent, a whole range of technologies became important and many of them had civilian applications,” says Alex Roland, a history professor who focuses on the military and technology at Duke University in Durham, N.C. “Each particular conflict, if it goes on long enough, spurs its own special kinds of development.” In America’s current conflicts, concerns about overstretching the military have allowed for significant investment in devices that allow fewer troops to do more. In years past, soldiers on guard duty watched their base’s perimeter through a pair of binoculars. Today, many rely on thermal imaging. A system created by FLIR, an imaging company in Wilsonville, Ore., can generate a clear picture of an area 20 kilometers away in total darkness and through smoke or fog. FLIR has worked with the military to provide these systems since the 1980s, seeing a boom in business during each conflict. But nothing has generated business like the Iraq and Afghanistan wars. Since 2000, the value of the company’s stock has increased by at least a hundredfold. “When you look at a situation like the last few years, where you have a couple $100 million of additional equipment being purchased [and] going into the Iraq and Afghanistan theaters, $200 million’s worth of equipment means we’re investing $20 million in additional research and development,”
Impact: Medical research provides massive benefits, vaccines and cures to the civilian population


The USAMRIID team taught and assisted safe techniques for patient care and the handling of fluid samples in the hospital laboratory for treating patients with a highly lethal disease. Our unrivaled investment in face transplant research (www.health.mil/Reference-Center) to help servicemembers with devastating combat injuries has actually benefited civilians the most thus far. As a result of our efforts with our civilian partners, seven face transplant surgeries have occurred in the United States, primarily on civilian patients. These surgeries are transforming modern medicine as we know it by opening the door for other medical advancements in immune-related diseases such as allergies, cancer and blood disorders. Countless people will be impacted by this critical work. The military has also figured prominently in the development of new vaccines (www.health.mil/Reference-Center), which have helped protect generations of people. Our involvement has led to significant contributions to life-saving vaccines including for yellow fever, typhoid, pneumococcus, hepatitis A, adenovirus, influenza, measles, mumps and rubella, meningococcal disease, Japanese encephalitis, hepatitis B, malaria and HIV. We continue to make significant contributions in this field. We remain dedicated to continuing our long tradition of supporting research efforts to address new health threats that affect all of us. Our research efforts have also led to the development of blood-clotting products, robotic exoskeletons, surgery directed by robots, spray-on skin to repair burns and new techniques to address traumatic brain injuries and post-traumatic stress disorder.

Analysis: This argument essentially points out that military expenditures can have overflows that benefit the civilian population in a big way. In many ways, it’s more potent than a jobs argument, because the idea is that not only does the driving force of economy improve with better technology, but countless diseases that affect every day Americans are cured. This provides a lives impact that the pro - the side advocating more military funding and presumably more involvement in conflicts - may not get elsewhere. In this way, it’s a very useful argument for weighing purposes as literally countless lives are saved by such military advances.
A2 – Military spending enables medical and tech innovation

Answer: The military budget isn’t on the decline, so there won’t be any decline in military research.

Warrant: Looking closely at the numbers, the military budget may actually be increasing


First, it’s worth noting, this budget—like all defense budgets through the decades—is much larger than it seems at first glance. According to the Defense Department, it amounts to $583 billion, a mere 0.4-percent increase over this year’s budget. However, that’s only the sum requested by the Defense Department. The Office of Management and Budget, which oversees the entire federal government, speaks of appropriations for “national defense,” which also include the Energy Department’s nuclear weapons programs and assorted items in various other agencies, which together total another $25 billion. All told, then, the budget request for national defense adds up to $608 billion—a 2.1-percent increase over this year’s budget: not enormous, but not trivial either, and certainly not a cut. But even this understates the magnitude of the money involved. Let’s look again at the Defense Department’s share of $582.7 billion. The Pentagon’s budget documents divide this request in two parts: the “base budget” and “OCO,” standing for Overseas Contingency Operations. OCO refers to the cost of wars that U.S. forces are fighting (or advising those fighting) in Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, and elsewhere.

Analysis: If there’s actually an increase in the military budget, research and development aren’t being cut, and so the aff ground gains no benefit.
Answer: Military research is comparatively less effective than civilian research, and is therefore a drain on funding.

Warrant: Defense spending on research could be better utilized in other sectors.


Military R&D is therefore characterized by low levels of productivity of the investment. Melman has reported that the US Commerce Department estimates that a commercial patent requires on average ten man-years of industrial R&D to be developed, and a thousands man-years for the R&D that the Defense Department and NASA contract out or perform in-house. (Melman 1983: 178). A study of the percentage of spin-offs from military R&D has estimated for the US a value between 5 and 10 per cent (ibid.). Besides the individual interesting cases of civilian spin-offs, there are three basic factors, outlined by Tirman, that reduce their scope and effect: many of the products would have been developed anyway by the industry; the largest benefits have already taken place, as the greatest potential is when a technology is in the early stage of development; finally, any agency that may spend the amount of resources the Defense Department invests in high technology will inevitably lead to some commercial by-products (Tirman 1984: 221). High military R&D expenditures are therefore a bad technological policy, a view on which there is broad agreement among the major US experts. Edwin Mansfield noted that, in spite of the spin-offs, 'the benefits to civilian technology seem decidedly less than if the funds were spent directly on civilian technology'
Warrant: Military research spending not efficient, preventing it from being competitive in the marketplace


(Mansfield 1980: 589). According to Richard Nelson, 'the large spillover from the defense and space programmes of the late 1950s and 1960s was the product of a rather special set of circumstances.... Many analysts have suggested that spillover has diminished markedly since the mid-1960s' (Nelson 1984a: 72). Nathan Rosenberg added an additional criticism: 'although the beneficial spillovers from the military and space programmes to the civilian sector are often cited, far less attention has been given to their possible deleterious effects in raising the costs of civilian R& D and in reducing the sensitivity of American engineers to cost considerations' (Rosenberg 1982: 284). Such a spin-off can make a lot of engineers unable to produce for competitive cost-conscious markets, such as the civilian ones, with a major effect, this time a negative one, on the pace of innovation and on the direction of technological change.

Analysis: If military research is less successful than domestic research, it stands to reason that the money spent on military research could be better spent in the civilian marketplace. This provides a tradeoff that the aff team will have a difficult time arguing past.
Answer: Military medical research is less effective than civilian medical research

Warrant: The process of consent for military research slows down experiments, making them less beneficial


In fact, much of modern research ethics is grounded in events that occurred in the context of war or government-sponsored research. Despite these similarities and common origins, research in the military has additional requirements designed to preserve service members’ informed consent rights. The special nature of the superior–subordinate relationship in the military necessitates careful protections to avoid perceptions of coercion or undue influence on a military subject. Additionally, current legal and regulatory requirements for advanced informed consent significantly restrict the flexibility of the military to conduct research using waiver of consent. This has implications on the ability of the nation to develop effective medical treatments for the global war on terrorism. Nevertheless, work is under way to realign defense research policy with the norms of civilian biomedical practice. Future directions include the adoption of waivers for military emergency research, and the cautious introduction of human subject studies on the battlefield.

Analysis: If military medical research is less effective due to more stringent requirements, it makes sense to let civilian groups do the research instead. This provides another tradeoff for places money currently funding the military could be better spent.
**PRO – Cyber Security**

**Argument:** The U.S should increase funding for cyber security.

**Warrant:** Cyber security poses an increasing threat to national security and the economy


“Most cyberattacks have limited impacts, but a **successful attack on some components of critical infrastructure** (CI)—most of which is held by the private sector—**could have significant effects on national security, the economy, and the livelihood and safety of individual citizens.** Thus, a rare successful attack with high impact can pose a larger risk than a common successful attack with low impact. **While it is widely recognized that cyberattacks can be costly to individuals and organizations, economic impacts can be difficult to measure,** and estimates of those impacts vary widely. **An often cited figure for annual cost to the global economy from cybercrime is $400 billion, with some observers arguing that costs are increasing substantially, especially with the continued expansion of ICT infrastructure through the Internet of Things and other new and emerging platforms. The costs of cyberespionage can be even more difficult to quantify but are considered to be substantial.”
Warrant: The U.S is falling prey to cyber espionage.


“Most of Cyber Command's new troops will focus on defense, detecting and stopping computer penetrations of military and other critical networks by America's adversaries like China, Iran or North Korea.

But there is an increasing focus on offense as military commanders beef up plans to execute cyber strikes or switch to attack mode if the nation comes under electronic assault.

"We're going to train them to the highest standard we can," Army General Keith Alexander, head of Cyber Command, told the Reuters Cybersecurity Summit last month.

"And not just on defense, but on both sides. You've got to have that."

Officials and experts have warned for years that U.S. computer networks are falling prey to espionage, intellectual property theft and disruption from nations such as China and Russia, as well as hackers and criminal groups. President Barack Obama will bring up allegations of Chinese hacking when he meets President Xi Jinping at a summit in California beginning on Friday - charges that Beijing has denied.

The Pentagon has accused China of using cyber espionage to modernize its military and a recent report said Chinese hackers had gained access to the designs of more than two dozen major U.S. weapons systems in recent years. Earlier this year, U.S. computer security company Mandiant said a secretive Chinese military unit was probably behind a series of hacking attacks that had stolen data from 100 U.S. companies. There is a growing fear that cyber threats will escalate from mainly espionage and disruptive activities to far more catastrophic attacks that destroy or severely degrade military systems, power grids, financial networks and air travel.

Now, the United States is redoubling its preparations to strike back if attacked, and is making cyber warfare an integral part of future military campaigns.”
**Warrant:** China is redirecting up to 30% more funding to cyberwarfare.


“China’s government is sharply increasing its investment in cyber warfare programs in what U.S. intelligence officials say is a major attempt to compete with superior U.S. military cyber capabilities.

The new spending priority was described by U.S. officials as a long-term, large-scale reallocation of resources by the Chinese, considered along with Russia to be among the most capable cyber warfare nation states.

“There is now data we have that suggests that they have redirected as much as 20 to 30 percent more funding to cyber than they have in previous years,” said a U.S. official familiar with details of the Chinese cyber warfare program.

The official said new intelligence reports indicate Beijing has “made a long term strategic commitment” to bolstering cyber warfare efforts.

According to U.S. officials who spoke on condition of anonymity, the major increase in Chinese efforts was set off after the Chinese concluded that their military cyber programs lag behind U.S. strategic cyber warfare efforts in significant ways.”
**Warrant:** China, Russia, Iran, and North Korea all possess advanced cyberweapons.


“Most cyberattacks linked to the U.S. and foreign governments in recent years involve cyberspying—breaking into a computer network and stealing data. More-aggressive covert weapons go further, either erasing computer records or destroying physical property.

“With some countries, we’re comfortable with knowing what their capabilities are, but with other countries we’re still lost,” said Andre McGregor, a former cyber special agent at the Federal Bureau of Investigation and now the director of security at Tanium Inc., a Silicon Valley cybersecurity startup. “We don’t have the visibility into their toolset.

The Military Balance, a widely read annual assessment of global military powers published by the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London, tallies tanks, battalions and aircraft carriers. When it comes to national cyberforces it says “capabilities are not assessed quantitatively.”

In the U.S., the National Security Agency, Central Intelligence Agency, FBI and others all play roles in combing through intelligence.

U.S. officials say their biggest concerns are the cyberweapons held by the Chinese, Russians, Iranians and North Koreans, countries that have deployed advanced attacks that either dug inside U.S. government networks or targeted top U.S. companies. Even Israel, a U.S. ally, was linked to hacking tools found on the computers of European hotels used for America’s diplomatic talks with Iran, according to the analysis of the spyware by a top cybersecurity firm. Israeli officials have denied spying on the U.S.

Cyberarmies tend to be integrated with a country’s military, its intelligence services, or both, as is the case in China and the U.S.”
Warrant: Current cyber security initiatives are inadequate.


“A $6 billion security system intended to keep hackers out of computers belonging to federal agencies isn't living up to expectations, an audit by the Government Accountability Office has found.

A public version of the secret audit — a secret version containing more sensitive findings was circulated to government agencies in November — released last week concerns the Einstein system, formally called the National Cybersecurity Protection System and operated by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security.

The GAO found that the system has limited capability to detect anomalies in network traffic that sometimes indicate attempts to attack a network. What it can do is scan for and detect attacks based on a list of known methods or signatures. Most of the signatures used to scan for the attacks are available in commercial-grade products, though a few were developed specially for the government.”
Warrant: Increased spending could fix clear holes in U.S cyber security.


“Mr. Enzi and the chairman of the House Budget Committee, Representative Tom Price of Georgia, have said they will not invite Mr. Obama’s budget director, Shaun Donovan, to testify before their panels, That is a break with a tradition dating to the start of the modern budget process in 1975 and a snub that captures the hostility that Mr. Obama’s agenda faces.
Speaker Paul D. Ryan, Republican of Wisconsin, dismissed the president’s budget as “a progressive manual for growing the federal government at the expense of hard-working Americans,” noting that the oil tax alone could add 24 cents a gallon to gasoline prices. Mr. Obama proposed the tax to pay for more than $300 billion in infrastructure improvements over 10 years.
The president said he had spoken to Mr. Ryan about the cybersecurity initiative, which is the centerpiece among new proposals that could garner bipartisan support, administration officials say, despite Republicans’ condemnation of the budget as a whole. “This is not an ideological issue,” Mr. Obama said.
The $19 billion cybersecurity request reflects a 35 percent increase above current spending. Part of that, a $3.1 billion proposal to overhaul the government’s computer systems, was prompted by a huge embarrassment: the Chinese theft of security records on 22 million Americans from the system run by the Office of Personnel Management.
The discovery prompted a major review of the government’s “legacy” computer systems that concluded, as numerous government-sponsored reports had warned for years, that the systems were simply not designed to withstand modern cyberattacks.
On Tuesday, Mr. Obama said the problem was so severe that some government systems, including for Social Security and the Internal Revenue Service, were running on software systems dating to when he was a child in the 1960s.
As for the rest of the $1.2 trillion in discretionary spending in the budget, about half would go to domestic programs and half to the military.”
Analysis: Cyber security is an issue with bipartisan support that is a glaring weakness in U.S military policy. U.S technology is either outdated or substantially flawed, and the time has come to finally invest in cyber security. The key to this argument is establishing the threat of cyber security and demonstrating that U.S funding will make a meaningful difference to U.S security. Given the increasingly large threat of cyber security, it’s very likely that an investment in cyber security is needed.
A2 – Cyber Security

**Answer:** Expanding cyber security could trigger an arms race.

**Warrant:** Cyber warfare can trigger greater threats beyond cyberspace.


“In their zeal to protect themselves in cyberspace, countries need to ensure that they do not trigger even greater threats beyond cyberspace, particularly military or economic forms of retaliation. At a time when the reported level of cyber incidents continues to rise and when cyber risks are perceived as growing even faster, the odds are increasing that a country will find itself in a cyber crisis. Such a crisis could take many different forms: the escalation of tensions associated with an actual, major cyberattack; the suspicion that such an attack has already occurred and must be countered; or the simple fear that an attack might soon occur and must be preempted.

Cyber crises are less likely to emanate from the unavoidable features of cyberspace than from each side's fear, often exaggerated, of what might result from its failure to respond. To avoid the unnecessary escalation of such crises, national cyberdefense agencies should monitor the messages and signals they send out about their own cyberoperations, sharpen their analyses of how potential adversaries would likely perceive the escalatory aspect of offensive strategies, and take additional cautionary measures to manage perceptions.”
Warrant: The U.S is already has perhaps the world’s most powerful cyberattack capability.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/01/31/AR2010013101834.html>

“Finally, the U.S. government has perhaps the world's most powerful and sophisticated offensive cyberattack capability. This capability remains highly classified. But the *New York Times* has reported that the Bush administration used cyberattacks on insurgent cellphones and computers in Iraq, and that it approved a plan for attacks on computers related to Iran's nuclear weapons program. And the government is surely doing much more. "We have U.S. warriors in cyberspace that are deployed overseas" and "live in adversary networks," says Bob Gourley, the former chief technology officer for the Defense Intelligence Agency. These warriors are now under the command of Lt. Gen. Keith Alexander, director of the National Security Agency. The NSA, the world's most powerful signals intelligence organization, is also in the business of breaking into and extracting data from offshore enemy computer systems and of engaging in computer attacks that, in the NSA's words, "disrupt, deny, degrade, or destroy the information" found in these systems. When the Obama administration created "cyber command" last year to coordinate U.S. offensive cyber capabilities, it nominated Alexander to be in charge. Simply put, the United States is in a big way doing the very things that Clinton criticized. We are not, like the Chinese, stealing intellectual property from U.S. firms or breaking into the accounts of democracy advocates. But we are aggressively using the same or similar computer techniques for ends we deem worthy. Our potent offensive cyber operations matter for reasons beyond the hypocrisy inherent in undifferentiated condemnation of cyberattacks. Even if we could stop all cyberattacks from our soil, we wouldn't want to. On the private side, hacktivism can be a tool of liberation. On the public side, the best defense of critical computer systems is sometimes a good offense. "My own view is that the only way to counteract both criminal and espionage activity online is to be proactive," Alexander said last year, adding that if the Chinese were inside critical U.S. computer systems, he would "want to go and take down the source of those attacks."
Analysis: The United States already has reasonably advanced technology to combat cyberwarfare. Currently, the United States is one of the most activist nations in the global cyberwarfare arms race. A funding increase likely isn’t necessary given the U.S’ cyber security proficiency, yet it could trigger escalation by empowering the U.S’ hacktivism. If the United States continues to act aggressively in the global cyberwarfare arms race, it could potentially lead to significant escalation or even retaliation from the U.S’ adversaries.
PRO – Increased spending funds counterterror operations

**Argument:** The U.S. should spend more money to fund and stop counter terrorism operations.

**Warrant:** Spending on counter terrorism works.


The material cost of a suicide bombing is as low as US$150. This modest investment will result in an average of 12 deaths and spread fear throughout the targeted population. The developed world is responding to the threat of fundamentalist Islamic terrorism by building ever-bigger, ever-better fortifications around key targets. Entry to airports and embassies is more difficult; key landmarks are blocked from potential bombers. **Since 2001, the world has spent about US$70 billion on increased homeland security measures. Predictably, this has reduced the number of trans-national attacks by about 34 per cent.** However, on average, terrorism has claimed 67 more deaths each year.

**Warrant:** Funding is worth the cost.


The advantages would be substantial. **Doubling the Interpol budget and allocating one-tenth of the International Monetary Fund’s yearly financial monitoring and capacity-building budget to tracing terrorist funds would cost about US$128 million annually.** Stopping one catastrophic terrorist event would save the world at least US$1 billion. The benefits could be almost ten times higher than the costs. Target nations must remember that the world faces many challenges that are, in many respects, more pressing than terrorism. The number of lives lost to *transnational* terrorist attacks since 2001 has been an annual average of 583, according to MIPT and US State Department figures. This is dwarfed by the death toll exacted by HIV/AIDS, malaria, malnutrition or even traffic accidents.
Warrant: Current Counterterrorism policy is working, spending more would make it even more effective.


The Obama administration relies on drones for one simple reason: they work. According to data compiled by the New America Foundation, since Obama has been in the White House, U.S. drones have killed an estimated 3,300 al Qaeda, Taliban, and other jihadist operatives in Pakistan and Yemen. That number includes over 50 senior leaders of al Qaeda and the Taliban—top figures who are not easily replaced. In 2010, Osama bin Laden warned his chief aide, Atiyah Abd al-Rahman, who was later killed by a drone strike in the Waziristan region of Pakistan in 2011, that when experienced leaders are eliminated, the result is “the rise of lower leaders who are not as experienced as the former leaders” and who are prone to errors and miscalculations. And drones also hurt terrorist organizations when they eliminate operatives who are lower down on the food chain but who boast special skills: passport forgers, bomb makers, recruiters, and fundraisers. Drones have also undercut terrorists’ ability to communicate and to train new recruits. In order to avoid attracting drones, al Qaeda and Taliban operatives try to avoid using electronic devices or gathering in large numbers. A tip sheet found among jihadis in Mali advised militants to “maintain complete silence of all wireless contacts” and “avoid gathering in open areas.” Leaders, however, cannot give orders when they are incommunicado, and training on a large scale is nearly impossible when a drone strike could wipe out an entire group of new recruits. Drones have turned al Qaeda’s command and training structures into a liability, forcing the group to choose between having no leaders and risking dead leaders.
Warrant: Current Policy is better than the alternative


But even the most unfavorable estimates of drone casualties reveal that the ratio of civilian to militant deaths—about one to three, according to the Bureau of Investigative Journalism—is lower than it would be for other forms of strikes. Bombings by F-16s or Tomahawk cruise missile salvos, for example, pack a much more deadly payload. In December 2009, the United States fired Tomahawks at a suspected terrorist training camp in Yemen, and over 30 people were killed in the blast, most of them women and children. At the time, the Yemeni regime refused to allow the use of drones, but had this not been the case, a drone’s real-time surveillance would probably have spotted the large number of women and children, and the attack would have been aborted. Even if the strike had gone forward for some reason, the drone’s far smaller warhead would have killed fewer innocents. Civilian deaths are tragic and pose political problems. But the data show that drones are more discriminate than other types of force.
Warrant: Terrorism is a threat.


He discussed the organization's ability to "crowdsource terrorism" through social media and the difficulties the U.S. has had in tracking Americans who have traveled to Syria to join its cause. Comey wouldn't divulge specific numbers, but estimates it's in the dozens. They range in age from 16 to 62, and include men and women, all drawn to "that siren song that is buzzing on their Twitter feed." Department of Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson offered similar concerns earlier in July. "**Without a doubt, there is the potential, the very real potential, of domestic acts of terrorism,**" he told a congressional panel. "**The terrorist threat to the homeland from overseas that I'm concerned about is one that is making active efforts to recruit people in response to ISIL's recruitment efforts.** And so we've been, as you know, very focused on that."

