Atharva and I negate the resolution.

Contention one is foreign aid.

Prioritizing debt reduction will always create spending cuts as **Romer '11** explains that "Republicans… insist that higher taxes would… do… long-term damage [so it is] better to cut federal spending." Furthermore, **Amadeo '18** explains that "tax increases… often end a politician's career," so they will always prefer spending cuts.

Unfortunately, foreign aid is first on the chopping block when budgets get cut because it makes the most sense politically.

Rampell '17 reports that "46 percent [of voters believe that]… foreign aid contributes a great deal to government debt, whereas only 18 percent… [think] the same about Medicare." Thus, **Natsios '17** explains that "when federal spending must be cut, the least painful reductions politically are in the foreign-affairs budget, because the immediate pain is felt by people who do not vote in American elections."

Precedent exists, as **Patrick '11** finds that even with a Democratic House majority, "The U.S. debt ceiling and deficit debate… led… the House Foreign Affairs committee… [to approve an] authorization bill… that included over $6 billion in [foreign aid] cuts."

The impact is preventing humanitarian crises.

U.S aid is critical to stabilizing countries around the world. **McCarthy '17** explains that "through foreign aid, the US has helped stabilize… failed states [such as] Kosovo, Cambodia, and Lebanon." Indeed, **Gates '17** finds that "[US aid programs helped] political instability and violent activity in African countries… [drop] 40 percent between 2004 and 2015."

This is becoming increasingly important, as **D'Aleio '18** predicts that "By 2030, 60 percent of the world's poor will be concentrated in fragile states" continuing that "the United States was the largest donor to fragile states in 2016."

Moreover, **Khazan '17** explains that "[aid cuts]… would mean [that]… 3 million people would be left without access to… HIV/AIDS treatment and 3 million children would be at higher risk of malnutrition." Furthermore, **Sieff '17** finds that "American food donations [alone] reach 1.3 million people every month and have saved lives and helped to avert famine."

Contention two is uplifting the poor.

Prioritizing economic growth over debt reduction creates jobs in two ways.

First, encouraging employment.

Pettinger '16 finds that "[under] economic growth, firms tend to employ more workers." The **IMF '16** explains that this is because "[companies] will not increase their capacity to produce [goods if demand is low]," like during periods of low growth.

Indeed, the **IMF** concludes that "[economic growth] accounts for over 70 percent of… employment in… the U.S," and **Amadeo '18** finds that "healthy economic growth… between 2 and 3 percent… will create… 150,000 jobs per month."

Second, infrastructure investment.

McBride '18 finds that "the nation's infrastructure… [is] exhibiting significant deterioration with a strong risk of failure." Thus, the **ASCE '13** writes that "if the… nation's infrastructure… [is not addressed] by 2020, the economy is expected to lose… 3.5 million jobs."

Fortunately, **Puzzanghera '18** reports that "infrastructure is one of the only areas of agreement among President Trump, congressional Republicans, and Democrats." **Weaver '19** corroborates that "for the first time… in decades, there is really a consensus that infrastructure [and]… infrastructure policy… need to be [seriously] addressed."

Problematically, infrastructure investment is impossible when prioritizing debt reduction as **Mattson-Teig '18** explains that "The biggest [obstacle for investment] is… pressure to reign in federal spending." Indeed, **Puzzanghera** quantifies that "the estimated cost [of infrastructure investment] is as much as $4.6 trillion through 2025."

Critically, **Bourbon '18** writes that "investment in widespread infrastructure improvement would create jobs [and] raise wages… which is key to eradicating hunger and poverty." **Needham '14** quantifies, "[infrastructure investment would create] 1.3 million jobs over the next 15 years… and… increase… [wages]… per household by … $4,400 by 2030."

The impact is reducing poverty.

Stein '18 writes that "40 million Americans live in poverty and 18.5 million Americans live in extreme poverty." Crucially, **Karniani '11** writes that "the best way to alleviate poverty is to increase the income of the poor by providing productive employment," since “labor is the main resource that most poor people are endowed with.”

Indeed, **Roemer ‘97** finds that "an increase in… GDP growth… [translates to a] one-for-one increase in [growth rate of] average incomes [for] the poorest 40%." Unemployment itself also has serious consequences, as **Shor ‘11** finds that "unemployment… increases the risk of [death] by 63 percent."

Thus, we negate.