## AT: Fund DoD CP

### 2AC – PDCP – Normal Means

#### Historically, Congress has increased funding for every new program from the DoD

American Institute of Physics, 6-15-2022, "DOD Budget: FY22 Outcomes and FY23 Request," No Publication, https://www.aip.org/fyi/2022/dod-budget-fy22-outcomes-and-fy23-request//jc

Following on a string of budget increases, funding across the Department of Defense’s Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation (RDT&E) accounts increased 11% in fiscal year 2022 to a new record of $123 billion. That is nearly $50 billion above where those accounts stood just five years earlier. The Biden administration is seeking a 7% increase in fiscal year 2023, which would bring RDT&E spending to $132 billion. Within RDT&E funding, the budget increased 12% to $18.9 billion for DOD’s early-stage science and technology portfolio, comprising Basic Research, Applied Research, and Advanced Technology Development accounts. The appropriation rebuffed the 13% cut to the portfolio the administration proposed, and it significantly exceeded the amounts proposed by House and Senate appropriators. That outcome stemmed from negotiations between Democrats and Republicans that resulted in the legislation containing a much higher allocation for overall defense spending than Democrats' initial drafts. For fiscal year 2023, the administration is seeking $16.5 billion across these three accounts, representing a 13% cut. However, Republicans are again insisting on higher defense spending than the administration proposes, which could well result in another spending increase.

#### Prefer most recent examples of APFIT

U.S. Department of Defense, 7-19-2022, "DoD Announces First Set of Projects to Receive Funding From the Pilot Program to Accelerat," https://www.defense.gov/News/Releases/Release/Article/3098211/dod-announces-first-set-of-projects-to-receive-funding-from-the-pilot-program-t///jc

The Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering (OUSD(R&E)) announced the first set of projects to receive funding via the pilot program to Accelerate the Procurement and Fielding of Innovative Technologies (APFIT). The purpose of the APFIT pilot program is to expeditiously transition technologies – with priority given to those developed by small businesses and/or nontraditional defense contractors – from pilot programs, prototype projects, and research projects into production. The benefits of this pilot will be to deliver war-winning capability earlier than scheduled while contributing to the viability of small business and nontraditional defense contractor vendors. APFIT is an additional tool the DoD can use to propel innovative capabilities across the “Valley of Death” and into the hands of the warfighter. “APFIT holds great promise to transform the way the Department procures next generations solutions. This pilot program is well positioned to be a key asset as we continue to work to bridge the valley of death,” stated Heidi Shyu, Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering. “The ten companies being funded will fill critical capability gaps. Without APFIT, their innovative technologies could take much longer to reach the hands of our warfighters.” The National Defense Authorization Act of FY22 directed the Secretary of Defense to establish APFIT as a competitive, merit-based program for innovative and mature technologies and products that can meet warfighter demands but currently lack the necessary funding to transition the capability into the production delivery phase. The U.S. Congress funded $100 million in FY22. Ten DoD program offices will each receive $10 million in APFIT funding. These program offices will in turn use that funding to procure innovative technologies from small businesses or nontraditional defense contractor vendors, as listed below. To be eligible for APFIT funding, these vendors must have received less than $500 million in cumulative revenue from DoD.

### 2AC – Solvency – Doesn’t Solve

#### The CP will just cause more wasteful spending

Kyle Rempfer, 3-12-2019, "Use-it or lose-it: DoD dropped $4.6 million on crab and lobster, and $9,000 on a chair in last-minute spending spree," Military Times, https://www.militarytimes.com/news/your-military/2019/03/12/use-it-or-lose-it-dod-dropped-46-million-on-crab-and-lobster-and-9000-on-a-chair-in-last-minute-spending-spree///jc

