

Atharva and I negate the resolution.

Our sole contention is reversing the revolution.

For years, the affordable housing crisis has been pushing thousands into homelessness and poverty, but a solution is finally in sight. [Wiltz '18 of Pew Research](#) finds that “rent control measures [have been approved] in Berkeley, Chicago, Washington, D.C., and... New York... [and] lawmakers in [numerous other states] have considered [passing] rent control bills.”

For example, [Ashmun '19 of the Sacramento Bee](#) writes that “[California is considering] a \$1.75 billion increase in funding for housing... [and] 3.5 million new housing units [could be] built... by 2025.” Even in our own backyard, [Sutherland '19 of the Boston Herald](#) reports that “more than \$26 million of new funding will go toward... [affordable] housing... [in] Boston.”

Unfortunately, affirming reverses current progress in two ways.

Subpoint A is demanding demolitions.

[Becker '18 of the Star Tribune](#) explains that “to get new [market-rate] housing, we have to tear down old housing.” This is because the [NAA '17](#) reports that “America’s densest cities are running out of room for new housing,” so developers must demolish. Unfortunately, **Becker** concludes that “the most cost-effective housing to tear down is... affordable housing.”

For this reason, [Austen '18 of the New York Times](#) finds that “[to accommodate] market-rate owners... 250,000 public-housing units have been demolished [nationwide].” [Thrush '18 of the New York Times](#) corroborates, writing that “from 2001 to 2013, the number of... [market-rate] apartments... increased by 36 percent, while units for poor people shrank by... 10 percent.”

The impact is exacerbating poverty.

[Badger '14 of the Washington Post](#) finds that “since 2011...2,000 low-income units [in Chicago] ... [have turned] into high-end apartments where the rent costs twice as much,” displacing the poor. Unfortunately, [Desmond '15 of the Institute for Research on Poverty](#) adds that “renters... [who] move... [for] involuntary [reasons such as demolition are]... 25 percent more likely to experience long-term housing problems... [and] 20 percent more likely... [to] lose their job.”

Subpoint B is burdening renters.

[Chew '18 of Shelterforce](#) writes that “new... [market-rate housing] is overwhelmingly geared toward the luxury market.” Specifically, [Kusisto '15 of the Wall Street Journal](#) finds that “in... U.S. metropolitan areas, 82% [of rental units built are] in the luxury category... due... to the rising cost of land and construction.” Problematically, [Chong '17 of Georgetown Law](#) explains that “[as] poorer communities are... converted to high-end neighborhoods... [rent] prices increase [and] the original residents of the neighborhood are forced out.”

Fortunately, [Montejo '18 of UC Berkeley](#) explains that “rent control ... can stabilize rents for existing tenants, improve affordability for tenants in the future, and preserve the... [cost] of housing that may otherwise become unaffordable.” There is no good alternative, as she furthers that “rent control is... [the only] cost effective policy with immediate effects... [since it] can be established as a matter of law and... is typically paid for through modest per-unit fees.”

[Blumgart '15 of Pacific Standard](#) thus finds that “in Cambridge... 40 percent of covered tenants moved out of their apartments after the end of rent regulations... [since] rents... increased by 50 percent.” Overall, [Zuk '16 of UC Berkeley](#) concludes that “the effect of subsidized units in reducing... displacement [pressures]... [is] more than double the effect of market-rate units.”

There are two impacts.

First, driving up displacement.

Chew continues that “market-rate housing... is linked to... mass displacement of low-income residents... [since it raises] area rents and real estate taxes.” Moreover, [Lloyd '18 of Housing Wire](#) writes that “when the rent burden increases by 2 percentage points... 1,500 more people are driven to homelessness.” Unfortunately, [the NHCHC '16](#) explains that “for every age group, homeless persons are three times more likely to die than the general population.”

Second, increasing living costs.

Even if poorer renters aren’t displaced, [Warren '18 of Johns Hopkins University](#) explains that “[an increase] in rent burden is associated with 25% increased odds of experiencing material hardship... [such as a lack of] food [or] medical care,” drastically decreasing their lifespan.

As a result, [Fischer '16 of the CBPP](#) finds that “federal rental assistance... [has lifted] 4 million people [in America]... out of poverty.” [Erickson '18 of the Associated Press](#) corroborates, writing that “families living in affordable housing are able to dedicate nearly five times as much [money] to health care [and] a third more to food compared to those who are rent burdened.”

Thus, we negate.