**Unionville Negates**

**Our First Contention is A Spooky Sequester**

Choosing how to solve the debt is no easy task. Amadeo of the Balance in 2018 explains that in 2011, “**Republicans and Democrats couldn't agree on the best way to lower the deficit, [so] they used the threat of sequester to force themselves to reach an agreement. When they couldn't agree, the sequester kicked in.**” Politico explains in 2012 that a sequester is “**mandatory cuts to federal programs. Literally, the money is** **taken away from the federal agencies affected.**”

 Amadeo continues that “**[in] 2011, Congress passed the Budget Control Act to reduce spending through sequestration. [As a result,] The 2013 budget was never approved. Instead, Congress passed two resolutions [that] incorporated sequestration.**” Unfortunately, Martin of the Center for American Progress writes in 2015 that “**In 2013, sequestration made sudden across-the-board cuts that did not distinguish between critical programs and wasteful spending.**” If we try to solve the debt, it’s likely Congress will disagree on how. Currently, we still have yet to decide on a regular budget for this year and we remain in a government shutdown because of it. The inability of Congress to compromise is why sequesters are probable.

The cuts as a result of the sequesters are heavy hitting. Berg of the DailyBeast in 2013 reports that “**the sequester… would do even greater harm to the tens of millions of Americans already suffering from poverty, hunger, and food insecurity. 70,000 low-income children would be kicked off early childhood education, 125,000 families would risk losing housing. And 100,000 formerly homeless people would be removed from programs to prevent them from returning to the streets.**” Moreover, Vallas of the Center for American Progress finds in 2014 that “**Sequestration cost the U.S. economy as many as 1.6 million jobs**

**Our Second Contention is Going Green**

When you affirm, you prioritize debt reduction policies rather than economic growth policy. This means every debt reduction policy directly trades off with an economic growth policy, hurting our overall economic growth.

Growth in the US is imperative for the switch to renewables because it creates more wealth to be invested. Apergis of the International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy in 2014 studies 80 countries from 1990 to 2012 and finds that “**economic growth encourages the use of more renewable energy.**” He explains that “**In order to facilitate the expansion of the renewable energy sector, economic growth is vital in generating the resources needed for research and development of renewable energy technologies and corresponding infrastructure.**” This is why the International Monetary Fund in 2011 finds that “**an additional 1 percentage point of GDP growth should raise G[reen] I[nvestment] growth by about 4 percent in the long-run,**”

Increasing investment in the US is absolutely critical because Milman of the Guardian in 2016 reports that “**about 295,000 premature deaths [from air pollution] could be prevented in the country if** **the US reduce[s] its emissions by 40% by 2030.**” We’re already on our way. Kim of the MarketPlace writes in 2018 that“**by 2025 … The United States is on track to cut carbon emissions by 17 percent,** **And it could hit 24 percent.**”

But these benefits don’t just stay in the US. The US helps grow international renewable energy in two ways.

First is through collective growth. Kose of Vox in 2017 explains that “**Because of its size and interconnectedness, developments in the US economy have important effects around the world.**” This is why Coy of Bloomberg in 2018 finds “**the U.S. is largely responsible for keeping global growth at an even pace despite the slowdown of many other major economies.**” Arora of the Journal of Economic Integration quantifies that “**A 1 per cent increase in U.S. growth is correlated with a 1 percent increase in growth in other countries.**” A growing economy also helps developing countries make the switch. Sadorsky of York University in 2009 studies 18 emerging economies and finds “**a 1% increase in GDP per capita increases the consumption of renewable energy per capita in emerging economies [by]  3.4%**” He explains this increase, writing“**As countries grow and develop, so too do their energy needs. Balanced against this increase in energy demand are energy security issues and climate change.**”

Second is through technology diffusion. Brant of the World Intellectual Property Organization in 2014 finds that “**Clean technologies are developed and diffused globally on an ongoing basis. Technology transactions take place around the world, every day, in developed, [and] developing markets, through: product sales; collaboration and sharing of know-how; joint development; [and] equipment maintenance**”

Increasing global investment is essential as Radford of EcoWatch in 2017 writes “ **a fossil fuel phase-out would save up to 7 million lives each year.**”