The federal government found a way to spend $97 billion in a single month last year, of which more than $61 billion can be attributed to the Pentagon. It’s not a new phenomenon. In the last month of every fiscal year, federal agencies work to spend all that’s left in their annual budgets. If they don’t, the agencies worry they’ll be appropriated a smaller share by Congress next year, hence the “use-it or lose-it” spending sprees. Rather than spend money on frivolous items, federal agencies like the Defense Department should admit their offices can be run on less, according to Adam Andrzejewski, founder and CEO of OpenTheBooks. OpenTheBooks is a nonprofit aimed at bringing transparency and efficiency to the federal budget. They released a report this March detailing fiscal 2018 use-it-or-lose-it spending habits. The military spent the most, by far, which isn’t surprising, Andrzejewski told Military Times. “Let me clear: Congress is the problem here, not DoD or other agencies,” he said. “Historically, both parties tend to look the other way at Pentagon waste. This is a shame because the troops and taxpayers suffer. Lower priority items get funded while mission critical needs are short-changed.” Andrzejewski calls the spending spree “Christmas in September” for the federal government. And last fiscal year was the worst his group has tracked so far. One of the stand-out purchases by the Pentagon included a $9,341 Wexford leather club chair purchased from the Interior Resource Group, according to the report. The DoD also bought $32 million worth of batteries, $4.3 million worth of books and pamphlets, $220 million worth of furniture, $7.6 million worth of workout equipment and $786.3 million on “guns, ammunition and bombs." The Pentagon spent the most on five of those products: $124.3 million on medium caliber ammunition, $92.3 million for modification purposes, $75 million on the Paveway family of laser-guided bombs, nearly $54 million on M795 TNT, and $2.8 million on 40mm ammunition systems. Federal agencies also like to splurge on luxury food items before the end of the fiscal year, according to the report. The Pentagon spent $2.3 million on crab, including snow crab, Alaskan king crab, and crab legs and claws, as well as another $2.3 million on lobster tail. Federal agencies also spent $293,245 on steak, to include rib eye, top sirloin and flank steak**.** Marines eat their meals during a birthday lunch at the Anderson Chow Hall, Marine Corps Base Hawaii, Nov. 11, 2018. Anderson Chow Hall held a birthday lunch celebrating the 243rd Corps Birthday, serving steak, lobster, crab legs and cake. (Sgt. Jesus Sepulveda Torres/Marines) Andrzejewski said that in some cases, like the surf-and-turf, the spending can actually trickle down to the troops. But that doesn’t mean the dollars couldn’t be better allocated on more necessary items at the beginning of the year if the funds are actually needed. “Our theory is that, in many cases, the people in charge of the accounts simply follow the path of least resistance,” he said. “When faced with the structural use-it or lose-it deadline they spend as much as they can on whatever is easiest to spend money on. Again, Congress created this perverse incentive structure.” The DoD also spent big on public relations and marketing in September, inking $153.3 million in contracts. The military also dropped $86.5 million on transportation contracts, of which more than $53.5 million went to passenger vehicles from Navistar Defense, the maker of Mine-Resistant Ambush Protected vehicles. Some of the big ticket spending items are attributed to the usual major defense contractors. The Pentagon spent $8.1 billion on contracts with Lockheed Martin and $5.1 billion with Boeing in September, for instance.

### 2AC – Solvency – AT: Sayler 22

#### Card flows AFF – doesn’t actually say funding solves case especially after we read a bunch of cards that prove the amount of funding is more than enough in the squo

Sayler 22 (Kelley M. Sayler, Analyst in Advanced Technology and Global Security, 4-6-2022, “Emerging Military Technologies: Background and Issues for Congress”, Congressional Research Service, accessed 6-22-2022, <https://sgp.fas.org/crs/natsec/R46458.pdf> )//kp

**Funding** Considerations

A number of **emerging** military **technologies**, including hypersonic weapons and directed energy weapons, have experienced fluctuations in funding over the years. According to a U.S. government interagency task force on the defense industrial base, such “**fluctuations challenge** the viability of **suppliers** within the industrial base by **diminishing** their ability to hire and retain a **skilled workforce**, [achieve] **production efficiencies**, and in some cases, [stay] in business.” 174 Other analysts have noted that such fluctuations are often due to unavoidable tradeoffs between technology investment priorities or to questions about a given technology’s feasibility or maturity.175

Some analysts have suggested that, given the potential for technological surprise, **funding** for overall research and development **is inadequate**. Summarizing such views, technology expert Martijn Rasser notes that reducing overall research and development in order to enable “big bets” or heavy investments in a particular technology or technologies, can be a risky approach because “we just don’t know where the next breakthroughs will come from.” 176

