Cinco RT PF Jan 2019 Blocks

A2 Neg

Can't Borrow Forever OV:

In the status quo the US is moving to unsustainable levels of debt,

Rutgers in 2018 finds that debt will soon reach unsustainable levels in the US when over 5% of the GDP and growth will be dedicated to servicing the debt and we tell you that will happen soon as by 2028 20% of federal revenue, over 900 billion dollars will be spent on interest.

This future uncertainty would cause investors to either demand higher interest rates or stop buying US bonds. In fact this trend is already materializing. Newsweek in 2018 finds that overall from 2008 to 2018 foreign owned debt has decreased by 12%, AND the WSJ furthers that in 2018 foreign purchasing has decreased by HALF over last year due to uncertainty over the deficit and rising costs of the dollar.

Overall Newsweek concludes that we cannot survive without high foreign participation with current deficit projections. **THIS IS WHY NEED TO REDUCE DEBT PEOPLE WON'T BAIL US OUT ANY MORE BY JUST LENDING US MORE MONEY FOREVER.**

If they ask For Where else they invest? Adler in 2018 finds that China for the first time is less risky investment for bonds compared to the US

A2 Econ growth solves for interest:

They give you the historical analysis, but there are 2 unique reasons as to why interest payments are now going to uniquely to be bad.

1st, is because this is the first time in US history we have increased spending at this rate and also drastically decreased our federal revenue due to things to like tax cuts, as interest rates rise and we get less money internally there will be more of a strain on the budget.

2nd, is because government programs are also projected to drastically increase their spending as medicaid and social security are predicted to become insolvent very soon, with the budget already being strained a rapid spike in interest would force the government to cut from other areas in order to avoid a default.

A/2: Any Decrease in HC

Turn: The Balance in 2018 writes the reinstating the Obamacare Mandate is crucial for debt reduction, and that it would reduce the debt by 143 billion dollars. This is crucial, as reinstating the mandate would save the 13 million people who are in danger of losing their HC due to rising premiums.

Contention One is saving Obamacare.

The New York Times in 2018 writes that the Republicans repealed the Tax Mandate within Obamacare, which penalized those who didn't purchase health insurance.

The Balance in 2018 writes that this Mandate is crucial for debt reduction, as they find that the Mandate actually would reduce the debt by 143 billion dollars.

Implementing the mandate back would not only reduce the debt, but stabilize the insurance markets, making insurance more affordable for the millions who cannot afford it right now or lost it due the the repeal of the mandate.

The BDN in 2017 concludes writing that without the mandate, 13 *million* people will lose their health insurance, and premiums will rise for the 100s of millions on health insurance right now.

A/2: Tech Industry

1. The Conversation in 2019 finds that in the status quo there is already a huge speculative bubble in the tech industry, with companies seeing huge amounts of speculative investments but negative returns. For example they find shares for apple and facebook have fallen by over 40% in the past few weeks, concluding that this could represent the eventual bubble pop. Indeed Forbes in 2018 finds that the current trend of the tech industry mirrors the 2000 tech boom crash.
   This a)turns their argument because growing the private sector just fuels more investment and speculation into the industry speeding up the burst of the bubble
   And b)delinks it because growth in the tech sector is coming to close as effects of the speculation kick in
2. The cuts to government will be worse later on a world where you wait and let interest rates rise up and then reduce the debt.
3. If you just increase funding for the tech industry does that not mean you automatically get all the great things they talk about, if apple got a lot of money they would just use that R&D to upgrade their product line not make life impacting advances.
4. Tax cuts have given a lot of new profit, so what new innovations and benefits have been made.
5. Link is super uncontextualized.

A/2: Reduction in debt--->recession

1. The PJ in 2019 finds that the last 4 recessions, have either been caused by overreaching by the FED or due to the pops in bubbles of certain industries, never has the balanced budget caused the recession.

A/2: Pass stimulus shit

The Day in 2018 writes that Trump and the GOP will not pass any stimulus package, no political probability.

2.Every recession afterwards we are so much better.

3.No recession now, no bailout because high debt.

4.Even if pass in both worlds comparatively, their is smaller because of political will.

Plus, whatever the actual cost, the Trump-led GOP seems poised to block greater spending during the next recession. National Economic Council Director Larry Kudlow opposed Barack Obama's major stimulus package in the last downturn. Outside adviser Stephen Moore recently counseled the president to "veto every spending bill headed his way between now and the 2020 election." Even if Trump ignores such guidance, the tea-party-influenced GOP, which has held onto control of the Senate, will probably have even less appetite for fiscal stimulus than it did in 2009 − when just three Republican senators and zero Republican representatives voted for the Recovery Act.