Analysis: This argument is crystal clear. The U.S. should spend more, most likely on the drone program, to fight terrorists overseas and protect ourselves from this existential threat. This gives you a potential direct link to American lives and a very clear weighing analysis for you to win.
A2 – Increased spending funds counterterror operations

**Answer:** Terrorism isn’t a threat

**Warrant:** Terrorism kills relatively few people


“The threat posed by terrorist groups should not be overrated. At this point, the narrative carried by the mainstream plays along with this misrepresentation. As previously pointed out, mainstream media and information technologies hype up the terrorist threat, which plays into the hands of groups like the Islamic State. **To put it simply, we are more likely to be killed in a car accident or by gunfire in the US than by a terrorist attack.** The media, then, should play their role in properly assessing the threat of terrorism—and so too should politicians. Without plunging into hysteria and calling for more government intervention into citizens’ lives, they should remember that the danger of terrorism is relatively small. Politicians should clarify that the likelihood of such attacks is not zero, but that absolute security is not possible. A sober assessment of the terrorism phenomenon is necessary but also essential in order not to fall into the trap of a “culture clash” that IS and some far-right politicians stir up. The main step toward conceptualizing responses to and understanding terrorism is essential to navigating the complexity of the multifaceted world we are living in.
Warrant: The threat of terrorism is overblown by western media.


“The threat posed by terrorist groups should not be overrated. At this point, the narrative carried by the mainstream plays along with this misrepresentation. As previously pointed out, mainstream media and information technologies hype up the terrorist threat, which plays into the hands of groups like the Islamic State. To put it simply, we are more likely to be killed in a car accident or by gunfire in the US than by a terrorist attack. The media, then, should play their role in properly assessing the threat of terrorism—and so too should politicians. Without plunging into hysteria and calling for more government intervention into citizens’ lives, they should remember that the danger of terrorism is relatively small. Politicians should clarify that the likelihood of such attacks is not zero, but that absolute security is not possible. A sober assessment of the terrorism phenomenon is necessary but also essential in order not to fall into the trap of a “culture clash” that IS and some far-right politicians stir up. The main step toward conceptualizing responses to and understanding terrorism is essential to navigating the complexity of the multifaceted world we are living in.

Analysis: If terrorism isn’t an actual threat, there is no reason to ever intervene, functionally delinking the affirmative from their impact.
Answer: Military spending not effective at fighting terrorism.

Warrant: Doesn’t address root cause of terrorism.


Some critics of the drone program, such as Ben Emmerson, the UN’s special rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism, have questioned the lethal approach, arguing for more focus on the factors that might contribute to extremism and terrorism, such as poverty, unemployment, and authoritarianism. Such a strategy is appealing in principle, but it is far from clear how Washington could execute it. Individuals join anti-American terrorist groups for many reasons, ranging from outrage over U.S. support for Israel to anger at their own government’s cooperation with the United States. Some people simply join up because their neighbors are doing so. Slashing unemployment in Yemen, bringing democracy to Saudi Arabia, and building a functioning government in Somalia are laudable goals, but they are not politically or financially possible for the United States, and even if achieved, they still might not reduce the allure of jihad.
Warrant: Interventions create the terror.


More than 95 percent of all suicide attacks are in response to foreign occupation, according to extensive research that we conducted at the University of Chicago’s Project on Security and Terrorism, where we examined every one of the over 2,200 suicide attacks across the world from 1980 to the present day. As the United States has occupied Afghanistan and Iraq, which have a combined population of about 60 million, total suicide attacks worldwide have risen dramatically — from about 300 from 1980 to 2003, to 1,800 from 2004 to 2009. Further, over 90 percent of suicide attacks worldwide are now anti-American. The vast majority of suicide terrorists hail from the local region threatened by foreign troops, which is why 90 percent of suicide attackers in Afghanistan are Afghans.

Analysis: This answer proves that interventions are not effective at fighting terrorism insofar as they don’t address the root cause of the problem and in fact make it worse by incentivizing a form of backlash. This narrative can be very persuasive to describe to a judge, and can independently win the round if run correctly.
**PRO – Drone Strikes**

**Argument:** The US would be likely to spend any increase in funding in large part towards more drones. This is good because drone strikes are better than other forms of military intervention

**Warrant:** Drones are the Pentagon’s largest procurement from their new budget


**Drones are on the wish lists of the Army, the Navy and Marines, and the Air Force.** In a short speech at the Department of Homeland Security on February 2, President Obama unveiled his nearly $4 trillion budget proposal for Fiscal Year 2016. It contains $536 billion in baseline spending and $51 billion in Overseas Contingency Operations* for the Department of Defense, exceeding the budget caps known as “sequestration” by $36 billion. In several hours of briefings, officials from each service outlined their portions of the budget and defended the rise in spending past the caps set by Congress. This is not the final budget. Lawmakers are likely to change it significantly, axing many of Obama’s proposals. These documents, and not the final product, are representative of the Pentagon’s drone plans. **The Pentagon plans on spending $2.9 billion on acquiring a variety of unmanned systems. This is out of a total allocation of $48.8 billion on aircraft and related systems across the services, the largest procurement allocation in the Pentagon’s proposed budget and almost double the $25.6 billion intended for shipbuilding and maritime systems.** Here’s what you need to know about the Department of Defense’s drone spending plans for FY 2016:
**Warrant:** Drones decrease militant attacks.

"International Law and Drone Strikes in Pakistan." (2014):
http://patrickjohnston.info/materials/drones.pdf

The 2FESL estimate in column 4 of Table 3 show that drone strikes are associated with an average decrease in militant attacks of almost 5 percentage points. This result is statistically significant at the one percent level. **From 2007 through 2011, the average agency suffered roughly 0.88 militant attacks per week. During weeks in which a drone strike occurred, agencies suffered an average of about 0.68 attacks. Given that drone strikes are associated with reductions in militant attacks in the areas where they occur, we also expect drone strikes to be negatively associated with the lethality, or “quality,” of militant attacks in these same areas.** This is indeed the case. Consistent with Hypothesis 2, the estimate presented in column 5 of Table 3 suggests that the lethality of **militant attacks declined by an average of nearly 25 percentage points in a given week in which a drone strike occurred.** On average, 2.77 people were killed or injured in militant attacks in FATA between 2007 and the end of the third quarter of 2011. This figure would decline substantially to 1.73 per week as a result of a single drone strike if the number of drone strikes would increase by one per agency-week.
Warrant: Drones are used to kill terrorist leaders and prevent them from using certain areas


Despite President Barack Obama’s recent call to reduce the United States’ reliance on drones, they will likely remain his administration’s weapon of choice. Whereas President George W. Bush oversaw fewer than 50 drone strikes during his tenure, Obama has signed off on over 400 of them in the last four years, making the program the centerpiece of U.S. counterterrorism strategy. The drones have done their job remarkably well: by killing key leaders and denying terrorists sanctuaries in Pakistan, Yemen, and, to a lesser degree, Somalia, drones have devastated al Qaeda and associated anti-American militant groups. And they have done so at little financial cost, at no risk to U.S. forces, and with fewer civilian casualties than many alternative methods would have caused. The Obama administration relies on drones for one simple reason: they work. According to data compiled by the New America Foundation, since Obama has been in the White House, U.S. drones have killed an estimated 3,300 al Qaeda, Taliban, and other jihadist operatives in Pakistan and Yemen. That number includes over 50 senior leaders of al Qaeda and the Taliban—top figures who are not easily replaced. In 2010, Osama bin Laden warned his chief aide, Atiyah Abd al-Rahman, who was later killed by a drone strike in the Waziristan region of Pakistan in 2011, that when experienced leaders are eliminated, the result is “the rise of lower leaders who are not as experienced as the former leaders” and who are prone to errors and miscalculations. And drones also hurt terrorist organizations when they eliminate operatives who are lower down on the food chain but who boast special skills: passport forgers, bomb makers, recruiters, and fundraisers. Drones have also undercut terrorists’ ability to communicate and to train new recruits. In order to avoid attracting drones, al Qaeda and Taliban operatives try to avoid using electronic devices or gathering in large numbers. A tip sheet found among jihadists

in Mali advised militants to “maintain complete silence of all wireless contacts” and “avoid gathering in open areas.” Leaders, however, cannot give orders when they are incommunicado, and training on a large scale is nearly impossible when a drone strike could wipe out an entire group of new recruits. Drones have turned al Qaeda’s command and training structures into a liability, forcing the group to choose between having no leaders and risking dead leaders.

**Warrant:** Leadership decapitation significantly reduces terrorists’ abilities


An analysis of leadership targeting in ninety counterinsurgencies since the 1970s suggests that removing militant leaders is neither ineffective nor counterproductive. Quite the opposite: on average, leadership decapitation (1) increases the chances of a rapid end to insurgencies; (2) enhances the probability of a government victory; (3) reduces the intensity of violent conflict; and (4) decreases the number of insurgent attacks. Killing or capturing high-value targets is far from a magic bullet, but states do it because it weakens insurgencies—in short, because it works. **Campaigns in which successful strikes occurred suggest that leadership decapitation increases the likelihood of ending an insurgency: more specifically, removing a top insurgent leader increased the chances of terminating costly campaigns in the year following the leader’s removal by roughly 25 percent.** This says nothing about the substantive
outcome of these campaigns, but averting the substantial costs of future counterinsurgency after having achieved a milestone of success is generally a desirable outcome for states. States are also more likely to defeat insurgencies after killing or capturing the insurgencies’ top leadership. Thus, decapitation has more than just symbolic effects. The findings suggest that states are almost 33 percent more likely to defeat insurgencies during years in which top militants are removed than in years in which similar attempts fail. This suggests that leadership decapitation is not a silver bullet, but it tends to put states at a sizable advantage over insurgencies.

**Analysis:** Drone strikes are one of the most effective ways to kill terrorists. It is clear that drone strikes provide a remarkable advantage over other forms of combat. Because of the Pentagon’s focus on drones, they will likely make up a large portion of any increase in spending we see from the topic. The link is thus very probable and easy to weigh against other teams less likely links. Drones are also really effective at ending terrorist groups and removing their leadership to make them less effective. This allows the government to take action against dangerous groups without putting any US troop lives at risk, a far better option than a traditional ground intervention.
A2 – Drone Strikes

**Argument:** Drone strikes increase terrorism

**Warrant:** Drone strikes are almost always followed by a terrorist attack


For the Taliban in Afghanistan the reaction functions we estimate are of the form, 11 where DS$_t$ and DU$_t$ represent drone strikes which were successful and which were not successful in killing a militant leader at time t, respectively. p is The estimation results are reported in table 10, with the second column giving the estimation results from the incidence specification and the fourth column giving the estimation results from the levels specification. **We find that there is no large and significant impact of unsuccessful drone strikes on terrorist attacks by the Taliban in Afghanistan, but a terrorist attack in Afghanistan is 8.8% more likely five days after a successful drone strike. This indicates that vengeance effects may be particularly strong when drone strikes are able to kill militant leaders for Taliban violence in Afghanistan.**
Warrant: Drone strikes fuel the sentiment that terrorists use for recruitment


The argument from conservatives that being imprisoned in Guantanamo Bay or being killed in a drone strike somehow deters terrorists is false. Jihadists are eager to die and suffer for their cause. If we wish to imprison suspected terrorists, we should try and jail them in military or civilian courts depending on the facts of their cases. An amorphous and endless American “war on terror” plays into our enemy’s conspiracy theories. Washington wantonly kills innocent Muslims across the globe, jihadists argue. Carrying our secret drone strikes worldwide with no explanation bolsters their claim. Holding prisoners for twelve years in Guantanamo Bay without trial bolsters extremists’ argument that we honor basic rights for our own citizen but blithely ignore them for others.

Analysis: Drone strikes may kill a few terrorists in the short term. But long term it tends to lead to more terror attacks against civilians and military targets. The terrorists become inflamed because of the attack and lash out and increase recruitment. This functions as a direct turn to the argument because it proves that the drone strikes do more harm than good.
**Argument**: Drone strikes kill civilians

**Warrant**: Drone strikes cause collateral damage


If the intensity of drone attacks and suicide bombing is analyzed from year 2007 to year 2009, **94% of the time, 15 civilians died** (either by suicide bombing or a drone strike) **for every one terrorist killed by a drone strike. From year 2010 to year 2012, eight civilians were killed for every one terrorist**. President Obama has called the presence of Al-Qaeda in the border areas of Pakistan a cancer, at the same time urging Pakistan to fight the cancer of extremism. In light of the data presented in this paper, we should question the appropriateness of this metaphor: Do the ills that plague Pakistan not include drone warfare and its deadly effects on civilians, for whose deaths no one has been held accountable?

**Analysis**: Drone strikes kill an extremely high amount of civilians per every terrorist taken out. This disparity is bad for two reasons. For one it gives terrorist groups propaganda to increase recruitment and control the local population. Secondly the US should not encourage or fund any policy that kills civilians not involved in any combat. These reasons provide an adequate response to any impacts that your opponent may bring up.
PRO – Okinawa

Argument: The US put into motion a plan to relocate the Okinawa base in 5 years, and more money could ensure this plan goes through instead of a complete removal

Warrant: The base is planned to be relocated soon


Japan’s Prime Minister Shinzo Abe agreed Friday to temporarily suspend work on the relocation of a U.S. Marine Corps base on Japan’s southern Okinawa island, reportedly saying he wants to end the dispute with the island’s government and residents, who want the base moved off the island. The government in Tokyo wants to move the airbase to another, less populated location on the island.

The base is currently at Futenma, a densely populated urban area, and Tokyo was working on reclaiming land offshore Camp Schwab — another U.S. base on Okinawa, in Henoko — where it would eventually relocate the airbase.

Abe said his government was accepting a court-mediated proposal of suspending relocation work to give more time for talks with Okinawa authorities to succeed. He also said, however, that the government’s stance on relocating the Futenma base within Okinawa had not changed, according to Reuters.

“There is no change to the government’s stance that the relocation to the Henoko area is the sole choice for the restoration of the Futenma base,” Abe told reporters.
Warrant: Trump is likely to demand exorbitant fees from Japan to pay for this relocation


It's unclear whether the US-Japan security alliance came up at their meeting, but, during his campaign, Trump repeatedly said that Japan should pay more for hosting US forces.

Under a treaty that dates back to the end of World War II, Japan does not use its own Self-Defense Forces to wage war, and relies on US forces to act as a buffer against rival nations.

Right now, the Japanese government is paying Washington $1.8 billion annually for this added security. Okinawa is central to the relationship, since the vast majority of US military bases in Japan are located on the small island.

“I’m expecting that Mr. Trump will demand a huge amount of money from Japan so that the Japanese government cannot even afford to pay,” she says.

Analysis: Trump’s proposal to force Japan to pay an increased amount could force the Japanese government to close the base instead of relocating it. Trump’s reasoning for demanding a greater amount of money is based on the idea that the US budget is stretched too thin and could be spent in other places. By increasing the overall budget, Trump will be less inclined to ask for more payment or make any other moves to delay relocation or even attempt to remove the base. This will help ensure the base will be safely relocated and not moved off the island of Okinawa.
Pro Arguments with Con Responses

Warrant: The Okinawa base acts to deter China and keeps us politically close with Japan.


The Okinawa bases alone do not deter China or anyone else. But they are an important part of a larger network of American resources, power, and influence that give the PRC pause. One first notes Okinawa’s location. It is near Taiwan, close to contested areas in the East China Sea and the South China Seas, and not far from the Korean Peninsula. Okinawa is a perfect place from which to deploy and conduct a range of military operations to counter an aggressor or someone seeking to upset long established rules regarding freedom of navigation and flight, and even international boundaries.

Time and distance still matter in warfare. Being close to where one will operate allows a more rapid and comprehensive response. Okinawa-based forces are able to move just about anywhere in Asia in a matter of days or even hours. This response time is much shorter than if based elsewhere in Japan — and weeks or months faster than US-based forces, even if based in Hawaii. Also, being nearby allows you to stay ‘on-scene’ longer. Try patrolling the South China Sea from bases in Hokkaido or Hawaii. By the time forces arrive it is almost time to go home.

Chinese behavior in the South China Sea shows it understands the role of ‘location’ as a part of deterrence. PLA forces operating out of Hainan Island can operate throughout the South China Sea. However, China’s recent island-building efforts much further south in the South China Sea demonstrate a clear understanding of the importance of basing forces ‘forward’ in the area one wants to control or influence.

Ultimately, US bases on Okinawa — with all the challenges and costs they involve — demonstrate a political commitment on the part of both governments — to include America’s promise to defend Japan. This sort of commitment is closely watched as an adversary decides how much to push. One recalls the classic example of Saddam Hussein miscalculating the United States’ willingness to defend Kuwait in 1990 that led to the First Gulf War.
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**Warrant:** A loss of this deterrence would lead to Chinese military action and be detrimental to the US


If, however, a large-scale reduction of the US forces in Okinawa were to be conducted in the face of local turmoil without a sound basis in military thinking, it would create a big hole in the fabric of the deterrent. Neighboring countries would sense a power vacuum. Consider what has happened in the South China Sea: After the United States pulled out of Vietnam, China grabbed the Paracels, and after the Russians left, it pushed the Vietnamese off Johnson South Reef. And after the US forces left the Philippines, China took over Mischief Reef from that country.

If the Chinese judged that the US military had been driven out of Okinawa, it would greatly increase the likelihood of their grabbing the Senkaku Islands in the East China Sea from Japan by force. And once they landed on these islands, it would become very difficult to dislodge them. Doing so would mean undertaking a combat operation that could well result in the first deaths in action for Japanese armed forces since World War II. Would Japan actually fight to get the Senkakus back? It is possible that the Japanese government would instead declare its intention to “negotiate persistently;” a line it has often used, and that the Senkakus would remain under China’s effective control indefinitely, just as Takeshima has since South Korea took it over in the 1950s.
**Warrant:** The Senkaku Islands are important economically and militarily for China


The Senkaku Islands have great strategic and economic advantages. The islands are near important shipping lanes where large amounts of international trade transit. There are also fishing areas both sides view as important, as well as possible natural resources like oil, gas, and mineral deposits around the islands. The dispute about the overlapping of the demarcation of the exclusive economic zone (EEZ) by the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) is also an important factor that makes the Senkaku Islands so sought after.

Their location is also strategically important due to the rising competition between China, Japan, and the United States for military supremacy in the Asia-Pacific region. According to a scholar at the Chinese academy of social sciences, if Japan manages to force China to abandon its claims on the islands, the American – led Asia-Pacific order underpinned by the US-Japan alliance would undoubtedly be reaffirmed. On the other hand, if China successfully fulfils its sovereign claims over the islands, then the era of the United States dominating the Asia-Pacific maritime order will end on the spot.
Warrant: The base also deters North Korean invasion of South Korea


The U.S. Marines on Okinawa play a critical role in Operations Plan 5027, the joint U.S.-South Korean war plan for responding to a North Korean invasion. Marine forces are capable of conducting a full range of combat operations in Korea. Even the threat of an amphibious invasion would force North Korea to divert ground forces from the front line. General Burwell Bell, former commander of U.S. Forces Korea, affirmed that:

[The Marines on Okinawa] have a critical role in any Korean contingency. They were my deep operational ground maneuver unit. Without them, it would be WWI all over again. When the North Koreans consider the potential for the United States Marines to interdict their logistics sites and fragile supply lines deep in their rear areas, the likelihood of the North seriously considering a sustained ground offensive drops drastically.

In seeking to justify removing U.S. Marine forces from Okinawa, some analysts have asserted that a Korean War would be over quickly and that South Korean forces would be sufficient to handle the North Korean forces. Both premises are dangerously wrong. U.S. war simulations reveal that, even a week after a North Korean invasion, the situation would remain precarious. Moreover, an invasion would result in horrific casualties in the hundreds of thousands as well as trillions of dollars’ worth of damage. A U.S. defense official commented:

[E]ven if South Korea could do it without U.S. Marines, it would be with far greater casualties and destruction. Why would you do that? Why would you send the military into a dangerous situation with fewer capabilities than necessary? Besides, you need those [South Korean] troops for the post-war collapse of North Korea.
Analysis: The Okinawa base is in an extremely precarious position with its relocation and Trump’s campaign promises involving Japan. However, the base is incredibly important to stability in the region. The base deters both Chinese and North Korean action against US allies and in furthering their own agendas. The base also allows us to keep close political ties with Japan which benefits the US. The risk of war between the US and China is by far more important than any other conflict impacts brought up on Neg because this war would be by far the most destructive due to the military power of the combatants.
A2 – Okinawa

**Argument:** Trump will not ask Japan for more money

**Warrant:** Japan pays more than most countries hosting US troops


<http://mainichi.jp/english/articles/20160530/p2a/00m/0na/017000c>.

The United States has about $5.5 billion budgeted for its military presence in Japan in fiscal 2016. That's around 600 billion yen, so Japan is in fact paying much more for the U.S. forces here than the United States itself. According to U.S. documents from 2004, Japan pays more than 70 percent of the cost of hosting U.S. forces, as compared to between 30 and 40 percent in South Korea, Germany, and other nations. However, as the role of Japan's Self-Defense Forces (SDF) expands under new security-related legislation, the Finance Ministry's Fiscal System Council has declared that U.S. military hosting costs "must be re-evaluated and reduced."

**Analysis:** Japan pays a far greater percentage of the US expenses than any other country hosting US troops. Trump will likely ask money from many other countries before he goes to Japan for money. This combined with the fact that Trump acting on many of his promises may be unrealistic serves to make the Aff link into the base leaving very improbable. After reading this response, a good idea would be to explain why your arguments are more probable to give you a weighing mechanism.
Argument: The base does not help to prevent conflict and war, in fact it may increase the risk


Officially, the most important purpose of the extensive system of bases on Okinawa, and more broadly the other 700+ American military bases on foreign soil, is the ability to deter potential hostile actions in the South Pacific and other regions. However, the sprawling military infrastructure, comprising 32 bases and 20% of the island’s area, is used daily for active power projection. This power projection may be characterized as ‘active’, rather than passive, as the bases have been used and continue to stand ready as forward staging areas for a range of conflicts and potential deployment contingencies, including the Cold War, the Vietnam War, the war in Afghanistan, and both wars in Iraq. As long as the infrastructure is there, it will be utilized. “The bases are effectively manned by a land combat “attack” force, held in readiness to be launched as a ground force into enemy territory or for the defense of US carriers and ships, but not for the defense of Okinawa or Japan as stipulated under the US-Japan security treaty” (Sapio Sept. 2009). The bases in the South Pacific, particularly Guam and Okinawa, are uniquely targeted as a buffer against Russia’s warm water port of Vladivostok, China and North Korea. With the current controversy over the Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands militarization by China, the reality of a half century of American militarization in the region exercising containment policy must be understood as a contributing factor to the Chinese territorial expansion. If the purpose of the bases is to deter conflict, one must reflect on what the plethora of violent global conflicts and rising regional tensions says about the inefficacy of their main stated purpose.
Analysis: China is not being deterred by Okinawa. They are continuing to gain power and go closer and closer to claiming territory they desire. If anything, the Okinawa base has possibly led to increasing tension between China and the US. Just as we would feel threatened from a Chinese military base near our own mainland, they feel threatened by our bases within their sphere of influence. It is possible that this is what leads them to challenge authority and attempt to gain control of more and more territory. If they are not being deterred and are possibly being provoked the base has no reason to stay open and may be making things worse.
Con Arguments with Pro Responses
CON – Increased military spending funds ineffective counterterrorism strategies

Argument: Increasing military spending simply increases investment into failing policies made to fight terrorism.