### 2AC – Turn – Too Much Funding Bad

#### Increased DoD funding trades off from other programs

Farhad Manjoo, 01-13-2022, “We Must Stop Showering the Military With Money”, New York Times, https://www.nytimes.com/2022/01/13/opinion/military-budget-build-back-better.html//jc

Of course, I’m only kidding. I don’t actually wonder about Manchin’s stance on showering the Department of Defense with more money than it asks for, even more than it seems to know what to do with. Right around the time he was bayoneting Build Back Better, Manchin joined 87 other senators — Democrats and Republicans — in rubber-stamping another gargantuan budget for the Pentagon. They allocated $768 billion for the military in 2022, roughly $24 billion more than the White House requested from Congress. Given all the challenges we face at home, does it make any sense to keep spending so many hundreds of billions on the Pentagon? And even just in terms of fighting wars, can anyone be satisfied with the way the military is managing its funds? The Pentagon has never passed an audit and says it may not be able to until 2028. In 2020 the U.S. military’s budget accounted for almost 40 percent of the world’s military expenditures. This level of spending has long been excessive, but after a pandemic that has claimed the lives of more Americans than any war we fought, continuing to throw money at the military is an act of willful disregard for the most urgent threats we face. According to a projection by the Congressional Budget Office, Congress is projected to spend about $8.5 trillion for the military over the next decade — about half a trillion more than is budgeted for all nonmilitary discretionary programs combined (a category that includes federal spending on education, public health, scientific research, infrastructure, national parks and forests, environmental protection, law enforcement, courts, tax collection, foreign aid, homeland security and health care for veterans). You don’t have to be a pacifist to wonder if this imbalance between military and nonmilitary spending makes sense. When we face so many other major challenges — from climate disasters to political instability and insurrection — shouldn’t we ask whether it remains wise to keep handing the military what is effectively a blank check? Are such lavish resources even good for national defense, or might the Pentagon’s near-bottomless access to funds have encouraged a culture of waste and indulgence that made it easier to blunder into Iraq and contributed to its failures in Afghanistan? This gets to what’s most frustrating about the Pentagon’s enormous budget: the halo of protection it enjoys in our political culture. Despite the Pentagon’s numerous missteps, our representatives too rarely ask how much money for the military may be way too much money for the military. We have long national debates about whether it makes sense to spend on things like parental leave or college tuition, but lawmakers seldom expect such rigor from the Defense Department. For example, why should we keep building aircraft carriers — each of which costs about $1.5 billion a year to operate — when we’ve already got most of the world’s fleet of active aircraft carriers? (We’ve got 11; no other nation has more than two, though China may be launching a third soon.) There is ample evidence that Congress’s reluctance to ask basic questions of the Pentagon has harmed, rather than helped, the military’s effectiveness. Consider the boondoggle that is the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter program — the plan the Pentagon conceived in the 1990s to build a new plane, which is expected to cost taxpayers more than $1 trillion over its 60-year life span. A recent audit from the Government Accountability Office found that even the Pentagon’s extended timeline for when the plane might finally go into full production is “not achievable,” and there were more than 850 “open deficiencies” in the project as of November 2020. I wonder if Manchin could explain to his constituents how tolerating such a level of mismanagement is good for our security. I also wonder if Manchin could explain the staggering size and top-heaviness of the Pentagon’s staffing — why the ratio of enlisted troops to officers is declining across the U.S. forces, cluttering the chain of command with layers of bureaucracy. A 2015 internal study found that the Pentagon employed (or hired contractors to employ) nearly as many deskbound, back-office people as it had active-duty troops. The report found that it could save $125 billion a year by, among other measures, reducing overstaffing through retirements and attrition. The Pentagon buried that report, according to The Washington Post. Not only do lawmakers give the Pentagon a free pass on its budget; sometimes they even force the agency to keep the little fat it’s trying to trim. The Air Force says that it’s ready to retire its fleet of A-10 Warthogs, fighter airplanes that date back to the 1970s. Congress forbade any such reduction in 2022. Starting in 2017, Congress even required each military service to submit an annual wish list of “unfunded priorities” — that is, goodies that the services might want but that the White House had not requested in its budget. It has since become routine for Congress to not only give the Pentagon much of what it asks for but also ladle on extras. The reasons such spending persists aren’t a big mystery. The military-industrial complex is every bit as politically powerful as Dwight Eisenhower warned it would be. (A recent Wall Street Journal headline captured the situation well: “Who Won in Afghanistan? Private Contractors.”) In another trick, the military spreads its contracts to a large number of congressional districts, giving every lawmaker a reason to celebrate excessive military spending. (Manchin put out a statement taking credit for all the benefits the new defense appropriation will bring to West Virginia.) And finally, there is plain patriotic posturing: Because every dollar to the Pentagon can be defended as protecting the troops and the nation’s security, no politician will ever get in trouble for giving too much money to the military. Mandy Smithberger, who studies Pentagon excess at the Project on Government Oversight, a nonpartisan independent group, told me that while she has hopes that younger generations will begin to question the military’s excessive spending, the situation is unlikely to change anytime soon. “It’s going to take members of Congress to really step up,” she said. That seems about as likely as pigs flying — or, more aptly, F-35s.