A/2: Only probable form of debt reduction is tax increases

1. The MIC in 2011 finds that the raising taxes in the US will not be able to effectively reduce the debt, this is because the US has a spending problem not a tax one. They find that even if you were able to boost taxes up as much as possible you still would not be able to cover projected spending. They conclude that rather than pushing for more tax reform we need more spending reform

A/2: Infrastructure

1.The issue isn't funding and negating won't solve. Plumer of Vox in 2015 writes the USFG has thrown mass amounts of funding towards infrastructure improvements. For instance, Obama's proposed $500 billion would of have done nothing, yet infrastructure conditions continue deteriorating. The problem is that most of the funding ends up misdirected towards areas which don't improve conditions. For instance, the SGA found most states generally spend federal dollars towards building new roads and highways rather than fixing the deteriorating ones. Negating doesn't change this.

2. The WSJ in 2019 finds the democrats initiative to build green infrastructure and lack of a clear consensus on how to fund the infra. Means the most politically probable thing to happen with the bill is just good ole' gridlock.

2 warrants

a) Politico in 2018 finds that even though infrastructure is something both parties want, the dems are pushing for huge climate change initiatives in any new infrastructure bill and Trump needs to appeal to these democrats if he wants support in the senate which will never happen.

b) The SSU in 2018 that there is no consensus on how to fund the infrastructure bill, the rising deficit and debt greatly limit the funding options for the bill and the implementation of the gas tax which is what has been proposed, hasn't been raised since 1993.

3. Politico in 2018 finds that this a terrible time for infrastructure, due to the fact that we are reaching max economic potential in the status quo and boost in the economy right now from infra. Would not create more jobs but rather move them round. Furthermore they find any new infrastructure plan would skyrocket the deficit, making the interest rate and debt problem worse.

4.Seq. also pulls investment and funding for infra. Programs that help the poor the most, that's why in 2013 over 100,000 families were pushed off housing vouchers. Prefer this over their vague impacts, because u know exactly where this funding goes.

5. City Lab in 2015 finds that the one key drivers of gentrification is the rise in public investment, as more funding towards schools and new transit increases the appeal of the community and brings in a rush of affluent gentrifiers. This rush of rich buyers pushes people out of the community and raises the price of housing. In fact, **Bluestone in 2010** reports that 74% of neighborhoods with new transit infrastructure saw rapid increases in rent prices; 88% of neighborhoods with new transit infrastructure saw rapid increases in home prices. When prices rise rapidly without income raising, people can no longer afford to live in the area and become displaced. Prefer impacting this subsect of the population as they are affected the most by fluctuations in their economic lifestyle and and pushed in long term poverty.

[Bluestone 10] 74% of neighborhoods with new transit infrastructure saw rapid increases in rent prices; 88% of neighborhoods with new transit infrastructure saw rapid increases in home prices

Barry Bluestone, Professor of Urban Studies at Northeastern University, "Maintaining Diversity In America's Transit-Rich Neighborhoods: Tools for Equitable Neighborhood Change," 10/2010, http://www.reimaginerpe.org/files/TRN_Equity_final(2).pdf. //AGA