Warrant: The US currently spends a large portion of its defense budget fighting terrorism.


Last month, The Washington Post published details of the nation’s top-secret intelligence budget, based on documents provided by former intelligence contractor Edward Snowden. The documents show that, for the current fiscal year that ends Sept. 30, the intelligence community requested a total of $52.6 billion, with $16.6 billion (31.6%) of that designated for counter-terrorism efforts. In fiscal year 2012, the United States spent $17.25 billion on counter-terrorism. Since the terrorist attacks on Sept. 11, 2001, the United States has spent more than $500 billion on intelligence, according to The Post. The 2013 budget request was about twice the size of the estimated 2001 budget (in constant dollars), the paper said.

In terms of money spent, monitoring and disrupting violent extremists and suspected terrorist groups is the intelligence community’s second-biggest mission objective, after warning U.S. leaders about economic instability, societal unrest and other critical events around the world (which takes about $20 billion). Other priorities include preventing the spread of weapons of mass destruction, protecting U.S. computer networks and defending against foreign espionage.
Warrant: Spending is projected to increase following recent terrorist attacks, but this fails to make fighting terrorism more effective.


Today, the United States spends far more on defense and counter-terrorism than any other country in the world. Its military expenditures alone top that of the next seven countries combined, which are China, Russia, Saudi Arabia, France, the United Kingdom, India and Germany, according to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute.

U.S. efforts to combat terrorism specifically "spread across nearly every agency in the government," said Scott Stewart, a former counter-terrorism agent for the U.S. State Department who is now vice president at Stratfor, a geopolitical intelligence firm. The to-do list is long: destroy terrorist havens, thwart attacks, block terrorist funding sources, protect physical assets such as federal buildings and public places, prosecute terrorist acts, and change hearts and minds through diplomacy. In the wake of the Paris attacks, there will likely be pressure to spend even more on anti-terrorism activities. But, said Stratfor's Stewart, "you can't spend your way out of this problem. There's not enough in anyone's budget to protect everything and monitor every threat."
**Warrant:** Current counter terrorism strategies are actively failing their objectives.


The U.S. approach to countering violent extremism is failing badly. Our current “light footprint,” counter-terrorism approach, posits that a combination of precisely targeted drone strikes, U.S. special forces raids, and training small, elite units of local forces can kill enough of the extremists’ “core” leadership to render those groups incapable. But, there has never been a strategy behind this hope, never an articulated theory of the case to explain where we were headed. **These methods have, for limited periods, degraded extremists’ capabilities. But, today it is clear they are fundamentally flawed and severely counter-productive.** Rather than reducing threats, our tactics produce more dangerous, more committed extremists. The crucible of the pressures we have created has not destroyed the extremists, instead it has evolved them into more **virulent forms.** Our singular focus on killing, without any serious attempt to ameliorate basic societal problems — and the absence of a moral core for our actions — have led huge swathes of the world to see us as the evil doers. **Extremists today seek revenge for those we have killed, to punish us for abuses they suffer, and to end our support for abusive, corrupt rulers.** There is no good news here. **We have tried the “easy” answers. They haven’t worked. Instead, they have costs tens of thousands of lives and hundreds of billions of dollars.** Our surges and partial counter insurgency efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan never had our full commitment. We were only partly at war. Similarly, today our counter-terrorism approach and the killings it requires are understood by few Americans. The public sees it all as some sort of action movie. The reality is that a light footprint only produces light, transitory results — but that reality is ignored
**Analysis:** This argument is straightforward and easy to weigh throughout the round. You should frame it by arguing that the resolution only specifies an increase in spending, but not a change in policy. You can argue that so long as the US continues to invest in ineffective and failing policies, the Affirmative will fail to access any benefits of increased spending. It is important to draw the distinction between spending and the actual details of a policy—this argument shows that as the world turns to the US to provide innovative strategies to address the rising threat of terrorism, simply investing in failing policies will never effectively combat terrorism.
A2 – Increased military spending funds ineffective counterterrorism strategies

**Answer:** Increased military spending is necessary to fund US efforts to fight the Islamic State.

**Warrant:** Proposed cuts to the defense budget will significantly impair the US’ ability to fight ISIS or support groups that do.


Members of Congress and the White House anticipated a peace dividend by winding down America's foreign wars, closing bases and shedding tens of thousands of troops. But President Obama's new, open-ended strategy to confront Islamic State fighters in Iraq and Syria is likely to eat into some of the nearly $500 billion in Pentagon spending cuts that were planned over the next decade. The first five weeks of U.S. airstrikes in northern Iraq has cost $262.5 million, according to the Pentagon, and Obama personally lobbied key members of Congress in recent days to appropriate $500 million to help train and arm Syrian rebels at camps in Saudi Arabia. While that's still a pittance compared with the total $496-billion Pentagon budget, or the $1.2 trillion spent for the ground wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, the costs of intervention are certain to increase under the plan to step up airstrikes, intensify surveillance and conduct counter-terrorism operations against the Sunni extremist force and its leaders.
Warrant: Increased spending is necessary to sustain an effective strategy against ISIS.


In a study released in April, the Pentagon outlined the impact of those mandatory cuts, including a drop to 420,000 active-duty soldiers from 470,000 in the Army; the retirement of a Navy aircraft carrier; and scrapping the KC-10 tankers that refuel fighter and bomber jets in midair. Rep. Mac Thornberry (R-Texas), the committee's vice chairman, questioned whether the nation was safe with rising threats around the world. "After the defense cuts and intelligence disclosures of the last few years, we are not as well positioned to prevent terrorist attacks as we were three to four years ago," he said. "To keep Americans safe and maintain global leadership, Congress and President Obama must work together to develop a long-term national security strategy and then stick with it."
Warrant: Increased military spending would go directly to substantiating counterterrorism strategies against ISIS.


If approved, the $572.8 billion spending bill would provide funding for ongoing military operations, including the war against the Islamic State militant group in Syria and Iraq, military personnel and pay, health and military family programs, operation and maintenance, research and development, procuring equipment and addressing the Guantanamo Bay detention center in Cuba. The House is expected to vote Friday to authorize the Omnibus spending bill. The money allocated would include $58.6 billion in overseas contingency operations (OCO) — funds for the global war against terror — as well as for training, backing countries in opposition to Russia and for intelligence and surveillance efforts.

Analysis: This answer is a good argument against more outdated strategies of counterterrorism that may have been ineffective in the past. If you can prove that the investment in military spending to fight ISIS is necessary, you can establish a bright-line for spending in counterterrorism.
CON – Increased military spending trades off with benefits of diplomacy

**Argument:** Increased military spending undercuts investments made in diplomatic efforts to resolve international conflicts.

**Warrant:** The spending gap between the military and diplomatic efforts is continuously widening.


President Barack Obama has long insisted that force alone can’t resolve America’s toughest challenges abroad. But if budgets are a window into a nation’s priorities, the U.S. values its soldiers far more than its diplomats. For fiscal 2016, the Pentagon has had nearly $600 billion at its disposal. That’s twice the size of the defense budget before the 9/11 attacks and more than 10 times the amount the State Department received for diplomacy. The ratio is widening. For fiscal 2017, Obama has asked Congress to increase Pentagon spending by $22 billion, while his State Department request has remained flat, at $50 billion. In fact, the Pentagon has more members of the armed forces serving in marching bands than the State Department has career diplomats. The result has been that the military—and the intelligence community, whose funding is secretly folded into the defense budget—increasingly performs diplomatic tasks that once were the State Department’s specialty. For instance, knowledgeable sources tell *Newsweek* that the CIA, not the State Department, is midwifing secret negotiations between Saudi Arabia and Houthi rebels to end the civil war in Yemen.
**Warrant:** Spending allocated to tools of soft power is needed to boost the efficiency of US diplomacy.


Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates called Monday for the United States government to commit more money and effort to “soft power” tools, including diplomacy, economic assistance and communications, because the military alone cannot defend America’s interests around the world. “We must focus our energies beyond the guns and steel of the military, beyond just our brave soldiers, sailors, marines and airmen,” he said. “We must also focus our energies on the other elements of national power that will be so crucial in the years to come.” Mr. Gates, who took over the top Pentagon job last December, said that “based on my experience serving seven presidents, as a former director of C.I.A. and now as secretary of defense, I am here to make the case for strengthening our capacity to use ‘soft power’ and for better integrating it with ‘hard power.’ ” One priority is money, Mr. Gates said. He called for “a dramatic increase in spending on the civilian instruments of national security — diplomacy, strategic communications, foreign assistance, civic action and economic reconstruction and development.” The defense secretary also said the United States government must improve its skills at public diplomacy and public affairs to better describe the nation’s strategy and values to a global audience.
**Warrant:** Strong diplomatic efforts are the key to appeasing international conflicts.


When channeled correctly, U.S. humanitarian aid, which reflects the generosity, compassion and decency of the American people, can have an enormous impact. It can also improve our nation’s image in eyes of the rest of the world. Public opinion of U.S. foreign policy around the world rose considerably when we launched a major relief mission after the 2004 Indian Ocean earthquake that killed several hundred thousand people. It increased again several years later, in 2011, after we responded to an earthquake and tsunami that caused massive death and destruction in Japan. 

Likewise, our world benefits when America exercises strong diplomacy, which has long been our nation’s hallmark. Now more than ever, our skill in statesmanship and negotiating will be needed to diffuse tensions, build consensus and resolve conflict. Still, the power of diplomacy is not a panacea when it comes to international relations. We simply cannot jump into every conflict, and we will always encounter questions about priorities and timing. But let it always be known that America will stand on the side of trying to solve conflict and defuse tensions by getting people to work together.
**Warrant:** A lack of adequate funding for diplomatic efforts inhibit successful foreign policy.


As of 2008, **State faces a personnel shortfall of about 2,400 relating to enduring core diplomatic work, emerging policy challenges, public diplomacy, and critical training needs. Persistent staffing gaps at hardship posts continue to impede important policy pursuits.** Staffing demands related to Iraq and Afghanistan translate not only into needs for resident personnel, but also for significant numbers of short-term staff diverted temporarily from other jobs, to the detriment of other important work. For example, all State political and USAID field positions in the Afghan provinces are vacant an average of two months a year due to the inability of organizations to cover scheduled absences.

**Analysis:** There is a lot of inherency evidence proving that increasing military spending simply widens the gap between two functions of US foreign policy that are supposed to work alongside each other. You can use this argument to mitigate the benefits of increased military spending by arguing that diplomatic success is the lynchpin in stable long term foreign policy efforts. If military spending continues to increase as the emphasis on diplomacy declines, the US will simply be more incentivized to increase their commitment to hard military efforts to solve conflicts instead of utilizing the very successful peacemaking efforts that diplomacy offers.
A2 – Increased military spending trades off with benefits of diplomacy

**Answer:** Strategic military efforts maximize the effectiveness of diplomacy.

**Warrant:** Investing in extensive networks of military organization allows diplomatic success to happen.


The driving concept behind this monograph is the thesis that not only does the military conduct diplomacy, but military diplomacy, at the combatant command level, provides a theater strategic capability essential to the effective implementation of United States foreign policy. The monograph demonstrates that this capability arises from several organizational advantages. **First, the authority vested in the combatant commander facilitates the development, resourcing and execution of military diplomacy programs within a unified chain of command. Second, the combatant command contains a highly capable staff founded on historically proven structures and doctrine. Third, an extensive network of personnel and organizations positioned to coordinate and liaise across multiple levels of authority facilitates the implementation of military diplomacy activities. Finally, an unmatched pool of resources, from which to execute military diplomacy, allows for great flexibility and responsiveness when adjusting to a complex environment.** The intended end-state of the monograph is to elicit two primary responses from the reader. First, that indeed the military does conduct diplomacy as part of its day-to-day mission set. Second, that military diplomacy is an essential tool in facilitating the achievement of United States strategic foreign policy aims and theater strategic objectives.
**Warrant:** Coercive diplomacy achieves political objectives in international conflicts.


**Analysis:** This answer essentially argues that there is a false tradeoff between military efforts and diplomatic success—in fact, diplomacy becomes more effective when the organizational structure of military means are strengthened. The Affirmative can argue that increased military spending makes existing diplomatic efforts more successful because of elements such as coercive diplomacy, but also do the leg work to make them enforceable, long standing policies as opposed to just one time agreements.
**Answer:** Diplomacy as a standalone approach to foreign policy is not as effective as American hegemony declines.

**Warrant:** The relative decline of the US as a world leader, shifting levels of violence, and other factors have made diplomatic negotiations a less viable tool of foreign policy.


There are other reasons for diplomacy’s demise. **The United States has lost its dominant position without any other nation rising to take its place. The result is nobody’s world. It is a place where America acts as a cautious boss, alternately encouraging others to take the lead and worrying about loss of authority.** Syria has been an unedifying lesson in the course of crisis when diplomacy is dead. Algeria shows how the dead pile up when talking is dismissed as a waste of time. **Violence, of the kind diplomacy once resolved, has shifted.** As William Luers, a former ambassador to Venezuela and the director of The Iran Project, said in an e-mail, it occurs “less between states and more dealing with terrorists.” One result is that “the military and the C.I.A. have been in the driver’s seat in dealing with governments throughout the Middle East and in state to state (Pakistan, Afghanistan, Iraq) relations.” The role of professional diplomats is squeezed.

**Analysis:** This answer can be used as kind of an add-on to the first one by arguing that current tools of diplomacy have become less effective in a changing world. Instead of negotiating with world leaders and diplomats, US policy must now be forced to enter talks with non-state actors, rebel groups, and opposition leaders. This shift in conflict violence has broken some of the traditional notions of diplomatic efforts. The Affirmative can argue one of two things: military spending returns the US to a traditional seat of world power where negotiations are the most viable, and that military spending complements the efforts of traditional diplomacy and makes them more effective tools overall.
CON – Military responses exacerbate international conflict

**Argument:** Increasing military spending reinforces the war-producing military industrial complex, which often lobbies for further U.S. military intervention into conflict. But a vast array of literature shows that military intervention worsens and intensifies conflicts.

**Warrant:** U.S. military spending plays into the military industrial complex, which involves lobbyist and contractors keeping the United States in perpetual wars abroad.


In January 1961, US President Dwight D Eisenhower used his farewell address to warn the nation of what he viewed as one of its greatest threats: the military-industrial complex composed of military contractors and lobbyists perpetuating war. Eisenhower warned that "an immense military establishment and a large arms industry" had emerged as a hidden force in US politics and that Americans "must not fail to comprehend its grave implications". The speech may have been Eisenhower's most courageous and prophetic moment. **Fifty years and some later, Americans find themselves in what seems like perpetual war.** No sooner do we draw down on operations in Iraq than leaders demand an intervention in Libya or Syria or Iran. **While perpetual war constitutes perpetual losses for families, and ever expanding budgets, it also represents perpetual profits for a new and larger complex of business and government interests.** The new military-industrial complex is fuelled by a conveniently ambiguous and unseen enemy: the terrorist. Former President George W Bush and his aides insisted on calling counter-terrorism efforts a "war". This concerted effort by leaders like former Vice President Dick Cheney (himself the former CEO of defence-contractor Halliburton) was not some empty rhetorical exercise. **Not only would a war maximise the inherent powers of the president, but it would maximise the budgets for military and homeland agencies.**
Warrant: Historically, U.S. military intervention has invoked regional fears that the United States is attempting to gain hegemonic control, which encourages resistance and conflict.


“Since the American triumph in the Cold War and the successful expulsion of the world's fourth largest army from Kuwait with so few allied casualties, Americans and foreigners alike have tended to assume that the U.S. military is capable of managing regional conflagrations whenever it chooses to do so. In reality, U.S. military intervention is generally not a viable solution to regional conflicts and should not be undertaken except in the rare instances in which American national security is at stake. In most cases regional conflicts cannot be helped--and may well be exacerbated--by the intervention of outside parties. U.S. intervention can be especially counterproductive, since it often intensifies smaller, less powerful countries' (the very nations most likely to be involved in regional conflicts) fears of America's hegemonic intentions. Militarily, too, the United States is ill-suited to suppress regional conflicts, in which warring forces frequently rely on guerrilla warfare, street fighting, and other tactics that are not easily met by America's high-tech war machine.
Warrant: In the Middle East, for example, U.S. intervention has exacerbated sectarian conflict, ruined America’s international reputation, and emboldened the Iranian regime to pursue nuclear weapons.


In response the U.S. attacked Iraq and deployed troops to Saudi Arabia, which became one of Osama bin Laden’s chief grievances. After the war’s end the U.S. remained entangled in the region with economic sanctions and no fly zones. Then President Bush invaded Iraq to “drain the swamp,” unleashing sectarian conflict in that country, diluting U.S. military strength worldwide, soiling America’s international reputation, and empowering Islamist Iran—even then feared to be developing nuclear weapons. Now the Iraqi government installed by Washington totters, so Tehran is sending a rescue mission. American intervention has broken pottery all over the Middle East. Every time the U.S. attempts to repair its last accident, it increases and spreads the mess. It is time for a different approach. One in which Washington does not attempt to micromanage the affairs of other nations. In which Washington practices humility.
**Warrant:** Intervention empirically lengthens the duration of conflict.


“Recent research has begun to focus on the role of outside interventions in the duration of civil conflicts. Assuming that interventions are a form of conflict management, ex ante expectations would be that they would reduce a conflict’s expected duration. Hypotheses relating the type and timing of outside interventions to the duration of civil conflicts are tested. The data incorporate 150 conflicts during the period from 1945 to 1999, 101 of which had outside interventions. Using a hazard analysis, the results suggest that third-party interventions tend to extend expected durations rather than shorten them. The only aspect of the strategy for intervening that reduces the likelihood that a conflict will end in the next month is that it be biased in favor of either the opposition or the government. In effect, neutral interventions are less effective than biased ones.”
**Warrant:** Further research has specified that civil wars with interventions last on average about 9 years, while those without intervention last about 1.5 years on average.


"Out of 138 intra-state conflicts since 1944, 89 attracted external interventions by at least one external third party. Within the 89 cases, if repeated interventions were taken into account the total number of interventions amounts to 190, of which 76 were accounted for by major powers. The countries with the dubious distinction of having the highest number of interventions are: USA (35), Former USSR/Russia (16), France (10), UK (9), China (6) and Cuba (5). Out of the 190 interventions, only 57 have led to an end in the fighting. External interventions are associated with longer-lasting wars. A scatter diagram of war duration and external interventions during 1960-99 for all countries that have experienced civil wars reveals an upward-sloping relationship (Figure 3.B). **Moreover, the mean duration of civil wars that were terminated and which had external interventions was nine years; while those wars that were terminated but did not have an intervention had a mean duration of only 1.5 years.**"
Warrant: Third party intervention corresponds to an increase in conflict duration by 1,140 days over the baseline, a 347% increase.


“In Figure 1e we plot the impact of two variables estimating the impact of third party states on civil war duration, Intervention (Government) and Balanced Intervention. The figure illustrates the rather striking impact that these two variables exert on the predicted median duration. Specifically, when third party states intervene on the side of the government, the expected median end point corresponds to an increase of about 1,140 days over the baseline duration, a 347% change in duration. A review of Figure 1e indicates that while the plot of the survival probabilities for intervention on the side of the government reaches the median, or 0.5, point on the y-axis, this does not occur for the plot reflecting the impact of balanced interventions on civil war duration. Indeed, as we noted above, only one of the 152 civil wars in our sample terminates with a balanced intervention. Given the discussion in the literature (e.g., Pillar 1983), we do not find this entirely surprising, as third parties may exit a conflict when they detect that the side they are supporting is likely to be defeated. Alternatively, there may be reasons exogenous to the civil war that dictate a third party’s departure and, in turn, this departure hastens the defeat of one of the parties. Regardless, the information contained in Figure 1e suggests that balanced interventions create stalemates that can have a tremendous positive impact on the duration of a civil war. Our findings regarding the impact of third parties on the duration of civil wars jibe quite nicely with the recent empirical analyses reported in Elbadawi and Sambanis, 2000, and Regan, 2000a, in which the authors find that external interventions result in civil wars of longer duration. “
**Warrant:** Even conflicts that end in negotiated settlements are 94% more likely to experience peace failure after military intervention.


Furthermore, military interventions prior to peace agreements increase the hazard of conflict recurrence. The Intervention coefficient summed with the interaction between the Intervention and Negotiated settlement ($\beta_{\text{Intervention}} + \beta_{\text{Intervention}} \times \beta_{\text{Negotiated Settlement}}$) is statistically significant with a value of 0.662, and a two-tailed, 95% confidence interval [0.007, 1.317]. **Substantively, these results indicate that civil conflicts that end in negotiated settlements with interveners present are 94% more likely to experience peace failure than conflicts ending in negotiated settlements that do not feature third party interveners.** The two-tailed 95% confidence interval around this effect is [0.7%, 273%]. As predicted by the Intervention Hypothesis, intervention decreases peace duration when civil conflicts end in a negotiated settlement.”

**Analysis:** This argument can be weighed pretty effectively in the context of the resolution: if the use of higher military spending to respond to conflict will actually lengthen and worsen that conflict, then the Pro’s advocacy is exacerbating the exact problem it attempts to solve. Pro may try to prove a myriad of other benefits of military spending, such as economic impacts or deterring terrorism, but civil wars are extremely violent and deadly, and result in mass loss of human life that will be very easy for you to weigh against Pro’s ancillary benefits. The strong literature base and historical saliency of this argument are additional factors that add to its strength.
A2 – Military responses exacerbate international conflict

Answer: Military intervention is necessary in many circumstances.