### 2AC – UQ – Space Specific

#### Squo solves

Thomas Novelly, 10-16-2021, "Space Force Looking for Surge in Funding for 2023 to Focus on Missile Defense Warning Systems," Military, https://www.military.com/daily-news/2022/03/29/space-force-looking-surge-funding-2023-focus-missile-warning.html//jc

The Space Force, America’s newest and smallest service branch, is seeking a huge increase in funding as part of the White House’s 2023 defense budget, with a goal of developing and growing the nation’s missile warning systems as tensions rise with China and Russia. In 2023 budget documents released Monday, Space Force – which falls under the department of the Air Force – requested $24.5 billion, which marked a nearly 40% increase from the previous year. The majority of funds are projected to be used on research and development as well as establishing more missile warning systems in space. Advertisement “The reason there is a Space Force, the reason the Obama administration changed its strategy for space was because of the threat,” Air Force Secretary Frank Kendall told reporters during a media roundtable Friday. “The widespread investment that both China and Russia have in anti-space, counter-space capabilities including things that threaten us in all different orbital regimes.” Read Next: New 'Basic Needs' Allowance on Top of Increases for Housing and Food in Air Force's 2023 Budget The majority of Space Force’s 2023 budget, 65%, would be focused on research, development, testing and evaluation, according to the budget documents. It’s a 33% increase from last year’s ask. Advertisement Since being created in 2019, Space Force's mission -- to protect and defend the massive U.S. satellite fleet -- is crucial in everything from the country's reliance on GPS to detecting abnormalities in the Earth's orbit, and the 2023 budget shows some of the largest investments in developing and growing their capabilities. Todd Harrison, director of the Aerospace Security Project at the nonprofit Center for Strategic and International Studies, said Monday’s budget numbers show that the military is taking space capabilities seriously with the Department of the Air Force focusing its attention not just on Russia but primarily on China. This past November, the Russian Federation destroyed one of its own Soviet-era satellites with a missile, sending thousands of scraps of shrapnel hurtling through space, a cloud of debris that threatened other orbiting satellites, including those belonging to the U.S. But even with that notable incident, China remains more of a threat, Harrison added. “China has the full suite of anti-satellite weapons, everything from jammers that could do electronic attacks to lasers that could blind the sensors on satellites, and missiles that could shoot down satellites and create debris,” Harrison said. Nearly $3 billion would be spent on missile warning development programs, which Kendall underscored as the biggest priority and goal for the new service. “There's no more important services than missile warning, and nuclear command control, particularly from space,” Kendall said. “So we're trying to move forward aggressively.” Many of the funding increases come from reallocated money and resources as the Space Development Agency moves from the Secretary of Defense’s Office to being a part of Space Force, and very little of the funds are connected to personnel increases, according to the budget documents. The 2023 budget transfers $1 billion to run personnel expenses separate from the Air Force, and would build the active-duty strength of the Space Force to 8,600 – adding 200 new Guardians to the total force, mostly through transfers from other service branches. The 2023 budget also requests funding to provide a 4.6% pay raise, a 4.2% basic housing allowance increase as well as a 3.6% basic allowance for subsistence, which can be used to offset the price of groceries during inflation. It also allows for a 4.6% pay increase for civilian contractors in the Space Force. There were no construction estimates in the 2023 budget request for Space Force, but the Air Force budget did ask for $68 milion to build a dormitory at Clear Space Force Station in Denali, Alaska.