This report is divided into four parts. The first chapter documents the diversity of the transit-served metropolitan areas and TRNs in the United States and explores the symbiotic relationship between diverse neighborhoods and successful transit. The second chapter reviews the most recent literature on neighborhood change, gentrification and displacement, both in general and in TRNs, and highlights the different ways in which gentrification can occur and the importance of understanding who moves into gentrifying neighborhoods. The third chapter presents the results of our new research on patterns of neighborhood change in 42 neighborhoods in 12 metropolitan areas first served by rail transit between 1990 and 2000, and draws conclusions about the likely mechanisms underlying the observed patterns of change in those neighborhoods. […] The average American family spends 19 percent of its monthly budget on transportation, the second highest item after housing. Using transit can create substantial savings: living in location-efficient neighborhoods (with a good mix of uses and access to public transportation) can provide a 16 percent cost savings compared to living in an automobile-dependent exurban neighborhood (CTOD, 2007). A recent Brookings Institution analysis similarly found that the working poor (those with incomes less than twice the federal poverty threshold, with a median income of $20,280 in 2003) spent 8.4 percent of their income just on commuting to work, if they commuted by driving, compared to 5.8 percent if they used public transit (Roberto, 2008). A final important group when assessing transit ridership is renters. With a disproportionate amount of rental housing located in transit-served metros and transit-rich neighborhoods, it should come as no surprise that renters are disproportionately represented among transit riders. While only 29 percent of all workers 16 years and older live in rental households, according to 2006-2008 American Community Survey data, 58 percent of those who report that they commute to work using public transportation are renters. A recent Brookings analysis of this data found that two-thirds of transit commuters in the principal cities of the 100 largest U.S. metropolitan areas, as well as more than 40 percent of those living in the suburban portions of those metros, are renters (Istrate, Puentes & Tomer, 2010). Like members of low-income households and people of color, renters are far less likely than homeowners to own a car. The 2006-2008 American Community Survey data indicates that while 95 percent of American homeowners own one or more motor vehicles, nearly 20 percent of renter households own no motor vehicle. Household Income (see Figure 3.4) While the racial and ethnic composition does not seem to have changed in any consistent way within the new TRNs, the economic composition of those neighborhoods did. Median household income increased more than in the surrounding metro area in more than three-fifths (62 percent) of the TRNs. The proportion of households with incomes exceeding $100,000 a year also rose more sharply than their metro areas in 60 percent of the TRNs. Housing Costs (see Figure 3.5) The increase in incomes in these neighborhoods is reflected in the cost of housing. *Median gross rent increased faster than in their metro areas in nearly three-quarters (74 percent) of the TRNs. The impact on home prices was even more dramatic, with nearly nine out of ten (88 percent) TRNs experiencing an increase in median housing values greater than the increase in home prices in the metro area.*

https://www.citylab.com/solutions/2015/02/americas-infrastructure-crisis-is-really-a-maintenance-crisis/385452/
-replace with this
-and this
http://www.governing.com/columns/smart-mgmt/col-why-this-is-year-begin-addressing-infrastructure-deficit.html

5.Turn this as infrastructure spending fuels gentrification of low-income neighborhoods. Delgadillo 17 finds that high-end infrastructure increases the pull factor of housing and causes the mass influx of higher-income families displacing the lower-income families.

7.Seq. also pulls investment and funding for infra. Programs that help the poor the most, that's why in 2013 over 100,000 families were pushed off housing vouchers. Prefer this over their vague impacts, because u know exactly where this funding goes.

https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-trump-bridges/crumbling-bridges-fret-not-america-its-not-that-bad-idUSKBN1FK0J0 -infra. Not that bad

Brad Plumer, 2-10-2015, "It doesn't matter how much we spend on infrastructure if it just gets wasted," Vox, https://www.vox.com/2015/2/10/8012211/infrastructure-crumbling-more-spending By now it's become a cliche to say that America's infrastructure is in disrepair. Cue that famous stat about how 24 percent of bridges are either structurally deficient or obsolete. With that in mind, many **politicians argue** that **the US needs to spend** a lot **more** money **on transportation**. President **Obama** has **proposed $478 billion over six years to upgrade** the nation's **roads, bridges, transit, and freight — a big bump from current levels.** The American Society of Civil Engineers wants to go further, asking for $1.6 trillion between now and 2020. But in many ways, calls for more money misdiagnose the problem. **One reason America's transportation infrastructure is faltering is that the considerable amount of money we *do* spend is often misdirected — leading to bloated costs and excessive sprawl while doing little to alleviate traffic congestion or deterioration.** Over at Streetsblog, Angie Schmitt recently wrote an excellent piece on this theme titled "More Money Won't Fix U.S. Infrastructure If We Don't Change How It's Spent." Her basic, crucial point is that **we don't pay nearly enough attention to where all this transportation money actually goes.** Take those "crumbling" roads and bridges we hear so much about. **Right now, the federal government kicks about $50 billion a year to state transportation agencies — with roughly 80 percent going toward roads and highways (another fifth goes to public transit).** Surely that should fix the problem? Except that, **historically, states have used the majority of their money to build brand-new roads and**

