

We negate Resolved: The United States federal government should prioritize reducing the federal debt over promoting economic growth.

### **Contention One is Stimulus Packages.**

The [New York Times in 2018](#) writes that due to the huge debt bubbles in student loans and risky investments, the next recession is closing in.

In response, the government passes huge economic stimulus packages that help the economy recover.

These packages are extremely effective, as [Stone of US news in 2015](#) writes that without proper federal responses the 2008 recession would have been more 3x worse, 2x longer, and would've raised unemployment significantly higher.

Unfortunately affirming would prevent this policy.

[Sahadi of CNN in 2009](#) finds that the stimulus package that helped the US from the great recession was funded mainly by taking on large amounts of debt.

However this sudden increase in debt to fund a new package would be impossible when you affirm because now the US is forced to crack down on the rising debt and de-prioritize initiatives that boost economic activity, such as stimulus packages.

This is crucial as, the [Huffington Post in 2017](#) concludes any recession in the US affects the global economy which is why the [IZA in 2010](#) finds the 2008 recession put 64 million people into poverty around the world. The slower we recover the slower the world recovers.

### **Contention Two is drastic measures.**

Because the national debt is so high, any measure to reduce the debt would be drastic in nature.

Unfortunately, these extreme measures hurt the poor significantly.

This happens in 2 specific ways,

The first is through top down tax hikes,

These taxes devastate small businesses, because

[Rich of Forbes in 2012](#) finds that even though the top tier of the US only accounts for 3.5% of total taxpayers, they account for 53% of all small business income in the US.

This is why the [The NFIB in 2013](#) empirically concludes that Obama's proposed tax increases in 2012 would have decreased economic productivity by \$200 billion dollars and wages by 1.8%, and led to the loss of 710,000 jobs.

The second is through an expansion of Sequestration measures.

When politicians need to reduce debt, but cannot agree on what to cut, Sequestration measures come in place. Sequestration measures are across the board cuts in spending.

The [New York Times in 2013](#) finds that the latest sequester measures were set to cut 85 billion dollars from the US federal budget cutting significant funding to things such as medicare and crucial relief programs.

These cuts in crucial areas impacted the poor the hardest. [Friedman of the Guardian in 2013](#) writes that 80% of the cuts in the sequestration in 2013 came from discretionary spending, which provides low income families with crucial aid and support.

He found that the Sequester had cut housing assistance for over 100 thousand families, cut welfare benefits for 3.8 million unemployed citizens, and cut over 750 thousand jobs.

### **Contention three is Infrastructure spending.**

In the status quo America's infrastructure is rapidly aging and deteriorating.

[The Conversation in 2017](#) furthers that even though the US is high in infrastructure development, it is falling behind other developing countries in terms of resiliency and sustainability, concluding the US must increase infrastructure investment by over 2 trillion dollars over the next 10 years in order to combat these problems.

Fortunately a solution is coming soon.

[Mann of the Wall Street Journal in 2018](#) writes that in the past Trump's infrastructure bill has failed to get enough support to pass. In response however, he has been looking to increase federal funding for the bill in an effort to muster support from the democrats.

Mann concludes that there are signs favoring a deal with the democrats in order to get the bill passed.

[The Hill in 2018](#) furthers that high ranking officials report that a new infrastructure bill is a top priority of Dems next year and are hopeful legislation will pass.

The [TTNews](#) yesterday reports that even with the government shutdown and the wall, infrastructure remains extremely bipartisan, with top Democrats, Republicans, and Trump have all expressed their willingness to work together on a comprehensive bill for funding.

However, by affirming, the US government is forced to prioritize the rising debt over economic growth and stop any infrastructure bill that would likely raise the deficit.

This is crucial as rotting infrastructure is destroying America.

[Mccarty of Forbes in 2017](#) that if funding gaps in infrastructure aren't filled the US will lose over 4 trillion in GDP and over 2.5 million jobs by 2025.

Furthermore, [Rouda of the Hill](#) last month furthers without increased infrastructure funding, every US household will lose \$3,400 annually due to infrastructure deficiencies, pushing millions into poverty.

#### **Contention 4 is Education Spending.**

[TSM in 2018](#) writes that a bipartisan bill including 71 Billion dollars for Education spending has recently been passed in the Senate, a large part of which are for Title 1 Grants for Low Income schools.