#### SDA and Space Force got a pay raise

Sandra Erwin, 3-13-2022, "Congress gives DoD more money for space, with caveats," SpaceNews, https://spacenews.com/congress-gives-dod-more-money-for-space-with-caveats///jc

The 2022 spending bill added nearly $1.3 billion for U.S. Space Force and Space Development Agency programs above what the Biden administration requested WASHINGTON — The defense spending bill for fiscal year 2022 that Congress passed last week gives the Pentagon $743.4 billion. Military space programs got a big boost. Appropriators added nearly $1.3 billion for U.S. Space Force and Space Development Agency projects above what the Biden administration requested. President Biden is expected to sign the $1.5 trillion federal spending bill before current funding expires on March 15. The government has been operating under continuing resolutions since the 2022 fiscal year started Oct. 1. The $1.3 billion Congress added for military space funds technology development projects run by the Space Force, pays for an extra Global Positioning System satellite, increases spending on small launch services and Space Development Agency (SDA) missile-detecting satellites. One of the largest items appropriators inserted into the budget is a $550 million demonstration of missile-tracking satellites to be developed by SDA for the U.S. Indo-Pacific military command. “The threats are driving space spending,” said Peter Garretson, a space and defense consultant and senior fellow at the American Foreign Policy Council. China’s recent displays of advanced space technology have not gone unnoticed, and there are growing worries about Russian aggression, he said. SDA is building a large mesh network of satellites in low Earth orbit to detect and track enemy missiles, and to move data around the globe. Increasing the agency’s budget is ”absolutely the right move at this point in time,” said Garretson. “I’m hoping that SDA with their multiple layers of satellites will really get the DoD back in the game of rapid innovation and technology development.”

### 2AC – UQ – Sufficient Funding [DoD]

#### DoD has sufficient funding

#### [a] DoD currently has left 54% of their budget untouched [do the math from the graph]

Congressional Justification of Budget, xx-xx-2022, "Department of Defense," Congressional Justification of Budget, https://www.usaspending.gov/agency/department-of-defense?fy=2022//jc
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#### [b] They have 2 times the amount of money available for every single program and obligation – they have to prove the aff is as expensive as literally everything else we are doing in defense programs.

Congressional Justification of Budget, xx-xx-2022, "Department of Defense," Congressional Justification of Budget, https://www.usaspending.gov/agency/department-of-defense?fy=2022//jcChart
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### 2AC – Net Ben – No Link

#### It only needs to send a few ambassadors to negotiate – an MOU can be done over the phone

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, 12-31-1981, "A Guide to Memorandum of Understanding Negotiation and Development," ASPE, https://aspe.hhs.gov/reports/guide-memorandum-understanding-negotiation-development-0