highways rather than fix their existing ones. Between 2009 and 2011, Smart Growth America found, states spent 55 percent of road funds on new construction — even though this represents just 1 percent of the overall system. (The amounts vary by state: North Dakota tilts heavily toward repairs, whereas Mississippi mostly focused on new building.) The remaining 45 percent of funds went to fix the other 99 percent of roadways. If all these new roads were beneficial, that might make sense. But, as Schmitt points out, that's not always the case. One study by the Center for American Progress found that 50 percent of US roads don't even generate enough traffic to pay for themselves in gas taxes. With driving on the decline and the National Highway System reaching the end of its natural lifespan, there's a good argument for devoting more scarce resources to repairing the expensive and dilapidated system we already have. Back in 2011, UCLA economist Matthew Kahn and the University of Minnesota's David Levinson made the case that Congress should devote most or even all federal gas-tax revenue toward repairs (and set up a separate infrastructure bank for new projects). For starters, they note that the productivity gains from expanding the road system were huge back in the 1950s, but those returns have diminished over time. Meanwhile, there's a good economic case for focusing on repairs. Poor road conditions are a "significant factor" in one-third of all traffic fatalities and cause extra wear-and-tear on cars. What's more, because of how pavement deteriorates, it'

Natalie **Delgadillo**, 9-28-**2017**, "How Cities Can Protect Poor People and Minorities From Climate Change," **Governing**,
http://www.governing.com/topics/transportation-infrastructure/gov-climate-change-environmental-justice-cap-report.html
To that end, the report recommends measures like a Washington, D.C., job training program, D.C. Water Works, which is meant to boost efforts to hire locally for D.C. Water's biggest projects. It's a dual win, CAP says: While the city makes itself more resilient to climate change, it's also helping residents do the same. **The report also mentions affordable housing and the serious equity problems that can result from city efforts to increase sustainable infrastructure. As neighborhoods become more "green," they tend to become more desirable to middle- and upper-income residents and displace the low-income residents originally living there**. Los Angeles' Measure JJJ is an example of what cities can do to mitigate these problems. The measure set affordable housing mandates for new developments near public transit and set local hiring standards for developers and construction companies building new units. Perhaps most crucially, the report stresses the importance of outreach and communication with low-income and minority communities. "These people know what a hot day feels like, they know what a flood looks like, they know they're vulnerable," says Kelly. "They're in the best position to identify risks and offer solutions."

https://www.wsj.com/articles/you-call-that-infrastructure-11546560801
-more prob. Stuff

https://www.politico.com/newsletters/morning-transportation/2018/12/21/trump-drags-infrastructure-into-wall-debate-463006 - more prob stuff

https://www.americanthinker.com/articles/2018/01/an_alternative_to_federal_infrastructure_investment.html
https://www.vox.com/2015/2/10/8012211/infrastructure-crumbling-more-spending

https://www.washingtonpost.com/powerpost/schumer-pelosi-want-climate-change-measures-in-any-infrastructure-deal-with-trump/2018/12/07/62aa868a-fa20-11e8-863c-9e2f864d47e7_story.html
https://www.politico.com/story/2018/12/07/democrats-climate-change-infrastructure-sch

A/2: Economy reduces the national debt

1. Just isn't true. NPR finds that in the 3rd quarter the US economy had a growth rate of 3% and is on set to reach the fastest annual growth in 13 years, however at the same time the national debt, and deficit spending has reached an all time high. Even if there is economic growth, if the US government passes legislation that only increases the debt it will always outpace incoming revenue from growth.
2. You can turn it. The evidence from our case says that the high growth right now is causing the fed to increase interest rates, further increasing growth would only cause interest rates to rise and thus also increase the cost to service our debt. This is why the AEI in 2018 finds that economic growth only leads to vicious cycle of higher rates and payments concluding that we need to fiscally reconstruct our budget and not promote economic growth in order to reduce the debt.
3. Quartz in 2018 finds Trump tax cuts increasing the debt to gdp right now.

A/2: Tax bad for Small buisn.

First, mitigate their impact. Washington Post in 2018 writes that the tax laws they talk about only affect 2.5% of all small businesses. Not a huge impact on scope.

Second, delink. Washington Post, internally citing a CBO study in 2018, finds that the argument that tax hikes would prevent people from hiring more people is false, because increasing after tax income doesn't create an incentive to hire more workers insofar as the need for more production doesn't increase as well.

Third, delink. It's not the "small firms" that matter but rather the "young firms". The Washington Post in 2018 writes that there is no relationship between the size of a firm and job growth, rather finding that helping small businesses manifest into long term sustainable firms is more important. More crucially, they conclude that tax cuts for the rich don't affect young firms anyways, meaning that

they don't link into job growth or helping small businesses. The impact of small businesses comes from specifically the young firms, and these aren't helped in their world.