[The New York Times in 2018](#) writes that in the long term, sending more money to low-income schools see significant academic improvements. In fact, they find that more recent studies show the effect is nearly double per dollar than usual estimates.

There are two key impacts.

The first is boosting the economy. [The Atlantic in 2018](#) writes that if we bring American students up to basic mastery of content we would see 32 trillion dollar benefit to the economy. The Atlantic concludes that any cost in investment in education would be easily outweighed by the economic benefit.

The Second is lifting kids out of poverty. A Policy Brief from [Northwestern University in 2018](#) writes that Low Income Students benefit the most from increased educational spending, finding that they are 10% more likely to graduate from high school, 13% more likely to have higher wages when they graduate, and thus overall 6% less likelier to live in poverty.

Now, is the time to act. Thus, we negate.

Neg Fire Shit:

<https://www.ttnews.com/articles/trump-congress-eye-possibility-infrastructure-bill-2019>

-sub in for infra. prob

<https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2018-12-21/mattis-resigns-and-puts-trump-s-presidency-in-peril>

<https://www.investors.com/news/us-national-debt-spirals-washington-budget-deficit-spending/>

<https://thehill.com/opinion/campaign/422797-how-democrats-can-claim-infrastructure-immigration-as-the-ir-issues>

<https://www.cfr.org/backgrounders/state-us-infrastructure>

<https://money.cnn.com/2016/03/16/investing/us-debt-dumped-foreign-governments-china/index.html>

-always econmic fluctuations as to why they dump

<https://theweek.com/articles/747998/national-debt-explained>

<https://theweek.com/articles/811752/how-paul-ryan-inadvertently-rescued-treasuries>

-paying off debt bad kills bonds

<https://www.cbsnews.com/news/u-s-national-debt-interest-costs-are-about-to-skyrocket-does-it-matter/>

-interest rates porp. Higher duringt the 1990s

[Laura of Fortune in 2018](#) writes that there is a “near certainty” that the economy falls into a recession in 2020 as a result of global jitters, heightened political tensions, and the actions of the federal reserve.

#### **Contention 4 is Education Spending.**

[TSM in 2018](#) writes that a bipartisan bill including 71 Billion dollars for Education spending has recently been passed in the Senate, a large part of which are for Title 1 Grants for Low Income schools.

[The New York Times in 2018](#) writes that in the long term, sending more money to low-income schools see significant academic improvements. In fact, they find that more recent studies show the effect is nearly double per dollar than usual estimates.

There are two key impacts.

The first is boosting the economy. [The Atlantic in 2018](#) writes that if we bring American students up to

basic mastery of content we would see 32 trillion dollar benefit to the economy. The Atlantic concludes that any cost in investment in education would be easily outweighed by the economic benefit.

The Second is lifting kids out of poverty. A Policy Brief from [Northwestern University in 2018](#) writes that Low Income Students benefit the most from increased educational spending, finding that they are 10% more likely to graduate from high school, 13% more likely to have higher wages when they graduate, and thus overall 6% less likelier to live in poverty.

[Thomas of CNBC in 2017](#) writes that the American Society of Civil Engineers gave the US's infrastructure grade an overall grade of D+.

<https://thehill.com/hilltv/rising/421054-dem-rep-hopeful-house-will-pass-infrastructure-plan-early-next-year-prob>

<https://www.wsj.com/articles/trump-administration-to-try-again-to-fulfill-infrastructure-pledge-1543762800>

<https://www.cnbc.com/2018/12/10/trump-meets-with-pelosi-and-schumer-about-border-wall-and-shutdown.html>

-pelosi talk about infras.

<https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2013/feb/27/budget-sequester-will-have-serious-economic-impact>

Squo debt inc.

[https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/economy/trump-calls-for-5-percent-spending-cut-in-some-programs/2018/10/17/112ce5a8-d236-11e8-b2d2-f397227b43f0\\_story.html](https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/economy/trump-calls-for-5-percent-spending-cut-in-some-programs/2018/10/17/112ce5a8-d236-11e8-b2d2-f397227b43f0_story.html)

-more recent but kinda worse on what trump wants

Sequs

Debt inc → only way to reduce debt is to take drastic austerity / tax hikes → hurt the poor & don't solve the problem

Tax hikes 1) hurt small businesses / 2) hurt poor

Sequester 1) hurt poor bc poor programs cut 2) slow down economic growth / productivity

US reliant on high deficit spending

