

Wayland Negates

We observe that The U.S debt is effectively limitless as [O'Brien explains in 2013](#) that "We can, and in fact have borrowed forever."

This is for 2 reasons

First, [Reagan explains in 2018](#) explains that "The U.S. Treasury is continuously raising the debt ceiling to meet the federal government's borrowing needs" [Davis furthers in 2019](#) that "[On their first day in office the Democrats passed a rule that automatically raises the debt ceiling once the House passes a budget."

Second, [Tully '18](#) explains that "the dollar [has a] central role in the global economy... [as] foreign nations park their earnings in dollars [and during times of] global crisis, investors and governments seek... treasuries and other dollar assets as a safe haven."

Indeed, even if the national debt was a problem, the [HBC '17](#) finds that "for every 0.1 percentage point of higher real economic growth, deficit levels could be reduced by roughly \$270 billion," meaning that the best way to solve it is by negating.

Our first contention is protecting the poor.

Prioritizing economic growth prevents social program cuts.

Reducing the debt is harmful because it would require deep cuts since our debt is so high. Problematically, as [Taylor in 2018](#) finds that "the deficit hit 804 billion this year and will permanently break 1 trillion in 2020 unless Congress cuts spending." Critically, [Zelizer in 2017](#) observes that "the GOP wants to cut federal healthcare and anti-poverty programs because of the deficit, while the right usually encounters backlash whenever they try to attack the existing federal benefits, cutting budgets in the name of debt reduction offers a less toxic mechanism for achieving the same goal." [The CBPP in 2017](#) confirms, finding that "Republicans want to cut health programs by 30% by 2027, and cut food stamps and anti-poverty programs by 15%." After a surplus is reached, funds will be reallocated to paying off the debt, further exacerbating these severe costs.

The impact is lives.

[CBPP](#) explains that "the proposed 104 billion dollar cuts to food stamps would cut 4 million people off." [The CBPP](#) finds that "federal funding cuts for Medicaid and a repealed individual

mandate would lead to a total coverage loss of over 20 million." This is deadly as [Guardian](#) finds in 2017 that "being uninsured leads to a 40% increase in the risk of death."

Our second contention is bailing out the economy

[Long of the Washington Post](#) reports last month, "the U.S will likely enter a recession come 2020, the worst economic outlook since November 2008." In fact, [Riddle of the New York Post](#) warns that "if mishandled, this crisis could be worse than the Great Depression." During recessions, the government promotes economic growth with bailouts to failing businesses and struggling households. However, [Fletcher explains in 2009](#) that "The money [for a bailout] would be borrowed, adding a huge sum to the federal deficit." Indeed, he continues that the bailout passed after the 2008 recession cost upwards of a trillion dollars." Thus affirming the resolution and prioritizing reducing the federal debt over programs like bailouts to promote economic growth would leave the U.S defenceless in the face of the next recession.

The Impact is a worse recession

Historically, [Coppola of Forbes](#) reports in 2018 that, "Europe's prioritization of reducing the debt over growing the economy prevented critical government action during the 2008 recession, causing a decade-long economic slump with double digit unemployment, throwing away an entire generation's future in the name of balanced budgets."

[Mathewes of Princeton](#) quantifies in 2015, "without bailouts in 2008, the recession would've lasted twice as long, growth would've been 10% lower, and unemployment would've increased by 6%, leaving 8.5 million more people unemployed."

U.S recession inevitably spreads to the rest of the world as [Evans '09](#) empirically finds that "[the 2008 recession] reversed a 20-year decline in world poverty... [pushing] 90 million [into poverty] in 2009, [increasing in global poverty rates by 6%]." Problematically, [Vergel '09](#) explains that "the world's poorest [are] [hit hardest] by... recession... [because of spiking oil and food prices]."

Thus, We Negate