Fourth turn. Their argument is that tax increases would decrease economic growth. But this is historically not true, and in fact looking at the past the opposite is true. The Washington Post in 2018 writes that job creation and economic growth was higher in 1993 after tax hikes rather than 2001 when taxes were lowered.

Prefer out analysis over theirs because it compares both worlds in the past.

A/2: Seq. budgets

1. Remember the case weighing we do with our second contention, yes these cuts are very bad but would be many times worse down the line when we end up having nothing to pay for these programs at all. We outweigh on the timeframe of their impact being magnitudes bigger in their world later.
2. https://www.fep.up.pt/investigacao/cef.up/WIP_Seminars/Seminar_21_10_2011_Miguel%20Viegas/empiricalpaper.pdf - this says that in the EU every country that fiscally consolidated aka sequestered had postitive welfare benefits

This says cutting deficits the right way by reducing spending is the best path as it doesn't hurt the economy, does a long term study over 25 countries, very good ev
https://voxeu.org/article/cut-deficits-cutting-spending

These shit straight delinks all sequestring shit:
https://www.usatoday.com/story/opinion/2015/09/20/sequestration-not-about-guns-v-butter-column/72255542/

A/2: Debt--->influence interest rates

A/2: IMF weighing

1. The Brookings Institution in 2015 finds a lot of problems with this analysis.
   First, it makes incorrect underlying assumptions about the relationship between debt and economic growth and thus underestimates the impact. In fact a previous IMF study found that debt had a significant effect on economic growth and a CBO projection found a 20% percent increase in GDP to debt ratio would decrease economic growth by 2%.
   Second, it doesn't take into account interest rates
   Third, does not' account for alt. Ways to increase budget without harming everyone

A/2: Foreign Aid gets cut

. The Gallup 2018 finds not

Next, I'm going to read a list of problems facing the country. For each one, please tell me if you personally worry about this problem a great deal, a fair amount, only a little or not at all? How much do you personally worry about federal spending and the budget deficit?

	Great deal	Fair amount	Only a little	Not at all	No opinion
	%	%	%	%	%
2018 Mar 1-8	51	26	15	7	1
2017 Mar 1-5	49	27	16	7	1
2014 Mar 6-9 ^	58	22	14	6	--
2013 Mar 7-10	61	23	11	4	1
2012 Mar 8-11	60	21	15	3	1
2011 Mar 3-6	64	23	8	4	1

Second, delink. The Economist writes that Trump literally signed a budget that increased foreign aid. Pref actions over words.

First, delink. The Borgen Report in 2018 finds that Cutting Foreign Aid won't actually reduce the debt, meaning even if politicians want to cut it they can only link into fiated actions that actually do reduce the debt a substantial amount

Second, Foreign Policy in 2016 writes that 6 pieces of bipartisan aid legislation has passed, providing aid for things like water, energy, and food sustainability. Literally these measures were backed by Mike Pence. This stuff is too bipartisan, it ain't gonna get cut. It also says that Trump is likely to embrace this bipartisan approach. We are good.

Third, the US would get huge ass backlash for just all of a sudden pulling out aid for some of the poorest countries in the world.

Fourth, the cuts are gonna be a lot worse later on as per the CBO evidence`/
;e.

But then on the impact, three turns.

1. **Turn.** Gryting of the Global Anticorruption Blog in 2017 explains[1] that 76% of current foreign aid goes to corrupt nations. That's bad because Murray of the Policy Center for Policy Analysis in 2013 explains[2] that additional revenue to corrupt nations worsens the conditions of their people and turns into a backdoor source funding for the arms trade.
2. **Turn.** Layton of Brigham Young University in 2008 explains[3] that after controlling for all other factors increases with foreign aid is associated with income inequality, because foreign aid mostly helps the rich rather than the poor.
3. **Turn.** Rajan of the National Bureau of Economic Research in 2005 finds[4] in a empirical analysis that an increase of aid of 1% of GDP decreases economic growth by 0.1% per year. Prefer this evidence over our opponents because it checks for long term growth, while theirs only looks at short term growth.

---

[1] https://globalanticorruptionblog.com/2017/01/13/the-aid-corruption-paradox-how-should-the-u-s-allocate-foreign-aid/

Unfortunately, it seems that in practice, the U.S. does not balance necessity with efficacy, and instead prioritizes a third consideration: self-interest. Studies have found that less corrupt governments do not end up receiving more foreign aid. Even worse, a study by Easterly shows that the high percentage of corrupt countries that receive aid from the U.S. is not actually explained by the fact that these are the poorest countries. Easterly showed that 76% of the U.S.'s aid went to corrupt countries while only 29% of its aid went to the least developed countries. Perhaps some citizens may believe that the U.S.'s focus on self-interest is justified, preferring their tax dollars to have at least tangential benefits to Americans.