Warrant: In the case of genocides, military intervention is necessary to challenge the perpetrator. Doing nothing allows the killings to go abated.


“Which intervention option is likely to be most effective in slowing or stopping the killing during an ongoing genocide or politicide? Doing nothing, as in the initial reactions to Bosnia and Rwanda, merely allows the killing to continue unabated, and may even escalate it by signaling apathy or consent (Gourevitch, 1998; Des Forges, 1999; Power, 2002a). Neutral interventions do not appear to have much of an ameliorative effect, and might also exacerbate the killing, as the establishment of "safe areas" in Bosnia and Rwanda demonstrated (Power, 2002a). Merely signaling that the world is watching is likely to do little to stop a regime bent on eliminating a domestic group. Aiding the perpetrator does not seem to be a route to reducing the severity of the killing either. Cases such as Uganda, Cambodia, and Bangladesh in the 1970s, and Bosnia and Kosovo in the 1990s, point to what I expect is the optimal solution. Interventions that directly challenge the perpetrator (or that directly provide support to the targets of genocide or politicide) should be most likely to reduce the severity of genocide or politicide.”
Con Arguments with Pro Responses

Warrant: Empirically, intervention by a single actor reduces the probability of genocide escalation and increases the probability that killings decrease


“The first column indicates the probabilities predicted for the case if no actor challenges the perpetrator militarily. Given that this case has already experienced a magnitude of killing of about 2.0, absent such an intervention, it appears likely that the killings will escalate. The predicted probability of escalation is 0.6422, or the sum of the predicted probabilities of the case experiencing magnitudes above 2.0. The probability that it will taper off on its own is 0.2836, while the probability that the magnitude of the killing will remain about the same is 0.0743. Even a single intervention against the perpetrator has a measurable effect on the severity of genocide or politicide in the "typical" case. When a single international actor challenges the perpetrator, the predicted probability that the killings will escalate drops from 0.6422 to 0.5510, while the probability that the killings will decrease jumps from 0.2836 to 0.3664. If two actors challenge the perpetrator, the probability of escalation drops further to 0.4564, while the probability that the killings will abate increases to 0.4580. Three challenging interventions increase the probability of lives saved to 0.5527.”
**Warrant:** Genocide is taking place right now and we have to do everything we can to stop it.


“**The New Year begins, mass killings continue, and the United States government has yet to declare what is happening in Iraq and Syria “genocide.” By now, the evidence is overwhelming: ISIS is systematically eradicating Yazidis, Christians, Shia Muslims and other ethnic and religious minorities in territories controlled by the terrorist group.** What’s at stake is more than a question of semantics: A declaration of genocide has significant legal and moral implications that would require the United States – and likeminded countries – to do whatever it takes to rescue the refugees and end the killing. At this point in human history, we should know genocide when we see it. In the aftermath of the Holocaust – and in the idealistic hope of preventing another one – the United Nations adopted the Genocide Convention, defining genocide as “acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnic, racial or religious group.” **Last November, a report issued by the Holocaust Museum documented the attempt by ISIS to exterminate the Yazidis, describing in detail the mass killings and sexual slavery inflicted on that community as well as on Christians and other religious minorities.”**

**Analysis:** This argument can be rhetorically compelling, because you can say that the circumstance surrounding the mass killings of multiple ethnic and religious groups globally isn’t solvable without direct intervention supplied by increased military spending. Even if the Con is right that military intervention risks lengthening conflict, the alternative is to stand by and do nothing as states collapse and millions are killed in the process.
Answer: Military spending can solve conflict without intervention.

Warrant: Deterrence to commit conflict generated when we have stronger means to retaliate against conflict.


“Mistakes in applying deterrence have come from misunderstandings about the concept itself, faulty threat assessments, forgetfulness about history, and shortsighted policymaking. Bringing these problems into focus can restore faith in deterrence where it has been lost, lower costs where the strategy has been misapplied, and reduce the danger of surprise in situations where the risk of conflict is unclear. Deterrence is a strategy for combining two competing goals: countering an enemy and avoiding war. Academics have explored countless variations on that theme, but the basic concept is quite simple: an enemy will not strike if it knows the defender can defeat the attack or can inflict unacceptable damage in retaliation.”
Warrant: Right now, the United States’ combat readiness is extremely low and incapable of providing an effective means of deterrence.


“Unrelenting budget constraints have degraded Army readiness and modernization to historically low levels, Army Chief of Staff Gen. Ray Odierno told a Senate panel here today. Testifying before the Senate Appropriations Committee’s defense subcommittee alongside Army Secretary John M. McHugh, Odierno discussed the impact of sequestration on the Army's readiness and modernization, and the risks of miscalculation and underinvestment. Degraded Readiness “This is not the time to be divesting … our military capabilities and capacities,” Odierno said. “But over the last three years we have done just that, decreasing the active component end strength by 80,000, and our National Guard and reserves by 18,000.” “We have deactivated 13 active duty brigade combat teams,” he said, “and we are in the process of eliminating three active component combat aviation brigades.” Citing the Aviation Restructure Initiative, Odierno said the Army is reducing its total aviation force by 800 aircraft, with almost 700 coming out of the active component. “We have slashed our investments in modernization by 25 percent,” he said. “We’ve purged our most-needed infantry fighting vehicle modernization and scout helicopter developmental programs. “The unrelenting budget impasse has also compelled us to degrade readiness to historically low levels,” Odierno continued. “Today, only 33 percent of our brigades are ready, when our sustained readiness rate should be closer to 70 percent.”

Analysis: If military spending can solve conflict without the need for intervention, then you can avoid all of the harms that Con describes while still stopping wars and saving lives. This argument thus both delinks Con from their impact and accesses as independent offense for you. You should reinforce the need for spending with the analysis about how our combat readiness levels are currently so low.
**CON – Increased military spending increases harmful drone use**

**Argument:** Increased military spending incentivizes the increased usage of drones

**Warrant:** The market for drone usage by the US military is increasing despite other cuts.


A recent report published by government market analyst Govini expounds on this phenomena, discovering that, despite sequestration, the unmanned aerial systems (UAS) market saw a 6 percent compound annual growth rate over the last five years. The Navy had until recently been testing and demonstrating for a potential surveillance and/or strike capability using the Northrop Grumman X-47B Salty Dog for the Unmanned Carrier-Launched Airborne Surveillance and Strike, known as UCLASS. Issues such as dithering on a platform focused on strike versus surveillance beset the program, though the program did achieve major milestones with the first successful unmanned system landing on an aircraft carrier and the first unmanned system to achieve aerial refueling. Recently, however, the Navy surprised most by announcing the program would be scrapped and restricted to the Carrier Based Aerial Refueling System program described by GAO as “an unmanned system designed to conduct automated aerial refueling of other carrier-based aircraft, as well as provide some intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capability.” Four contractors make up 66 percent of the awards for UAS in the defense sector, totaling $9 billion.
Warrant: Drone warfare is devastating US foreign policy goals and increasing anti-American sentiment abroad.


In an almost-invisible campaign that started modestly under Bush and expanded dramatically under Obama, the U.S. has launched more than 1,600 drone strikes in Afghanistan, Iraq, Pakistan, Yemen, Somalia, Libya and even, in one case, in the Philippines, according to Micah Zenko of the Council on Foreign Relations. Drone strikes may be an efficient way to kill terrorists, but they're no way to make friends.

That's one of the messages of a stinging new report issued recently by a panel of experts convened by Washington's independent Stimson Center, a thoroughly establishment group of former officials from both Democratic and Republican administrations. Blue-ribbon commissions in Washington often pull their punches; this one, chaired by retired Army Gen. John P. Abizaid and former Pentagon official Rosa Brooks, didn't. Among its highlights: Just because drone wars have succeeded in killing terrorists doesn't mean they're working. “The Obama administration's heavy reliance on targeted killings as a pillar of U.S. counter-terrorism strategy rests on questionable assumptions and risks increasing instability,” the report warns. After a decade of drone strikes, it notes, we face more Islamic extremists, not fewer. The widespread use of drones has created a backlash around the world, and not only in remote villages in Pakistan or Yemen. The report quotes retired Gen. Stanley McChrystal, the former U.S. commander in Afghanistan, warning that the tactic creates resentment “much greater than the average American appreciates.” Reliance on drones for “targeted killing” has allowed the CIA and Pentagon to obscure exactly whom we are fighting.
Warrant: Increased drone warfare increases civilian casualties and motivations for terrorism.


By most accounts, hundreds of dangerous militants have, indeed, been killed by drones, including some high-ranking Qaeda figures. But for six years, when the heavy cloak of secrecy has occasionally been breached, the results of some strikes have often turned out to be deeply troubling. Every independent investigation of the strikes has found far more civilian casualties than administration officials admit. Gradually, it has become clear that when operators in Nevada fire missiles into remote tribal territories on the other side of the world, they often do not know who they are killing, but are making an imperfect best guess. Micah Zenko, a scholar at the Council on Foreign Relations and lead author of a 2013 study of drones, said the president’s statement “highlights what we’ve sort of known: that most individuals killed are not on a kill list, and the government does not know their names.” Most security experts still believe that drones, which allow a scene to be watched for hours or days through video feeds, still offer at least the chance of greater accuracy than other means of killing terrorists. By most accounts, conventional airstrikes and ground invasions kill a higher proportion of noncombatants. But without detailed, reliable, on-the-ground intelligence, experience has shown, drones make it possible to precisely kill the wrong people. Mr. Zenko said that an average of separate counts of American drone strikes by three organizations, the New America Foundation, the Bureau of Investigative Journalism and The Long War Journal, finds that 522 strikes have killed 3,852 people, 476 of them civilians. But those counts, based on news accounts and some on-the-ground interviews, are considered very rough estimates.
Analysis: This argument is probably one of the more current-issues specific arguments on the topic. You will probably be able to find politics updates or newer cards as the month goes on. In terms of impact framing, you can argue that military spending will inevitably increase investment in drone technology and further incentivize its usage since it is more cost-effective than conventional warfare technology. This means that even if drone technology has certain benefits, the US will always have to contend with the knowledge that drone strikes are inconsistent when it comes to accuracy, and consistently poses the threat of civilian casualties.
A2 – Increased military spending increases harmful drone use

**Answer:** Drone strikes are crucial in overseas operations and save comparatively more lives.

**Warrant:** Drone strikes are the best way to remove the threat to American lives and civilians abroad, and reforms can be made to moderate any harms caused by strikes.


First, states have a primary responsibility for the protection of their own citizens. If drone strikes are the best way to remove an all-too-real threat to American lives, then that is an especially weighty consideration. Second, I **doubt that ending drone strikes would substantially reduce anti-Americanism in the Islamic world or put a dent in radical recruitment.** Third, the U.S can do a lot to moderate some harms caused by its use of drones. By being clearer about what it’s doing and offering detailed legal justification, the U.S. could mitigate damage to international law and the threat of uncontrolled proliferation. Finally, there is evidence that drone strikes are less harmful to civilians than other means of reaching Al Qaeda and affiliates in remote, lawless regions (for example, large-scale military operations). And that is what is required of states in armed conflict, legally and ethically: where civilian casualties cannot be avoided, they must be minimized.

**Warrant:** Drone strikes have broken down significant terrorist networks.

AT A time when Islamic jihadism has become a major threat in at least half a dozen countries, it’s important to acknowledge that the group that has posed the greatest threat to Americans and the U.S. homeland — the original al-Qaeda affiliate in Pakistan — has been devastated. **By all accounts, U.S. counterterrorism actions — above all drone strikes — have eliminated several generations of the organization’s leadership and pushed its survivors into far corners of Pakistan and Afghanistan, where they have scant chance to concoct operations like that of Sept. 11, 2001.**

**Warrant:** A lack of drone strikes would post greater risks to Americans.

What shouldn’t be up for review is whether drone attacks will continue to be a weapon in the U.S. counterterrorism arsenal. It’s true that the strikes have generated a backlash in public opinion, especially in the Muslim world. We have frequently expressed concern that the Obama administration has not accompanied targeted military action with more robust efforts to stabilize the countries where it takes place — a failing whose consequences can be seen in the collapse of Yemen’s government. There is a danger that U.S. drone strikes could be taken as a model for action by Russia, China or other powers against opponents who are not terrorists. Nevertheless, there is little question that drones are the least costly means of eliminating militants whose first aim is to kill Americans. “If we were not engaged against the terrorists,” CIA Director John Brennan said recently, “I think we would be facing a horrendous, horrendous environment.” He’s right.

Analysis: Drones incorporate some of the most strategic warfare tactics and highly precise technology that the US has to offer. They have contributed significantly to leadership decapitation among terrorist networks and removed countless threats to civilians abroad and Americans. This answer should weigh the costs of drone technology versus the benefits, and can effectively argue that any increased spending in drones will strengthen the institutional reviews and limits in place already to improve the way drones are deployed. You can think about this in a comparative sense-the US would still try to pursue the same type of counterterrorism strategies with or without drones, but the costs of doing so without drone technology raises the costs of conventional warfare to an unacceptable amount.

Answer: Drones are the most humane type of warfare.
Warrant: Drones reduce civilian casualties in armed conflicts and provide intelligence that can be reviewed by analysts in real time.


Like any other weapons system, drones have caused civilian casualties. But they also have the potential to dramatically reduce civilian casualties in armed conflicts, and particularly in counterinsurgencies. Their ability to follow targets for days or weeks accomplishes two things that contribute to saving the lives of innocents: First, it confirms that the target is engaged in the behavior that put them on the target list, reducing the likelihood of striking someone based on faulty intelligence. Second, by establishing a "pattern of life" for the intended target, it allows operators to predict when the target will be sufficiently isolated to allow a strike that is unlikely to harm civilians.

Another, less obvious, feature that reduces civilian casualties is that drones are controlled remotely, so the decision to employ a weapon can be reviewed in real time by lawyers, intelligence analysts, and senior commanders without any concern (in most cases) that a hesitation to act may cost lives. Even more importantly, the operators themselves are not concerned for their own safety, eliminating the possibility that the combination of tension, an unexpected occurrence, and a concern for personal safety leads to weapons being fired when they shouldn't be.

Warrant: Drones have the lowest civilian casualty rate of targeted weapons.

How do we know that this has succeeded? **Bowden mentions studies done by several independent organizations that have assessed civilian casualties caused by drones in Pakistan.** The three most well respected and independent sources on this issue are the Long War Journal, the New America Foundation and The Bureau of Investigative Journalism (TBIJ). Among these, the U.K.-based TBIJ has consistently produced the highest estimates of civilian casualties for drone strikes. According to TBIJ, between January 2012 and July 2013, there were approximately 65 drone strikes in Pakistan, which they estimate to have killed a minimum of 308 people. Yet of these casualties, even TBIJ estimates that only 4 were civilians. **This would amount to a civilian casualty rate of less than 1.5 percent, meaning that only 1 in 65 casualties caused by drones over that 19-month period was a civilian.** This speaks to drones effective discrimination between civilian and military targets that no other weapons system can possibly match. Another indication that drones cause fewer civilian casualties than traditional warfare was provided by Hamid Karzai in 2011. **The U.S. was employing all types of units in Afghanistan, ground troops, airstrikes, artillery and drones. But the source of friction with the Afghan government was not drones but rather special forces night raids. Karzai proclaimed that he would withhold further cooperation until his government was given greater control over night raids. Drones did not cause him or the Afghan people any appreciable concern.**

**Analysis:** US strategy in foreign affairs will always inevitably have an element of warfare, or be involved in an existing conflict. This argument says that while drone technology may pose some threat of civilian casualties, not using them defers to traditional warfare tactics in modern conflicts that tend to kill comparatively more civilians. Additionally, this answer proves that drone technology can be improved, providing and evolving and more concise ways to fight conflicts and pro.
CON – Increased military spending increases the free-riding problem

**Argument:** Increases military spending subsidizes the security commitments we have to our international allies. But this spending allows countries to free ride under extended US security without contributing anything to our mutual security.

**Warrant:** US security allies free ride off of domestic military spending.


Does our analysis support the theory of free-riding? Our results are mixed but still suggest free-riding by the vast majority of smaller allies—a result that is robust to a range of plausible changes to model specification. For only one county (West Germany) our results are inconclusive. Only for Portugal can we clearly reject the hypothesis of free-riding and we have argued above that Portugal is likely to be an outlier. Yet, our analysis does not support the hypothesis that the degree of free-riding is a function of country size. **Smaller and larger NATO members do not significantly differ in their degree of free-riding. Instead, we find that the degree of free-riding is correlated with geographical position in relation to the Warsaw Pact. NATO countries closer to Moscow exhibit lower free-riding as do countries that share a land border or are contiguous with one of the Warsaw Pact countries.**
Warrant: Increased military spending by the US allows security allies to spend less to maintain their defense commitments.


Throughout NATO’s existence, U.S. leaders have complained about the tendency of the alliance’s European members to skimp on defense spending and take advantage of America’s security shield to free ride. The free-rider problem, bad even during the Cold War, became worse when that struggle ended. In the past few years, especially since the onset of the global economic crisis, the problem has become much worse as European nations struggle to deal with increasingly burdensome social welfare states. Military spending in Europe has moved from the realm of inadequate to the realm of pathetic. America’s already huge defense budget continues to grow. Counting the costs of the missions in Iraq and Afghanistan, the U.S. spends nearly as much on the military as the rest of the world combined. This year, defense spending will be roughly five percent of America’s almost $15 trillion GDP. Contrast that with the efforts of the NATO allies. Even Britain and France, the two countries with the most serious defense budgets, provide little cause for satisfaction. The former is currently spending a mere 2.6 percent of GDP, and the latter an even smaller 2.1 percent.
**Warrant:** Free riding allies cost American taxpayers who shoulder the defense burden of other countries and pay to keep troops stationed abroad.


**But unless Washington changes the incentive structure, the behavior of the NATO allies will never improve.** U.S. leaders need to make the Europeans less confident that they can continue their free-riding ways. Ideally, Washington should at long last carry out Secretary of State John Foster Dulles’s 1954 threat to conduct an “agonizing reappraisal” of America’s NATO commitment to Europe’s defense. **Even if we did not want to go that far initially, a good first step would be to withdraw at least half of the U.S. troops still stationed on the continent and close some of the bases there.** Such action would be a cost-saving measure at a time when the U.S. is awash in red ink, running annual federal budget deficits approaching $1.6 trillion. But it would also send a stark, tangible message to the Europeans that would convey the depth of American dissatisfaction about their free-riding behavior. Implementing even that modest retrenchment would require overcoming the predictable shrill objections of allied governments. It would also require overcoming the lobbying efforts of American military contractors and other vested interests that are just as comfortable as the Europeans are with the status quo. **But the Obama administration owes it to American taxpayers — and to the American military that continues to bear an unfairly disproportionate share of the collective defense burden — to at least make the effort.**
Warrant: The US should not continue to disproportionately spend on our security commitments because mutual security is not guaranteed from allies.


Indeed, we can affix numbers to this bad habit. Many allies dedicate under 2 percent of GDP to their armed forces, whereas Washington spent 4.4 percent of GDP in 2012. U.S. taxpayers shelled out an average of 6 percent of GDP annually throughout the Cold War. Whether an ally matches what America spends makes a rough-and-ready gauge for an ally’s mettle. Few measure up. Such neglect betokens dangerous levels of trust in America’s capacity to bear the brunt of allied defense. This isn’t kicking the dirt over American decline. It’s simple political reality. There are no automatic commitments to dispatch forces to protect others. If you doubt me, parse the text of the Taiwan Relations Act, the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty, or even Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty. You’ll find wiggle-room in the closest of international covenants. That’s because deploying armed force is and will always remain a political act, subject to the political conditions of the moment. Allies kid themselves if they assume a U.S. president can simply throw a switch in times of trouble, setting the military machinery in motion. Don’t depend on us too much, folks.

Analysis: This is a good framing argument for the Negative side to use throughout the round. You can argue that any amount of increased military spending by the US will inherently tie us further to allies that don’t share the same cost burden. You can weigh out this argument by proving that free-riding allies force American taxpayers to shoulder the costs of their inability to invest in their own security commitments, as well as pay to station troops in other countries even though the same promises of safety may not be reciprocated. This framing helps to undercut a lot of the Affirmative’s offense, and you can argue that the harms of this problem will always mitigate any of the benefits of increased military spending.
A2 – Increased military spending increases the free-riding problem

**Answer:** Allies are starting to contribute more to international security commitments.

**Warrant:** Allies are beginning to reformulate their funding to better share the cost burden of extended security.


More important, perhaps, NATO nations are spending a lot more on actual fighting equipment rather than staffs and pensions -- eight allocated more than 20 percent of their military budgets to hardware. Readiness is also being stressed: Last year's Exercise Trident Juncture in Southern Europe was the largest joint drill in over a decade, involving 36,000 troops, 140 aircraft and 60 ships. Just as Russia has shaken Europe out of its defense stupor, so have China and North Korea energized the rest of East Asia. Japan has allocated a record $42 billion in fiscal 2016 (although a sluggish yen means its global spending power has increased at a lower rate). The budget includes purchases of six next-generation Lockheed-Martin F-35s and three Global Hawk drones, and funding for building a new guided missile destroyer.
**Warrant:** Allies are implementing structural reforms to better sustain their increased security investments.


More than money, though, Japan's seriousness should be judged by its structural reforms, arguably the most significant since its self-defense force was created after **World War II.** Last April, Tokyo and Washington reached significant agreements on increased Japanese support for ballistic-missile defense, maritime security and intelligence sharing. Japanese defense forces can now use military action to protect the U.S. even if their own islands are not under direct threat. Prime Minister Shinzo Abe is pushing other measures to loosen restrictions, and continues to fight local opposition to building a new U.S. base on the island of Okinawa, to which Japan will contribute $3 billion. **South Korea, contra Trump's assertion that "we get nothing," contributes $866 million a year for the U.S. presence.** No, that doesn't offset the full expense for the 29,000 Americans stationed there. But the Koreans also have half a million troops of their own protecting against Kim Jong Un's hungry hordes. **Seoul has steadily expanded defense spending this decade, and is now set for a binge, increasing outlays by $215 billion between now and 2020, or 7 percent annually. The big-ticket item under consideration is a new air- and missile-defense system, a homemade substitute for deploying America's Thaad missile shield, which has been held up by Chinese objections.**

**Analysis:** As the global market begins to turn around for countries, many are able to restructure their structural spending to better support military spending and security commitments to their allies. While the free-riding problem may have been particularly salient while countries were recovering from market downfalls since 2006, many have started to reinvest in defense elements such as troop garrisons, weapons, and technology development in airpower.
**Con Arguments with Pro Responses**

**January 2017**

**Answer:** Allies shoulder other critical parts of Western alliances outside of defense spending.

**Warrant:** European allies are turning around their spending trends and contribute to other critical components of extended security.