Stage One. Planning Stage. The planning stage is essential as a basis for subsequent MOU activity and will, if carefully executed, provide a set of decisions and determinations which will facilitate smooth negotiation and implementation of the relationship with the provider. It is also essential as the basis for developing a contract. Step One. Begin with internal brainstorming. Administrators, case managers, or others involved in your agency's efforts should identify: What you want or need another party to provide; What you are willing to negotiate; What you are willing to give up; What you have to offer; The rationale for entering the MOU process. Step Two. Identify the potential providers in the community. In this process, identify provider needs and explore ways in which you can, to some extent, address their needs. Be realistic about what you can expect providers to deliver and what you can deliver. Explore ways to establish appropriate relationships in order to maximize the probability of achieving what you want. Step Three. Define your agency's program objectives for a particular MOU and evaluate whether you can accomplish the objectives without the MOU. The definition of program objectives is a crucial process in the development of an MOU. Clearly defined program objectives can be translated into the terms and conditions of the MOU. In developing the objectives you should: Define the client population to be served; Define the service to be provided, or the understanding you desire; Assess any costs, both direct and indirect, to your agency and the agency with which you are negotiating an MOU; Define the minimally acceptable standards of performance. Program objectives stated in terms of measurable outcomes will facilitate monitoring, evaluation, and MOU renogotiation later on after the MOU has been implemented. Program objectives can be used as a point of reference against which to weigh the advantages and disadvantages of developing an MOU. Their consideration will assist you in determining whether the creation of an MOU will unnecessarily formalize a relationship, create unnecessary bureaucracy or be counterproductive. An MOU should not be attempted if it will disrupt a good relationship. Finally, reference to program objectives will help you set up the criteria for agencies and individuals with which to negotiate an MOU. Step Four. Identify the level of staff to be involved in the negotiation process. Involve those persons in the process as early as possible. Their value in negotiation will be enhanced if they are thoroughly familiar with what you want accomplished. Step Five. Identify agencies which have money for services. Consider some of the ways you can tap into their money and services. For example, you could act as a referral source to the agency or perform preauthorizations for service for them. Step Six. Identify agencies which authorize or pay for services. Consider ways to negotiate some transfer of authority to the case management agency. Step Seven. Identify individuals who are influential among service providers and enlist their support and assistance. Stage Two. Negotiation Stage. The negotiation stage begins through contact with the agency, preferably in-person. It is a good idea to include the staff member who will be responsible for implementing the MOU in the initial visit. Have a clear agenda for the meeting. Describe your agency, what you hope to demonstrate through case management, why the participation of the provider agency is Important, and how clients will be better served by the joint effort. Sell the concept of case management as one that eliminates duplication and enhances delivery of services to clients and their families. After the sales pitch, service providers will probably be able to anticipate what you want from them. You have spent time during the planning stage identifying what you want and what you are prepared to negotiate and now is the time to lay out your expectations. Be realistic about what you expect and be prepared for trade-offs. Develop a timetable with the provider, setting clear deadlines. It is helpful if each party knows what time constraints and limitations exist in the process. Important points to consider are listed below. Identify the internal review process for both your agency and the provider. If the approval of an Advisory Board or Board of Directors is required, learn when these groups meet and plan with that date in mind. Check on whether you or the provider require a legal review and build that into the timeline. Identify any insurance needs, relevant personnel policies, and requirements for physical examinations, T.B. or other tests. Decide who will pay if any tests are required. Identify strategies for enhancing the professional status of both the provider and the case management agency in the community. One strategy is to jointly serve on each other's Boards. Identify whether staff in-service training is required in order to implement the MOU. Agree on how, when, and who will provide that training. If the reaction is negative, you might try a little community pressure. Find an influential friend in another agency, or locate a helpful Board member or use your state agency contacts. A little persuasion or arm-twisting is all part of a tough negotiation process. Any research components in your program should be discussed in the process of negotiating MOU's with provider agencies. Confidentiality assurance should be discussed with the provider during the negotiation stage. It should be understood that only authorized persons may have access to client information and records, that the records must be adequately secured at all times, that release of information is allowable only with the client's permission. These are good practice procedures which protect the rights of clients. Stage Three. Completing the MOU. This final step begins with the preparation of a draft of the MOU instrument which is based on your meeting and negotiations with the provider agency. Generally, since you are initiating the process, you will assume responsibility for preparing the draft. Send the draft to the other party, along with a cover letter in which you identify controversial areas. Try to negotiate those points where there is some flexibility and identify the immutable points. This phase of the negotiation could be handled by phone or in person, however personal contact may carry more impact in terms of developing the relationship. Involving the persons with the authority to negotiate for the agency at this draft stage can minimize the time to complete the MOU. If programmatic objectives have been specified in the planning process, developing a system for monitoring and/or evaluation can be fairly easy. You could identify data needs and develop the appropriate forms and filing and tracking systems to be used jointly by your agency and the agency with which you are developing the MOU. Special Concerns. Timing. The finalization process can take as little as a few days, or as long as a few months. Factors which tend to increase the amount of time to finalize the MOU are: the people involved, the individual personalities and the number of individuals can impact on the length of time needed to finalize the MOU; the number of drafts prepared and reviewed; legal review; board review; staff review; revisions; negotiations; holidays; anything subject to action by a third party; involvement by more than two agencies; turf issues and interagency feuds.