[2] http://www.ncpathinktank.org/pub/bg167

There are also the costs from the redistribution of payments from the Authority to governments of developing countries. Many of these governments are less than savory, and traditional aid funds or revenues from existing natural resources are already being channeled into the pockets of the governing class and used to keep them in power. An additional revenue stream from the Authority would further cement their positions and worsen the condition of their peoples, further suppressing global growth. Add to this the aforementioned risk of allocating funds to separatist or terrorist organizations, which could turn the Authority into a backdoor source of funding for the arms trade. Thus, if the Authority works in the way it is constituted, it would represent a perverse cost to the poorest people in the world.

[3] https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1173&context=sigma

The newly developed database offoreign aid loans (PLAID) provides data on the independent variable, and the Gini coefficient is used as the measure of the dependent variable. In addition, we control for eight separate causes of income inequality. The study includes two panel datasets including 169 observations from twenty:four countries. To account for limitations in the DLS, we used a Feasible Generalized Least Squared (FGLS) model. The results suggest that a highly substantive relationship exists between foreign aid and inequality, although the efj(!Cts may be subject to endogeneity. Holding all things constant, this .finding shows that while aid may help the poor, it clearly benefits the rich more

[4] http://www.nber.org/papers/w11513.pdf

The results are quite clear. In all four cases, the estimated aid coefficient is negative, and statistically significant at conventional levels in three (1960-2000, 1970-2000, and 1980- 2000). The magnitude in these cases suggests that an increase in aid of 1 percentage point of GDP is correlated with lower long-run growth of approximately 0.1 percentage points per year.

A/2: Clinton borrowing

1. Quartz in 2018 writes that household debt is literally at an all time high of 13 trillion in the status quo, a)alt. Causes to just debt b)This means the bubble is already extremely big, gonna blow up anyways so at best accelerating the trend,
2. Whelan of Forbes in 2012 writes that what drove the unsustainable asset bubble under clinton was high housing prices and also ownership which is why under Bush who ballooned the deficits private debt also drastically increased.
3. Voting aff is comparatively, because the cbo evidence finds that bringing the debt down to sustainable levels is gonna cost a lot more of gdp later over 50% more, tax cuts worse later on.
4. Link should have materialized in 2000, it didn't why??

A/2: Shift to riskier investment

1. Hedge investors why shift to risky
2. https://business.financialpost.com/news/economy/beware-the-mother-of-all-credit-bubbles- already a huge ass gigantic corporate debt bubble
3. Recession coming already, side that best pulls us out
4. Make this one faster but every single one after this wre are bettet

A/2: Trump Proposed to cut stuff

1. The Atlantic in 2018 finds that Trump always puts cuts into his budget proposals in multiple programs across the government, but lawmakers always ignore his budget proposals and his push to cut certain parts of the budget
2. The Washington Post in 2018 historically and not just under Trump budget proposals never get passed, they are just political ploys.

A/2: Reducing the debt increased the debt

1. The NTU finds that prioritizing reducing the debt under the budget control act in 2013 saved over 1.9 trillion dollars, prefer what has actually happened in the US before when we have reduced debt.
2. The Huffington Post in 2013 finds that europe went through the wrong fiscal policy at the wrong time, instead of expanding their budget deficit they used fiscally austerity during the recession which made their economies go further into decline. The US is not in a recession but rather in a boom, the economy can take cuts in spending and not see the debt increase in the long term.

A/2: Print More money solves for debt

1. Investors would be spooked if we do this, seen examples of hyperinflation all around the world.
2. MarketWatch in 2016, we tried in the past to pay for things like vietnam war but it caused inflation, interest goes to countries and also investors, who will invest into other goods.
3. The NYmag finds the theory that says we can just print money for everything MMT, also says that when an economy is at or near full capacity like we are at now would require large tax hikes to reduce inflation. They find these tax hikes would be especially hard to carry out and would never happen.
4. Marketwatch in 2018 writes that both parties really hate MMT and thus zero probability of it being used anytime soon.

https://www.garynorth.com/public/7028.cfm

A/2: No political will for stim.

1. Thinkprogress in 2011 finds that 85% of all house republicans supported stim. Package under bush.