The first complication is that European defense spending is starting to turn around. Indeed, in 2015, U.S. defense spending fell far faster than European defense spending. As Bloomberg View’s Toby Harshaw noted, numerous European countries are ramping up their defense spending in response to Vladimir Putin’s Russia. French diplomat Simond de Galbert wrote in the Atlantic last month: “Although it is very unlikely that all European NATO countries will soon be spending as much as 2 percent of their GDP on defense, as required by NATO, the main European powers are at the threshold (like the United Kingdom and Poland), closely approaching it (France), or taking steps to increase resources allocated to defense (Germany).” The second and more significant complication is that while the United States does bear a disproportionate cost of military spending, our European allies have borne a disproportionate burden on other aspects of the Western alliance. Consider, for example, the cost of imposing economic sanctions. As de Galbert notes: “Washington pushed Europeans to put harsh sanctions on Iran, but the United States itself had little leverage on the Iranian economy, having had virtually no trade with the country since 1979. In many ways, it was the European choice to back sanctions that made them so effective—and it was the Europeans who bore many of the costs.” The Iran sanctions are insignificant compared to the joint U.S.-E.U. sanctions against Russia, however. Prior to the imposition of sanctions, European trade with Russia was 10 times the level of American trade. Estimates of the costs of the sanctions to Europe’s economy have ranged as high as $700 billion and 2 million lost jobs. Those estimates are on the very high end; more sober estimates up the cost at roughly 0.4 percent of GDP in 2015.
**Analysis:** This answer proves not only that our European allies are increasing their military spending and providing a more fluid commitment to cost bearing, but that their support important parts of our alliances in other ways. Security allies often back economic sanctions posed on recalcitrant powers that fail to respond to other forms of coercive diplomacy. Without our allies contributing to these costs, US foreign policy would not have been effective in sanctioning Iran or Russia.
CON – Increased military spending trades off with job creation in other sectors

**Argument:** Military spending trades off with creating job opportunities and job stability in other vital sectors of the American economy.

**Warrant:** Increased military investment creates the least amount of jobs compared to investment in other sectors.


Military spending by the federal government is often considered a vital support to employment and economic recovery. **However, military spending creates fewer jobs than the same amount of money would have, if invested in other sectors.** Clean energy and health care spending create 50 percent more jobs than the equivalent amount of spending on the military. Education spending creates more than twice as many jobs. There are three reasons why this is the case. Industries such as education and clean energy are more labor-intensive. For a given level of spending, more of those dollars go toward hiring workers and less on equipment and materials. Also, a greater percentage of spending in education, health care, and clean energy construction stays within the US, creating more domestic jobs. Military personnel spend more of their earnings abroad and foreign contractors and employees get some portion of Pentagon spending. Finally, since wages and benefits are lower in those sectors than they are for military contractors and personnel on average, the same amount of money hires more people in those non-military sectors. **As a result, if over the years 2001-2014 the US had not been at war but instead had channeled resources into expanding the clean energy industry, broadening health care coverage, and increasing educational opportunities, between 1 and 3 million more jobs would have been created, reducing unemployment significantly.** $1 billion in military spending creates approximately 11,200 jobs, compared with 26,700 in education, 16,800 in clean energy, and 17,200 in health care. The same amount of spending generates more jobs in certain non-military sectors because of differences in labor intensity, domestic investment, and wage levels.
**Warrant:** Spending cuts in other areas make reallocation of defense spending to domestic spending even more critically necessary.


Then there's a separate item of bad news: **misguided budget cuts in Washington are pulling funding from obviously important investments like natural disaster preparedness, infrastructure improvements, the criminal justice system, and early-childhood education, among many other things.** Budget-cutting fever in the capital shows no sign of subsiding, even though arguments for austerity have been debunked and our annual federal budget deficit has fallen sharply. Admittedly, in the scheme of overall US military spending, those cuts remain marginal. Sequestration shaved around $40 billion from the Pentagon's funding this year—which is a modest figure relative to that $600 billion budget. Still, it's a start. **With these cuts already underway and slated to continue in 2014, we can at least begin to imagine what sort of resources it might be possible to free from the military economy and how, if we're smart, these could help fuel our transition to a low-carbon, twenty-first-century economy that would work for us and for the planet.**
Warrant: Reallocating spending from the military into other sectors supports job creation across the board.


That's because it's possible to "harvest" military-generated technology and repurpose it for this task. As the sequestration cuts begin to bite into the defense sector, some high-tech production facilities and the workforce that goes with them will need to find a new purpose. Taxpayers have invested billions of dollars over decades in developing inventive technology, building infrastructure, and training skilled workers to fulfill military contracts for the war economy. It's time for the American public to start seeing all this harnessed to new purposes, first among them tackling our climate crisis.
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**Warrant:** Reversing military spending stimulates job creation in other sectors.


In the United States, cuts in public-sector spending have caused the loss of 550,000 public-sector jobs — think teachers, police, and firefighters — since January 2009, adding to the raw unemployment numbers and removing the multiplier effect that takes place when employees spend their paychecks. The result: Despite gaining private-sector jobs every month for the past 21 months as of November, we have been badly hurt by reduced public-sector spending, which has cut jobs and economic growth.

**One major change that can reverse this:** a substantial reduction in America’s military spending. In the current fiscal year, the United States is spending upwards of $650 billion on its military, including the costs of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. This is far more than it spends on Medicare and, more importantly, considerably in excess of what is required for America’s legitimate national security needs.
Warrant: Rethinking current security commitments and decreasing military spending creates jobs.


The United States should and will be the strongest country in the world. But it can achieve that status for significantly less than it is now spending. An early withdrawal of U.S. troops from Afghanistan over the next six months would save hundreds of billions of dollars. In addition, we could reach savings of more than $100 billion annually by adopting strategic concepts appropriate to the current world situation, rather than continuing to rack up bills fighting threats that no longer exist. We could also save tens of billions of dollars a year by curtailing our commitment to the defense of Western Europe — which was perfectly sensible when President Harry Truman made it but is wholly inexplicable now that Europeans are wealthy, strong, and threatened by no one — as well as by reducing our military presence in Japan and forgoing the new proposal for stationing U.S. Marines in Australia. We do not need to maintain the fighting capacity we had during the height of the Cold War to engage the Soviet Union in an all-out conflict. Terrorists are terrible people who should be confronted, but they are not a thermonuclear-armed Soviet empire. Fighting them, though in many ways more complicated, should be less expensive. Reducing excessive military spending — my proposal cuts approximately $900 billion in the next 10 years — would allow us to provide the short-term economic stimulus needed to continue the progress we are making in breaking out of the recession.

Analysis: This argument is fairly straightforward and easy to weigh throughout the round. Jobs may be the most grounded and applicable impacts in the debate and should be framed as such. While increasing military spending may trigger a nebulous saving-lives impact, the evidence proving that military investments comparatively create the least amount of jobs and are bankrupting other important sectors of our economy is empirically proven. You should weigh out in round that the US government has an obligation to improve the quality of life of citizens directly affected by a lack of access to healthcare, education, and other vital services.
A2 – Increased military spending trades off with job creation in other sectors

Answer: Military spending stimulates job creation.

Warrant: Military spending in institution installations provide several economic benefits on the state level.


The DoD contributes billions of dollars each year to state economies through the operation of military installations. This spending helps sustain local communities by creating employment opportunities across a wide range of sectors, both directly and indirectly. Impacts generally include salaries and benefits paid to military personnel and retirees, defense contracts, local business activity supported by military operations, tax revenues and other military spending. In 2015, for example, military installations in North Carolina supported 578,000 jobs, $34 billion in personal income and $66 billion in gross state product. This amounts to roughly 10 percent of the state’s overall economy. In Kentucky the military spent about $12 billion from 2014 to 2015, which was a reduction of $3.5 billion since the last report in 2012. With around 38,700 active duty and civilian employees, the military is the largest employer in Kentucky by more than 21,000 jobs. They also support the highest payroll with a total of $3.85 billion, $80 million higher than the second largest industry in Kentucky. Even states with relatively small military footprints have reported significant economic impacts. A study in Massachusetts, for example, found that by investing $9.1 billion in FY 2011, military installations contributed another $4.6 billion in spending and added more than 30,600 jobs to the state economy.
Warrant: Increased military spending in a Trump administration spurs private sector job creation.


President-elect Donald Trump wants a U.S. military with more ships, more troops and more aircraft, but getting it won't be easy, even with a Republican Congress. Still, the ambitious plan could translate into more jobs in the private sector from coast to coast. It could include work not only in building new fighter jets and missiles, but in shipyards in Virginia and elsewhere. "The Trump plan — at least what we know of it so far — is probably so positive for defense overall that there's probably many more winners than there are individual losers," said Roman Schweizer, a defense analyst at Cowen. Analysts estimate Trump's defense plan, which was disclosed during a national security policy speech in Philadelphia on Sept. 7, could add upwards of $250 billion more to U.S. military spending over the next four years, with a portion coming from freeing up funds from nondefense programs. Trump's Navy plan calls for 350 surface ships and submarines, up from 276 today and above the Pentagon's current target of 308 ships over the next 10 years. "Clearly shipbuilding is one sector that will benefit," said Cowen's Schweizer, a former acquisition professional with the Navy's Littoral Combat Ship program. The analyst said the companies with the biggest potential exposure to Trump's planned ship build-up are major defense contractor General Dynamics, shipbuilder Huntington Ingalls and BWX Technologies, a maker of nuclear reactors for aircraft carriers and submarines. An acceleration of Navy shipbuilding also could result in tens of thousands of new private-sector jobs created in shipyards on both coasts. It's unclear how many of the new submarines would be created, but the Navy's current submarine fleet stands at just over 50 and had been projected to fall to 41 boats in 2029, according to the Congressional Research Service.
**Analysis:** This argument points out two effective things for the Affirmative: one, that the local and community impact of military funded programs, projects, and installations help to sustain state economies in a way that directly impacts the lives of citizens, and two, that the defense spending plan laid out by the President-elect could spur job creation in the private sector to accommodate manufacturing and technological development needs. Both serve as warranted responses to job loss through defense spending.

**Answer:** Increased spending is necessary because previous cuts to defense spending threaten millions of jobs.

**Warrant:** Defense cuts could lead to dangerous job loss in the manufacturing sector.


The report’s findings paint a stark picture of the potential harm the BCA budget caps and across-the-board cuts under sequestration will have—a loss of 1,010,000 private sector jobs, including 130,000 manufacturing jobs, by 2014. This job loss will increase the unemployment rate by 0.7 percent and decrease GDP by almost 1 percent by 2014. The report shows that the long-lasting effects of these cuts will be felt by not just by the defense equipment supply chain, but also the everyday Americans who are protected by these products. These cuts and the subsequent job loss will be particularly harmful to a wide range of manufacturing industries that are direct and indirect suppliers of defense equipment and supplies. The largest losses will be in large nondurables and transport equipment, including the aerospace industry that will lose 3.4 percent of its jobs, the ships and boats industry that will lose 3.3 percent of its jobs and the search and navigation equipment industries that will lose 9.3 percent of its jobs. Business leaders are already taking steps to reduce payroll to prepare themselves for the cuts ahead.
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**Warrant:** Job loss from spending cuts would occur in low-skill job and small business sectors, effectively devastating large portions of state economies.


George Mason University professor Stephen Fuller told the Armed Services Committee members that if the supercommittee pulls the “trigger” on hundreds of billions of dollars in cuts to Pentagon spending, the result will be the loss of more than 1 million jobs. Fuller, who this week authored an analysis for the Aerospace Industries Association on the impact of potential cuts in procurement and research and development funding, said at Wednesday’s hearing that 10 states would suffer about 60 percent of those job losses, with California, Texas and Virginia the hardest-hit. The brunt of the impact, he added, would be felt in sectors beyond the defense industry. “Only about 35 percent [of the projected job losses] are in the aerospace and military equipment manufacturing sectors,” Fuller said Wednesday. “In fact, only 125,000 of those are manufacturing jobs specific to the production of these products, these military hardware. The other 65 percent are jobs on Main Street.” Fuller’s report echoes the projections of the Pentagon, which has previously estimated that the across-the-board spending cut slated to be enacted if the debt supercommittee fails in its task would cost the United States as many as 1.5 million defense jobs and would lead to a one-percentage-point increase in the country’s unemployment rate.

**Analysis:** The defense industry relies on increased military spending to secure contracts and continue their businesses. Proposed military spending and defense cuts threaten the jobs that sustain this sector. The Affirmative can argue that job loss in these sectors have long term effects on sustaining American dominance in land, air, and naval power in terms of manufacturing and technological development.
CON – Higher military spending escalates the global arms race

Argument: Increasing U.S. military spending would heighten global tensions and cause paranoid states with cold relations to the U.S. to respond in turn with their own arms growth. Such an escalation would amount to an arms race, a dangerous affair for global stability.

Warrant: The current U.S. plans to increase military spending in Europe to combat Russian aggression would send hostile signals and heighten insecurity, leading us to spiral into an arms race with Russia.


“By planning to increase spending in this way, the US is sending hostile signals to Russia at the very time when there is less reason to do so than for a long time. It is nearly two years since Russia annexed Crimea and 18 months since the downing of MH17. The fighting in eastern Ukraine has died down; there is no evidence of recent Russian material support for the anti-Kiev rebels, and there is a prospect, at least, that the Minsk-2 agreement could be honoured, with Ukraine (minus Crimea) remaining – albeit uneasily – whole. In Syria, Russia has signed up to the war against Isis; it has helped orchestrate the only diplomatic process there is, and has acquiesced in principle to the eventual departure of President Bashar al-Assad. Moscow’s continued support is also crucial to the implementation of the Iran nuclear deal. The first real prospect of improved Russia-west relations since the ill-fated “reset” of 2009 looks as though it has been scotched almost before it has begun. Worse still, by attaching the new spending specifically to Poland and the “new” Nato states, the US is sending two more – linked – messages. The first is that Washington is prepared to take direct responsibility for the security of these countries. Not only does this leave them with no incentive whatsoever to normalise relations with their giant neighbour. It will inevitably heighten Russia’s own sense of insecurity, and prompt a new spiral in what we once called the arms race. New nuclear deployments cannot be ruled out.”
Warrant: United States military buildup on the South China Sea has also drawn critical reactions from Chinese officials, who see U.S. deployment as militarization.


“The U.S. has talked about militarization in the South China Sea. But can it explain whether its own increased military deployment in the region is equivalent to militarization?” said Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesperson Hua Chunying said at a media briefing, according to Xinhua, a state-run news agency. The United States had a conventional military presence in the Philippines for nearly a century until 1991, when the country ordered the U.S. military to leave its naval base in Subic Bay after the countries could not reach an agreement on the extension of a lease. A U.S. Special Operations task force was based in the Philippines for 13 years after the Sept. 11, 2001 attacks, but was phased out last year in favor of keeping a small amount of U.S. troops nearby to assist Philippine forces in their fight against Islamist militants.”
Warrant: Arms races tend to spiral out of control, engendering hostilities that evolve into conflict, as is well documented by international relations literature.


“An arms race is an interstate competition that motivates states to innovate, design and deploy the most lethal war technology in order to gain the upper hand against their rival states. However, arms races also create the looming danger of mutual destruction as an unintended by-product of both states striving to gain the upper hand in the battlefield. Primarily, in older economic and political theories, arms races are viewed as an action–reaction process triggered, fuelled and shaped by real or perceived external threat. One state, fearing a second state as a threat, embarks on a military build-up. The rival state, observing the action of the first state, reacts by augmenting its military power, which in turn motivates the first state to increase its military power and thus the arms race starts. This action–reaction framework is consistent with several prominent international relations models such as the security dilemma, the spiral model, and structural neo-realist theory. It is well-documented in the existing literature that military spending can pose a security dilemma, when a state chooses to retaliate to the military build-up of another state because it is unaware of the rival’s true intentions. The reciprocated increases in arming potentially engender a spiral of hostilities, increasing the chances for the outbreak of armed conflict.”
Warrant: Arms races among states with mature rivalries drastically increase the probability of conflict.


“As should be clear from the results reported in Model 7, the phase in which the arms race occurs matters when predicting war onset.10 The arms race component term is negative, suggesting that arms races that occur early in the life of the rivalry are unlikely to be followed by war; but the relationship does not reach conventional levels of statistical significance. Yet, the probability of war is 78% lower for an infant rivalry that has experienced an arms race as compared to rivalry in the same phase without an arms race.11 In addition, rivalry phase alone appears to be a poor predictor of war. The interactions between arms race and the latter two, however, are both positive and statistically significant.12 Arms races that occur in those phases are much more likely to go to war than those occurring in the first phase. An adolescent rivalry that has experienced an arms race has a 68% greater probability of war onset over the baseline; a mature rivalry has a 222% increase in the probability of war over the baseline.13 Furthermore, later phase rivalries that have experienced an arms race have a greater risk of war than similar rivalries that have not experienced an arms race. The probability of war increases by 147% when moving from an adolescent stage rivalry without an arms race to one with an arms race; a similar change from a mature rivalry without an arms race to one with an arms race increases the probability of war by 331%.”
**Warrant:** During the year of an arms race, the chance of a militarized interstate dispute (MID) between strategic rivals more than doubles from 16% to 35%, and the chance of war increases from 1/100 to 1/20.


"In addition to escalation, arms races seem to have an important substantive impact on the likelihood of conflict, especially in comparison with the other variables in our models. For example, as Table II shows, the chance of a MID for strategic rivals more than doubles, from 16% on average to 35% during an arms race year, and the chance of war changes from 1 in 100 to 1 in 20 during arms race years. These results are especially dramatic in comparison with the two other variables that are statistically significant across both models – contiguity increases the probability of both types of conflict by just over 23%, and an alliance decreases these probabilities by more than half."

**Analysis:** This argument is strong because it’s well based in both the current and historical context of U.S. international relations. The image of an arms race escalating and exploding to the point of war is an image that will be easy for judges to understand, and something that you can make very persuasive and compelling. Furthermore, this argument will also interact well with most Pro arguments, because even if Pro proves that military spending can be used to stop conflicts, if such spending creates more conflict in the first place, then the United States will be trapped in a permanent cycle of violence and escalation.
A2 – Higher military spending escalates the global arms race

**Answer:** Higher U.S. military spending would actually decrease the chance of an arms race.

**Warrant:** Because of waning U.S. power, Japan is now seeking its own military prowess.


Continuing in the footsteps of his grandfather, Prime Minister Nobusuke Kishi, who fought to make similar revisions during his time in office, Abe seeks to establish Japan as a military power to fill in the vacuum left by the United States. His legacy hinges on his ability to secure Japan’s future as a legitimate, reliable, and independent military player in ensuring regional and international peace. In a rapidly changing East Asia, and an increasingly global world with increasingly global threats, revising archaic definitions of constitutional pacifism are a complicated but necessary response to the current unequal security relationship between the U.S. and Japan.
Warrant: Japanese militarization will likely set off a regional arms race.


“Considering that Japan faces imminent threats in East Asia, including territorial disputes with China, Russia, and South Korea, and North Korea's nuclear threat, reinforcing military capability by establishing a national defense force would be rational. Also, Japan should no longer depend fully on the US as a safeguard. That being said, Japan's increase in military capability would most likely exacerbate regional security dilemma. In other words, security for Japan becomes insecurity for neighboring states, which eventually turn into insecurity for all. This could become an arms race among China, North and South Korea, and Russia and increase the cost of potential armed conflict. Additionally, enhancing military power will inevitably lead to increase in domestic taxes, which will create grievance among citizens. Moreover, if even a single Japanese soldier is killed in battlefield, the masses would soon lose confidence in the LDP, and the credibility of the party will be questioned, causing domestic instability. Furthermore, most importantly, the constitution amendment means betrayal of the determination of our grandparents not to repeat war and aspiration for peace. Thus, although amendment of Article 9 would seemingly improve security situation surrounding Japan, it will produces a number of undesirable consequences.
Warrant: This is happening elsewhere, also: as U.S. military power has declined, global military spending just experienced a recent jump, with non-western countries ramp up their militaries. Analysts expect this to be a directional shift.


“Last year, the world’s military spending increased for the first time in four years, a directional shift that may herald even higher spending on armaments and operations in years to come, according to new data compiled by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI). The world heaped more than $1.6 trillion on military programs and personnel in 2015, roughly 1 percent more than in 2014, a SIPRI analyst declared at the nonpartisan Stimson Center in Washington, D.C. on April 5. The increase follows four years of decline, which was preceded by 12 years of steady increases. So the brief falloff is over, and the familiar routine is back. “The dynamic for state spending has changed everywhere,” Aude Fleurant, Director of the Arms and Military Expenditure Programme at SIPRI said during a panel discussion. Many non-western countries in particular increased their military spending in 2015, she said.”

Analysis: This argument functions as a way that you to provide a better solution for the kinds of impacts that Con is talking about. Even if U.S. military spending bears some risk of creating an arms race, the risk of arms race is much higher if every country that relies on the United States for protection now feels the need to develop their own military. As such, the current stagnation of U.S. military power bears an exponentially higher risk of global arms escalation than a world in which the United States increases its spending.
Answer: United States military spending won’t launch an arms race.

Warrant: Russia’s economy is weak and the country isn’t prepared to significantly respond to increased U.S. military spending.


“As the U.S. ramps up spending in Europe, Russia has its hands full managing a reeling economy. Low oil and gas prices are expected to force a 10 percent cut in Russian defense procurement this year, according to the chief executive of Rostec, a state-owned weapons-maker. “I doubt [the ERI] will provoke any significant response from Russia, which has serious financial problems due to sanctions and low oil prices,” retired Adm. James Stavridis, former supreme allied commander of NATO, wrote in an email to The Diplomat. Regardless of Russia’s reaction, the big boost in funding for the ERI is the right call, he said. The Obama administration “is awakening to the reality that Europe and the Middle East will continue to matter deeply and require U.S. engagement and leadership,” wrote Stavridis, now dean of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University. “NATO is the central security pillar for doing so.”
Warrant: China’s military spending is also slowing down because its economy is stagnating.

<http://www.reuters.com/article/china-parliament-defence-idUSKCN0W60A5>.

“China's defence budget this year is likely to rise at its slowest pace since 2010, in line with the decelerating economy and by a much lower figure than had been expected in military and diplomatic circles. Fu Ying, spokeswoman for China's parliament, said the figure would increase by about seven to eight percent from 2015, following a nearly unbroken two-decade run of double-digit budget increases. China's military build-up has rattled nerves around the region, particularly because China has taken an increasingly assertive stance in its territorial disputes in the East and South China Seas. Fu told a news conference the defence budget would be released on Saturday, when the annual session of China's largely rubber-stamp legislative body opens. It will be the first single-digit rise in spending since 2010, when the military budget logged a 7.5 percent increase.”

Analysis: If the United States’ main rivals, China and Russia, are facing economic constraints to their military, then the arms race scenario that Con describes simply isn’t feasible. This response essentially delinks Con from the impact that they’re attempting to achieve. It can be made effective by painting the Con’s doomsday scenario of an impact as improbable and unrealistic.
**CON – The wait and see approach is superior**

**Argument:** The United States should not be adopting blanket policies when it comes to military spending. Instead, the US should be looking at a ‘wait and see’ approach to determine what funding and what aid is necessary for the US to give.

**Warrant:** The ‘wait and see’ approach would create a better force and reduce total costs.


**Without the strategic justifications just criticized, the U.S. military could be far cheaper.** As a rich state remote from trouble, the United States can afford a wait-and-see approach to distant threats, letting others bear the initial cost of meeting them. **Abandoning the pretension that global trade depends on U.S. protection would allow vast reductions in overseas missions and peacetime military expenditures.** Avoiding the conflation of foreign disorder with foreign threats would allow American leaders to plan for fewer occupational wars. Shedding these missions would allow the Pentagon to lose force structure—reducing the number of U.S. military personnel, the weapons and vehicles procured for them, and operational costs. 19 **The resulting force would be more elite, less strained and far less expensive**—it could be reduced in cost by a quarter to a third, leaving aside war costs. Here is a rough overview of the savings that sort of force would offer to taxpayers. Certainly, these estimates are rough and deeper cuts would be possible. 20 A disinclination to occupy poor states and protect rich ones would leave far fewer missions for U.S. ground forces. **Cutting a third of the units in the Army and Marines as troops retire would save at least $250 billion over the decade** and leave a force capable of winning any conceivable ground war. Additional tens of billions could be saved by cutting personnel associated with these missions from other services.
Warrant: Wait and see approach was the best move to take when it came to Russian cyberattacks.

<http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/war_stories/2016/10/obama_might_adopt_a_wait_and_see_approach_in_response_to_russia_s_hacking.html>

Richard Clarke, former White House counterterrorism chief and now a cybersecurity consultant, speculates that it might be an attempt to deter the Russians from interfering with our election any further. “Maybe Obama has decided not to do anything until after the election,” Clarke said in a phone conversation. Maybe, instead, he’s waiting to see whether the Russians actually try to alter the election’s results, for instance by removing Democrats’ names from the registration rolls they’ve hacked or by altering the transmission of vote counts. Meanwhile, Obama is telling the Russians that he knows what they’re doing, who’s doing it, and why. The Clapper-Johnson statement said that “senior-most Russian officials” were interfering with “the U.S. election process.” Maybe (and Clarke emphasized that he has no inside knowledge of what’s really going on inside the White House) the message to the Russians is: We’re watching. If there are signs on Election Day that they you’re interfering with the election results, then the hammer comes down. It’s still not clear what form that hammer might take. In any case, responding now, in some half-hearted way that the Russians could match, might just provoke them to step up their hacking—might actually impel them to do something on Election Day. It could be that Obama is taking aim but holding fire as long as they don’t follow through on what they seem to be preparing to do.
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**Warrant:** The ‘wait and see’ approach is respected and used on an international level.


<http://www.ecfr.eu/article/commentary_view_from_dublin_a_wait_and_see_approach311368>

Ireland is reluctant to move to deeper sanctions unless there are massive Russian violations of the Minsk agreements. It *advocates a “wait and see” approach: political dialogue should be continued and existing sanctions should be rolled over.* However, sanctions should not be extended as long as the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe and the Franco-German diplomatic initiative continue to report that Minsk is generally being implemented. Despite Ireland’s increasingly close economic ties to Britain, it is also careful to avoid the more hawkish position of its nearest neighbour. And, as a non-NATO member of the European Union, it continues to stress the importance of keeping open potential channels of communications with Moscow. Dublin’s position is that restrictive measures against Russia, coupled with open dialogue and continued political and economic engagement with the various sides in the conflict, offer the best way of creating the conditions for a breakthrough.
**Warrant:** The United States has taken this approach successfully with other international conflicts.


<http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/perspectives/PE100/PE137/RAND_PE137.pdf>

What this means is that U.S. policies in the aftermath of a nuclear agreement with Iran cannot be divorced from any of these other demands. At the same time, the nuclear agreement will be a factor in the design of the overall U.S. military posture, and our intent is to provide the Air Force with a framework for thinking about its possible implications. **For many reasons, policymakers will be attracted to a cautious “wait and see” approach in the days after a nuclear agreement.** This will likely pertain to U.S. policies overall, but especially to U.S. military posture in the region. **The rationale for such an approach lies in the uncertainties over Iranian intentions to comply with the agreement,** the potential for change in the nature and priorities of the Iranian leadership, and future Iranian behavior in the region.3 **A “wait and see” approach is also made more attractive by the fact that the U.S. military posture in the region advances a number of broader objectives**—such as degrading ISIL and reassuring partners—that would work against reductions narrowly based on a nuclear agreement. Finally, the historical legacy of other adversaries cheating on agreements will understandably predispose policymakers to such an approach.
Warrant: A wait and see approach does lead to action, and the action is thus more planned out and is more strategic.

<http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/perspectives/PE100/PE137/RAND_PE137.pdf>

While a “wait and see” approach in the aftermath of a nuclear agreement is the likely starting point, U.S. policymakers may see Iran’s behavior as reason for policy changes (e.g., Iran’s successful implementation of the nuclear agreement, moderation in its actions in the region and toward the United States). Changes could also come about for reasons external to what is happening in the Middle East; i.e., the need to respond to military priorities elsewhere in the world, or to domestic pressure to reduce defense spending. So, there are potential pathways to change in U.S. policies in the aftermath of a nuclear agreement, and it is these that we describe. Such policy changes would be fairly straightforward in leading to reductions in the USAF posture and activities in the region, were it not for the demands that have arisen in the ISIL campaign.

Analysis: A blanket policy would lead the United States to posture itself as if it was already for a massive international conflict. There is no reason to prepare for something that isn’t necessarily going to require a larger military. Another approach that can be taken is on an individual conflict basis, by using the ‘wait and see’ approach. This best allows the negative to absorb the affirmative’s impact by allowing for increased military spending if the conflict needs it, but it still allows for cutbacks if the situation calls for it. This approach has been used by the US and other nations, and has been extremely successful in situations with Russia and Iran. This is a good compromise on the negative because it solves for the issues on the affirmative while taking the benefits.
A2 – The wait and see approach is superior

**Answer:** The American public doesn’t support the ‘wait and see’ approach.

**Warrant:** When the US used the ‘wait and see’ approach in Iraq, the American public opposed it.


Exactly 12 years ago, just before the Persian Gulf War, most Americans believed that the United States should take a patient approach in dealing with Iraq after its invasion of Kuwait in August 1990 -- **most wanted to wait and see if diplomatic and economic sanctions would be effective before using military force.** But today, amid continued threats of terrorism post-Sept. 11, **the American public is much less likely to argue for patience when it comes to combating perceived threats to national security.** An August 1990 Gallup/Newsweek poll* asked Americans if President George H.W. Bush "should quickly begin military action against Iraq" or if he "should wait to see if economic and diplomatic sanctions were effective." An overwhelming 80% of respondents said Bush should wait to see if the sanctions were successful; only 17% said Bush should begin military action quickly. In subsequent months, the number of Americans saying that Bush should "wait to see" decreased slightly. In October and November, roughly seven in 10 respondents said Bush should take the wait-and-see approach, while a little more than one in five adults said Bush should begin military action. **By the end of December 1990, only a slight majority of respondents (53%) said the United States should wait and see if diplomatic and economic efforts would solve the problems with Iraq,** and support for military action increased to 41%. **By early January 1991, the public was essentially divided** on employing diplomatic efforts (46%) versus taking military action (49%).
Analysis: If the American public saw the effects of the wait and see approach and decided that in times of international conflict it was unsuccessful, then we can expect them to already be predisposed to disliking the ‘wait and see’ approach. The American government should not be utilizing an approach that their constituents disapprove of and think is unsuccessful. This is beneficial as a counter-argument for the affirmative because it shows that the wait and see approach may seem strategic at first, but over time, eventually becomes unpopular and a major failure.

Answer: The wait and see approach hasn’t always worked.

Warrant: The approach did not deter the situation with North Korea.


The United States is taking a "wait-and-see" approach to North Korea after Kim Jong Un stated in his New Year's speech he seeks to improve relations between North and South Korea. U.S. State Department spokesman Ori Abramowitz told Voice of America Washington supports improved inter-Korea relations, but that the United States would judge Pyongyang by its actions rather than its words. Abramowitz said the United States urges North Korea to refrain from actions that heighten tensions, and take firm steps toward implementing its international obligations and commitments. In his New Year's speech, Kim had said unification is the most urgent and vital task of the nation, adding that the "outside anti-unification forces should be pushed aside to open a new era of independent unification." But Kim may have other priorities – that include strengthening North Korea's military power, in case of war. Pyongyang's state-controlled media outlet KCNA reported Tuesday, local time, Kim inspected a shooting competition held by the Korean People's Army, his first military activity of 2016. North Korea stated the shooting competition was held in commemoration of the upcoming Seventh Party Congress, adding, "Comrade Kim Jong Un watched the competition from an observation post and listened to reports on the game's progress." According to KCNA, Kim said that North Korea's "reliable soldiers are really good shooters" adding, "Well-trained snipers seem to be always hitting the target." But Kim also said the quality of training needs to be improved.
Analysis: The ‘wait and see’ approach in North Korea did not end up being successful because it didn’t deter North Korea from acting any differently. They still continued with their shooting competition, and they still started planning for a war. It didn’t end up being effective because the United States simply sat in the backseat. The affirmative should use this evidence to show that there are times when the approach is unsuccessful, and thus shouldn’t be our solution since there are times when it has failed on a drastic level.
CON – Military Spending Trades off with Other Spending

**Argument:** If the government were to significantly increase its military spending, it would likely trade off with other sectors of government spending to the detriment of the U.S.

**Warrant:** Basic economics tells us there will always be a tradeoff between military and nonmilitary spending


**Guns versus butter.** It's the classic debate that really tells us a lot about our priorities that we set for the kind of society we can expect to live in -- **how much money a country spends on the military versus how much money is expended on non-military, domestic needs.** To perhaps explain the obvious, **buying a gun (or missile defense or a sophisticated bomber) means you don't have those dollars for butter (or a national health care plan or free college education).**
**Warrant:** Military spending often trades off with other areas of spending, such as public infrastructure


In other nations, particularly ones that are still developing economically, a focus on military spending often means foregoing other important spending priorities. There are many nations that have a standing military but an unreliable public infrastructure from hospitals to roads to schools. North Korea is an extreme example of what an unrelenting focus on military spending can do to the standard of living for the general population. The generous debt terms that the US enjoys are far from universal, so the trade off between military spending and public infrastructure is more painful for many nations.
**Warrant:** Increased military spending almost always trades off with both physical infrastructure spending and human capital investment


It follows from the above discussion that what gets pushed out, or forgone, by military spending is often not private-sector investment spending but non-military public spending. This includes both physical capital, or physical infrastructure (such as roads, bridges, mass transit, schools, drinking water, wastewater, dams, solid waste, hazardous waste, navigable waterways and energy) and human capital, or soft/social infrastructure, such as health and education. In other words, it is often the proverbial butter that gets melted away when a disproportionately large share of public money is allocated to the production of guns. Official macroeconomic figures show that, over the past five decades, government spending (at the federal, state and local levels) as a percentage of GNP (gross national product) has remained fairly steady—at about 20 percent. Given this nearly constant share of the public sector of GNP, it is not surprising that increases in military spending have almost always been accompanied or followed by compensating decreases in non-military public spending. This is, of course, not fortuitous because instead of financing through progressive taxation such additions to military spending have been increasingly accompanied by tax cuts on the wealthy.
Impact: Infrastructure spending going down is detrimental for important public systems


In September 2003, ASCE released a Progress Report that examined trends and assessed the progress and decline of the nation’s infrastructure. The Progress Report, prepared by a panel of 20 eminent civil engineers with expertise in a range of practice specialties, examined 12 major categories of infrastructure: roads, bridges, mass transit, aviation, schools, drinking water, wastewater, dams, solid waste, hazardous waste, navigable waterways and energy. The report concluded: “The condition of our nation’s roads, bridges, drinking water systems and other public works have shown little improvement since they were graded an overall D+ in 2001, with some areas sliding toward failing grade.” Thomas L. Jackson, ASCE President, pointed out: “Time is working against our nation’s infrastructure. . . . Since we graded the infrastructure in 2001, our roads are more congested than ever, the number of unsafe and hazardous dams has increased, and our schools are unable to accommodate the mandated reductions in class size” (http://www.asce.org/reportcard/index.cfm?reaction=news&page=5).

Commenting on this ominous trend of the nation’s infrastructure, Seymour Melman, emeritus professor of industrial engineering at Columbia University, wrote, “All this is an important indicator of the opportunity cost, of what has been forgone, as a consequence of the Permanent War Economy” (Melman 2003).
Impact: Military spending trades off with private investment and overall GDP


This paper investigates the relationship between defense spending and economic growth for the G-7 nations during the years 1964-1965. Using a two-way, fixed effects regression model, time series and cross-sections are pooled. The percentage change in real GDP is assumed to be a function of the percentage of GDP devoted to military spending and the percentage change in population. Results indicate a statistically significant, inverse relationship between defense spending and economic growth. If the percentage of GDP spent on defense spending increases by one percentage point, economic growth decreases by almost 1.3 percentage points. F-tests indicate the two-way, fixed effects model is superior to both the one-way, fixed effects model or the random effects model.
Impact: Increased military spending cuts government programs and increases inequalities


But while the Pentagon contractors and other beneficiaries of war dividends are showered with public money, low- and middle-income Americans are squeezed out of economic or subsistence resources in order to make up for the resulting budgetary shortfalls. For example, as the official Pentagon budget for 2008 fiscal year is projected to rise by more than 10 percent, or nearly $50 billion, “a total of 141 government programs will be eliminated or sharply reduced” to pay for the increase. These would include cuts in housing assistance for low-income seniors by 25 percent, home heating/energy assistance to low-income people by 18 percent, funding for community development grants by 12.7 percent, and grants for education and employment training by 8 percent (Shakir et al. 2007). Combined with redistributive militarism and generous tax cuts for the wealthy, these cuts have further exacerbated the ominously growing income inequality that started under President Reagan.
Impact: The programs cut by increased military spending are extremely important for countless Americans


Ever since Reagan arrived in the White House in 1980, opponents of non-military public spending have been using an insidious strategy to cut social spending, to reverse the New Deal and other social safety net programs, and to redistribute national/public resources in favor of the wealthy. That cynical strategy consists of a combination of drastic increases in military spending coupled with equally drastic tax cuts for the wealthy. As this combination creates large budget deficits, it then forces cuts in non-military public spending (along with borrowing) to fill the gaps thus created. For example, at the same time that President Bush is planning to raise military spending by $50 billion for the next fiscal year, he is also proposing to make his affluent-targeted tax cuts permanent at a cost of $1.6 trillion over 10 years, or an average yearly cut of $160 billion. Simultaneously, "funding for domestic discretionary programs would be cut a total of $114 billion” in order to pay for these handouts to the rich. The targeted discretionary programs to be cut include over 140 programs that provide support for the basic needs of low- and middle-income families such as elementary and secondary education, job training, environmental protection, veterans’ health care, medical research, Meals on Wheels, child care and HeadStart, low-income home energy assistance, and many more (Greenstein 2007).

Analysis: Military spending has the potential to create massive trade offs for all forms of domestic spending and worsen our economy significantly. This is extremely problematic, because it perpetuates inequalities and if America is unsuccessful domestically, its foreign policy prowess is unimportant by comparison. This argument makes a great deal of intuitive sense, because it makes use of the most basic economic tradeoff ever taught: guns vs. butter. Not only will it make perfect sense to all judges, but the weighing is very clear - we need to focus more on our own country than the issues that exist in other countries.
A2 – Military Spending Trades off with Other Spending

Answer: Decreased defense spending creates military tradeoffs that are problematic

Warrant: Recent military budget cuts have removed jobs and compromised our readiness for conflict


The chart above comes from a recent report from the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, which asked seven teams of experts to come up with ways to meet the Pentagon's new spending constraints in the coming decades. It shows what areas different teams would cut — some experts advised heavily slashing the civilian workforce, others advocated cutting aircraft inventory. (There were some areas of consensus, though: surface ships were generally cut more than submarines, for instance.) The cuts weren't always painless. For instance: "Five of seven teams agreed that they could not fully resource their strategies under the assumed fiscal guidance unless they accepted near-term risk by reducing current readiness programs."
These are trade-offs Hagel will have to navigate.

Analysis: If the current rate of military budgets are causing tradeoffs within the military, tradeoffs outside of the military are inconsequential because our national security must come first.
Answer: There is no tradeoff between military and domestic expenditures.

Warrant: Defense spending is unavailable for nondefense purposes.

<http://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw/vol4/iss8/18>

It is a truism that resources devoted to defense are unavailable for nondefense purposes. Investment in defense takes place partly by reducing civilian spending on consumer and capital goods through tax rates that are higher than they would otherwise be and partly by reducing government spending on non-defense programs. The purpose of this paper is to test for the existence and magnitude of the latter tradeoff over the years 1929-1971 in the United States. In particular, the analysis concerns the tradeoff between defense and three social welfare policies: health, public aid and housing. In addition, the analysis examines whether these tradeoffs differ during periods of war and peace. Theoretical Arguments One prevailing theory is that no tradeoff occurs between military and welfare expenditures. Proponents of this theory argue that modern society moves toward a warfare-welfare state in which political elites must buy off the populace with welfare goods. One reason is that welfare policy promotes the growth of GNP by contributing to better physical and psychological health for the workers which in turn promotes efficiency and production. (Baran and Sweezy, 1966; Rimlinger, 1971, 59-60; Helo, 1974, 89-90). Another argument in favor of this theory is that welfare spending contributes to political order by co-opting the masses and rewards them for fighting wars. (Gouldner, 1970).

Analysis: If the idea of a tradeoff between the two types of spending is a myth, there’s no reason not to increase defense spending. This is a complete block on the con argument.
Answer: Military expenditures benefit the economy, removing the harms of potential tradeoffs.

Warrant: These spending cuts have harmed the economy


Liberals take the Keynesian line that government spending acts like an economic multiplier: it not only generates immediate economic activity by guaranteeing that money is spent (creating demand), but that spending provides an opportunity for private actors to recycle the money into further investment and further spending. This chart, from the FT’s Matthew Klein based on data from the BEA, seems to show that government has a pretty straightforward effect on GDP. When spending goes up, it adds to economic growth. When it goes down, it subtracts from it and hobbles the economy:

Klein has another chart isolating the effect of defence spending on growth. Reduced military spending — the withdrawal of troops from Iraq and Afghanistan, basically — also hurts growth. The chart shows that as military spending went negative in 2011, it truncated GDP growth. Only recently, as non-defence government spending has outweighed defence cuts, has total government spending been a net contributor to GDP again.
Warrant: Defense cuts have cost the economy 1 million jobs


Meanwhile, a special congressional committee established by the recently enacted Budget Control Act began gearing up to recommend budget cuts that could destroy a million jobs — jobs tied to the current level of defense spending. What's wrong with the picture is that Washington is wasting a lot of time and energy trying to implement contradictory measures that will cancel each other out in terms of their impact on the economy. The Budget Control Act signed by the president in August could result in cuts to defense totaling $100 billion annually for nine straight years beginning in fiscal 2013, and similarly sizable cuts to domestic programs. In a moment, I'll illustrate how the defense cuts by themselves could wipe out a million jobs, many of them high-paying tech positions in areas related to exports and innovation.
**Warrant:** Military expenditures can fund important soft powers that improve the economy


**National security depends also on soft power,** the ability of a country to generate and use its economic power and to project its national values. **This, in turn, depends on long-term factors that contribute to economic growth and increase the total resource base available not only for defense but to provide economic security in the form of income and business opportunities for individuals.** Economic growth depends on building human capital. It also depends on science, technology, and innovation. In addition, the **increased integration of the U.S. economy into global markets means that U.S. security also depends on global economic stability, on a balanced international economy, the ability to coordinate key economic policies with other leading nations, and deterring threats to the international financial system.** Soft power also enables the country to project American values through diplomacy, economic assistance, fostering democracy and human rights, and promoting sustainable development abroad. Congress plays a major role in each of these elements of national security. This analysis illustrates how **disparate parts of the U.S. economy affect the security of the nation.** Security is achieved not only by military means but by the whole of the American economy.

**Analysis:** If military expenditures actually benefit the economy, even if tradeoffs exists their occurrence is offset by the economic boon of more spending. This removes any negative impact the con could garner from it.
CON – Cooperation with other nations

Argument: Rather than increasing the numbers of the supplies and weapons we already have, we should be looking for alliances and weapons in other countries. These alliances are more useful in times of conflict.

Warrant: The US has a glut of military spending that surpasses that of every other nation


U.S. military spending has soared over the past decade, and we now spend $700+ billion a year on our military (see chart at top). This dwarfs the military spending of any other country on the planet. The No. 2 military spender in the world, China, spends about $140 billion a year on its military--less than a quarter as much. (See chart at right). Our military spending is so huge, in fact, that it accounts for a staggering 41% of all the military spending in the world. That's more than the next 15 biggest military spenders put together. The only military spending category in which the U.S. isn't absurdly dominant is military spending as a percent of GDP. Our economy is so huge that our level of military spending as a percent of the economy---5%--is behind that of several other countries. Importantly, however, these other countries are small countries with small economies. No other developed or big country comes close to us in military spending, even as a percent of GDP. So suggesting that we can't cut military spending without rendering ourselves a weakling relative to the competition is absurd. Of course we can.
Warrant: Increased spending is only necessary during unilateral war; this is historically proven.


In fiscal year (FY) 2008, there were 154,000 troops in Iraq and 33,000 troops in Afghanistan. The FY 2015 request is for an average of 11,661 troops to be in Afghanistan over the course of the year. The number of troops in Afghanistan is set to reach 9,800 at the end of December 2014. **Overall funding for overseas contingency operations has declined by just over 70 percent since 2008 as the war in Iraq has wound down.** Funding for Iraq and Afghanistan was as high as $187 billion in FY 2008, which represents 30 percent of SIPRI's measure of U.S. military spending for that year. The FY 2015 budget request for overseas contingency operations is $58.7 billion. **The FY 2015 request for funding for overseas contingency operations (OCO) is $26.6 billion less than the 2014 enacted level. The decrease in funding is greatest for operations/force protection in Afghanistan, which will decline $15.2 billion in FY 2015. The FY 2015 request includes funding for two new initiatives, a Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund and funding for the European Reassurance Initiative**
Warrant: Current issues can be handled by alliances rather than money and manpower.


As CAP said in June when it advocated for action against ISIS in Iraq, “The United States should not undertake military action lightly and should be wary of unintended consequences. But not all military action is the same. Ground troops or invasions to control a country are very different from limited air strikes or targeted assistance to help push back terrorist extremists.” **Focusing too much on direct U.S. military action in the fight against ISIS ignores the equally important diplomatic and economic steps** that will be required to defeat this extremist group. U.S. military strikes or even boots on the ground cannot defeat ISIS alone and could become a rallying cry and recruitment tool for extremists, repeating one of the most costly strategic errors of the 2003 Iraq War. At the same time, **building a unified, committed coalition to effectively degrade ISIS will require intense diplomatic and military leadership from the United States to mobilize and coordinate partners.** The United States must leverage its unique capabilities in the military, security assistance, and intelligence arenas. **Working together, nations committed to defeating ISIS should take concerted action to empower regional and local forces to fight back against ISIS terrorism.** A successful U.S. strategy will require reinvigorated support for Syrian opposition forces to establish a third way that is opposed to President Bashar al-Assad’s regime on one side and ISIS on the other.
Warrant: More nations need to be involved in current issues because this cannot be handled unilaterally.


The terror attacks that struck Brussels on Tuesday came as a shock, but perhaps not a surprise. They are just the latest carnage in a bitter war being waged by jihadist fanatics against the world, their battlefield now sadly all too common in Western cities. What we know so far is that the two attacks in Brussels were planned and carried out by the same people that were behind the Paris attacks of last November. What we don’t know is if there are more people in this terror cell ready to blow themselves up in order to cause a maximum number of casualties. It’s clear that we can’t continue doing business as usual as these attacks rage across the world. **We need more international cooperation in the fight against Islamist terrorism. We need countries such as Turkey and Israel to work together – these countries are faced with similar threats, as evidenced by last Saturday’s attack in Istanbul and the countless stabbings over recent months in Israel.** We need a United Nations that rises to the challenge, stops its obsession with slamming Israel and instead focuses on delivering to the peoples of this world what they really need: a solution to the security threats they are faced with. The UN could do a lot if only it was willing to change its ways. **We also need to reinforce police and strengthen intelligence services on the national and supranational levels so that they can do better in preventing terror attacks.**
**Warrant:** Structural prevention with allies should be preferred to funding for war preparation.

National Research Council. *International Conflict Resolution After the Cold War.*

<http://www.ibtimes.co.uk/hackers-could-be-targeting-toasters-mine-bitcoins-expert-warns-1475625>

A second previously underutilized strategy for conflict resolution is sometimes called structural prevention to distinguish it from “operational prevention,” which involves dealing with immediate crises likely to erupt quickly into deadly violence. Structural prevention involves creating organizations or institutionalized systems of laws and rules that establish and strengthen nonviolent channels for adjudicating intergroup disputes, accommodating conflicting interests, and transforming conflicts by finding common ground. Structural prevention typically focuses on the problems of culturally divided states, especially those with weak democratic traditions, deep ethnic divisions, and histories of collective violence perpetrated by one group against another or by past governments against civilian populations. Various tools are available for structural prevention, including institutions for transitional justice, truth telling, and reconciliation; electoral and constitutional design; autonomy arrangements within federal governance structures; laws and policies to accommodate linguistic and religious differences; training for law enforcement officials in following the rule of law; institutions assuring civilian control of military organizations; and the development and support of institutions of civil society.

**Analysis:** The basic premise behind the affirmative side is that international conflict needs the United States to funnel more money in. However, this can be proven false on two fronts. The first is that the biggest international conflict (the instability of the Middle East because of the rise of ISIS) can be better solved through a multi-lateral effort than through unilateral spending; Furthermore, and more importantly, there are ways for international cooperation to be better as a long-term solution. Funding for the military, typically, is increased during times of war. This is not the best way to solve conflict. Structural prevention is a better long-term solution because it guarantees longer terms of stability. Any other solutions besides funding for the defense is a reason to not buy the affirmative’s case.
A2 – Cooperation with other nations

Answer: Some of our allies need us to unilaterally defend them.

Warrant: Our NATO allies rely on the United States for protection.


The other thing we expect of our military is that it be able to protect not just the U.S. homeland, but also our allies around the world. The United States is pledged to defend every other NATO member state if they’re ever under attack. To be sure, every other NATO member state has also pledged to defend the U.S. But let’s just say that in practice, the U.S. is not banking on the Estonians to ride to the rescue in case of an invasion while the Estonians are certainly banking on the U.S. having their back if the Russians come knocking. And NATO is just the tip of the iceberg. Michael Beckley, a political scientist at Tufts, has observed that since World War II, the United States has signed defense pacts with more than 60 countries. This U.S.-led global alliance contains 25 percent of the world’s population and generates 75 percent of global GDP. America’s allies have primary responsibility for their own defense, to be sure. Yet they really do count on the U.S. to step up when the going gets tough.

Analysis: There are times of international conflict where the United States has pledged to act unilaterally to defend its allies, and in these times, the US cannot rely on other nations to help. It is not just about defending our own nation or intervening in terror situations in the Middle East. As a result, increased spending is important because we need enough for a counter-insurgency effort, which requires a full complement of capabilities rather than just heavy firepower or strategic defenses.
Answer: Our spending has decreased to a dangerous level.

Warrant: Our enemies and our allies have felt the devastating effects of decreased spending already.


The results of these cuts have been disastrous for our military and for our ability to project power and deter our enemies. The slight increase in President Obama's proposed 2016 budget won't significantly change that. At the end of this process, our military will be significantly smaller, dramatically less capable and dangerously unready to deploy if these budget cuts remain in place. The Army is on the path to be reduced to pre-World War II levels. The Navy is at pre-WWI levels. And our Air Force has the smallest and oldest combat force in its history. Our force reductions have been felt throughout the world -- by our friends and our enemies. They have presented not just a crisis of readiness for America, but also a perilous strategic weakness. Our adversaries have been emboldened by what they perceive as our diminished military presence. History has shown that every time we have unreasonably cut resources from our military in anticipation of a peace dividend, it has only cost us more to make up for the deficit we create in military readiness and capability, and the expected era of perpetual peace fails to materialize. We think we are saving money, but in the long run, we end up paying more and creating more risk and uncertainty. We can afford the military we need, but we must make it a priority.

Analysis: The simple response to the argument that international cooperation is more important than increased spending is that we need to defend our allies. Our current spending levels have put us at a high-risk level because our enemies know that we have been decreasing our military spending. With pre-World War levels, our allies are susceptible, and if we cannot defend them, then we are breaking the contract that we signed with more than 60 NATO allies.
CON – Efficiency

**Argument:** The U.S military does not spend its money efficiently

**Warrant:** The U.S military wastes more money than the entire economy of 80 nations can produce in a year.


“As the Pentagon prepares for the formal release its budget next week, there is much talk within the department that the $600 billion-plus that is likely to be proposed is inadequate. In fact, rooting out billions of dollars of waste in the Pentagon budget would leave more than enough to provide a robust defense of the country without increasing spending.

Waste at the Pentagon is nothing new. But recent revelations suggest that it may be reaching historic levels.

The Special Inspector General for Afghan Reconstruction has uncovered scandal after scandal involving U.S. aid to that country, including the creation of private villas for a small number of personnel working for a Pentagon economic development initiative and a series of costly facilities that were never or barely used.

An analysis by ProPublica puts the price tag for wasteful and misguided expenditures in Afghanistan at $17 billion, a figure that is higher than the GDP of 80 nations.

Sen. Charles Grassley, R-Iowa, has called for a full audit of the unit responsible for the most egregious Afghan cases. And on Jan. 20th, the Senate Armed Services Readiness Subcommittee held hearings on the subject. The Pentagon's witness, Principal Deputy Undersecretary of Defense for Policy Brian McKeon, was decidedly on the defensive as senators from both parties peppered him with questions about his department's poor record keeping and lack of accountability.”
**Warrant:** The military invests in wasteful projects under the guise of necessity.


One of the most unsettling facets of federal finance is the way the government devalues past investments. The political system is so focused on the next budget -- and the next election -- that it ignores sunk costs. Thus, every program termination is considered "savings," without regard to the money that was spent to get the project in question to its current state.

This fiscal myopia is especially pronounced in the defense budget, where the government makes most of its capital investments. Cancellation of weapons systems that have been in development for a decade or longer is typically greeted as evidence that policymakers have made "hard choices" and had the courage to stand up to the "military-industrial complex." The fact that previous administrations may have spent billions of dollars trying to satisfy a valid military requirement is barely mentioned -- as is the fact that future administrations will have to spend additional money starting over on a replacement project.
**Warrant:** The U.S spends over $500 billion on overseas bases, most of which are unnecessary holdovers from the cold war era.


“The vast majority of the $601 billion will be funneled towards the military's base budget, which includes funding for the procurement of military equipment and the daily operations costs of US bases.”
Warrant: The U.S military has wasted over $100 billion since the cold war ended.


If you add up all the money spent on military systems that got funded but not fielded since the Cold War ended, it probably tops $100 billion. We'll never know the full amount, because some of the biggest projects are hidden in secret spy-agency accounts. Defense contractors are reflexively blamed for the waste because politicians and policymakers are even less interested in accountability than they are in precise accounting.

What the record shows, though, is that weapons makers aren't the real cause of the waste. They only have one customer -- the government -- so they will do pretty much whatever that customer pays them to do. The real problem lies with the limited attention span of a political system that barely notices the sacrifices and assumptions of past administrations and cares only about the fiscal run-up to the next election. Because the system is so indifferent to expenditures it cannot control, it devalues past investments and squanders billions of dollars every year in the guise of pursuing "savings."

Warrant: The U.S spends over $600 billion on overseas bases, most of which are unnecessary holdovers from the cold war era.

Analysis: The function of this argument is to establish that even if it’s true that there are branches of the military that need support, there are other branches that are dramatically overfunded and bleeding taxpayer dollars. While an increase in funding to one particular project could fix the problem, it would be far easier and cheaper simply to redirect funds from another.
A2 – Efficiency

Answer: Investing in the military is efficient and can actually create more growth than it costs.

Warrant: Former fed chairman Ben Bernanke believes military spending creates growth.

Kulwant, Saluja. “Cutting defense spending could hurt economy, Bernanke warns.”

“Former Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke warned Monday that reduced defense spending could have adverse long-term economic impacts, including undermining technological innovations that ultimately produce jobs in the private sector.

Speaking at a Brookings Institution event, Bernanke said, “By far the most important (impact), certainly in the United States, has been the linkage between defense military appropriations and broader technological trends.

“That is one of the major sources of U.S. growth over time. We remain a technological leader. That’s one of our national strengths.”

Bernanke cited as examples the Manhattan Project and the creation of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, the precursor to the Internet.

“One innovation I really like is laser surgery,” Bernanke said. “There has since been something like 55,000 patents related to laser technology. Things that have come out have been laser surgery, DVDs, barcodes.”
**Warrant:** World War Two played a role in ending the Great Depression


**World War II is the great natural experiment in the effects of large increases in government spending,** and as such has always served as an important positive example for those of us who favor an activist approach to a depressed economy. **Christy Romer is very much on the same wavelength.**

It’s especially relevant because in the 1930s, as today, many wise heads insisted that unemployment was structural, that many of the unemployed could not be gainfully employed no matter how much demand increased. Then demand actually did increase, **and as Christy says,**

But **World War II has something to tell us here, too.** Because nearly 10 million men of prime working age were drafted into the military, there was a huge skills gap between the jobs that needed to be done on the home front and the remaining work force. Yet businesses and workers found a way to get the job done. Factories simplified production methods and housewives learned to rivet.

Here the lesson is that demand is crucial — and that jobs don’t go unfilled for long. If jobs were widely available today, unemployed workers would quickly find a way to acquire needed skills or move to where the jobs were located.

**Analysis:** Many influential economists (especially those who subscribe to Keynesian Economics) believe that substantial government spending in the military can lift the economy out of recession. While the New Deal likely played a significant role in the end of the Great Depression, there is a decent amount of evidence to suggest that it was the creation of new accessible jobs in the military that served as the tipping point.
CON - Alienates our Allies

Argument: U.S. military spending alienates us from our allies, who are uncomfortable with what they see as excessive unilateral action, which is damaging to our global standing and military success.

Warrant: High military spending makes our allies dislike us


The war against terrorism clearly shows that the United States cannot and should not attempt to meet the array of existing threats by itself. Instead, we should cooperate with our allies and help build international institutions to share the necessary security responsibilities. If we do not work with our allies on military matters, we cannot expect them to cooperate with us in other areas important to our security such as getting better intelligence about possible terrorist activities, drying up financial flows to terrorist groups, and bringing terrorists to justice. By keeping military spending at or near Cold War levels and continuing to assume unilateral responsibility and leadership during most cases of international turmoil, we are going to overload domestic circuits and, as you saw in your trips to the NATO summit in May 2001 and to Europe in May 2002, may alienate European allies by widening the technology gap between our military and theirs. We may also aggravate the grievances that serve as rallying points for those who fan the flames of anti-Americanism and thus potentially worsen the terrorist problem. Moreover, we will not be able to solve the gravest threats to our security — global problems such as terrorism, drugs, disease, and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD).
**Warrant:** Intervention in Iraq is a perfect example of U.S. military spending and subsequent unilateral action upsetting our allies


<http://www.pewglobal.org/2007/03/14/americas-image-in-the-world-findings-from-the-pew-global-attitudes-project/>

Just over half of Moroccans (56%) and 49% of Jordanians think such attacks are justifiable. Even in Turkey, where bin Laden is unpopular and support for terrorism is generally low, about one-in-four say suicide bombings against Americans and Westerners in Iraq can be justified. But, as we have documented, **anti-Americanism is the case in much of the world, not just Muslim countries, and certain aspects of American power and American policy are central to this.** First, there is a general perception that the U.S. acts unilaterally in the international arena, failing to take into account the interests of other countries when it makes foreign policy decisions. Our polling since 2001 has shown a growing perception that the U.S. acts unilaterally, and the war in Iraq has crystallized that opinion. In 2005, only 18% of the French, 19% of the Spanish, and 21% of Russians said that the U.S. takes into account the interests of countries like theirs when making policy.
**Impact:** Opinions of the U.S. decline significantly in nations that are our allies when we engage in international conflicts like Iraq


<http://www.pewglobal.org/2007/03/14/americas-image-in-the-world-findings-from-the-pew-global-attitudes-project/>

Our 44-country 2002 poll found America’s image slipping in seven of the eight Latin American countries surveyed, while our 2006 survey revealed declines in Japan and India, two still relatively pro-American Asian powers. Other polls international polls, such as BBC and Gallup have confirmed the continuing world-wide nature of America’s image problem. Second, while anti-Americanism is a global phenomenon, it is clearly strongest in the Muslim world. For instance, in all five predominantly Muslim countries included in our 2006 study, fewer than one-third of those surveyed had a favorable view of the U.S. Moreover, with the Iraq war, anti-Americanism spread to parts of the Muslim world where the U.S. had previously been relatively popular. In Indonesia, for example, between 2002 and 2003 America’s favorability rating dropped from 61% to only 15%. In Turkey it plunged from 52% in the late 1990s to 15% by 2003. After Iraq, many in Muslim countries began to see the U.S. as a threat to Islam, and what had perhaps been loathing for the U.S. turned into both fear and loathing. A 2005 Pew study found that in all five majority Muslim countries surveyed, solid majorities said they worried that the U.S. might become a military threat to their country. This includes 65% in Turkey – a longstanding NATO ally. Third, among many people, anti-Americanism is an intensely held opinion, which makes it difficult to change.

The first eye opener for me was a 2003 European Union poll that 53% of people in EU countries saw the U.S. as a threat to world peace. Strikingly, Europeans were as likely to say this about the U.S. as they were to say it about Iran and North Korea. The 2006 Pew survey had similar findings. The British, French, and Spanish publics were all more likely to say the U.S. presence in Iraq poses a great danger to regional stability and world peace than to say this about the current governments of Iran or North Korea.
Impact: The U.S. needs its European allies in order to maintain success


Because of their level of technological achievement, their solid democratic systems, their military competence, their wealth, and other enduring factors, our European allies will perforce play important roles in addressing the risks to U.S. security and well-being. Moreover, the collapse of totalitarianism and the commitment to build democratic political institutions and free market economies by Europe's former communist states represent a historical opportunity to expand the circle of states that see it in their interest to cooperate in the pursuit of common goals. If the reform process is successful, the importance of Europe as a partner in meeting the world's problems will increase still further. For these reasons, the United States will continue to have a great stake in maintaining influence in the decisions and policies of Europe's governments and multinational organizations. NATO in particular, the institutional embodiment of the trans-Atlantic partnership, has been the key element in maintaining general peace in Europe for more than 45 years, an achievement unparalleled by any other international organization. Critical to America's interests in the region is maintaining the viability and vitality of NATO as an institution which is able to deter and defend against any attacks on its members. At the core of NATO's success is the integrated military command structure, through which the forces of the Alliance cooperate, train, and plan together for the common defense.

Analysis: The United States needs to maintain its European allies if it ever wants to participate in multilateral responses to conflict. However, by spending massive sums on our military and using them to engage in reckless actions, we alienate these very nations from helping us in the future. This argument is very good for weighing, because the resolution asks for impacts relating to our ability to respond to conflict, and without our allies it’s essentially impossible to respond effectively to international confrontations. This argument makes a great deal of intuitive sense and is easy to explain and weigh.
A2 – Alienates our Allies

**Answer:** Our allies like that we spend so much on our military

**Warrant:** Other nations can free ride off of our large military expenditures


John J. Mearsheimer, distinguished professor at the University of Chicago, explained at a discussion convened at the Center for the National Interest in Washington, DC, on Thursday. “It’s just taken for granted that free riding happens,” he said. Mearsheimer was joined by Richard Burt, former U.S. ambassador to Germany and assistant secretary of state for European and Canadian affairs, as well as by moderator and National Interest editor Jacob Heilbrunn, in a lively discussion about the future of America and its allies. Both Mearsheimer and Burt agreed that free riding is much too prevalent and much too little discussed. For Mearsheimer, free riders are a natural consequence of the larger strategy of liberal hegemony that the United States has pursued since the end of the Cold War. America’s belief that it should be the world’s policeman, that it is uniquely deputized to promote democracy and human rights worldwide, inevitably led other nations to lean on U.S. largesse while cutting their own security spending.
**Warrant:** Free riding prevents European nations from having to spend large sums or do anything to prevent conflict


<https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/blog/2016/mar/11/barack-obama-right-criticise-natos-free-riders-course-he-is>

Mind you, when it comes to the Nato allies, Obama is right. **Sheltering under the big American umbrella since 1945, most Europeans have become comfortably well-off and lazy, more concerned with having a nice time than with the basics of self-defence.** The richest undefended empire in history – as I like to call the EU – is facing growing problems on its eastern and southern flanks. Both refugees and related violence press on us from Syria, Iraq, and across north Africa to Morocco, and Europe is making a very poor job of tackling them. **Of course, we’re free riding. All this at a time when some idiots think they can float Britain off the continent (Nato defends us, not the EU, the ninnies tell each other) and go it alone.** What the Obama interview serves to tell us yet again is that this president may still be an internationalist in outlook, but he is much less of one than most since 1945. Donald Drumpf and Bernie Sanders – Jeremy Sanders as I like to call him – are doing well against expectations to be the next president. Both are isolationists.

**Analysis:** Europe relies on our large military expenditures, so the idea that they will for some reason abandon us as an ally should we increase our own makes very little intuitive sense.
Answer: Our European allies are now increasing their spending levels to match ours

Warrant: European nations are increasing their spending levels within NATO


Donald Drumpf now seems to be taking credit for NATO member-states increasing their defense expenditures. The only problem is that the United States and others have been urging these member-states to spend more for quite some time — including President Obama in an interview with The Atlantic. At the NATO summit in Warsaw in July, the alliance announced a bureaucratic reorganization, which seems to be the change Drumpf is referencing. Just five member-states have crossed the threshold of spending 2 of GDP on defense, which is what NATO encourages, but there are signs that other NATO members are on their way to reaching that benchmark. The only problem is Drumpf has nothing to do with this change. As Matthew Fay, a defense policy analyst with the Niskanen Center, told Politifact in August: “It is comical to suggest NATO would change its counterterrorism policy in response to anything Donald Drumpf has said about it over the course of his campaign.”

Analysis: Europe increasing its own military spending proves that they don’t dislike the idea of spending money on the military, and would be hypocrites to criticize us while they themselves are doing the same.
**Answer:** We do not need allies in Europe

**Warrant:** Our European allies help little to respond to international conflicts, making maintaining relations with them unnecessary


These figures highlight that these nations were unable to sustain large numbers of casualties or even sustain deploying and equipping a large number of troops with adequate equipment in a war zone. The latter point became central in the Libyan intervention, where the United States was to lead from behind. NATO essentially ran out of precision-guided munitions on its aircraft, so the Danish, Norwegian, and other small air forces had to do nearly 40 percent of the attacks because they flew American aircraft that could be resupplied with U.S. weaponry and spare parts. This unwillingness to take casualties or to even invest in defense is unlikely to change in the near to medium term for the European nations. They know the United States will not abandon its NATO treaty obligations. Additionally, these countries took their peace dividend after the death of the Cold War to rapidly shrink their armed forces and shift that money to social welfare programs. Further, given their countries’ aging demographics, European governments cannot significantly increase defense spending because of their growing commitments to healthcare and the shrinking demographic of able-bodied men and women who can be sent to the battlefield. Moreover, because Europe is a far closer target for ISIS, it will use what money is available to boost the homeland security efforts of these nations.

**Analysis:** Our alliance with Europe isn’t as necessary as it used to be. Putting aside the fact that Europe would never stop allying with us over increases in our military expenditures, which has been happening for decades, it wouldn’t really matter if they did, because Europe is largely a useless ally for the United States.
CON – Profiteering

Argument: Military spending increases war profiteering and companies benefiting from war. This leads to more conflict and other harmful impacts

Warrant: Companies benefit the most from military spending and only cutting spending solves

St., Samuel Weigley 24/7 Wall. "10 Companies Profiting the Most from War." USA Today. Gannett Satellite Information Network, 10 Mar. 2013. Web. 08 Dec. 2016.<http://www.usatoday.com/story/money/business/2013/03/10/10-companies-profiting-most-from-war/1970997/>. The business of war is profitable. In 2011, the 100 largest contractors sold $410 billion in arms and military services. Just 10 of those companies sold over $208 billion. Based on a list of the top 100 arms-producing and military services companies in 2011 compiled by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), 24/7 Wall St. reviewed the 10 companies with the most military sales worldwide. These companies have benefited tremendously from the growth in military spending in the U.S., which by far has the largest military budget in the world. In 2000, the U.S. defense budget was approximately $312 billion. By 2011, the figure had grown to $712 billion. Arm sales grew alongside general defense spending growth. SIPRI noted that between 2002 and 2011, arms sales among the top 100 companies grew by 51%. However, the trend has recently reversed. In 2011, the top 100 arms dealers sold 5% less compared to 2010. Susan Jackson, a SIPRI defense expert, said in an email to 24/7 Wall St. that austerity measures in Western Europe and the U.S. have delayed or slowed the procurement of different weapons systems. Austerity concerns have exacerbated matters. Federal budget cuts that took effect in March mean military spending could contract by more than $500 billion over the coming decade unless policymakers negotiate a pullback on the mandated cuts.
**Warrant:** War profiteering also increases the likelihood of conflict


Eisenhower warned that "an immense military establishment and a large arms industry" had emerged as a hidden force in US politics and that Americans "must not fail to comprehend its grave implications". The speech may have been Eisenhower's most courageous and prophetic moment. **Fifty years and some later,** Americans find themselves in what seems like perpetual war. No sooner do we draw down on operations in Iraq than leaders demand an intervention in Libya or Syria or Iran. While perpetual war constitutes perpetual losses for families, and ever expanding budgets, it also represents perpetual profits for a new and larger complex of business and government interests.  
This new coalition of companies, agencies, and lobbyists dwarfs the system known by Eisenhower when he warned Americans to "guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence… by the military-industrial complex". Ironically, it has had some of its best days under President Barack Obama who has radically expanded drone attacks and claimed that he alone determines what a war is for the purposes of consulting Congress.
**Warrant:** Income inequality results in economics harms for everyone


Specifically, we find that, on average, a 1 percentage point increase in the Gini coefficient reduces GDP per capita by around 1.1% over a five-year period; the long-run (cumulative) effect is larger and amounts to about -4.5%. While the average effect of income inequality on GDP per capita is negative and significantly different from zero, it varies with countries' initial income level. In an econometric model that includes an interaction term between initial GDP per capita and income inequality, the coefficient on the interaction term is negative and significantly different from zero at the 1% level. Quantitatively, the size of the coefficient on the interaction term implies that differences in initial income induce a substantial effect on the impact that changes in income inequality have on GDP per capita. For example, at the 25th percentile of initial income the predicted effect of a 1 percentage point increase in the Gini coefficient on GDP per capita is 2.3% (with a corresponding standard error of 0.6%); at the 75th percentile of initial income the effect is -5.3% (the corresponding standard error is 0.8%).

**Warrant:** Income inequality leads to death


In 2009, the *British Medical Journal (BMJ)* published a study that revealed what seems to be a shocking truth: those who live in societies with a higher level of income
inequality are at a greater risk for premature death. Here in the United States, our high level of income inequality corresponds with 883,914 unnecessary deaths each year. More specifically, the report concluded that if we had an income distribution more like that of the Netherlands, Germany, France, Switzerland — or eleven other wealthy countries — every year, about one in three deaths in the US could be avoided. **Put that into perspective.** According to the Centers for Disease Control (CDC), tobacco, including second-hand smoke, causes approximately 480,000 deaths every year, and in 2010, traffic accidents killed 33,687 people and 31,672 others died of gunshot wounds.

**Analysis:** This argument provides an extremely clear link into several important impacts. The link to war profiteering is proven and true and we see that military spending directly allows these companies to make massive amounts of profit. Using this profit, the companies lobby and encourage war leading to even more funding and more conflict. In addition, they increase income inequality resulting in economic harms and a huge amount of deaths each and every year. These two links into lives allow you to outweigh many arguments that may have weaker links into life or do not link in at all. This makes the argument strong offense for the Neg
A2 – Profiteering

**Argument:** The military and military spending is actually very beneficial to our economy and does not increase inequality

**Warrant:** Military salaries benefit the economies in the states they are located in

“The DoD contributes billions of dollars each year to state economies through the operation of military installations. This spending helps sustain local communities by creating employment opportunities across a wide range of sectors, both directly and indirectly. Active duty and civilian employees spend their military wages on goods and services produced locally, while pensions and other benefits provide retirees and dependents a reliable source of income. States and communities also benefit from defense contracts with private companies for equipment, supplies, construction and various services such as health care and information technology. At least 26 states have recently completed or are in the process of completing military economic impact studies. Impacts generally include salaries and benefits paid to military personnel and retirees, defense contracts, local business activity supported by military operations, tax revenues and other military spending. In 2015, for example, military installations in North Carolina supported 578,000 jobs, $34 billion in personal income and $66 billion in gross state product. This amounts to roughly 10 percent of the state’s overall economy. In Kentucky the military spent about $12 billion from 2014 to 2015, which was a reduction of $3.5 billion since the last report in 2012. With around 38,700 active duty and civilian employees, the military is the largest employer in Kentucky by more than 21,000 jobs. They also support the highest payroll with a total of $3.85 billion, $80 million higher than the second largest industry in Kentucky.”

Even states with relatively small military footprints have reported significant economic impacts. A study in Massachusetts, for example, found that by investing $9.1 billion in FY 2011, military installations contributed another $4.6 billion in spending and added more than 30,600 jobs to the state economy.

**Analysis:** Contrary to what many believe, the military money does not simply go to the wealthy. Military spending contributes greatly to the economy and tends to produce a huge number of jobs across the nations and in local communities. This would outweigh the inequality impact because even if inequality grows at the very least people now have a job, something that is much easier for judges to conceptualize and tends to have much larger impacts on people’s lives.
**CON – The Military Industrial Complex Perpetuates Conflict**

**Argument:** Private military contractors who work with the U.S government have a perverse incentive to perpetuate conflict.

**Warrant:** Private military contractors profit when the U.S goes to war.


In January 1961, US **President Dwight D Eisenhower used his farewell address to warn the nation of what he viewed as one of its greatest threats: the military-industrial complex composed of military contractors and lobbyists perpetuating war.**

Eisenhower warned that "an immense military establishment and a large arms industry" had emerged as a hidden force in US politics and that Americans "must not fail to comprehend its grave implications". The speech may have been Eisenhower's most courageous and prophetic moment. Fifty years and some later, Americans find themselves in what seems like perpetual war. No sooner do we draw down on operations in Iraq than leaders demand an intervention in Libya or Syria or Iran. **While perpetual war constitutes perpetual losses for families, and ever expanding budgets, it also represents perpetual profits for a new and larger complex of business and government interests.**
Warrant: Private military contractors have a financial incentive to generate conflict.


There are thousands of lobbyists in Washington to guarantee the ever-expanding budgets for war and homeland security. One such example is former DHS Secretary Michael Chertoff who pushed the purchase of the heavily criticised (and little tested) full-body scanners used in airports. When Chertoff was giving dozens of interviews to convince the public that the machines were needed to hold back the terror threat, many people were unaware that the manufacturer of the machine is a client of the Chertoff Group, his highly profitable security consulting agency. (Those hugely expensive machines were later scrapped after Rapiscan, the manufacturer, received the windfall.)

Lobbyists maintain pressure on politicians by framing every budget in "tough on terror" versus "soft on terror" terms. They have the perfect products to pitch - products that are designed to destroy themselves and be replaced in an ever-lasting war on terror.

Analysis: The military industrial complex succeeds when there is a high demand for defense technology. Given that the demand for defense technology is at its peak when there is an ongoing conflict abroad, the military industrial complex has an incentive to either keep those conflicts going or even to start new ones.
**Argument:** The military industrial complex undermines U.S interests domestically and abroad by using their power and influence to market extravagant, unnecessary defense technology.

**Warrant:** The U.S is increasing its military expenditures even though they’re unneeded.


The spending spree extends well beyond intelligence. **The Pentagon’s budget has more than doubled in the past decade, to some $700 billion per year.** All told, **the ostensible imperatives of national security thereby consume roughly half of all federal discretionary dollars.** Even more astonishing, annual U.S. military outlays now approximate those of all other nations, friends as well as foes, combined.

**In Ike’s day, competition with the Soviet Union provided the rationale for such outsized expenditures.** Today, with no remotely comparable competitor at hand, **devotees of military metaphysics conjure a variety of arguments to justify the Pentagon’s budgetary demands.** One such, usually made with an eye toward China, is that relentlessly outspending any and all would-be challengers to U.S. preeminence will dissuade them from even mounting an attempt. A second transforms modest threats into existential ones, with the mere existence of a Mahmoud Ahmadinejad or Osama bin Laden mandating extraordinary exertions until the United States eliminates every last such miscreant—a day that will never come.
Warrant: Those within the military industrial complex exaggerate threats in order to secure more funding.


The threat inflation that led to the bomber and missile “gaps” of the 1950s remains a cherished Washington tradition. In memos written after September 11, then–Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld urged his staff to “keep elevating the threat” and demanded “bumper sticker statements” to gin up public enthusiasm for the global war on terror. The key, he wrote, was to “make the American people realize they are surrounded in the world by violent extremists.” What worked during the Cold War still works today: to get Americans on board with your military policy, scare the hell out of them.
Warrant: Lobbyists and advocates working for the military industrial complex have disproportionate influence and connections, allowing them to market their products.


In the meantime, the revolving door connecting the world of soldiering to the world of arms purveyors continues to turn. For those at the top, the American military profession is that rare calling where retirement need not imply a reduced income. On the contrary: senior serving officers shed their uniforms not merely to take up golf or go fishing but with the reasonable expectation of raking in big money. In a recent e-mail, a serving officer who is a former student of mine reported that on a visit to the annual meeting of the Association of the United States Army—in his words, “the Sodom and Gomorrah of the Military Industrial Complex”—he was “accosted by two dozen former bosses, now in suits with fancy ties and business cards, hawking the latest defense technologies.”

Analysis: Not only do military contractors have a perverse incentive to worsen conflicts, but they also have the power and money to get their way, even if it’s bad for the American people. Lobbyists and advocates have secured billions if not trillions of dollars in defense contracts that realistically were extraneous.

The key to this argument is explaining the relevance of the military industrial context in the context of increasing spending. First, one could argue that increased spending would only empower the military industrial complex, and enable them to double down on their efforts. Second, one could also argue that increased spending would inevitably be ineffective because the military industrial complex rewards wasteful spending or unnecessary because they encourage reactionary responses even when there is little threat of conflict.
A2 – The Military Industrial Complex Perpetuates Conflict

**Answer:** A robust military industrial complex is key to military success.

**Warrant:** The U.S cannot go to war without the assistance of private military contractors.


It is a fact that currently **private contractors are the equivalent of an American Express card. The U.S. military’s literally can’t go to war without them.**

However, this does not mean that all the reasons given for the use of such contractors are credible. Consider the main selling point that all such PMCs use when bidding for contracts. They all claim that using the private sector is more cost-effective than using their public sector counterparts.

At first glance it sounds reasonable. After all, private contracting companies don’t have to maintain standing forces, pay pensions, or provide benefits, to name just a few things that the public sector must do.

**Analysis:** This response functions as a prerequisite – even if it’s true that there are some salient concerns with private military contractors, it’s possible to win the debate round by simply establishing that the military can’t act without them. Due to troop shortages, the United States counts on the work of defense contractors, and likely couldn’t do much of anything internationally without them.
**Answer:** The assumption that private military contractors function as a corrupt unit is flawed.

**Warrant:** The market for private military contractors is fairly diverse and competitive.


Where are the most private military and security personnel working?

There are markets on every continent, and there are employees on every continent. When a private military and security company gets a contract with the U.S. government, oftentimes the work is subcontracted. I’ve seen as many as four layers of subcontractors in a given situation. There’s a company that finds workers to work as subcontractors. The workers themselves often come from Third World countries.

Do other nations use private security companies as much as the United States does?

Other countries do. It’s been an expanding trend. Russia, Israel – there are many countries that have them. China entered the market in recent years. [But] the same companies that work for our government are not working for those governments.

**Analysis:** The key to making this argument on the con is establishing that the military industrial complex is powerful enough to make change. Part of that argument entails demonstrating that the military industrial complex works together as a force to lobby congress. While this is undeniably true, it’s also true that private contractors do not always work together, especially given that there are so many other firms that they need to compete with. At that point, it’s hard for one single private military firm to conduct the kinds of abusive behavior that’s been described.
**Answer:** Competition makes military industrial contractors more efficient.

**Warrant:** Companies provide an on-call service, which fills in the gaps where the military realistically can’t.


It depends on who you ask. The companies promote themselves as on-call businesses, which effectively fill the gap between what the government can do and what is needed. But, that said, the issue of efficiency versus effectiveness is huge within the military. Just because these companies are on call and hired temporarily for a particular job doesn’t mean necessarily that’s always the smartest thing to do. If you talk to anyone in the military, they’ll say there’s a major difference between effectiveness of defense strategy and efficiency. Sometimes the most effective strategy in terms of winning a war or ending a conflict won’t necessarily be the most efficient. And that’s where the flaw is.

**Analysis:** Part of the issue with military readiness is that the U.S is fairly far from many of the sites of global conflict, and our troops aren’t always ready to be deployed. Those in the military industrial complex, however, profit by always being ready for deployment. Given that there is a free-market for private military contractors, the U.S can simply choose whichever one is the most ready or potentially the most effective for a given mission. This ability to pick and choose would make the U.S’ military campaigns far more effective.
CON – Foreign military aid

**Argument:** With a larger military budget, the US would likely spend a large portion of that on foreign military aid. This is extremely harmful to the world and will only incite more conflict

**Warrant:** The US uses a huge amount of military aid in the status quo and we can’t even monitor it properly


From the war on the Islamic State group to the conflict in Afghanistan, arming and training foreign military forces is a centerpiece of the Obama administration's foreign policy. But these high profile cases are just the tip of the iceberg. Data compiled by the Security Assistance Monitor shows that the United States is proposing to provide arms and training to 137 countries in fiscal year 2017. Much of this aid is provided through new programs created by the Pentagon since 2001. Reporting on military aid is fragmented, so it is difficult for Congress, the media or the public to get a full picture of the U.S. government's far flung activities in this critical area. As a December 2015 report by the Congressional Research Service has noted, there has been little effort to evaluate the effectiveness of programs designed to "build partner capacity" – another term for military and related assistance. The report further noted that "identifying how much money DOD actually spends on [these] activities is nearly impossible at present." While a full accounting has not been done, it's clear that in recent years the failures of large-scale U.S. military assistance programs have outpaced the successes. The collapse of the Syria "train and equip" program and the loss of thousands of U.S.-supplied military items to the Islamic State group by Iraqi security forces are just two of the most prominent examples. The loss of $500 million in U.S. military equipment in Yemen, much of which may have ended up with the Houthi rebels or al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula, is another case in...
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point. Meanwhile, U.S.-supplied weapons have been used by Saudi Arabia to help put down the democracy movement in Bahrain and to launch a catastrophic military campaign in Yemen that has killed thousands of civilians.

Warrant: States receiving more military aid tend to be less cooperative with US interests


What can states expect to receive in return for the military aid they provide to other states? Can military aid buy recipient state compliance with donor objectives? In this study, we systematically investigate the effects of US military assistance on recipient state behavior toward the United States. We build on existing literature by creating three explicit theoretical models, employing a new measure of cooperation generated from events data, and controlling for preference similarity, so that our results capture the influence military aid has on recipient state behavior independent of any dyadic predisposition toward cooperation or conflict. We test seven hypotheses using a combination of simultaneous equation, cross-sectional time series, and Heckman selection models. We find that, with limited exceptions, increasing levels of US military aid significantly reduce cooperative foreign policy behavior with the United States. US reaction to recipient state behavior is also counterintuitive; instead of using a carrot-and-stick approach to military aid allocations, our results show that recipient state cooperation is likely to lead to subsequent reductions in US military assistance. Table 3 presents results from using equation 1 to simulate the substantive

impact of the statistically significant independent variables on recipient state cooperation. States that do not receive any US military aid display an average level of cooperation with the United States of +1.5 when all other variables are held constant at their means. The model predicts that states that obtain the average amount of US military aid ($20 million) will be less cooperative—scoring an average of 11 on the cooperation-conflict scale. An increase in US military aid to one standard deviation above the mean leads to an additional six-point reduction in the monthly cooperation score of the recipient state. In contrast, an increase in the number of US troops from its mean to one standard deviation above the mean raises recipient state cooperation almost one point. Democratic recipients are on average four points more cooperative than nondemocratic recipients.

**Analysis:** Any increase in military spending would likely lead to an increase in aid. This is because the US uses aid as a quick response to instability and sends it to many countries across the globe. An increase in aid would only be harmful however as it tends to lead only to more conflict and violence. This functions as a strong impact for the Neg as they can prove that a likely form of US spending would only lead to more problems.
A2 – Foreign military aid

Argument- Foreign aid would be outweighed by other beneficial forms of military spending

Warrant- Military aid is a tiny portion of the US budget compared to overall military spending


So the range goes from $31.3 billion to $39.9 billion. On a total federal budget of just under $3.5 trillion, that's 0.9 percent to less than 1.2 percent. In addition, we found multiple reports that put the figure in the ballpark of what Rubio mentioned.

The Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget wrote in 2015 that "foreign aid represents a total of 0.7 percent of the budget, or 1 percent if military aid is included. That means fully eliminating foreign aid would save only $35 billion or $40 billion per year – a very small fraction of projected annual deficits."

Analysis- Military aid is a tiny portion of the entire US budget. This means two things. First, it is unlikely that military aid would even be targeted in a budget increase. The Neg must prove that military aid is a likely sector of growth or they cannot even access the argument. Secondly, it means that budget increases in other sectors will likely prove more important and have a larger impact on the world as it is composed of more money which is what drives conflict. These responses allow you to easily outweigh the argument.
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Argument: Military aid does not even count as military spending

Warrant: The State Department’s office of Foreign Operations controls military aid, not the military


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCO TOTALS BY ACCOUNT</th>
<th>FY 2017 Request</th>
<th>Budget Amendment</th>
<th>Revised FY 2017 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diplomatic Engagement</td>
<td>14,894,189</td>
<td>5,775,000</td>
<td>20,669,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplomatic &amp; Consular Programs (D&amp;CP)</td>
<td>5,260,189</td>
<td>1,772,710</td>
<td>7,032,899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Office of the Inspector General (OIG)</td>
<td>2,132,249</td>
<td>746,210</td>
<td>2,878,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embassy Security, Construction, &amp; Maintenance (ESCM)</td>
<td>54,900</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>57,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities (CIPA)</td>
<td>1,238,800</td>
<td>1,024,000</td>
<td>2,262,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions for International Organizations (CIO)</td>
<td>1,588,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,588,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Response Mechanism</td>
<td>96,240</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>96,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Assistance</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Support Fund (ESF)</td>
<td>9,634,800</td>
<td>4,002,290</td>
<td>13,637,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Narcotics Control &amp; Law Enforcement (INCLE)</td>
<td>3,672,153</td>
<td>2,460,400</td>
<td>6,132,553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration and Refugee Assistance (MRA)</td>
<td>1,876,003</td>
<td>260,400</td>
<td>2,136,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Refugee &amp; Migration Assistance (ERMA)</td>
<td>1,588,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,588,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonproliferation, Antiterrorism, Demining &amp; Related (NADR)</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Military Financing (FMF)</td>
<td>214,254</td>
<td>128,000</td>
<td>342,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peacekeeping Operations (PKO)</td>
<td>1,012,150</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,012,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Disaster Assistance (IDA)</td>
<td>349,100</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>439,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition Initiatives (TI)</td>
<td>1,832,000</td>
<td>953,200</td>
<td>2,785,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID Operating Expenses (OE)</td>
<td>62,600</td>
<td>73,490</td>
<td>136,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID Office of the Inspector General</td>
<td>98,460</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>113,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID Capital Investment Fund (USAID CIF)</td>
<td>133,840</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>133,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex Crisis Fund (CCF)</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis: The military budget does not even include foreign military aid. As shown in the chart above Foreign Military Financing along with several other military programs are controlled through the State Department. This is separate from traditional military spending which occurs through the Department of Defense. The topic states that the US will increase military spending implying that it goes towards the US military. They cannot simply call anything involving the military topical. This response means that the opponents argument is not at all topical and should not be considered.